

Lectures on Ordinal Analysis *

Toshiyasu Arai (University of Tokyo, JAPAN)

The lecture rely on the followings, especially on starred ones.

- [Buchholz75] W. Buchholz, Normalfunktionen und konstruktive Systeme von Ordinalzahlen. In: Diller, J., Müller, G. H. (eds.) *Proof Theory Symposium Keil 1974*, Lect. Notes Math. vol. 500, pp. 4-25, Springer (1975)
- [Buchholz92]* W. Buchholz, A simplified version of local predicativity, in *Proof Theory*, eds. P. H. G. Aczel, H. Simmons and S. S. Wainer (Cambridge UP,1992), pp. 115–147.
- [Buchholz00]* W. Buchholz, Review of the paper: A. Setzer, Well-ordering proofs for Martin-Löf type theory, *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 6 (2000) 478-479.
- [Jäger82]* G. Jäger, Zur Beweistheorie der Kripke-Platek Mengenlehre über den natürlichen Zahlen, *Archiv f. math. Logik u. Grundl.*, 22(1982), 121-139.
- [Jäger83]* G. Jäger, A well-ordering proof for Feferman's theory T_0 , *Archiv f. math. Logik u. Grundl.*, 23(1983), 65-77.
- [Rathjen94]* M. Rathjen, Proof theory of reflection, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 68 (1994) 181–224.
- [Rathjen05b] M. Rathjen, An ordinal analysis of parameter free Π_2^1 -comprehension, *Arch. Math. Logic* 44 (2005) 263-362.
- (An ordinal analysis of set theory) [Jäger82]*.
- (Operator controlled derivations) A streamlined technique introduced in [Buchholz92]*, and its extension in [Rathjen94]*.
- (Shrewd cardinals) [Rathjen05b]
- (Well-foundedness proofs) Distinguished classes are introduced in [Buchholz75]. I have learnt it in [Jäger83]* and its improved version in [Buchholz00]*.

*This is a lecture notes for a mini-course in Department of Mathematics, Ghent University, 14 Mar.-25 Mar. 2023. I'd like to thank A. Weiermann and F. Pakhomov for the hospitality during my stay in Gent, Belgium.

Plan

1. $KP\omega$
2. Rathjen's analysis of Π_3 -reflection
Well-foundedness proof in $K\Pi_3$ (skipped)
3. First-order reflection
4. First-order reflection (contd.)
5. Π_1^1 -reflection
6. Π_1^1 -reflection (contd.)
7. Π_1^1 -reflection (contd.)
8. Π_1 -collection
9. Π_1 -collection (contd.)

An ordinal α is said to be *recursive* iff there exists a recursive (computable) well ordering on ω of type α . ω_1^{CK} (*Church-Kleene* ω_1) denotes the least non-recursive ordinal.

- Definition 0.1**
1. $Prg[\prec, U] :\Leftrightarrow \forall x[\forall y \prec x(y \in U) \rightarrow x \in U]$
(U is *progressive* with respect to \prec).
 2. $TI[\prec, A] :\Leftrightarrow Prg[\prec, A] \rightarrow \forall x A(x)$ for formulas $A(x)$, and
 $TI[\prec, U] \Leftrightarrow Prg[\prec, U] \rightarrow \forall x U(x)$ (transfinite induction on \prec).
 3. Let \prec be a computable strict partial order on ω . If \prec is well-founded, then let $|n|_\prec := \sup\{|m|_\prec + 1 : m \prec n\}$, and $|\prec| := \sup\{|n|_\prec + 1 : n \in \omega\}$ (the order type of \prec). Otherwise let $|\prec| := \omega_1^{CK}$.

Definition 0.2 For a theory T comprising elementary recursive arithmetic EA the *proof-theoretic ordinal* $|T|$ of T is defined by

$$|T| := \sup\{|\prec| : T \vdash TI[\prec, U] \text{ for some recursive well order } \prec\} \quad (1)$$

where U is a fresh predicate constant.

Now, most brutally speaking, the aim of the ordinal analysis is to compute and/or describe the proof-theoretic ordinals of natural theories, thereby measuring the proof-theoretic strengths of theories with respect to Π_1^1 -consequences.

1 Ordinal analysis of KP_ω

1.1 Kripke-Platek set theory

A fragment KP of Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory ZF , Kripke-Platek set theory, is introduced. Let $\mathcal{L}_{set} = \{\in, =\}$ be the set-theoretic language. In this section we deal only with set-theoretic models $\langle X; \in \upharpoonright (X \times X) \rangle$, and the model is identified with the sets X .

Definition 1.1 ($\Delta_0, \Sigma_1, \Pi_2, \Sigma$)

1. A set-theoretic formula is said to be a Δ_0 -formula if every quantifier occurring in it is *bounded* by a set. *Bounded quantifiers* is of the form $\forall x \in u, \exists x \in u$.
2. A formula of the form $\exists x A$ with a Δ_0 -matrix A is a Σ_1 -formula. Its dual $\forall x A$ is a Π_1 -formula.
3. The set of Σ -formulas [Π -formulas] is the smallest class including Δ_0 -formulas, closed under positive operations \wedge, \vee , bounded quantifications $\forall x \in u, \exists x \in u$, and existential (unbounded) quantification $\exists x$ [universal (unbounded) quantification $\forall x$], resp.

For example $\forall x \in u \exists y A$ ($A \in \Delta_0$) is a Σ -formula but not a Σ_1 -formula.

4. A formula of the form $\forall x A$ with a Σ_1 -matrix A is a Π_2 -formula.

We see easily that Δ_0 -formulas are *absolute* in the sense that for any transitive sets $X \subset Y$ (X is transitive iff $\forall y \in X \forall x \in y (x \in X)$), $X \models A[\bar{x}] \Leftrightarrow Y \models A[\bar{x}]$ for any Δ_0 -formula A and $\bar{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ with $x_i \in X$.

Definition 1.2 Axioms of KP are **Extensionality** $\forall a, b [\forall x \in a (x \in b) \wedge \forall x \in b (x \in a) \rightarrow a = b]$, **Null set** (the empty set \emptyset exists), **Pair** $\forall x, y \exists a (x \in a \wedge y \in a)$, **Union** $\forall a \exists b \forall x \in a \forall y \in x (y \in b)$, and the following three schemata.

Δ_0 -Separation For any set a and any Δ_0 -formula A , the set $b = \{x \in a : A(x)\}$ exists. Namely $\exists b \forall x [x \in b \leftrightarrow x \in a \wedge A(x)]$.

Δ_0 -Collection $\forall x \in a \exists y A(x, y) \rightarrow \exists b \forall x \in a \exists y \in b A(x, y)$ for Δ_0 -formulas A .

Foundation or \in -Induction $\forall x [\forall y \in x F(y) \rightarrow F(x)] \rightarrow \forall x F(x)$ for arbitrary formula F .

KP_ω denotes KP plus Axiom of **Infinity** $\exists x \neq \emptyset \forall y \in x [y \cup \{y\} \in x]$.

1.2 Constructible hierarchy and admissible sets

The constructible hierarchy $\{L_\alpha : \alpha \in ON\}$.

1. $L_0 := \emptyset$.
2. $L_{\alpha+1}$ is the collection of all definable sets in (L_α, \in) .
3. $L_\lambda := \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} L_\alpha$ for limits λ .
4. $L := \bigcup_{\alpha \in ON} L_\alpha$.

Note that $L_{\omega\alpha} \models \text{KP} - (\Delta_0\text{-Collection})$ for $\alpha > 0$, and $\omega \in L_{\omega\alpha}$ if $\alpha > 1$.

Definition 1.3 1. A transitive set A is *admissible* if $(A; \in) \models \text{KP}$.

2. An ordinal α is *admissible* if L_α is admissible.
3. A relation R on an admissible set A is *A-recursive* [*A-recursively enumerable*, *A-r.e.*] (*A-finite*) if R is Δ_1 [Σ_1] ($R \in A$), resp.
4. A function on an admissible set A is *A-recursive* if its graph is *A-r.e.*
5. An ordinal α is *recursively regular* iff $L_\alpha \models \text{KP}\omega$.

Observe that an ordinal α is recursively regular iff α is a multiplicative principal number $> \omega$, and for any L_α -recursive function $f : \beta \rightarrow \alpha$ with a $\beta < \alpha$, $\sup\{f(\gamma) : \gamma < \beta\} < \alpha$ holds.

Theorem 1.4 (Π_2 -Reflection on L)

For any Σ -predicate A

$$\text{KP}\omega \vdash \forall x \in L \exists y \in L A(x, y) \rightarrow \exists z \in L \forall x \in z \exists y \in z A(x, y).$$

In particular for recursively regular ordinals Ω ,

$$\forall \alpha < \Omega \exists \beta < \Omega A(\alpha, \beta) \rightarrow \exists \gamma < \Omega \forall \alpha < \gamma \exists \beta < \gamma A(\alpha, \beta).$$

Lemma 1.5 $|\text{KP}\omega| \leq |\text{KP}\omega|_\Sigma := \min\{\alpha : \forall A \in \Sigma (\text{KP}\omega \vdash A \Rightarrow L_\alpha \models A)\}$.

Proof. Suppose $\text{KP}\omega$ proves $\text{TI}[\prec, U]$ for a computable order \prec on ω , where a unary predicate U may occur in Foundation schema, but not in Δ_0 -Separation nor Δ_0 -Collection. Then $\forall n \in \omega \exists \alpha (\alpha = |n|_\prec = \sup\{|m|_\prec + 1 : m \prec n\})$ is provable in $\text{KP}\omega$. Therefore $|\text{KP}\omega| \leq |\text{KP}\omega|_\Sigma$. \square

The *Mostowski collapsing* $\text{clpse}(b)$ of a set b is defined by $C_b(x) = \{C_b(y) : y \in x \cap b\}$ and $\text{clpse}(b) := C_b(b) = \{C_b(x) : x \in b\}$.

Definition 1.6 We say that a class \mathcal{C} is Π_n -classes for $n \geq 2$ if there exists a set-theoretic Π_n -formula $F(\bar{a})$ with parameters \bar{a} such that for any transitive set P with $\bar{a} \subset P$, $P \in \mathcal{C} \Leftrightarrow P \models F(\bar{a})$ holds. For a whole universe L , $L \in \mathcal{C}$ denotes the formula $F(\bar{a})$. By a Π_0^1 -class we mean a Π_n -class for some $n \geq 2$.

1.3 Buchholz' ψ -functions

In this section we work in KP_ω .

We are in a position to introduce a collapsing function $\psi_\sigma(\alpha) < \sigma$ (even if $\alpha \geq \sigma$). The following definition is due to [Buchholz86].

Definition 1.7 Let $\Omega = \omega_1$ or $\Omega = \omega_1^{CK}$. Define simultaneously by recursion on ordinals $\alpha < \Gamma_{\Omega+1}$ the classes $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$ ($X \subset \Omega$) and the ordinals $\psi_\Omega(\alpha)$ as follows.

$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$ is the Skolem hull of $\{0, \Omega\} \cup X$ under the functions $+$, φ , and $\beta \mapsto \psi_\Omega(\beta)$ ($\beta < \alpha$).

Let

$$\psi_\Omega(\alpha) = \min(\{\Omega\} \cup \{\beta < \Omega : \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta) \cap \Omega \subset \beta\}) \quad (2)$$

Let us interpret $\Omega = \omega_1$. Then we see readily that $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$ is countable for any countable X .

To see that the ordinal $\psi_\Omega(\alpha)$ could be defined, it suffices to show the existence of an ordinal $\beta < \Omega$ such that $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta) \cap \Omega \subset \beta$: let $\beta = \sup\{\beta_n : n \in \omega\}$ with $\beta_{n+1} = \min\{\beta < \Omega : \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta_n) \cap \Omega \subset \beta\}$ and $\beta_0 = 0 < \Omega$. Then $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta) \cap \Omega \subset \beta$ since $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta) = \bigcup_n \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta_n)$, and $\beta < \Omega$ since $\Omega > \omega$ is regular.

The ordinal $\psi_{\Omega_1}(\varepsilon_{\Omega_1+1})$ is called the *Bachmann-Howard ordinal*.

Proposition 1.8 1. $\alpha_0 \leq \alpha_1 \wedge X_0 \subset X_1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(X_0) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_1}(X_1)$.

2. $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\psi_\Omega(\alpha)) \cap \Omega = \psi_\Omega(\alpha)$ and $\psi_\Omega(\alpha) \notin \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\psi_\Omega(\alpha))$.

3. $\alpha_0 \leq \alpha \Rightarrow \psi_\Omega(\alpha_0) \leq \psi_\Omega(\alpha) \wedge \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\psi_\Omega(\alpha_0)) \subset \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\psi_\Omega(\alpha))$.


4. $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\psi_\Omega(\alpha)) \cap \alpha \Rightarrow \psi_\Omega(\alpha_0) < \psi_\Omega(\alpha)$. Therefore
 $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\psi_\Omega(\alpha_0)) \wedge \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\psi_\Omega(\alpha)) \Rightarrow (\alpha_0 < \alpha \leftrightarrow \psi_\Omega(\alpha_0) < \psi_\Omega(\alpha))$.

5. $\psi_\Omega(\alpha)$ is a strongly critical number such that $\psi_\Omega(\alpha) < \Omega$.

6. $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta) \Leftrightarrow \text{SC}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta)$, where $\text{SC}(0) = \text{SC}(\Omega) = \emptyset$, $\text{SC}(\gamma) = \{\gamma\}$ if $\gamma \neq \Omega$ is strongly critical, and $\text{SC}(\varphi\gamma\delta) = \text{SC}(\gamma + \delta) = \text{SC}(\gamma) \cup \text{SC}(\delta)$.

7. $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\psi_\Omega(\alpha)) = \mathcal{H}_\alpha(0)$ and $\psi_\Omega(\alpha) = \min\{\xi : \xi \notin \mathcal{H}_\alpha(0) \cap \Omega\}$.

Proposition 1.8.7 means that $\psi_\Omega(\alpha)$ is the Mostowski's collapse of the point Ω in the iterated Skolem hull $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(0)$ of ordinals $\{0, \Omega\}$ under addition $+$ and the binary Veblen function φ . This suggests us that the ordinal $\psi_\Omega(\alpha)$ could be a substitute for Ω in a restricted situation.



1.4 Computable notation system $OT(\Omega)$ of ordinals

By Proposition 1.8.7 we have $\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}}(0) = \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}}(0) = \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}}(\psi_{\Omega}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}))$, and hence each ordinal below $\psi_{\Omega}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$ can be denoted by terms built up from $0, \Omega, +, \varphi, \psi$. Although the representation is not uniquely determined from ordinals, e.g., $\psi_{\Omega}(\psi_{\Omega}(\Omega)) = \psi_{\Omega}(\Omega)$, α can be determined from the ordinal $\psi_{\Omega}(\alpha)$ if $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(0)$, cf. Propositions 1.8.4 and 1.8.7. We can devise a recursive notation system $OT(\Omega)$ of ordinals with this restriction in such a way that the following holds

Proposition 1.9 *EA proves that $(OT(\Omega), <)$ is a linear order.*

1.5 Ramified set theory

Definition 1.10 *RS-terms t and their levels $|t|$ are defined recursively as follows.*

1. For each ordinal $\alpha \in OT(\Omega) \cap (\Omega + 1)$, L_{α} is an RS-term of level $|L_{\alpha}| = \alpha$.
2. Let $\theta(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be a formula in the set-theoretic language, and s_1, \dots, s_n be RS-terms such that $\max\{|s_i| : 1 \leq i \leq n\} < \alpha$. Then the formal expression $[x \in L_{\alpha} : \theta^{L_{\alpha}}(x, s_1, \dots, s_n)]$ is an RS-term of level $|[x \in L_{\alpha} : \theta^{L_{\alpha}}(x, s_1, \dots, s_n)]| = \alpha$.

RS denotes the set of all RS-terms.

Let $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a formula such that each quantifier is bounded by a variable y , $Qx \in y$, all free variables occurring in θ are among the list x_1, \dots, x_n , and each x_i occurs freely in θ . An *RS-formula* is obtained from such a formula $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ by substituting RS-terms t_i for each x_i .

Let $k(L_{\alpha}) := \{\alpha\}$, $k([x \in L_{\alpha} : \theta^{L_{\alpha}}(x, s_1, \dots, s_n)]) = \{\alpha\} \cup \bigcup_{i \leq n} k(s_i)$ and

$$k(\theta(t_1, \dots, t_n)) := \bigcup_{i \leq n} k(t_i), \quad |\theta(t_1, \dots, t_n)| := \max\{|t_1|, \dots, |t_n|, 0\}.$$

The bound L_{Ω} in $\exists x \in L_{\Omega}$ and $\forall x \in L_{\Omega}$ is the replacements of the unbounded quantifiers \exists and \forall , resp.

Definition 1.11 Let s, t be RS-terms with $|s| < |t|$.

$$(s \dot{\in} t) := \begin{cases} B(s) & t \equiv [x \in L_{\alpha} : B(x)] \\ \top & t \equiv L_{\alpha} \end{cases}$$

where \top denotes a true literal, e.g., $\emptyset \notin \emptyset$.

We assign disjunctions or conjunctions to sentences as follows. When a disjunction $\bigvee (A_i)_{i \in J}$ [a conjunction $\bigwedge (A_i)_{i \in J}$] is assigned to A , we denote $A \simeq \bigvee (A_i)_{i \in J}$ [$A \simeq \bigwedge (A_i)_{i \in J}$], resp.

Definition 1.12 1. $(A_0 \vee A_1) := \bigvee (A_i)_{i \in J}$ and $(A_0 \wedge A_1) := \bigwedge (A_i)_{i \in J}$ with $J := 2$.

2. $(a \in b) := \bigvee (t \dot{\in} b \wedge t = a)_{t \in J}$ and $(a \notin b) := \bigwedge (t \dot{\in} b \rightarrow t \neq a)_{t \in J}$ with $J := Tm(|b|) := \{t \in RS : |t| < |b|\}$.
3. Let a, b be set terms.
 $(a \neq b) := \bigvee (\neg A_i)_{i \in J}$ and $(a = b) := \bigwedge (A_i)_{i \in J}$ with $J := 2$ and $A_0 := (\forall x \in a(x \in b))$, $A_1 := (\forall x \in b(x \in a))$.
4. $\exists x \in b A(x) := \bigvee (t \dot{\in} b \wedge A(t))_{t \in J}$ and $\forall x \in b A(x) := \bigwedge (t \dot{\in} b \rightarrow A(t))_{t \in J}$ with $J := Tm(|b|)$.

Lemma 1.13 $\forall i \in J (k(i) \subset k(A_i) \subset k(A) \cup k(i))$ for $A \simeq \bigvee (A_i)_{i \in J}$, where $k(0) = k(1) = \emptyset$.

The rank $\text{rk}(A), \text{rk}(a) < \Omega + \omega$ of RS-formulas A and RS-terms a are defined so that the followings hold for any formula A .

Proposition 1.14 1. $\text{rk}(A) \in \{\omega | \mathcal{A}| + n : n \in \omega\}$ for RS-terms and RS-formulas A .

$$2. \text{rk}(B(t)) \in \{\omega | t| + n : n \in \omega\} \cup \{\text{rk}(B(L_0))\}.$$

3. Let $A \simeq \bigvee (A_i)_{i \in J}$. Then $\forall i \in J (\text{rk}(A_i) < \text{rk}(A))$.

Definition 1.15 1. Let $B(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a Δ_0 -formula, and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in RS$ be $|a_i| < \Omega$. Then $B(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is a $\Delta(\Omega)$ -formula.

2. Let $A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a Σ -formula, and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in RS$ be $|a_i| < \Omega$. Then $A^{(L_\Omega)}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is a $\Sigma(\Omega)$ -formula, where for RS-terms c , $A^{(c)}$ denotes the result of replacing unbounded existential quantifiers $\exists x(\dots)$ by $\exists x \in c(\dots)$.

3. Let $B \equiv A^{(L_\Omega)}$ be a $\Sigma(\Omega)$ -formula, and $\alpha \in OT(\Omega) \cap \Omega$. Then $B^{(\alpha, \Omega)} \equiv A^{(L_\alpha)}$. For $\Gamma \subset \Sigma(\Omega)$, $\Gamma^{(\alpha, \Omega)} := \{B^{(\alpha, \Omega)} : B \in \Gamma\}$.

Let us define a derivability relation $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma$ for finite sets Θ of ordinals, $\gamma, a < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, $b < \Omega + \omega$ and RS-sequents, i.e., finite sets of RS-formulas Γ .

Definition 1.16 $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma$ holds if

$$\{\gamma, a, b\} \cup k(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \tag{3}$$

and one of the following cases holds:

(V) There are $A \in \Gamma$ such that $A \simeq \bigvee (A_i)_{i \in J}$, an $i \in J$ with

$$|i| < a \tag{4}$$

and an $a(i) < a$ for which $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a(i)} \Gamma, A_i$ holds.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a(i)} \Gamma, A_i}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \text{ (V)} (|i| < a)$$

(\wedge) There is an $A \in \Gamma$ such that $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_i)_{i \in J}$, and for each $i \in J$, there is an $a(i)$ such that $a(i) < a$ for which $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(i)] \vdash_b^{a(i)} \Gamma, A_i$ holds.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(i)] \vdash_b^{a(i)} \Gamma, A_i\}_{i \in J}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} (\wedge)$$

(cut) There are C and $a_0 < a$ such that $\text{rk}(C) < b$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg C$ and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} C, \Gamma$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg C \quad \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} C, \Gamma (\text{rk}(C) < b)}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} (\text{cut})$$

($\Delta_0(\Omega)$ -Coll) $b \geq \Omega$, and there are a formula $C \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ and an $a_0 < a$ such that $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, C$ and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\alpha\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg C^{(\alpha, \Omega)}$ for every $\alpha < \Omega$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, C \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\alpha\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \neg C^{(\alpha, \Omega)}, \Gamma\}_{\alpha < \Omega}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} (\Delta_0(\Omega)\text{-Coll})$$

Lemma 1.17 (Tautology) $\mathcal{H}_0[\mathbf{k}(A)] \vdash_0^{2d} \neg A, A$ with $d = \text{rk}(A)$.

Lemma 1.18 (Inversion)

$\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma, A \Rightarrow \forall i \in J (\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(i)] \vdash_b^a \Gamma, A_i)$ for $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_i)_{i \in J}$.

Lemma 1.19 (Boundedness) Let $a \leq \beta \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap \Omega$ and $\Lambda \subset \Sigma(\Omega)$. Then $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma, \Lambda \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma, \Lambda^{(\beta, \Omega)}$.

Lemma 1.20 (Embedding)

Let $\Gamma[\vec{x} := \vec{a}]$ ($\vec{a} \subset RS$) denote a closed instance of a sequent Γ with restriction of unbounded quantifiers to \mathbf{L}_Ω . Assume $\text{KP}\omega \vdash \Gamma$. Then

$$\exists m, l < \omega \forall \vec{a} \subset RS [\mathcal{H}_0[\mathbf{k}(\vec{a})] \vdash_{\Omega+m}^{\Omega+l} \Gamma[\vec{x} := \vec{a}]]$$

where $\mathbf{k}(\vec{a}) = \mathbf{k}(a_1) \cup \dots \cup \mathbf{k}(a_n)$ for $\vec{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

Let $\theta_c(a)$ be the c -th iterate of $\theta_1(a) = \omega^a$. $\theta_0(a) = a$, $\theta_{c+d}(a) = \theta_c(\theta_d(a))$, and $\theta_{\omega^c}(a) = \varphi_c(a)$.

Lemma 1.21 (Predicative Cut-elimination)

$\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{b+c}^a \Gamma \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{\theta_c(a)} \Gamma$ if $\neg(b < \Omega \leq b + c)$.

Theorem 1.22 (Collapsing)

Suppose

$$\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\Omega(\gamma)) \tag{5}$$

for a finite set Θ of ordinals, and $\Gamma \subset \Sigma(\Omega)$. Then for $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^a$ and $\beta = \psi_\Omega(\hat{a})$

$$\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\Omega^a \Gamma \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta] \vdash_\beta^\beta \Gamma.$$

Proof. This is seen by induction on a . Observe that $\mathbf{k}(\Gamma) \cup \{\beta\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta]$ by $\gamma < \hat{a} + 1$ and (3).

Case 1. The last inference is a (\bigvee) .

Let $A \in \Gamma$ be such that $A \simeq \bigvee (A_i)_{i \in J}$, and for an $i \in J$ and an $a(i) < a$

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\Omega}^{a(i)} \Gamma, A_i}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\Omega}^a \Gamma} (\bigvee)$$

By IH it suffices to show $|i| < \psi_\Omega(\hat{a})$ for (4). We can assume $\mathbf{k}(i) \subset \mathbf{k}(A_i)$. Then $|i| \in \mathbf{k}(A_i) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\Omega(\gamma))$ by (3) and the assumption (5). On the other hand we have $|i| < \Omega$. Hence $|i| \in \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}}(\psi_\Omega(\hat{a})) \cap \Omega = \psi_\Omega(\hat{a})$.

Case 2. The last inference is a (\bigwedge) .

Let $A \in \Gamma$ be such that $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_i)_{i \in J}$, and for each $i \in J$, there are $a(i) < a$ such that

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(i)] \vdash_{\Omega}^{a(i)} \Gamma, A_i\}_{i \in J}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\Omega}^a \Gamma} (\bigwedge)$$

By IH it suffices to show that $\forall i \in J (\mathbf{k}(i) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\Omega(\gamma)))$. For example consider the case when $A \equiv (\forall x \in u B(x))$ for a set term u . Then $J = \{t \in RS : |t| < |u|\}$. Since A is a $\Sigma(\Omega)$ -sentence, we have $|a| < \Omega$. On the other hand we have $|u| \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ for $|u| = \max \mathbf{k}(u)$, and hence $\mathbf{k}(i) \subset |u| \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\Omega(\gamma)) \cap \Omega = \psi_\Omega(\gamma)$ for any $i \in J$.

Case 3. The last inference is a $(\Delta_0(\Omega)\text{-Coll})$.

There are a sentence $C \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ and an $a_0 < a$ such that

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\Omega}^{a_0} \Gamma, C \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\alpha\}] \vdash_{\Omega}^{a_0} \neg C^{(\alpha, \Omega)}, \Gamma\}_{\alpha < \Omega}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\Omega}^a \Gamma} (\Delta_0(\Omega)\text{-Coll})$$

Let $\hat{a}_0 = \gamma + \omega^{a_0}$ and $\beta_0 = \psi_\Omega(\hat{a}_0)$. IH yields $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta_0}^{\beta_0} \Gamma, C$. Boundedness 1.19 yields $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta_0}^{\beta_0} \Gamma, C^{(\beta_0, \Omega)}$, where $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1}[\Theta]$. On the other hand we have $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\beta_0\}] \vdash_{\Omega}^{a_0} \neg C^{(\beta_0, \Omega)}, \Gamma$, and $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\Omega}^{a_0} \neg C^{(\beta_0, \Omega)}, \Gamma$. IH yields $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0 + \omega^{a_0} + 1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta_1} \neg C^{(\beta_0, \Omega)}, \Gamma$, where $\beta_1 = \psi_\Omega(\hat{a}_0 + \omega^{a_0})$ with $\hat{a}_0 + \omega^{a_0} = \gamma + \omega^{a_0} + \omega^{a_0} < \hat{a}$. A *(cut)* with $\text{rk}(C^{(\beta_0, \Omega)}) < \beta$ yields $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \Gamma$.

Case 4. The last inference is a *(cut)*.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\Omega}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg C \quad \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\Omega}^{a_0} C, \Gamma}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\Omega}^a \Gamma} (\textit{cut})$$

We obtain $\text{rk}(C) < \Omega$, and $\text{rk}(C) \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap \Omega \subset \psi_\Omega(\gamma) \leq \beta$. IH followed by a *(cut)* yields the lemma. \square

Lemma 1.23 (Truth)

If $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\Omega}^a \Gamma$ with $\Gamma \subset \Delta(\Omega)$, then $L_\Omega \models \Gamma$.

Theorem 1.24 $\text{KP}\omega \vdash \Gamma$ and $\Gamma \subset \Sigma(\Omega_1) \Rightarrow \exists m < \omega [L_\Omega \models \Gamma^{(\psi_\Omega(\omega_m(\Omega+1)), \Omega)}]$.

Proof. Let $\text{KP}\omega \vdash \Gamma$ for a set Γ of Σ -sentences. By Embedding 1.20 pick an $m < \omega$ such that $\mathcal{H}_0[\emptyset] \vdash_{\Omega+m}^{\Omega+m} \Gamma$. Predicative Cut-elimination 1.21 yields $\mathcal{H}_0[\emptyset] \vdash_\Omega^a \Gamma$ for $a = \omega_m(\Omega + m)$. Let $\beta = \psi_\Omega(\hat{a})$ with $\hat{a} = \omega^a = \omega_{m+1}(\Omega + m)$. We then obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\emptyset] \vdash_\beta^\beta \Gamma$ by Collapsing 1.22, and $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\emptyset] \vdash_\beta^\beta \Gamma^{(\beta, \Omega)}$ by Boundedness 1.19. We see $L_\Omega \models \Gamma^{(\beta, \Omega)}$ from Truth 1.23. From $\beta < \psi_\Omega(\omega_{m+2}(\Omega + 1))$ and the persistency of Σ -formulas, we conclude $L_\Omega \models \Gamma^{(\psi_\Omega(\omega_{m+2}(\Omega+1)), \Omega)}$. \square

1.6 Well-foundedness proof in $\text{KP}\omega$

In this subsection $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \dots$ range over ordinal terms in $OT(\Omega)$, and $<$ denotes the relation between ordinal terms defined in Definition ???. An ordinal term α is identified with the set $\{\beta \in OT(\Omega) : \beta < \alpha\}$. For ordinal terms α, β , ordinal terms $\alpha + \beta$ and ω^α are defined trivially.

In this subsection we show that the theory ID for non-iterated positive elementary inductive definitions on \mathbb{N} proves the fact that the relation $<$ on $OT(\Omega)$ is well-founded up to each $\alpha < \psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$.

Theorem 1.25 For each $n < \omega$

$$\text{ID} \vdash \text{TI}[\langle \uparrow \psi_\Omega(\omega_n(\Omega + 1)), B \rangle]$$

for any formula B in the language $\mathcal{L}(\text{ID})$.

Acc denotes the accessible part of $<$ in $OT(\Omega)$, which is defined in ID as the least fixed point $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ of the operator $\mathcal{A}(X, \alpha) := \alpha \subset X \Leftrightarrow (\forall \beta < \alpha (\beta \in X))$. It suffices to show the following, which is equivalent to Theorem 1.25.

Theorem 1.26 For each $\alpha < \psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$, $\text{ID} \vdash \alpha \in \text{Acc}$.

The least fixed point *Acc* enjoys $\forall \alpha (\alpha \subset \text{Acc} \rightarrow \alpha \in \text{Acc})$, and $\forall \alpha (\alpha \subset F \rightarrow \alpha \in F) \rightarrow \text{Acc} \subset F$. From these we see easily that *Acc* is closed under $+$, φ besides $0 \in \text{Acc}$. Hence we obtain $\Gamma_0 = \psi_\Omega(0) \in \text{Acc}$. Likewise $\Gamma_1 = \psi_\Omega(1) \in \text{Acc}$ follows. To prove $\psi_\Omega(\Omega) \in \text{Acc}$, we need to show $\psi_\Omega(\alpha) \in \text{Acc}$ for any $\alpha < \Omega$ such that $\psi_\Omega(\alpha)$ is an ordinal term, i.e., $G(\alpha) < \alpha$. This means that when $\psi_\Omega(\beta)$ occurs in α , then $\beta < \alpha$ holds. Thus we have a chance to prove inductively that $\psi_\Omega(\alpha) \in \text{Acc}$. The ordinal term α is built from $0, \Omega$ and some ordinal terms $\psi_\Omega(\beta)$ with $\beta < \alpha$ by $+$, φ . Let us assume that each of ordinals $\psi_\Omega(\beta) < \Omega$ occurring in α is in $W_0 = \text{Acc} \cap \Omega$, and denote the set of such ordinals α by M_1 . Though we don't have $\Omega \in \text{Acc}$ in hand (since this means that $OT(\Omega) \cap \Omega$ is well-founded, which is the fact we are going to prove), Ω is in the accessible part W_1 of the set M_1 . It turns out that W_1 is progressive on M_1 , and $\Omega \in W_1$. Moreover $\omega^{\Omega+1} \in W_1$ is seen as for the jump set for epsilon numbers. In this way we see that $\alpha \in W_1$, i.e., $\psi_\Omega(\alpha) \in W_0$ for each $\alpha < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$.

Let $\text{SC}(\alpha)$ denote the set of strongly critical parts of α defined in Proposition 1.8.6, and let $\text{SC}_\Omega(\alpha) = \text{SC}(\alpha) \cap \Omega$.

Definition 1.27 $M_1 = \{\alpha \in OT(\Omega) : \text{SC}_\Omega(\alpha) \subset W_0\}$.

Proposition 1.28 $G(\beta) < \alpha \Rightarrow \text{SC}_\Omega(\beta) < \psi_\Omega(\alpha)$ for $\psi_\Omega(\alpha) \in OT(\Omega)$.

Proof. By induction on the length of ordinal terms β . Assume $G(\beta) < \alpha$. By IH we can assume $\beta = \psi_\Omega(\gamma)$. Then $\gamma \in G(\beta)$ and $\text{SC}_\Omega(\beta) = \{\beta\}$. Hence $\gamma < \alpha$ and $\beta < \psi_\Omega(\alpha)$. \square

In what follows we work in ID except otherwise stated.

Lemma 1.29 $M_1 \cap \Omega = W_0$.

$$\mathcal{A}(X) := \{\alpha \in M_1 : M_1 \cap \alpha \subset X\}.$$

Proposition 1.30 For each formula F , $\mathcal{A}(F) \subset F \rightarrow \Omega \in F$.

Proof. Assuming $\mathcal{A}(F) \subset F$, we see $\alpha \in W_0 \Rightarrow \alpha \in F$ by induction on $\alpha \in W_0$. \square

Lemma 1.31 For each formula F , $\mathcal{A}(F) \subset F \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(j[F]) \subset j[F]$, where $j[F] := \{\beta \in OT(\Omega) : \forall \alpha (M_1 \cap \alpha \subset F \rightarrow M_1 \cap (\alpha + \omega^\beta) \subset F)\}$.

Lemma 1.32 For each formula F and each $n < \omega$, $\mathcal{A}(F) \subset F \rightarrow \omega_n(\Omega + 1) \in F$.

$$\alpha \in W \Leftrightarrow (\psi_\Omega(\alpha) \in OT(\Omega) \rightarrow \psi_\Omega(\alpha) \in W_0).$$

Lemma 1.33 $\mathcal{A}(W) \subset W$.

Proof. Assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(W)$ and $\psi_\Omega(\alpha) \in OT(\Omega)$. Then $\alpha \in M_1$ and $M_1 \cap \alpha \subset W$. We show

$$\gamma < \psi_\Omega(\alpha) \rightarrow \gamma \in W_0$$

by induction on the length of ordinal terms γ . We can assume that $\gamma = \psi_\Omega(\beta)$. Then $\beta < \alpha$. We see $\beta \in M_1$ from IH. Therefore $\beta \in M_1 \cap \alpha \subset W$, which yields $\gamma = \psi_\Omega(\beta) \in W_0$. Therefore $\psi_\Omega(\alpha) \in W_0$. \square

Let us show Theorem 1.26. We show that ID proves $\psi_\Omega(\omega_n(\Omega + 1)) \in W_0$ for each $n < \omega$. By Lemmas 1.32 and 1.33 we obtain $\omega_n(\Omega + 1) \in W$. Thus $\psi_\Omega(\omega_n(\Omega + 1)) \in W_0$ by the definition of W .

2 Rathjen's analysis of Π_3 -reflection

Given an analysis of $\text{KP}\omega$ for a single recursively regular ordinal, it is not hard to extend it to an analysis of theories of recursively regular ordinals of a given order type, e.g., to KPl , or equivalently to $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA+BI}$. Or to an iteration of recursively regularities in another manner. Specifically an ordinal analysis of KPM for recursively Mahlo ordinals is not an obstacle.

Let us introduce a Π_i -recursively Mahlo operation RM_i and its iterations. A Π_i -recursively Mahlo operation RM_i for $2 \leq i < \omega$, is defined through a universal Π_i -formula $\Pi_i(a)$ such that for each Π_i -formula $\varphi(x)$ there exists a natural number n such that $\text{KP} \vdash \forall x[\varphi(x) \leftrightarrow \Pi_i(\langle n, x \rangle)]$. Let \mathcal{X} be a collection of sets.

$$P \in RM_i(\mathcal{X}) \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \forall b \in P [P \models \Pi_i(b) \rightarrow \exists Q \in \mathcal{X} \cap P (b \in Q \models \Pi_i(b))]$$

(read: P is Π_i -reflecting on \mathcal{X} .)

Let $RM_i = RM_i(V)$, and V is Π_i -reflecting if $V \in RM_i$. Under the axiom $V = L$ of constructibility, $V \in RM_2$ iff $V \models \text{KP}\omega$, and $V \in RM_2(RM_2)$ iff V is *recursively Mahlo* universe. When $V = L_\sigma$, the ordinal σ is recursively Mahlo ordinal.

Let KPM denote a set theory for recursively Mahlo universes. For an ordinal analysis of KPM , it suffices for us to have two step collapsings $\alpha \mapsto \sigma = \psi_M(\alpha) \in RM_2$ and $(\sigma, \beta) \mapsto \psi_\sigma(\beta)$.

Assume that $P \in \mathcal{X}$ is given by a Δ_0 -formula. Then there exists a Π_{i+1} -formula rm_i such that for any non-empty transitive sets $P \in V \cup \{V\}$, $P \in RM_i(\mathcal{X}) \leftrightarrow rm_i^P$, where rm_i^P denotes the result of restricting unbounded quantifiers in rm_i to P .

An iteration of RM_i along a definable relation \prec is defined as follows.

$$P \in RM_i(a; \prec) :\Leftrightarrow a \in P \in \bigcap \{RM_i(RM_i(b; \prec)) : b \in P \models b \prec a\}.$$

Assume that $b \prec a$ is given by a Σ_1 -formula. Then there exists a Π_{i+1} -formula $rm_i(a, \prec)$ such that for any non-empty transitive sets $P \in V \cup \{V\}$ and $a \in P$, $P \in RM_i(a; \prec) \leftrightarrow rm_i^P(a, \prec)$.

For $2 \leq N < \omega$, KPII_N denotes a set theory for Π_N -reflecting universes V , which is obtained from $\text{KP}\omega$ by adding an axiom $V \in RM_N$ (the axiom for Π_N -reflection) stating that its universe is Π_N -reflecting. This means that for each Π_N -formula φ , $\varphi(a) \rightarrow \exists c[ad_N^c \wedge a \in c \wedge \varphi^c(a)]$ is an axiom, where $ad_2^c := (\forall x \in c \forall y \in x(y \in c))$, i.e., c is transitive, and for $N > 2$, $ad \equiv ad_N$ denotes a Π_3 -sentence such that $P \models ad \Leftrightarrow P \models \text{KP}\omega$ for any transitive and well-founded sets P . KPII_2 is a subtheory of $\text{KP}\omega + (V = L)$, which is interpreted in $\text{KP}\omega$: $\text{KP}\omega + (V = L) \vdash \varphi \Rightarrow \text{KP}\omega \vdash \varphi^L$, cf. Theorem 1.4.

KPII_{N+1} is much stronger than KPII_N since Π_N -recursively Mahlo operation RM_N can be iterated in KPII_{N+1} . For example, KPII_{N+1} proves $\forall \alpha \in ON[V \in RM_N(\alpha; \prec)]$ by induction on ordinals α . Suppose $\forall \beta < \alpha[V \in RM_N(\beta; \prec)]$. Let φ be a Π_N -formula such that $V \models \varphi$, and $\beta < \alpha$. We can reflect a Π_{N+1} -formula $V \in RM_N(\beta; \prec) \wedge \varphi$, and obtain a set P such that $P \in RM_N(\beta; \prec) \wedge P \models \varphi$. Hence $V \in RM_N(\alpha; \prec)$. This means that V is in the diagonal intersection $\Delta_\alpha RM_N(\alpha; \prec)$, i.e., $V \in \bigcap \{RM_N(\alpha; \prec) : \alpha \in ON \cap V\}$. Since this is a Π_{N+1} -formula, the Π_{N+1} -reflecting universe V reflects it: there exists a set $P \in V$ such that P is in the diagonal intersection, i.e., $P \in \bigcap \{RM_N(\alpha; \prec) : \alpha \in ON \cap P\}$, and so forth.

Let $ON \subset V$ denote the class of ordinals, $ON^\varepsilon \subset V$ and $<^\varepsilon$ be Δ -predicates such that for any transitive and well-founded model V of $\text{KP}\omega$, $<^\varepsilon$ is a well order

of type $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ on ON^ε for the order type \mathbb{K} of the class ON in V . $[\omega_n(\mathbb{K}+1)] \in ON^\varepsilon$ denotes the code of the ‘ordinal’ $\omega_n(\mathbb{K}+1)$, which is assumed to be a closed ‘term’ built from the code $[\mathbb{K}]$ and n , e.g., $[\alpha] = \langle 0, \alpha \rangle$ for $\alpha \in ON$, $[\mathbb{K}] = \langle 1, 0 \rangle$ and $[\omega_n(\mathbb{K}+1)] = \langle 2, \langle 2, \dots \langle 2, \langle 3, [\mathbb{K}], \langle 0, 1 \rangle \rangle \dots \rangle \rangle$.

$<^\varepsilon$ is assumed to be a standard epsilon order with base \mathbb{K} (not on \mathbb{N} , but on V) such that $KP\omega$ proves the fact that $<^\varepsilon$ is a linear ordering, and for any formula φ and each $n < \omega$,

$$KP\omega \vdash \forall x (\forall y <^\varepsilon x \varphi(y) \rightarrow \varphi(x)) \rightarrow \forall x <^\varepsilon [\omega_n(\mathbb{K}+1)] \varphi(x) \quad (6)$$

Theorem 2.1 ([A14a])

For each $N \geq 2$, $KPII_{N+1}$ is Π_{N+1} -conservative over the theory

$$KP\omega + \{V \in RM_N([\omega_n(\mathbb{K}+1)]; <^\varepsilon) : n \in \omega\}.$$

From (6) we see that $KPII_{N+1}$ proves $V \in RM_N([\omega_n(\mathbb{K}+1)]; <^\varepsilon)$ for each $n \in \omega$.

Let us consider the simplest case $N = 3$, i.e., an ordinal analysis of set theory $KPII_3$ for Π_3 -reflecting universe. It turns out that $KPII_3$ is proof-theoretically reducible to iterations of recursively Mahlo operations $V \in RM_2([\omega_n(\mathbb{K}+1)]; <^\varepsilon)$ ($n \in \omega$), but how to analyze it proof-theoretically? Here we need a breakthrough done by [Rathjen94].

2.1 Ordinals for $KPII_3$

In this subsection we define collapsing functions $\psi_\sigma^\xi(a)$ for $KPII_3$. It is much easier for us to justify the definitions with an existence of a small large cardinal. Let \mathbb{K} be the least weakly compact cardinal, i.e., Π_1^1 -indescribable cardinal, and $\Omega = \omega_1$. In general for $n \geq 0$, $A \subset ON$ is Π_n^1 -*indescribable* in an ordinal π iff for every $\Pi_n^1(P)$ -formula $\varphi(P)$ with a predicate P and $C \subset \pi$, if $(L_\pi, C) \models \varphi(P)$, then $(L_\alpha, C \cap \alpha) \models \varphi(P)$ for an $\alpha \in A \cap \pi$. First let us introduce the Mahlo operation. Let $A \subset \mathbb{K}$ be a set, and $\alpha \leq \mathbb{K}$ a limit ordinal. $\alpha \in M_2(A)$ iff $A \cap \alpha$ is Π_0^1 -indescribable in α .

As in Definition 1.7 we define the Skolem hull $\mathcal{H}_a(X)$ and simultaneously classes $Mh_2^a(\xi)$ as follows.

Definition 2.2 Define simultaneously by recursion on ordinals $a < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ the classes $\mathcal{H}_a(X)$ ($X \subset \Gamma_{\mathbb{K}+1}$), $Mh_2^a(\xi)$ ($\xi < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$) and the ordinals $\psi_\sigma^\xi(a)$ as follows.

1. $\mathcal{H}_a(X)$ denotes the Skolem hull of $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{K}\} \cup X$ under the functions $+$, φ , and $(\sigma, \nu, b) \mapsto \psi_\sigma^\nu(b)$ ($b < a$).
2. Let for $\xi > 0$,

$$\pi \in Mh_2^a(\xi) :\Leftrightarrow \{a, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \ \& \ \forall \nu \in \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \cap \xi (\pi \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\nu))) \quad (7)$$

$\pi \in Mh_2^a(0)$ iff π is a limit ordinal.

3. For $0 \leq \xi < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$,

$$\psi_{\pi}^{\xi}(a) = \min(\{\pi\} \cup \{\kappa \in Mh_2^a(\xi) : \{\xi, \pi, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \& \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \pi \subset \kappa\}) \quad (8)$$

and $\psi_{\Omega}(\alpha) = \min\{\beta < \Omega : \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(\beta) \cap \Omega \subset \beta\}$.

We see that each of $x = \mathcal{H}_a(y)$, $x = \psi_{\kappa}^{\xi}a$ and $x \in Mh_2^a(\xi)$, is a Σ_1 -predicate as fixed points in ZFL

Since the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}}(\pi)$ is π for any infinite cardinal $\pi \leq \mathbb{K}$, pick an injection $f : \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}}(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ so that $f''\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}}(\pi) \subset \pi$ for any weakly inaccessible $\pi \leq \mathbb{K}$.

Lemma 2.3 (Cf. Theorem 4.12 in [Rathjen94].)

1. There exists a Π_1^1 -formula $mh_2^a(x)$ such that $\pi \in Mh_2^a(\xi)$ iff $L_{\pi} \models mh_2^a(\xi)$ for any weakly inaccessible cardinals $\pi \leq \mathbb{K}$ with $f''\{a, \xi\} \subset L_{\pi}$.
2. $\mathbb{K} \in Mh_2^a(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}) \cap M_2(Mh_2^a(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}))$ for every $a < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$.

Proof. 2.3.1. Let π be a weakly inaccessible cardinal and f an injection such that $f''\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}}(\pi) \subset L_{\pi}$. Assume that $f''\{a, \xi\} \subset L_{\pi}$. Then for $f(\xi) \in f''\mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$, $\pi \in Mh_2^a(\xi)$ iff for any $f(\nu) \in L_{\pi}$, if $f(\nu) \in f''\mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$ and $\nu < \xi$, then $\pi \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\nu))$, where $f''\mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \subset L_{\pi}$ is a class in L_{π} .

2.3.2. We show the following $B(\xi)$ is progressive in $\xi < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$:

$$B(\xi) :\Leftrightarrow \mathbb{K} \in Mh_2^a(\xi) \cap M_2(Mh_2^a(\xi))$$

Note that $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{K})$ holds for any $\xi < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$.

Suppose $\forall \nu < \xi B(\nu)$. We have to show that $Mh_2^a(\xi)$ is Π_0^1 -indescribable in \mathbb{K} . It is easy to see that if $\pi \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\xi))$, then $\pi \in Mh_2^a(\xi)$ by induction on π . Let $\theta(P)$ be a first-order formula with a predicate P such that $(L_{\mathbb{K}}, C) \models \theta(P)$ for $C \subset \mathbb{K}$.

By IH we have $\forall \nu < \xi [\mathbb{K} \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\nu))]$. In other words, $\mathbb{K} \in Mh_2^a(\xi)$, i.e., $(L_{\mathbb{K}}, C) \models mh_2^a(\xi) \wedge \theta(P)$. Since the universe $L_{\mathbb{K}}$ is Π_1^1 -indescribable, pick a $\pi < \mathbb{K}$ such that $(L_{\pi}, C \cap \pi)$ enjoys the Π_1^1 -sentence $mh_2^a(\xi) \wedge \theta(P)$, and $\{f(a), f(\xi)\} \subset L_{\pi}$. Therefore $\pi \in Mh_2^a(\xi)$. Thus $\mathbb{K} \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\xi))$. \square

Lemma 2.4 For every $\{a, \xi\} \subset \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$, $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}^{\xi}(a) < \mathbb{K}$ for the Π_1^1 -indescribable cardinal \mathbb{K} .

Proof. Let $\{a, \xi\} \subset \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$. By Lemma 2.3.2 we obtain $\mathbb{K} \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\xi))$. On the other, $\{\kappa < \mathbb{K} : \{\xi, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa), \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{K} \subset \kappa\}$ is a club subset of \mathbb{K} . Hence $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}^{\xi}(a) < \mathbb{K}$ by the definition (8). \square

From the definition (8) we see

$$\pi \in Mh_2^a(\mu) \cap \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \& \xi \in \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \cap \mu \Rightarrow \pi \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\xi)) \& \psi_{\pi}^{\xi}(a) < \pi$$

In what follows M_2 denote the Π_2 -recursively Mahlo operation RM_2 .

2.2 Operator controlled derivations for $K\Pi_3$

$OT(\Pi_3)$ denotes a computable notation system of ordinals with collapsing functions $\psi_\sigma^\nu(b)$. $\kappa = \psi_\sigma^\nu(b) \in OT(\Pi_3)$ if $\{\sigma, \nu, b\} \subset OT(\Pi_3) \cap \mathcal{H}_b(\kappa)$, $\nu = m_2(\kappa) < m_2(\sigma)$ and

$$SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \kappa \ \& \ \nu \leq b \quad (9)$$

where $m_2(\Omega) = 1$ and $m_2(\mathbb{K}) = \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$. We need the condition (9) in our well-foundedness proof of $OT(\Pi_3)$, cf. Proposition 3.30 and Lemma 3.38.

Operator controlled derivations for $K\Pi_3$ are defined as in Definition 1.16 for $KP\omega$ together with the following inference rules. For ordinals $\pi = \psi_\sigma^\xi(a)$, let $m_2(\pi) = \xi$.

($\text{rf}_{\Pi_3}(\mathbb{K})$) $b \geq \mathbb{K}$. There exist an ordinal $a_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap a$, and a $\Sigma_3(\mathbb{K})$ -sentence A enjoying the following conditions:

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg A \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, A^{(\rho, \mathbb{K})} : \rho < \mathbb{K}\}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rf}_{\Pi_3}(\mathbb{K}))$$

The inference says that $\mathbb{K} \in RM_3$.

($\text{rf}_{\Pi_2}(\alpha, \pi, \nu)$) There exist ordinals $\alpha < \pi \leq b < \mathbb{K}$, $\nu < m_2(\pi)$ such that $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \pi$ and $\nu \leq \gamma$, cf. (9), $a_0 < a$, and a finite set Δ of $\Sigma_2(\pi)$ -sentences enjoying the following conditions:

1. $\{\alpha, \pi, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$.
2. For each $\delta \in \Delta$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg \delta$.
3. For each $\alpha < \rho \in Mh_2(\nu) \cap \pi$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)}$ holds.
By $\rho \in Mh_2(\nu)$ we mean $\nu \leq m_2(\rho)$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg \delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)} : \alpha < \rho \in Mh_2(\nu) \cap \pi\}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rf}_{\Pi_2}(\alpha, \pi, \nu))$$

The inference says that $\pi \in M_2(Mh_2^2(\nu))$ provided that $\{m_2(\pi), \gamma, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\pi)$.

The axiom for Π_3 -reflection follows from the inference ($\text{rf}_{\Pi_3}(\mathbb{K})$) as follows. Let $A \in \Sigma_3(\mathbb{K})$ with $d = \text{rk}(A) < \mathbb{K} + \omega$, and $d_\rho = \text{rk}(A^{(\rho, \mathbb{K})})$ for $\rho < \mathbb{K}$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_0[\mathbf{k}(A) \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_0^{2d_\rho} A^{(\rho, \mathbb{K})}, \neg A^{(\rho, \mathbb{K})}}{\mathcal{H}_0[\mathbf{k}(A)] \vdash_0^{2d} A, \neg A \quad \mathcal{H}_0[\mathbf{k}(A) \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_0^{\mathbb{K}} \exists z A^{(z, \mathbb{K})}, \neg A^{(\rho, \mathbb{K})}}{\mathcal{H}_0[\mathbf{k}(A)] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathbb{K}+\omega} \neg A, \exists z A^{(z, \mathbb{K})}} \quad (\text{rf}_{\Pi_3}(\mathbb{K}))$$

An appropriate name for this collapsing technique would be stationary collapsing since in order for this procedure to work, a single derivation has to be collapsed into a ‘‘stationary’’ family of derivations. [Rathjen94]

We see from the following proof that $\alpha = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K})$ holds in every inference $(\text{rf}\Pi_2(\alpha, \kappa, a_0))$ occurring in a witnessed derivation of $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}$. Let us call the unique ordinal α a *base*.

Lemma 2.5 *Assume $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_2(\mathbb{K})$, $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma))$, and $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^a \Gamma$ with $a \leq \gamma$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}$ holds for any $\kappa \in Mh_2(a) \cap \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K} \cdot \omega)$ such that $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K}) < \kappa$, where $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^{\mathbb{K}+a}$ and $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\hat{a})$.*

Proof. By induction on a . Note that there exists a $\kappa \in OT(\Pi_3)$ such that $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K}) < \kappa \in Mh_2(a) \cap \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K} \cdot \omega)$. F.e. $\kappa = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}^a(\gamma + \mathbb{K} + 1)$.

Case 1. Consider the case when the last inference is a $(\text{rf}\Pi_3(\mathbb{K}))$. For $\Sigma_3 \ni A \simeq \bigvee (A_i)_{i \in J}$,

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg A \quad \{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{a_0} \Gamma, A^{(\rho, \mathbb{K})} : \rho < \mathbb{K}\}}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^a \Gamma} (\text{rf}\Pi_3(\mathbb{K}))$$

Let

$$\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K}) \leq \sigma \in Mh_2(a_0) \cap \kappa.$$

Let $i \in Tm(\sigma)$, i.e., $k(i) \subset \sigma$. For each $i \in Tm(\sigma)$ Inversion yields $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+|i|}[\Theta \cup k(i)] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg A_i$ with $k(i) < \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + |i|)$. By IH we obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\} \cup k(i)] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta_0} \Gamma^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}, \neg A_i^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}$ for every $i \in Tm(\sigma)$, where $\beta_0 = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\hat{a}_0)$ with $\hat{a}_0 = \gamma + \omega^{\mathbb{K}+a_0} = \gamma + |i| + \omega^{\mathbb{K}+a_0}$. A (\wedge) yields

$$\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta_0+1} \Gamma^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}, \neg A^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}$$

On the other hand we have $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+\sigma}[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{a_0} \Gamma, A^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}$ with $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma+\sigma}(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \sigma))$, but $\sigma \notin \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K}))$. We obtain $\kappa \in Mh_2(a_0)$ by $a_0 < a$, and $\gamma + \sigma + \mathbb{K} = \gamma + \mathbb{K}$. IH yields

$$\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta_0} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}, A^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}$$

A (cut) of the cut formula $A^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}$ with $\text{rk}(A^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}) < \kappa < \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K} \cdot \omega) \leq \beta$ yields

$$\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta_0+2} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}, \Gamma^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}$$

On the other side

$$\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_0^{2d} \neg \theta^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}, \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}$$

holds for each $\theta \in \Gamma \subset \Sigma_2(\mathbb{K})$, where $d = \max\{\text{rk}(\theta^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}) : \theta \in \Gamma\} < \kappa + \omega < \beta$.

Moreover we have $a_0 < \hat{a}$, $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(a_0) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \cap \mathbb{K} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma)) \cap \mathbb{K} \subset \kappa$. A $(\text{rf}\Pi_2(\delta, \kappa, a_0))$ with $\delta = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K})$, $\{\delta, \kappa, a_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}]$ yields $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_0^{2d} \neg \theta^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}, \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}\}_{\theta \in \Gamma} \quad \frac{\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta_0+1} \Gamma^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}, \neg A^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})} \quad \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta_0} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}, A^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}}{\{\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta_0+2} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}, \Gamma^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}\}_{\delta < \sigma \in Mh_2(a_0) \cap \kappa}}}{\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}} (\text{rf}\Pi_2(\delta, \kappa, a_0))$$

Case 2. The last inference is a (*cut*) of a cut formula C with $\text{rk}(C) < \mathbb{K}$. Then $\text{rk}(C) \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap \mathbb{K} \subset \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma) < \beta$ by (3), Proposition 3.1 and the assumption $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma))$.

Case 3. The last inference is a (\wedge) with a main formula $\Pi_1(\mathbb{K}) \ni A \simeq \bigwedge(A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. We may assume $J = Tm(\mathbb{K})$. Then $A^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})} \simeq \bigwedge(A_\iota)_{\iota \in Tm(\kappa)}$, and we obtain the lemma by pruning the branches for $\iota \notin Tm(\kappa)$.

Case 4. The last inference is a (\vee) with a main formula $\Sigma_2(\mathbb{K}) \ni A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. We may assume $J = Tm(\mathbb{K})$. Then $A^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})} \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota \in Tm(\kappa)}$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{a_0} \Gamma, A_\iota}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^a \Gamma} (\vee)$$

We may assume that $\mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset \mathbf{k}(A_\iota)$. Then by (3) and $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma))$ we obtain $\mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap \mathbb{K} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma)) \cap \mathbb{K} \subset \kappa$, and $\iota \in Tm(\kappa)$. \square

An ordinal term α in $OT(\Pi_3)$ is said to be *regular* if either $\alpha \in \{\Omega, \mathbb{K}\}$ or $\alpha = \psi_\sigma^\nu(a)$ for some σ, a and $\nu > 0$.

Lemma 2.6 *Let λ be regular, $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_1(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma$, where $a < \mathbb{K}$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \ni \lambda \leq b < \mathbb{K}$, and $\forall \kappa \in [\lambda, b)(\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\kappa(\gamma)))$. Let $\hat{a} = \gamma + \theta_b(a)$ and $\beta = \psi_\lambda^\eta(\hat{a})$ such that $0 \leq \eta \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, $\eta < m_2(\lambda)$, $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\eta) \subset \beta$ and $\eta \leq \gamma$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta] \vdash_\beta^\beta \Gamma$ holds.*

Proof. By main induction on b with subsidiary induction on a as in Theorem 1.22.

Case 1. Consider first the case when the last inference is a ($\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\alpha, \sigma, \nu)$) with $b \geq \sigma > \alpha$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \sigma)} : \alpha < \rho \in Mh_2(\nu) \cap \sigma\}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} (\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\alpha, \sigma, \nu))$$

where $\Delta \subset \Sigma_2(\sigma)$, $\{\alpha, \sigma, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, $\nu < m_2(\sigma)$, $\nu \leq \gamma$ and $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \sigma$.

Case 1.1. $\sigma < \lambda$: Then $\{\neg\delta\} \cup \Delta^{(\rho, \sigma)} \subset \Delta_0(\lambda)$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$. For any $\lambda \leq \kappa < b$, we obtain $\rho < \sigma \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap \kappa \subset \psi_\kappa(\gamma)$. SIH yields the lemma.

Case 1.2. $\sigma \geq \lambda$: For each $\delta \in \Delta$, let $\delta \simeq \bigvee(\delta_i)_{i \in J}$. We may assume $J = Tm(\sigma)$. Inversion yields $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+|i|}[\Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(i)] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta_i$. Let $\hat{a}_0 = \gamma + \theta_b(a_0)$ and $\rho = \psi_\sigma^\nu(\hat{a}_0 + \alpha)$, where $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho)$ by the assumption, $\{\alpha, \sigma, \nu, \hat{a}_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ with $\nu < m_2(\sigma)$. Hence $\{\alpha, \sigma, \nu, \hat{a}_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho)$ and $\alpha < \rho$ by $\alpha < \sigma$. Therefore, cf. (9), $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \rho \in Mh_2(\nu) \cap \sigma \cap \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+\alpha+1}[\Theta]$.

For each $\mathbf{k}(i) \subset \rho$ and $\neg\delta_i \in \Sigma_1(\sigma)$, we obtain $\gamma + |i| + \theta_b(a_0) = \hat{a}_0$ by $|i| < \rho < \sigma \leq b$, and $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1}[\Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(i)] \vdash_{\rho_0}^{\rho_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta_i$ by SIH for $\rho_0 = \psi_{|sig(\hat{a}_0)} \leq \rho$. Hence $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+\alpha+1}[\Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(i)] \vdash_\rho^\rho \Gamma, \neg\delta_i$. By Boundedness we obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+\alpha+1}[\Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(i)] \vdash_\rho^\rho \Gamma, \neg\delta_i^{(\rho, \sigma)}$. A (\wedge) yields

$$\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+\alpha+1}[\Theta] \vdash_\rho^{\rho+1} \Gamma, \neg\delta^{(\rho, \sigma)}.$$

On the other hand we have $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \sigma)}$, and $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_0 + \alpha + 1}[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \sigma)}$. By SIH we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_1 + 1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \sigma)}$$

for $\beta_1 = \psi_\sigma(\widehat{a}_1) > \rho$, with $\widehat{a}_1 = \widehat{a}_0 + \alpha + \theta_b(a_0) \leq \gamma + \theta_b(a_0) \cdot 3 < \widehat{a}$. Therefore we obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_1 + 1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta_1}^{\beta_1 + \omega} \Gamma$ by several (*cut*)'s of $\text{rk}(\delta^{(\rho, \sigma)}) < \rho + \omega < \beta_1$.

If $\sigma = \lambda$, then we are done. Let $\lambda < \sigma \leq b$. Then $\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap \sigma \subset \beta_1$. MIH yields $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_2 + 1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta_2}^{\beta_2} \Gamma$, where $\widehat{a}_2 = \widehat{a}_1 + \theta_{\beta_1}(\beta_1 + \omega) < \widehat{a}$ by $\beta_1 < \sigma \leq b$, and $\beta_2 = \psi_\lambda(\widehat{a}_2) < \psi_\lambda(\widehat{a}) \leq \beta$.

Case 2. Next the last inference is a (*cut*) of a cut formula C with $d = \text{rk}(C) < b$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, -C \quad \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, C}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \text{ (cut)}$$

If $d < \lambda$, then SIH yields the lemma. Let $\lambda \leq d$ and $\widehat{a}_0 = \gamma + \theta_b(a_0)$.

Case 2.1. There exists a regular $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ such that $d < \sigma \leq b$: For $\{-C, C\} \subset \Delta_0(\sigma)$, we obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_0 + 1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta_0}^{\beta_0} \Gamma, C$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_0 + 1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta_0}^{\beta_0} \Gamma, -C$ for $\beta_0 = \psi_\sigma(\widehat{a}_0)$ by SIH. A (*cut*) yields $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_0 + 1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta_0}^{\beta_0 + 1} \Gamma$. MIH yields $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_1 + 1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \Gamma$, where $\widehat{a}_1 = \widehat{a}_0 + \theta_{\beta_0}(\beta_0 + 1) < \widehat{a}$ and $\beta_1 = \psi_\lambda(\widehat{a}_1) < \psi_\lambda(\widehat{a}) \leq \beta$.

Case 2.2. Otherwise: Then there is no regular $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ such that $d < \sigma \leq b$. Let $d + c = b$. Then by Cut-elimination we obtain $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_d^{\theta_c(a)} \Gamma$. MIH yields $\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a} + 1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\psi_\lambda(\widehat{a})}^{\psi_\lambda(\widehat{a})} \Gamma$, where $\gamma + \theta_d(\theta_c(a)) = \gamma + \theta_b(a) = \widehat{a}$. \square

Theorem 2.7 *Assume $\text{KPII}_3 \vdash \theta^{L_\Omega}$ for $\theta \in \Sigma$. Then there exists an $n < \omega$ such that $L_\alpha \models \theta$ for $\alpha = \psi_\Omega(\omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1))$ in $OT(\Pi_3)$.*

Proof. By Embedding there exists an $m > 0$ such that $\mathcal{H}_0[\emptyset] \vdash_{\mathbb{K} + m}^{\mathbb{K} + m} \theta^{L_\Omega}$. By Cut-elimination, $\mathcal{H}_0[\emptyset] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^a \theta^{L_\Omega}$ and $\mathcal{H}_a[\emptyset] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^a \theta^{L_\Omega}$ for $a = \omega_m(\mathbb{K} + m)$. By Lemma 2.5 we obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\omega^a + 1}[\{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \theta^{L_\Omega}$, where $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\omega^a)$, $a + \omega^{\mathbb{K} + a} = \omega^a$, $(\theta^{L_\Omega})^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})} \equiv \theta^{L_\Omega}$ and $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(a + \mathbb{K}) < \kappa \in \text{Mh}_2(a) \cap \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(a + \mathbb{K} \cdot \omega)$. F.e. $\kappa = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}^a(a + \mathbb{K} + 1) \in \mathcal{H}_{a + \mathbb{K} + 2}[\emptyset]$. Hence $\mathcal{H}_{\omega^a + \mathbb{K} + 2}[\emptyset] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \theta^{L_\Omega}$. Lemma 2.6 then yields $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma + 1}[\emptyset] \vdash_{\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \theta^{L_\Omega}$ for $\gamma = \omega^a + \mathbb{K} + \theta_\beta(\beta)$ and $\beta_1 = \psi_\Omega(\gamma) < \psi_\Omega(\omega^a + \mathbb{K} \cdot 2) < \psi_\Omega(\omega_{m+2}(\mathbb{K} + 1)) = \alpha$. Therefore $L_\alpha \models \theta$. \square

3 Well-foundedness proof in KPII_3

$OT(\Pi_3)$ denotes the computable notation system in section 2. $\kappa = \psi'_\sigma(b) \in OT(\Pi_3)$ only if $\nu = m_2(\kappa) < m_2(\sigma)$, $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \kappa$ and $\nu \leq b$, cf. (9). In this section we show the

Theorem 3.1 *KPII_3 proves the well-foundedness of $OT(\Pi_3)$ up to each $\alpha < \psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K} + 1})$.*

We assume a standard encoding $OT(\Pi_3) \ni \alpha \mapsto [\alpha] \in \omega$, and identify ordinal terms α with its code $[\alpha]$.

3.1 Distinguished sets

In this subsection we work in KPL .

Definition 3.2 [Buchholz00].

For $\alpha \in OT(\Pi_3)$, $X \subset OT(\Pi_3)$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) &:= \text{closure of } \{0, \Omega, \mathbb{K}\} \cup (X \cap \alpha) \text{ under } +, \varphi \\ &\text{and } (\sigma, \alpha, \nu) \mapsto \psi_\sigma^\nu(\alpha) \text{ for } \sigma > \alpha \text{ in } OT(\Pi_3) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$\alpha^+ = \Omega_{a+1}$ denotes the least regular term above α if such a term exists. Otherwise $\alpha^+ := \infty$.

Proposition 3.3 Assume $\forall \gamma \in X [\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)]$ for a set $X \subset OT(\Pi_3)$.

1. $\alpha \leq \beta \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\beta(X) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$.
2. $\alpha < \beta < \alpha^+ \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\beta(X) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$.

Proof. 3.3.1. We see by induction on $\ell\gamma$ ($\gamma \in OT(\Pi_3)$) that

$$\forall \beta \geq \alpha [\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X) \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cup (X \cap \beta)] \quad (11)$$

For example, if $\psi_\pi^\nu(\delta) \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$ with $\pi > \beta \geq \alpha$ and $\{\pi, \delta, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cup (X \cap \beta)$, then $\pi \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$, and for any $\gamma \in \{\delta, \nu\}$, either $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ or $\gamma \in X \cap \beta$. If $\gamma < \alpha$, then $\gamma \in X \cap \alpha \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. If $\alpha \leq \gamma \in X \cap \beta$, then $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$ by the assumption, and by IH we have $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cup (X \cap \gamma)$, i.e., $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. Therefore $\{\pi, \delta, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$, and $\psi_\pi^\nu(\delta) \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$.

Using (11) we see from the assumption that $\forall \beta \geq \alpha [\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X) \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)]$.

3.3.2. Assume $\alpha < \beta < \alpha^+$. Then by Proposition 3.3.1 we have $\mathcal{C}^\beta(X) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$ is easily seen from $\beta < \alpha^+$. \square

Definition 3.4 1. $\text{Prg}[X, Y] := \forall \alpha \in X (X \cap \alpha \subset Y \rightarrow \alpha \in Y)$.

2. For a definable class \mathcal{X} , $TI[\mathcal{X}]$ denotes the schema:
 $TI[\mathcal{X}] := \text{Prg}[\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}] \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{Y}$ holds for any definable classes \mathcal{Y} .
3. For $X \subset OT(\Pi_3)$, $W(X)$ denotes the *well-founded part* of X .
4. $Wo[X] := X \subset W(X)$.

Note that for $\alpha \in OT(\Pi_3)$, $W(X) \cap \alpha = W(X \cap \alpha)$.

Definition 3.5 For $X \subset OT(\Pi_3)$ and $\alpha \in OT(\Pi_3)$,

1. $D[X] := \forall \alpha (\alpha \leq X \rightarrow W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)) \cap \alpha^+ = X \cap \alpha^+)$ (12)

A set X is said to be a *distinguished set* if $D[X]$.

2. $\mathcal{W} := \bigcup\{X : D[X]\}$.

Let $\alpha \in X$ for a distinguished set X . Then $W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)) \cap \alpha^+ = X \cap \alpha^+$. Hence X is a well order.

Proposition 3.6 *Let X be a distinguished set. Then $\alpha \in X \Rightarrow \forall \beta[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)]$.*

Proof. Let $D[X]$ and $\alpha \in X$. Then $\alpha \in X \cap \alpha^+ = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)) \cap \alpha^+ \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. Hence $\forall \gamma \in X (\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X))$, and $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$ for any $\beta \leq \alpha$ by Proposition 3.3.1. Moreover for $\beta > \alpha$ we have $\alpha \in X \cap \beta \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$. \square

Proposition 3.7 *$X \cap \alpha = Y \cap \alpha \Rightarrow \forall \beta < \alpha^+ [\mathcal{C}^\beta(X) = \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)]$ if $\forall \gamma \in X (\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X))$ and $\forall \gamma \in Y (\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y))$.*

Proof. Assume that $X \cap \alpha = Y \cap \alpha$ and $\alpha \leq \beta < \alpha^+$. We obtain $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)$. On the other hand we have $\mathcal{C}^\beta(X) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ and similarly for $\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$ by Proposition 3.3.2. Hence $\mathcal{C}^\beta(X) = \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. \square

Proposition 3.8 *$\alpha \leq X \ \& \ \alpha \leq Y \Rightarrow X \cap \alpha^+ = Y \cap \alpha^+$ if $D[X]$ and $D[Y]$.*

Proof. For distinguished set X , $\alpha \leq X \Rightarrow X \cap \alpha^+ = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)) \cap \alpha^+$. Hence the proposition follows from Propositions 3.6 and 3.7. \square

Proposition 3.9 *\mathcal{W} is the maximal distinguished class.*

Proof. First we show $\forall \gamma \in \mathcal{W} (\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(\mathcal{W}))$. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{W}$, and pick a distinguished set X such that $\gamma \in X$. Then $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X) \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(\mathcal{W})$ by $X \subset \mathcal{W}$.

Let $\alpha \leq \mathcal{W}$. Pick a distinguished set X such that $\alpha \leq X$. We claim that $\mathcal{W} \cap \alpha^+ = X \cap \alpha^+$. Let Y be a distinguished set and $\beta \in Y \cap \alpha^+$. Then $\beta \in Y \cap \beta^+ = X \cap \beta^+$ by Proposition 3.8. The claim yields $W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W})) \cap \alpha^+ = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)) \cap \alpha^+ = X \cap \alpha^+ = \mathcal{W} \cap \alpha^+$. Hence $D[\mathcal{W}]$. \square

Definition 3.10 $\mathcal{G}(X) := \{\alpha \in OT(\Pi_3) : \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \ \& \ \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cap \alpha \subset X\}$.

Lemma 3.11 *For $D[X]$, $X \subset \mathcal{G}(X)$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma \in X$. We have $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)) \cap \gamma^+ = X \cap \gamma^+$. Hence $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$. Assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma$. Then $\alpha \in W(\mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)) \cap \gamma^+ \subset X$. Therefore $\mathcal{C}^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma \subset X$. \square

Definition 3.12 For ordinal terms $\alpha, \delta \in OT(\Pi_3)$, finite sets $G_\delta(\alpha) \subset OT(\Pi_3)$ are defined recursively as follows.

1. $G_\delta(\alpha) = \emptyset$ for $\alpha \in \{0, \Omega, \mathbb{K}\}$. $G_\delta(\alpha_m + \dots + \alpha_0) = \bigcup_{i \leq m} G_\delta(\alpha_i)$. $G_\delta(\varphi\beta\gamma) = G_\delta(\beta) \cup G_\delta(\gamma)$.
2. $G_\delta(\psi_\pi^\nu(a)) = \begin{cases} G_\delta(\{\pi, a, \nu\}) & \delta < \pi \\ \{\psi_\pi^\nu(a)\} & \pi \leq \delta \end{cases}$.

Proposition 3.13 *For $\{\alpha, \delta, a, b, \rho\} \subset OT(\Pi_3)$,*

1. $G_\delta(\alpha) \leq \alpha$.
2. $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(b) \Rightarrow G_\delta(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(b)$.

Proof. These are shown simultaneously by induction on the lengths $\ell\alpha$ of ordinal terms α . It is easy to see that

$$G_\delta(\alpha) \ni \beta \Rightarrow \beta < \delta \ \& \ \ell\beta \leq \ell\alpha \quad (13)$$

3.13.1. Consider the case $\alpha = \psi_\pi^\nu(a)$ with $\delta < \pi$. Then $G_\delta(\alpha) = G_\delta(\{\pi, a, \nu\})$. On the other hand we have $\{\pi, a, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$. Proposition 3.13.2 with (13) yields $G_\delta(\{\pi, a, \nu\}) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha) \cap \pi \subset \alpha$. Hence $G_\delta(\alpha) < \alpha$.

3.13.2. Since $G_\delta(\alpha) \leq \alpha$ by Proposition 3.13.1, we can assume $\alpha \geq b$.

Consider the case $\alpha = \psi_\pi^\nu(a)$ with $\delta < \pi$. Then $\{\pi, a, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(b)$ and $G_\delta(\alpha) = G_\delta(\{\pi, a, \nu\})$. IH yields the proposition. \square

Proposition 3.14 *Let $\gamma < \beta$. Assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$ and $\forall \kappa \leq \beta [G_\kappa(\alpha) < \gamma]$. Moreover assume $\forall \delta [\ell\delta \leq \ell\alpha \ \& \ \delta \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma \Rightarrow \delta \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)]$. Then $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$.*

Proof. By induction on $\ell\alpha$. If $\alpha < \gamma$, then $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma$. The third assumption yields $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$. Assume $\alpha \geq \gamma$. Except the case $\alpha = \psi_\pi^\nu(a)$ for some π, a, ν , IH yields $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$. Suppose $\alpha = \psi_\pi^\nu(a)$ for some $\{\pi, a, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$ and $\pi > \gamma$. If $\pi \leq \beta$, then $\{\alpha\} = G_\pi(\alpha) < \gamma$ by the second assumption. Hence this is not the case, and we obtain $\pi > \beta$. Then $G_\kappa(\{\pi, a, \nu\}) = G_\kappa(\alpha) < \gamma$ for any $\kappa \leq \beta < \pi$. IH yields $\{\pi, a, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$. We conclude $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(X)$ from $\pi > \beta$. \square

Lemma 3.15 *Suppose $D[Y]$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(Y)$. Let $X = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)) \cap \alpha^+$. Assume that the following condition (71) is fulfilled. Then $\alpha \in X$ and $D[X]$.*

$$\forall \beta (Y \cap \alpha^+ < \beta \ \& \ \beta^+ < \alpha^+ \rightarrow W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)) \cap \beta^+ \subset Y) \quad (14)$$

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(Y)$. By $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha \subset Y$ and $Wo[Y]$ we obtain by Proposition 3.6

$$X \cap \alpha = Y \cap \alpha = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha \quad (15)$$

Hence $\alpha \in X$.

Claim 3.16 $\alpha^+ = \gamma^+ \ \& \ \gamma \in X \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$.

Proof of Claim 3.16. Let $\alpha^+ = \gamma^+$ and $\gamma \in X = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)) \cap \alpha^+$. We obtain $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) = \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ by Propositions 3.6 and 3.3. Hence $Y \cap \gamma \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) \cap \gamma$. $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y))$ yields $Y \cap \gamma \subset X$. Therefore we obtain $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$. \square of Claim 3.16.

Claim 3.17 $D[X]$.

Proof of Claim 3.17. We have $X \cap \alpha = Y \cap \alpha$ by (15). Let $\beta \leq X$. We show $W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(X)) \cap \beta^+ = X \cap \beta^+$.

Case 1. $\beta^+ = \alpha^+$: We obtain $\mathcal{C}^\beta(X) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)$ by Proposition 3.3, Claim 3.16 and (15).

Case 2. $\beta^+ < \alpha^+$: Then $\beta^+ \leq \alpha$.

First let $Y \cap \alpha^+ < \beta$. Then the assumption (71) yields $W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)) \cap \beta^+ \subset Y$. We obtain $W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(X)) \cap \beta^+ \subset Y \cap \beta^+ = X \cap \beta^+$ by (15). It remains to show $Y \cap \beta^+ \subset W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y))$. Let $\gamma \in Y \cap \beta^+$. We obtain $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y))$ by $D[Y]$. On the other hand we have $\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ by Proposition 3.3. Moreover Proposition 3.6 yields $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. Hence $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y))$.

Next let $\beta \leq Y \cap \alpha^+$. We obtain $Y \cap \beta^+ = W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)) \cap \beta^+$, and $X \cap \beta^+ = W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(X)) \cap \beta^+$ by (15). □ of Claim 3.17.

This completes a proof of Lemma 3.15. □

Proposition 3.18 *Let $D[X]$.*

1. Let $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subset X$ with $\alpha + \beta = \alpha \# \beta$ and $\alpha > 0$. Then $\gamma = \alpha + \beta \in X$.
2. If $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subset X$, then $\varphi_\alpha(\beta) \in X$.

Proof. Proposition 3.18.2 is seen by main induction on $\alpha \in X$ with subsidiary induction on $\beta \in X$ using Proposition 3.18.1. We show Proposition 3.18.1. We obtain $\alpha \in X \cap \gamma^+ = W(\mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)) \cap \gamma^+$ with $\gamma^+ = \alpha^+$. We see that $\alpha + \beta \in W(\mathcal{C}^\gamma(X))$ by induction on $\beta \in X \cap \alpha \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$. □

Proposition 3.19 *Let $X_0 = W(\mathcal{C}^0(\emptyset)) \cap 0^+$ with $0^+ = \Omega$, and $X_1 = W(\mathcal{C}^\Omega(X_0)) \cap \Omega^+$. Then $0 \in X_0$, $\Omega \in X_1$ and $D[X_i]$ for $i = 0, 1$.*

Proof. For each $\alpha \in \{0, \Omega\}$ and any set $Y \subset OT(\Pi_3)$ we have $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)$. First we obtain $0 \in \mathcal{G}(\emptyset)$ and $D[\emptyset]$. Also there is no β such that $\beta^+ < 0^+$. Hence the condition (71) is fulfilled, and we obtain $0 \in X_0$ and $D[X_0]$ by Lemma 3.15.

Next let $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\Omega(X_0) \cap \Omega$. We show $\gamma \in X_0$ by induction on the lengths $\ell\gamma$ of ordinal terms γ as follows. We see that each strongly critical number $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\Omega(X_0) \cap \Omega$ is in X_0 since if $\psi_\sigma^\nu(\beta) < \Omega$, then $\sigma = \Omega$. Otherwise $\gamma \in X_0$ is seen from IH using Proposition 3.18 and $0 \in X_0$. Therefore we obtain $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X_0)$. Let $\beta^+ < \alpha^+$. Then $\beta^+ = \Omega$ and $\beta < \Omega$. Then $W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(X_0)) \cap \Omega = W(\mathcal{C}^0(X_0)) \cap \Omega = X_0$ by Proposition 3.3. Hence the condition (71) is fulfilled, and we obtain $\Omega \in X_1$ and $D[X_1]$ by Lemma 3.15. □

Definition 3.20 $\beta \prec \alpha$ iff there exists a sequence $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \leq n} (n > 0)$ such that $\alpha = \sigma_0$, $\beta = \sigma_n$ and for each $i < n$, there are some ν_i, a_i such that $\sigma_{i+1} = \psi_{\sigma_i}^{\nu_i}(a_i)$.

Note that $\beta \prec \alpha \Rightarrow m_2(\beta) < m_2(\alpha)$.

Lemma 3.21 *Suppose $D[Y]$ with $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Y$, and for $\eta \in OT(\Pi_3)$*

$$\eta \in \mathcal{G}(Y) \tag{16}$$

and

$$\forall \gamma \prec \eta (\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(Y) \Rightarrow \gamma \in Y) \quad (17)$$

Let $X = W(\mathcal{C}^\eta(Y)) \cap \eta^+$. Then $\eta \in X$ and $D[X]$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.15 and the hypothesis (16) it suffices to show (71), i.e.,

$$\forall \beta (Y \cap \eta^+ < \beta \& \beta^+ < \eta^+ \rightarrow W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)) \cap \beta^+ \subset Y).$$

Assume $Y \cap \eta^+ < \beta$ and $\beta^+ < \eta^+$. We have to show $W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)) \cap \beta^+ \subset Y$. We prove this by induction on $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)) \cap \beta^+$. Suppose $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^+$ and

$$\text{MIH} : \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma \subset Y.$$

We show $\gamma \in Y$. We can assume that

$$Y \cap \eta^+ < \gamma \quad (18)$$

since if $\gamma \leq \delta$ for some $\delta \in Y \cap \eta^+$, then by $Y \cap \eta^+ < \beta$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$ we obtain $\delta < \beta$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)$ and $\delta \in W(\mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)) \cap \delta^+ = Y \cap \delta^+$. Hence $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)) \cap \delta^+ \subset Y$.

We show first

$$\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(Y) \quad (19)$$

First $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ by $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^+$ and Proposition 3.3. Second we show the following claim by induction on $\ell\alpha$:

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \in Y \quad (20)$$

Proof of (20). Assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$. We can assume $\gamma^+ \leq \beta$ for otherwise we have $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma = \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma \subset Y$ by MIH.

By induction hypothesis on lengths, $\alpha < \gamma < \beta^+ < \eta^+$, Proposition 3.18, and $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Y$, we can assume that $\alpha = \psi_\pi^\nu(a)$ for some $\pi > \gamma$ such that $\{\pi, a, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$.

Case 1. $\beta < \pi$: Then $G_\beta(\{\pi, a, \nu\}) = G_\beta(\alpha) < \alpha < \gamma$ by Proposition 3.13.1. Proposition 3.14 with induction hypothesis on lengths yields $\{\pi, a, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. Hence $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma$ by $\pi > \beta$. MIH yields $\alpha \in Y$.

Case 2. $\beta \geq \pi$: We have $\alpha < \gamma < \pi \leq \beta$. It suffices to show that $\alpha \leq Y \cap \eta^+$. Then by (18) we have $\alpha \leq \delta \in Y \cap \eta^+$ for some $\delta < \gamma$. $\mathcal{C}^\delta(Y) \ni \alpha \leq \delta \in Y \cap \delta^+ = W(\mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)) \cap \delta^+$ yields $\alpha \in W(\mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)) \cap \delta^+ \subset Y$.

Assume first that γ is not a strongly critical number. By $\alpha = \psi_\pi^\nu(a) < \gamma$, we can assume that $\gamma \neq 0$. Let δ denote the largest immediate subterm of γ . We obtain $\delta \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma$ by (18), $Y \cap \eta^+ < \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. Hence $\delta \in Y$ by MIH. Also by $\alpha < \gamma$, we obtain $\alpha \leq \delta$, i.e., $\alpha \leq Y$, and we are done.

Next let $\gamma = \psi_\kappa^\xi(b)$ for some b, ξ and $\kappa > \beta$ by (18) and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. We have $\alpha < \gamma < \pi \leq \beta < \kappa$. We obtain $\pi \notin \mathcal{H}_b(\gamma)$ since otherwise by $\pi < \kappa$ we would have $\pi < \gamma$. Therefore $\alpha = \psi_\pi^\nu(a) < \psi_\kappa^\xi(b) = \gamma < \pi < \kappa$ with $\pi \in \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$ and $\pi \notin \mathcal{H}_b(\gamma)$. This yields $a > b$ and $\{\kappa, b, \xi\} \notin \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$.

On the other hand we have $\{\kappa, b, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\gamma)$. This means that there exists a subterm $\delta < \gamma$ of one of κ, b, ξ such that $\delta \notin \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$. Also we have $\{\kappa, b, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. Then $\delta \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma$. By MIH we obtain $\alpha \leq \delta \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma \subset Y$.
 \square of (20) and (19).

Hence we obtain $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(Y)$. We have $\gamma < \beta^+ \leq \eta$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$. If $\gamma \prec \eta$, then the hypothesis (17) yields $\gamma \in Y$. In what follows assume $\gamma \not\prec \eta$.

If $G_\eta(\gamma) < \gamma$, then Proposition 3.14 yields $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\eta(Y) \cap \eta \subset Y$ by $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(Y)$.

Suppose $G_\eta(\gamma) = \{\gamma\}$. This means, by $\gamma \not\prec \eta$, that $\gamma \prec \tau$ for a $\tau < \eta$. Let τ denote the maximal such one. We have $\gamma < \tau < \eta$. From $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ we see $\tau \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$. Next we show that

$$G_\eta(\tau) < \gamma \quad (21)$$

Let $\tau = \psi_\kappa^\mu(b)$. Then $\eta < \kappa$ by the maximality of τ , and $G_\eta(\tau) = G_\eta(\{\kappa, b, \mu\}) < \tau$ by Proposition 3.13.1. On the other hand we have $\tau \in \mathcal{H}_a(\gamma)$. Proposition 3.13.2 yields $G_\eta(\tau) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\gamma)$. We see $G_\eta(\tau) < \gamma$ inductively.

Proposition 3.14 with (21) yields $\tau \in \mathcal{C}^\eta(Y)$, and $\tau \in \mathcal{C}^\eta(Y) \cap \eta \subset Y$ by $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(Y)$. Therefore $Y \cap \eta^+ < \gamma < \tau \in Y$. This is not the case by (18). We are done. \square

Proposition 3.22 $\alpha \leq \mathcal{W} \cap \beta^+ \ \& \ \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(\mathcal{W}) \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{W}$.

Proof. This is seen from Propositions 3.3, 3.6 and 7.39. \square

3.2 Mahlo universes

In Proposition 3.9, we saw that \mathcal{W} is the maximal distinguished class, which is Σ_2^{1-} -definable and a proper class in KPII_3 . \mathcal{W}^P in Definition 3.25 denotes the maximal distinguished class *inside* a set P . \mathcal{W}^P exists as a set.

Let ad denote a Π_3^- -sentence such that a transitive set z is admissible iff $(z; \in) \models ad$. Let $lmtad : \Leftrightarrow \forall x \exists y (x \in y \wedge ad^y)$. Observe that $lmtad$ is a Π_2^- -sentence.

Definition 3.23 L denotes a whole universe, which is a model of KPII_3 .

1. By a *universe* we mean either the whole universe L or a transitive set $Q \in L$ with $\omega \in Q$. Universes are denoted by P, Q, \dots
2. For a universe P and a set-theoretic sentence φ , $P \models \varphi \Leftrightarrow (P; \in) \models \varphi$.
3. A universe P is said to be a *limit universe* if $lmtad^P$ holds, i.e., P is a limit of admissible sets. The class of limit universes is denoted by $Lmtad$.

Lemma 3.24 $W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X))$ as well as $D[X]$ are absolute for limit universes P .

Proof. Let P be a limit universe and $X \in \mathcal{P}(\omega) \cap P$. Then $W(X)$ is Δ_1 in P , and so is $W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X))$. Hence $W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)) = \{\beta \in OT(\Pi_3) : P \models \beta \in W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X))\}$, and $D[X] \Leftrightarrow P \models D[X]$. \square

Definition 3.25 For a universe P , let $\mathcal{W}^P := \bigcup\{X \in P : D[X]\}$.

Lemma 3.26 Let P be a universe closed under finite unions, and $\alpha \in OT(\Pi_3)$.

1. There is a finite set $K(\alpha) \subset OT(\Pi_3)$ such that $\forall Y \in P \forall \gamma [K(\alpha) \cap Y = K(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{W}^P \Rightarrow (\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(\mathcal{W}^P) \Leftrightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y))]$.
2. There exists a distinguished set $X \in P$ such that $\forall Y \in P \forall \gamma [X \subset Y \ \& \ D[Y] \Rightarrow (\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(\mathcal{W}^P) \Leftrightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y))]$.

Proof. 3.26.1. F.e. the set of subterms of α enjoys the condition for $K(\alpha)$.
 3.26.2. By $X, Y \in P \Rightarrow X \cup Y \in P$, pick a distinguished set $X \in P$ such that $K(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{W}^P \subset X$. \square

Proposition 3.27 For each limit universe P , $D[\mathcal{W}^P]$ holds, and $\exists X (X = \mathcal{W}^P)$ if P is a set.

Proof. $D[\mathcal{W}^P]$ is seen as in Proposition 3.9. \square

For a universal Π_n -formula $\Pi_n(a)$ ($n > 0$) uniformly on admissibles, let

$$P \in M_2(\mathcal{C}) := P \in Lmtad \ \& \ \forall b \in P [P \models \Pi_2(b) \rightarrow \exists Q \in \mathcal{C} \cap P (Q \models \Pi_2(b))].$$

Lemma 3.28 Let \mathcal{C} be a Π_0^1 -class such that $\mathcal{C} \subset Lmtad$. Suppose $P \in M_2(\mathcal{C})$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^P)$. Then there exists a universe $Q \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^Q)$.

Proof. Suppose $P \in M_2(\mathcal{C})$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^P)$. First by $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^P)$ and Lemma 3.26 pick a distinguished set $X_0 \in P$ such that $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X_0)$ and $K(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{W}^P \subset X_0$. Next writing $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^P) \cap \alpha \subset \mathcal{W}^P$ analytically we have

$$\forall \beta < \alpha [\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^P) \Rightarrow \exists Y \in P (D[Y] \ \& \ \beta \in Y)]$$

By Lemma 3.26 we obtain $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^P) \Leftrightarrow \exists X \in P \{D[X] \ \& \ K(\beta) \cap \mathcal{W}^P \subset X \ \& \ \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)\}$. Hence for any $\beta < \alpha$ and any distinguished set $X \in P$, there are $\gamma \in K(\beta)$, $Z \in P$ and a distinguished set $Y \in P$ such that if $\gamma \in Z \ \& \ D[Z] \rightarrow \gamma \in X$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$, then $\beta \in Y$. By Lemma 3.24 $D[X]$ is absolute for limit universes. Hence the following Π_2 -predicate holds in the universe $P \in M_2(\mathcal{C})$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \beta < \alpha \forall X \exists \gamma \in K(\beta) \exists Z \exists Y [\{D[X] \ \& \ (\gamma \in Z \ \& \ D[Z] \rightarrow \gamma \in X) \ \& \ \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)\} \\ & \Rightarrow (D[Y] \ \& \ \beta \in Y)] \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Now pick a universe $Q \in \mathcal{C} \cap P$ with $X_0 \in Q$ and $Q \models (22)$. Tracing the above argument backwards in the limit universe Q we obtain $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^Q) \cap \alpha \subset \mathcal{W}^Q$ and $X_0 \subset \mathcal{W}^Q = \bigcup\{X \in Q : Q \models D[X]\} \in P$. Thus Lemma 3.26 yields $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}^Q)$. We obtain $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^Q)$. \square

Definition 3.29 We define the class $M_2(\alpha)$ of α -recursively Mahlo universes for $\alpha \in OT(\Pi_3)$ as follows:

$$P \in M_2(\alpha) \Leftrightarrow P \in Lmtad \ \& \ \forall \beta \prec \alpha [SC_{\mathbb{K}}(m_2(\beta)) \subset \mathcal{W}^P \Rightarrow P \in M_2(M_2(\beta))] \tag{23}$$

$M_2(\alpha)$ is a Π_3 -class.

Proposition 3.30 *If $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(Y)$, then $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(m_2(\eta)) \subset Y$.*

Proof. Let $\nu = m_2(\eta)$. Then $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \eta$ by (9). From $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^\eta(Y)$ we see $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \mathcal{C}^\eta(Y)$. Hence $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \mathcal{C}^\eta(Y) \cap \eta \subset Y$ by $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(Y)$. \square

Lemma 3.31 *If $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ and $P \in M_2(M_2(\eta))$, then $\eta \in \mathcal{W}^P$.*

Proof. We show this by induction on \in . Suppose, as IH, the lemma holds for any $Q \in P$. By Lemma 3.28 pick a $Q \in P$ such that $Q \in M_2(\eta)$, and for $Y = \mathcal{W}^Q \in P$, $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Y$ and

$$\eta \in \mathcal{G}(Y) \tag{16}$$

On the other the definition (23) yields $\forall \gamma \prec \eta[SC_{\mathbb{K}}(m_2(\gamma)) \subset \mathcal{W}^Q \Rightarrow Q \in M_2(M_2(\gamma))]$. Hence by Proposition 3.30 $\forall \gamma \prec \eta[\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^Q) \Rightarrow Q \in M_2(M_2(\gamma))]$.

IH yields with $Y = \mathcal{W}^Q$

$$\forall \gamma \prec \eta(\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(Y) \Rightarrow \gamma \in Y) \tag{17}$$

Therefore by Lemma 3.21 we conclude $\eta \in X$ and $D[X]$ for $X = W(\mathcal{C}^\eta(Y)) \cap \eta^+$. $X \in P$ follows from $Y \in P \in Lmtad$. Consequently $\eta \in \mathcal{W}^P$. \square

Lemma 3.32 1. $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \mathbb{K} = \mathcal{W} \cap \mathbb{K}$.

2. $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})$.

3. For each $n \in \omega$, $TI[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1)]$.

Proof. We show Lemma 3.32.3. It suffices to show $TI[\mathcal{W}]$. Assume $Prg[\mathcal{W}, A]$ for a formula A , and $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}$. Pick a distinguished set X such that $\alpha \in X$. Then $X \cap \alpha^+ = \mathcal{W} \cap \alpha^+$, and hence $Prg[X \cap (\alpha + 1), A]$. $Wo[X]$ yields $A(\alpha)$. \square

Lemma 3.33 $\forall \eta[m_2(\eta) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1) \Rightarrow L \in M_2(M_2(\eta))]$ holds for each $n \in \omega$.

Proof. We show the lemma by induction on $\nu = m_2(\eta) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})$ up to each $\omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1)$. Suppose $\nu \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})$ and $L \models \Pi_2(b)$ for a $b \in L$. We have to find a universe $Q \in L$ such that $b \in Q$, $Q \in M_2(\eta)$ and $Q \models \Pi_2(b)$.

By the definition (23) $L \in M_2(\eta)$ is equivalent to $\forall \gamma \prec \eta[m_2(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W}) \Rightarrow L \in M_2(M_2(\gamma))]$. We obtain $\gamma \prec \eta \Rightarrow m_2(\gamma) < m_2(\eta) = \nu$. Thus IH yields $L \in M_2(\eta)$. Let g be a primitive recursive function in the sense of set theory such that $L \in M_2(\eta) \Leftrightarrow P \models \Pi_3(g(\eta))$. Then $L \models \Pi_2(b) \wedge \Pi_3(g(\eta))$. Since this is a Π_3 -formula which holds in a Π_3 -reflecting universe L , we conclude for some $Q \in L$, $Q \models \Pi_2(b) \wedge \Pi_3(g(\eta))$ and hence $Q \in M_2(\eta)$. We are done. \square

Remark 3.34 Only here we need Π_3 -reflection. Therefore it suffices for a whole universe L to admit iterations of Π_2 -recursively Mahlo operations along a well founded relation \prec which is Σ on L : $L \in M_2^{\prec}(\mu) = \bigcap \{M_2(M_2^{\prec}(\nu)) : L \models \nu \prec \mu\}$. Hence our wellfoundednes proof is formalizable in a set theory axiomatizing such universes L .

Lemma 3.35 For each $n \in \omega$, $m_2(\eta) < \omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1)$ & $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \Rightarrow \eta \in \mathcal{W}$.

Proof. Assume $\nu = m_2(\eta) < \omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1)$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$. By Proposition 3.30 we obtain $\nu \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})$. Lemma 3.33 yields $L \in M_2(M_2(\eta))$. From this we see $L \in M_2(\mathcal{C})$ with $\mathcal{C} = M_2(M_2(\eta))$ as in the proof of Lemma 3.33 using Π_3 -reflection of the whole universe L once again. Then by Lemma 3.28 pick a set $P \in L$ such that $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ and $P \in \mathcal{C} = M_2(M_2(\eta))$. Lemma 3.31 yields $\eta \in \mathcal{W}^P \subset \mathcal{W}$. \square

3.3 Well-foundedness proof (concluded)

Definition 3.36 For terms $\alpha, \kappa, \delta \in OT(\Pi_3)$, finite sets $\mathcal{E}(\alpha), K_\delta(\alpha), k_\delta(\alpha) \subset OT(\Pi_3)$ are defined recursively as follows.

1. $\mathcal{E}(\alpha) = \emptyset$ for $\alpha \in \{0, \Omega, \mathbb{K}\}$. $\mathcal{E}(\alpha_m + \dots + \alpha_0) = \bigcup_{i \leq m} \mathcal{E}(\alpha_i)$. $\mathcal{E}(\varphi\beta\gamma) = \mathcal{E}(\beta) \cup \mathcal{E}(\gamma)$. $\mathcal{E}(\psi_\pi^\nu(a)) = \{\psi_\pi^\nu(a)\}$.
2. $\mathcal{A}(\alpha) = \bigcup \{\mathcal{A}(\beta) : \beta \in \mathcal{E}(\alpha)\}$ for $\mathcal{A} \in \{K_\delta, k_\delta\}$.
3. $K_\delta(\psi_\pi^\nu(a)) = \begin{cases} \{a\} \cup K_\delta(\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu)) & \psi_\pi^\nu(a) \geq \delta \\ \emptyset & \psi_\pi^\nu(a) < \delta \end{cases}$.
4. $k_\delta(\psi_\pi^\nu(a)) = \begin{cases} \{\psi_\pi^\nu(a)\} \cup k_\delta(\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu)) & \psi_\pi^\nu(a) \geq \delta \\ \emptyset & \psi_\pi^\nu(a) < \delta \end{cases}$.

Note that $K_\delta(\alpha) < a \Leftrightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(\delta)$.

Definition 3.37 For $a, \nu \in OT(\Pi_3)$, define:

$$A(a, \nu) \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})[\psi_\sigma^\nu(a) \in OT(\Pi_3) \Rightarrow \psi_\sigma^\nu(a) \in \mathcal{W}]. \quad (24)$$

$$\text{MIH}(a) \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \forall b \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap a \forall \nu \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W}) A(b, \nu). \quad (25)$$

$$\text{SIH}(a, \nu) \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})[\xi < \nu \Rightarrow A(a, \xi)]. \quad (26)$$

Lemma 3.38 For each n the following holds: Assume $\{a, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1)$, $\text{MIH}(a)$, and $\text{SIH}(a, \nu)$ in Definition 3.37. Then

$$\forall \kappa \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})[\psi_\kappa^\nu(a) \in OT(\Pi_3) \Rightarrow \psi_\kappa^\nu(a) \in \mathcal{W}].$$

Proof. Let $\alpha_1 = \psi_\kappa^\nu(a) \in OT(\Pi_3)$ with $\{a, \kappa, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})$ and $\nu \leq a < \omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1)$, cf. (9). By Lemma 3.35 it suffices to show $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$.

By Proposition 3.6 we have $\{\kappa, a, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$, and hence $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$. It suffices to show the following claim.

$$\forall \beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1[\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}]. \quad (27)$$

Proof of (27) by induction on $\ell\beta_1$. Assume $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1$ and let

$$\text{LIH} :\Leftrightarrow \forall \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1[\ell\gamma < \ell\beta_1 \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{W}].$$

We show $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$. By Propositions 3.18, 3.19 and LIH, we may assume that $\beta_1 = \psi_\pi^\xi(b)$ for some π, b, ξ such that $\{\pi, b, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$.

$\beta_1 = \psi_\pi^\xi(b) < \psi_\kappa^\nu(a) = \alpha_1$ holds iff one of the following holds: (1) $\pi \leq \alpha_1$. (2) $b < a$, $\beta_1 < \kappa$ and $\{\pi, b, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$. (3) $b = a$, $\pi = \kappa$, $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$ and $\xi < \nu$. (4) $a \leq b$ and $\{\kappa, a, \nu\} \not\subset \mathcal{H}_b(\beta_1)$.

Case 1. $\pi \leq \alpha_1$: Then $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$ by $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$.

Case 2. $b < a$, $\beta_1 < \kappa$ and $\{\pi, b, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$: Let B denote a set of subterms of β_1 defined recursively as follows. First $\{\pi, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\xi) \subset B$. Let $\alpha_1 \leq \beta \in B$. If $\beta =_{NF} \gamma_m + \dots + \gamma_0$, then $\{\gamma_i : i \leq m\} \subset B$. If $\beta =_{NF} \varphi\gamma\delta$, then $\{\gamma, \delta\} \subset B$. If $\beta = \psi_\sigma^\mu(c)$, then $\{\sigma, c\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\mu) \subset B$.

Then from $\{\pi, b, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$ we see inductively that $B \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$. Hence by LIH we obtain $B \cap \alpha_1 \subset \mathcal{W}$. Moreover if $\alpha_1 \leq \psi_\sigma^\mu(c) \in B$, then we see $c < a$ from $\{\pi, b, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$. We claim that

$$\forall \beta \in B (\beta \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})) \quad (28)$$

Proof of (28) by induction on $\ell\beta$. Let $\beta \in B$. We can assume that $\alpha_1 \leq \beta = \psi_\sigma^\mu(c)$ by induction hypothesis on the lengths. Then by induction hypothesis we have $\{\sigma, c\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\mu) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})$. On the other hand we have $\mu \leq c < a$ by (9). MIH(a) yields $\beta \in \mathcal{W}$. Thus (28) is shown. \square

In particular we obtain $\{\pi, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\xi) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})$. Moreover we have $\xi \leq b < a$ by (9). Therefore once again MIH(a) yields $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$.

Case 3. $b = a$, $\pi = \kappa$, $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$ and $\xi < \nu \leq a$: As in (28) we see that $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\xi) \subset \mathcal{W}$ from MIH(a). SIH(a, ν) yields $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$.

Case 4. $a \leq b$ and $\{\kappa, a, \nu\} \not\subset \mathcal{H}_b(\beta_1)$: It suffices to find a γ such that $\beta_1 \leq \gamma \in \mathcal{W} \cap \alpha_1$. Then $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$ follows from $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$ and Proposition 3.22.

$k_\delta(\alpha)$ denotes the set in Definition 3.36. In general we see that $a \in K_\delta(\alpha)$ iff $\psi_\sigma^h(a) \in k_\delta(\alpha)$ for some σ, h , and for each $\psi_\sigma^h(a) \in k_\delta(\psi_{\sigma_0}^{h_0}(a_0))$ there exists a sequence $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \leq m}$ of subterms of $\alpha_0 = \psi_{\sigma_0}^{h_0}(a_0)$ such that $\alpha_m = \psi_\sigma^h(a)$, $\alpha_i = \psi_{\sigma_i}^{h_i}(a_i)$ for some σ_i, a_i, h_i , and for each $i < m$, $\delta \leq \alpha_{i+1} \in \mathcal{E}(C_i)$ for $C_i = \{\sigma_i, a_i\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(h_i)$.

Let $\delta \in SC_{\mathbb{K}}(f) \cup \{\kappa, a\}$ such that $b \leq \gamma$ for a $\gamma \in K_{\beta_1}(\delta)$. Pick an $\alpha_2 = \psi_{\sigma_2}^{h_2}(a_2) \in \mathcal{E}(\delta)$ such that $\gamma \in K_{\beta_1}(\alpha_2)$, and an $\alpha_m = \psi_{\sigma_m}^{h_m}(a_m) \in k_{\beta_1}(\alpha_2)$ for some σ_m, h_m and $a_m \geq b \geq a$. We have $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{W}$ by $\delta \in \mathcal{W}$. If $\alpha_2 < \alpha_1$, then $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{W} \cap \alpha_1$, and we are done. Assume $\alpha_2 \geq \alpha_1$. Then $a_2 \in K_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2) < a \leq b$, and $m > 2$.

Let $\{\alpha_i\}_{2 \leq i \leq m}$ be the sequence of subterms of α_2 such that $\alpha_i = \psi_{\sigma_i}^{h_i}(a_i)$ for some σ_i, a_i, h_i , and for each $i < m$, $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_{i+1} \in \mathcal{E}(C_i)$ for $C_i = \{\sigma_i, a_i\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(h_i)$.

Let $\{n_j\}_{0 \leq j \leq k}$ ($0 < k \leq m - 2$) be the increasing sequence $n_0 < n_1 < \dots < n_k \leq m$ defined recursively by $n_0 = 2$, and assuming n_j has been defined so that $n_j < m$ and $\alpha_{n_j} \geq \alpha_1$, n_{j+1} is defined by $n_{j+1} = \min(\{i : n_j < i < m, \alpha_i < \alpha_{n_j}\} \cup \{m\})$. If either $n_j = m$ or $\alpha_{n_j} < \alpha_1$, then $k = j$ and n_{j+1} is undefined. Then we claim that

$$\forall j \leq k (\alpha_{n_j} \in \mathcal{W}) \ \& \ \alpha_{n_k} < \alpha_1 \quad (29)$$

Proof of (29). By induction on $j \leq k$ we show first that $\forall j \leq k (\alpha_{n_j} \in \mathcal{W})$. We have $\alpha_{n_0} = \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{W}$. Assume $\alpha_{n_j} \in \mathcal{W}$ and $j < k$. Then $n_j < m$, i.e., $\alpha_{n_{j+1}} < \alpha_{n_j}$, and by $\alpha_{n_j} \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_{n_j}}(\mathcal{W})$, we have $C_{n_j} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_{n_j}}(\mathcal{W})$, and hence $\alpha_{n_{j+1}} \in \mathcal{E}(C_{n_j}) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_{n_j}}(\mathcal{W})$. We see inductively that $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_{n_j}}(\mathcal{W})$ for any i with $n_j \leq i \leq n_{j+1}$. Therefore $\alpha_{n_{j+1}} \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_{n_j}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_{n_j} \subset \mathcal{W}$ by Proposition 3.22.

Next we show that $\alpha_{n_k} < \alpha_1$. We can assume that $n_k = m$. This means that $\forall i (n_{k-1} \leq i < m \Rightarrow \alpha_i \geq \alpha_{n_{k-1}})$. We have $\alpha_2 = \alpha_{n_0} > \alpha_{n_1} > \dots > \alpha_{n_{k-1}} \geq \alpha_1$, and $\forall i < m (\alpha_i \geq \alpha_1)$. Therefore $\alpha_m \in k_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2) \subset k_{\alpha_1}(\{\kappa, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(h))$, i.e., $a_m \in K_{\alpha_1}(\{\kappa, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(h))$ for $\alpha_m = \psi_{\sigma_m}^{h_m}(a_m)$. On the other hand we have $K_{\alpha_1}(\{\kappa, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(h)) < a$ for $\alpha_1 = \psi_{\sigma}^h(a)$. Thus $a \leq a_m < a$, a contradiction.

(29) is shown, and we obtain $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_{n_k} \in \mathcal{W} \cap \alpha_1$.

This completes a proof of (27) and of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.39 For each $\alpha \in OT(\Pi_3)$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W})$.

Proof. This is seen by meta-induction on $\ell\alpha$. By Propositions 3.18, 3.19, and Lemma 3.32, we may assume $\alpha = \psi_{\kappa}^{\nu}(a)$. By IH pick an $n < \omega$ such that $\{\kappa, \nu, a\} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_{n+1}(\mathbb{K} + 1)$. Lemma 3.38 yields $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}$. \square

Theorem 3.1 follows from Lemma 3.39 and the fact $\mathcal{W} \cap \Omega = W(\mathcal{C}^0(\emptyset)) \cap \Omega = W(OT(\Pi_3)) \cap \Omega$.

4 Π_4 -reflection

In this paper we focus on the ordinal analysis of Π_3 reflection. This means no genuine loss of generality, as the removal of Π_3 reflection rules in derivations already exhibits the pattern of cut elimination that applies for arbitrary Π_n reflection rules as well. ([Rathjen94])

In this section \mathbb{K} denotes either a Π_2^1 -inaccessible cardinal or a Π_4 -reflecting ordinal. Skolem hull $\mathcal{H}_a(X)$ and a Mahlo class $Mh_3^a(\xi)$ are defined as in Definition 2.2: Let for $\xi > 0$,

$$\pi \in Mh_3^a(\xi) :\Leftrightarrow [\{a, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \ \& \ \forall \nu \in \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \cap \xi (\pi \in M_3(Mh_3^a(\nu)))]$$

where $\alpha \in M_3(A)$ iff A is Π_1^1 -inaccessible in α or α is Π_3 -reflecting on A .

Then as in (8)

$$\psi_{\pi}^{\xi}(a) = \min(\{\pi\} \cup \{\kappa \in Mh_3^a(\xi) : \{\xi, \pi, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \ \& \ \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \pi \subset \kappa\})$$

where $\xi = m_3(\psi_{\pi}^{\xi}(a))$.

As in Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 we see the following for Π_2^1 -inaccessible cardinal \mathbb{K} .

Lemma 4.1 Let $a \in \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{K}) \cap \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$. Then $\mathbb{K} \in M_3(Mh_3^a(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}))$. For every $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{K}) \cap \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$, $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}^{\xi}(a) < \mathbb{K}$.

Operator controlled derivations for KPII_4 are closed under the following inference rules. For convenience let us attach an assignment $\bar{m} : \pi \mapsto \bar{m}(\pi) = (\bar{m}_2(\pi), \bar{m}_3(\pi))$ to the derivations, where $\bar{m}_i(\pi) \leq m_i(\pi)$ for $i = 2, 3$. Although our derivability relation should be written as $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta], \bar{m}) \vdash_b^a \Gamma$, let us write $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma$.

($\text{rfI}_{\Pi_4}(\mathbb{K})$) $b \geq \mathbb{K}$. There exist an ordinal $a_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap a$, and a $\Sigma_4(\mathbb{K})$ -sentence A enjoying the following conditions:

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg A \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, A^{(\rho, \mathbb{K})} : \rho < \mathbb{K}\}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rfI}_{\Pi_4}(\mathbb{K}))$$

($\text{rfI}_{\Pi_3}(\alpha, \pi, \nu)$) There exist ordinals $\alpha < \pi \leq b < \mathbb{K}$, $\nu < \bar{m}_3(\pi) \leq m_3(\pi)$ with $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \pi$ and $\nu \leq \gamma$, $a_0 < a$, and a finite set Δ of $\Sigma_3(\pi)$ -sentences enjoying the following conditions:

1. $\{\alpha, \pi, \nu\} \cup \bar{m}(\pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$.
2. For each $\delta \in \Delta$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta$.
3. Let

$$\rho \in Mh_3(\nu) :\Leftrightarrow \nu \leq m_3(\rho).$$

Then for each $\alpha < \rho \in Mh_3(\nu) \cap \pi$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho)}$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)}\}_{\alpha < \rho \in Mh_3(\nu) \cap \pi}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rfI}_{\Pi_3}(\alpha, \pi, \nu))$$

Finite proofs in KPII_4 are embedded to controlled derivations with inferences ($\text{rfI}_{\Pi_4}(\mathbb{K})$), and then ($\text{rfI}_{\Pi_4}(\mathbb{K})$) is replaced by inferences ($\text{rfI}_{\Pi_3}(\alpha, \pi, \nu)$) as in Lemma 2.5.

Lemma 4.2 *Assume $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_3(\mathbb{K})$, $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma))$, and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^a \Gamma$ with $a \leq \gamma$. Then, $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}$ holds for every $\kappa \in Mh_3(a) \cap \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K} \cdot \omega)$ such that $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K}) < \kappa$, where $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^{\mathbb{K}+a}$ and $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\hat{a})$.*

Let us try to eliminate inferences ($\text{rfI}_{\Pi_3}(\alpha, \pi, \nu)$) from the resulting derivations following the proof of Lemma 2.5. Let $Mh_2(\xi; a)$ be a Mahlo class for which the following holds.

Lemma 4.3 *Let $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_2(\pi)$ with $\xi = m_3(\pi)$, and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\pi}^a \Gamma$. Then for any $\kappa \in Mh_2(\xi; a) \cap \pi$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\pi}^{\kappa+\omega a} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}$ holds¹.*

¹Here we don't need to collapse derivations and cut ranks $< \pi$.

Consider the crucial case. Let $\Delta \subset \Sigma_3(\pi)$, $\pi \in Mh_3(\xi)$ and $\nu < \xi$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\pi}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_{\pi}^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)} : \alpha < \rho \in Mh_3(\nu) \cap \pi\}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\pi}^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\alpha, \pi, \nu))$$

Let $\sigma \in Mh_2(\xi; a_0) \cap \kappa$. By IH with Inversion we obtain $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash_{\pi}^{\kappa + \omega a_0 + 1} \Gamma^{(\sigma, \pi)}, \neg\delta^{(\sigma, \pi)}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$.

On the other hand we have $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash_{\pi}^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\sigma, \pi)}$ for $\alpha < \sigma \in Mh_3(\nu) \cap \pi$. Assume $Mh_2(\xi; a) \subset Mh_2(\xi; a_0)$. IH yields $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash_{\pi}^{\kappa + \omega a_0} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}, \Delta^{(\sigma, \pi)}$.

Let $\alpha < \sigma \in Mh_2(\xi; a_0) \cap Mh_3(\nu) \cap \kappa$. A (cut) of the cut formulas $\delta^{(\sigma, \pi)}$ then yields $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash_{\pi}^{\kappa + \omega a_0 + p} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}, \Gamma^{(\sigma, \pi)}$ for a $p < \omega$.

On the other hand we have $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_0^{2d} \neg\theta^{(\kappa, \pi)}, \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}$ for each $\theta \in \Gamma \subset \Sigma_2(\pi)$, where $d = \max\{\text{rk}(\theta^{(\kappa, \pi)}) : \theta \in \Gamma\} < \kappa + \omega < \pi$.

Now $\kappa \in Mh_2(\xi; a) \cap \pi$ needs to reflect $\Pi_2(\kappa)$ -formulas $\neg\theta^{(\kappa, \pi)}$ down to some $\alpha < \sigma \in Mh_2(\xi; a_0) \cap Mh_3(\nu) \cap \kappa$.

$$a_0 < a \ \& \ \nu < \xi \Rightarrow Mh_2(\xi; a) \subset M_2(Mh_2(\xi; a_0) \cap Mh_3(\nu))$$

Thus we arrive at the following definition of the Mahlo classes $Mh_2^\gamma(\xi; a)$, which is a Π_3 -class in the sense that there is a Π_3 -formula $\theta(\gamma, \xi, a)$ such that $\alpha \in Mh_2^\gamma(\xi; a)$ iff $L_\alpha \models \theta(\gamma, \xi, a)$, while $Mh_3^\gamma(\nu)$ is a Π_4 -class.

$$\pi \in Mh_2^\gamma(\xi; a) \text{ iff } \{\gamma, \xi, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\pi) \text{ and}$$

$$\forall \{\nu, b\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\pi) [\nu < \xi \ \& \ b < a \Rightarrow \pi \in M_2(Mh_2^\gamma(\xi; b) \cap Mh_3^\gamma(\nu))].$$

It turns out that we need Mahlo classes $Mh_2^\gamma(\bar{\xi}; \bar{a})$ for finite sequences $\bar{\xi}$ and \bar{a} in our proof-theoretic study, cf. Lemma 4.13. Let us explain the classes intuitively in the next subsection.

4.1 Mahlo classes

Let $M_i = RM_i$ and P, Q, \dots denote transitive classes in $L \cup \{L\}$ for a Π_4 -reflecting universe L . For classes \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} and $i = 2, 3$ let

$$\mathcal{X} \prec_i \mathcal{Y} : \Leftrightarrow \forall P \in \mathcal{Y} (P \in M_i(\mathcal{X}))$$

Definition 4.4 Let

$$M_2(\xi; a) := \bigcap \{M_2(M_2(\xi; b) \cap M_3(\nu)) : \nu < \xi, b < a\}.$$

In general for classes \mathcal{Y} let

$$M_2^\mathcal{Y}(\xi; a) := \mathcal{Y} \cap \bigcap \{M_2(M_2^\mathcal{Y}(\xi; b) \cap M_3(\nu)) : \nu < \xi, b < a\}.$$

Proposition 4.5 For a Π_3 -class \mathcal{Y} and $\mu < \xi$, $M_2^\mathcal{Y}(\xi; a) \cap M_3(\mu) \prec_2 \mathcal{Y} \cap M_3(\xi)$ and $M_2^\mathcal{Y}(\xi; a) \supset \mathcal{Y} \cap M_3(\xi)$.

Proof. By induction on a , we show $P \in \mathcal{Y} \cap M_3(\xi) \Rightarrow P \in M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\xi; a)$.

Let $P \in \mathcal{Y} \cap M_3(\xi)$, $\nu < \xi$ and $b < a$. By IH we obtain $P \in M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\xi; b)$. Since $M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\xi; b)$ is a Π_3 -class, we obtain $P \in M_2(M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\xi; b) \cap M_3(\nu))$ by $P \in M_3(\xi)$. Therefore $P \in M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\xi; a)$.

Since $M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\xi; a)$ is a Π_3 -class and $P \in M_3(\xi) \subset M_3(M_3(\mu))$, we obtain $P \in M_2(M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\xi; a) \cap M_3(\mu))$. \square

Let $\nu < \mu < \xi$. From Proposition 4.5 we see $M_2(\xi; a) \cap M_3(\mu) \prec_2 M_3(\xi)$, and $M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mu; b) \cap M_3(\nu) \prec_2 \mathcal{Y} \cap M_3(\mu)$ for $\mathcal{Y} = M_2(\xi; a)$.

Let us write $M_2((\xi, \mu); (a, b))$ for $M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mu; b)$, where $\xi > \mu$. Let $\nu < \mu < \xi$. We obtain $M_2((\xi, \mu); (a, b)) \cap M_3(\nu) \prec_2 M_2(\xi; a) \cap M_3(\mu) \prec_2 M_3(\xi)$.

Proposition 4.6 *Let $\xi_1, \zeta < \xi$, $c < b$ and $d < a$. Then $M_2((\xi, \mu); (a, c)) \cap M_3(\nu) \prec_2 M_2((\xi, \mu); (a, b))$ and $M_2((\xi, \xi_1); (d, e)) \cap M_3(\zeta) \prec_2 M_2((\xi, \mu); (a, b))$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{Y} = M_2(\xi; a)$. Then $M_2((\xi, \mu); (a, c)) \cap M_3(\nu) = M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mu; c) \cap M_3(\nu) \prec_2 M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mu; b) = M_2((\xi, \mu); (a, b))$ by $c < b$ and $\nu < \mu$.

Next we show $M_2^{\mathcal{X}}(\xi_1; e) \cap M_3(\zeta) \prec_2 \mathcal{Y} \supset M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mu; b)$, where $\mathcal{X} = M_2(\xi; d)$ and $M_2((\xi, \xi_1); (d, e)) = M_2^{\mathcal{X}}(\xi_1; e)$. We have $\mathcal{X} \cap M_3(\xi_1) \cap M_3(\zeta) = M_2(\xi; d) \cap M_3(\xi_1) \cap M_3(\zeta) \prec_2 M_2(\xi; a) = \mathcal{Y}$ by $d < a$ and $\xi_1, \zeta < \xi$. On the other hand we have $M_2^{\mathcal{X}}(\xi_1; e) \supset \mathcal{X} \cap M_3(\xi_1)$ by Proposition 4.5. Hence $M_2^{\mathcal{X}}(\xi_1; e) \cap M_3(\zeta) \prec_2 \mathcal{Y}$. \square

The same argument applies not only to pairs $(\xi > \mu)$, (a, b) , but also to triples, and so forth.

Let $\bar{\xi} = (\xi_0 > \xi_1 > \dots > \xi_n)$ and $\bar{a} = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ be sequences in the same lengths. By iterating the process $\mathcal{Y} \mapsto \{M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\xi; a)\}_a$ with $M_3(\xi)$, we now define classes $M_2(\bar{\xi}; \bar{a})$ by induction on the length n of the sequences $\bar{\xi}, \bar{a}$ as follows.

$M_2(\langle \rangle; \langle \rangle)$ denotes the class of transitive sets in $L \cup \{L\}$.

For $\bar{\xi} * (\xi) = (\xi_0 > \dots > \xi_n > \xi)$ and $\bar{a} * (a) = (a_0, \dots, a_n, a)$ define for the Π_3 -class $\mathcal{Y} = M_2(\bar{\xi}; \bar{a})$

$$M_2(\bar{\xi} * (\xi); \bar{a} * (a)) = M_2^{\mathcal{Y}}(\xi; a)$$

Namely

$$M_2(\bar{\xi} * (\xi); \bar{a} * (a)) = M_2(\bar{\xi}; \bar{a}) \cap \bigcap \{M_2(M_2(\bar{\xi} * (\xi); \bar{a} * (b)) \cap M_3(\nu)) : \nu < \xi, b < a\}$$

Proposition 4.6 is extended to finite sequences. To state an extension, let us redefine classes $M_2(\bar{\xi}; \bar{a})$ through ordinals $\alpha = \Lambda^{\xi_0} a_0 + \dots + \Lambda^{\xi_n} a_n$ as follows, where Λ is a big enough ordinal such that $\Lambda > a_0$.

Let $\alpha = \Lambda^{\xi_0} a_0 + \dots + \Lambda^{\xi_n} a_n$, where $\xi_0 > \dots > \xi_n$ and $a_0, \dots, a_n \neq 0$.

$$M_2(\alpha) := \bigcap \{M_2(M_2(\beta) \cap M_3(\nu)) : (\beta, \nu) < \alpha\}$$

where for segments $\alpha_i = \Lambda^{\xi_0} a_0 + \dots + \Lambda^{\xi_i} a_i$ of $\alpha = \Lambda^{\xi_0} a_0 + \dots + \Lambda^{\xi_n} a_n$

$$(\beta, \nu) < \alpha \Leftrightarrow \exists i \leq n [\beta < \alpha_i \ \& \ \nu < \xi_i].$$

F.e. in Proposition 4.6 we have $(\Lambda^\xi a + \Lambda^\mu c, \nu) < \Lambda^\xi a + \Lambda^\mu b$ and $(\Lambda^\xi d + \Lambda^{\xi_1} e, \zeta) < \Lambda^\xi a + \Lambda^\mu b$, but $(\Lambda^\xi a + \Lambda^\mu c, \mu) \not< \Lambda^\xi a + \Lambda^\mu b$, where $\nu < \mu < \xi$, $\xi_1, \zeta < \xi$, $c < b$ and $d < a$.

Proposition 4.7 $(\beta, \nu) < \alpha < \gamma \Rightarrow (\beta, \nu) < \gamma$.

$\alpha \dot{+} \beta$ designates that $\alpha + \beta = \alpha \# \beta$.

Lemma 4.8 (Cf. Lemma 3.2 in [A09].)

If $\xi > 0$ and $\beta < \Lambda^{\xi+1}$, then $M_2(\alpha \dot{+} \beta) \prec_2 M_2(\alpha, \xi) := M_2(\alpha) \cap M_3(\xi)$.

Proof. Suppose $P \in M_2(\alpha, \xi) = M_2(\alpha) \cap M_3(\xi)$ and $\beta < \Lambda^{\xi+1}$.

We show $P \in M_2(\alpha \dot{+} \beta)$ by induction on ordinals β . Let $(\gamma, \nu) < \alpha \dot{+} \beta$. We need to show that $P \in M_2(M_2(\gamma, \nu))$.

Let δ be a segment of $\alpha \dot{+} \beta$ such that $\gamma < \delta$ and $\nu < \mu$ where $\delta = \dots + \Lambda^\mu b$. If δ is a segment of α , then $P \in M_2(M_2(\gamma, \nu))$ by $P \in M_2(\alpha)$.

Let $\delta = \alpha \dot{+} \beta_0$, where β_0 is a segment of β . Then $\nu < \mu \leq \xi$. We claim that $P \in M_2(\gamma)$. If $\gamma < \alpha$, then Proposition 4.7 yields $P \in M_2(\alpha) \subset M_2(\gamma)$. Let $\gamma = \alpha \dot{+} \gamma_0 < \alpha \dot{+} \beta_0$. IH yields $P \in M_2(\gamma)$. Thus the claim is shown. On the other hand we have $P \in M_3(\xi)$ and $\nu < \xi$. Since $M_2(\gamma)$ is a Π_3 -class, we obtain $P \in M_3(M_2(\gamma, \nu)) \subset M_2(M_2(\gamma, \nu))$. $P \in M_2(\alpha \dot{+} \beta)$ is shown.

By $P \in M_2(\alpha \dot{+} \beta)$ and $P \in M_3(\xi) \subset M_3$ with $\xi > 0$, we obtain $P \in M_3(M_2(\alpha \dot{+} \beta)) \subset M_2(M_2(\alpha \dot{+} \beta))$. \square

4.2 Skolem hulls and collapsing functions

We can assume $\xi < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ and $a < \Lambda = \mathbb{K}$. For $\alpha < \Lambda^{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}}$, let us define $Mh_2^\gamma(\alpha)$ as follows. (β, ν) denotes pairs of ordinals $\beta < \Lambda^{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}}$ and $\nu < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ such that $\beta + \Lambda^\nu = \beta \# \Lambda^\nu$. Let $\alpha = \Lambda^{\beta_0} a_0 + \dots + \Lambda^{\beta_n} a_n$, where $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1} > \beta_0 > \dots > \beta_n$ and $0 < a_0, \dots, a_n < \Lambda$. Then $\pi \in Mh_2^\gamma(\alpha)$ iff $\{\gamma, \alpha\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\pi)$ and

$$\forall \{\nu, \beta\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\pi) [(\beta, \nu) < \alpha \Rightarrow \pi \in M_2(Mh_2^\gamma(\beta) \cap Mh_3^\gamma(\nu))]$$

where for segments $\alpha_i = \Lambda^{\beta_0} a_0 + \dots + \Lambda^{\beta_i} a_i$ of $\alpha = \Lambda^{\beta_0} a_0 + \dots + \Lambda^{\beta_n} a_n$

$$(\beta, \nu) < \alpha \Leftrightarrow \exists i \leq n [\beta < \alpha_i \ \& \ \nu < \beta_i].$$

For example, if $\nu < \xi$ and $a_0 < a$, then $(\Lambda^\xi a_0, \nu) < \Lambda^\xi a$. The exponents β_i of α designate ‘ Π_3 -Mahlo degrees’.

Proposition 4.9 $(\beta, \nu) < \alpha < \gamma \Rightarrow (\beta, \nu) < \gamma$.

Definition 4.10 Define simultaneously by recursion on ordinals $a < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ the classes $\mathcal{H}_a(X)$ ($X \subset \Gamma_{\mathbb{K}+1}$), $Mh_2^a(\alpha)$ ($\xi < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$), the ordinals $\psi_\sigma^{(\alpha, \xi)}(a)$ as follows.

1. $\mathcal{H}_a(X)$ denotes the Skolem hull of $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{K}\} \cup X$ under the functions $+$, φ , and the following.

Let $\{\sigma, b, \alpha, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(X)$, $\alpha \in \{0\} \cup [\Lambda, \Lambda^{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}})$, $\xi \in [0, \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1})$ and $b < a$. Then $\psi_\sigma^{(\alpha, \xi)}(b) \in \mathcal{H}_a(X)$.

2. $\pi \in Mh_3^a(\xi) :\Leftrightarrow \{a, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \ \& \ \forall \nu \in \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \cap \xi (\pi \in M_3(Mh_3^a(\nu)))$,
where $\alpha \in Mh_3^a(0)$ iff α is a limit ordinal.

3. For $\alpha < \Lambda^{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}}$ and $a < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$, $\pi \in Mh_2^a(\alpha)$ iff $\{a, \alpha\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$ and

$$\forall \{\beta, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) [(\beta, \nu) < \alpha \rightarrow \pi \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\beta, \nu))]$$

where

$$Mh_2^a(\beta, \nu) = Mh_2^a(\beta) \cap Mh_3^a(\nu)$$

and $\alpha \in Mh_2^a(0)$ iff α is a limit ordinal. Note that $Mh_2^a(\alpha)$ is a Π_3 -class.

4. Let $m_2(\mathbb{K}) = 0$, $m_3(\mathbb{K}) = \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$, $m_2(\Omega) = 1$ and $m_3(\Omega) = 0$.

(a) For $\{\xi, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{K}) \cap \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ with $0 < \xi \leq a$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\mathbb{K}}^{(0, \xi)}(a) &= \min(\{\mathbb{K}\} \cup \{\kappa \in Mh_3^a(\xi) : \{\xi, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \ \& \ \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{K} \subset \kappa\}). \\ m_2(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}^{(0, \xi)}(a)) &= 0 \text{ and } m_3(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}^{(0, \xi)}(a)) = \xi. \end{aligned}$$

(b) Let $0 \leq \alpha < \Lambda^{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}}$ and $0 < \xi < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ be ordinals, $0 < c \leq a < \Lambda = \mathbb{K}$
with $c \in \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$ and $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha, \xi)$. Then for $\beta = \alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^{\xi c}$

$$\psi_{\sigma}^{(\beta, 0)}(a) = \min(\{\sigma\} \cup \{\kappa \in Mh_2^a(\beta) : \{\sigma, \alpha, \xi, c, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \ \& \ \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \sigma \subset \kappa\}).$$

$$m_2(\psi_{\sigma}^{(\beta, 0)}(a)) = \beta \text{ and } m_3(\psi_{\sigma}^{(\beta, 0)}(a)) = 0.$$

(c) Let $0 < \beta, \alpha < \Lambda^{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}}$ and $0 < \nu < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ be such that $\{\beta, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$,
 $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\beta, \nu) \subset (a+1) < \mathbb{K}$ and $(\beta, \nu) < \alpha$. Then for $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha)$ with
 $m_3(\sigma) = 0$

$$\psi_{\sigma}^{(\beta, \nu)}(a) = \min(\{\sigma\} \cup \{\kappa \in Mh_2^a(\beta, \nu) : \{\sigma, \beta, \nu, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \ \& \ \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \sigma \subset \kappa\}).$$

$$m_2(\psi_{\sigma}^{(\beta, \nu)}(a)) = \beta \text{ and } m_3(\psi_{\sigma}^{(\beta, \nu)}(a)) = \nu.$$

(d)

$$\psi_{\sigma}(a) = \min\{\kappa \leq \sigma : \{\sigma, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \ \& \ \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \sigma \subset \kappa\}.$$

We write $\psi_{\sigma}(a)$ for $\psi_{\sigma}^{(0, 0)}(a)$.

Let \mathbb{K} be a Π_2^1 -inaccessible cardinal. As in Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 we see that
 $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}^{(0, \xi)}(a) < \mathbb{K}$ for every $\{a, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{K}) \cap \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$.

It is easy to see that $\psi_{\sigma}^{(\beta, \nu)}(a) < \sigma$ if $(\beta, \nu) < \alpha$, $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha)$ and $\{\beta, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$.

Lemma 4.11 (Cf. Lemma 3.2 in [A09].) *Assume $\mathbb{K} \geq \sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha, \xi)$ with
 $0 < \xi < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$, $\beta < \Lambda^{\xi+1}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$. Then $\sigma \in M_3(Mh_2^a(\alpha \dot{+} \beta))$ holds, a
fortiori $\sigma \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\alpha \dot{+} \beta))$.*

Proof. Suppose $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha, \xi) = Mh_2^a(\alpha) \cap Mh_3^a(\xi)$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$ with $\beta < \Lambda^{\xi+1}$. We show $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha \dot{+} \beta)$ by induction on ordinals β . Let $\{\gamma, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$ and $(\gamma, \nu) < \alpha \dot{+} \beta$. We need to show that $\sigma \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\gamma, \nu))$.

Let δ be a segment of $\alpha \dot{+} \beta$ such that $\gamma < \delta$ and $\nu < \mu$ where $\delta = \dots + \Lambda^\mu b$. If δ is a segment of α , then $\sigma \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\gamma, \nu))$ by $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha)$.

Let $\delta = \alpha \dot{+} \beta_0$, where β_0 is a segment of β . Then $\nu < \mu \leq \xi$. We claim that $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\gamma)$. If $\gamma < \alpha$, then Proposition 4.9 with $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$ yields $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha) \subset Mh_2^a(\gamma)$. Let $\gamma = \alpha \dot{+} \gamma_0 < \alpha \dot{+} \beta_0$ with $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$. IH yields $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\gamma)$. Thus the claim is shown. On the other hand we have $\sigma \in Mh_3^a(\xi)$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma) \cap \xi$. Since $Mh_2^a(\gamma)$ is a Π_3 -class, we obtain $\sigma \in M_3(Mh_2^a(\gamma, \nu)) \subset M_2(Mh_2^a(\gamma, \nu))$ with $Mh_2^a(\gamma, \nu) = Mh_2^a(\gamma) \cap Mh_3^a(\nu)$. $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha \dot{+} \beta)$ is shown.

By $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha \dot{+} \beta)$ and $\sigma \in Mh_3^a(\xi) \subset M_3$ with $\xi > 0$, we obtain $\sigma \in M_3(Mh_2^a(\alpha \dot{+} \beta))$. \square

Corollary 4.12 *If $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\alpha, \xi)$ and $c \in \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma) \cap \Lambda$ with $\xi > 0$, then $\psi_\sigma^{(\beta, 0)}(a) < \sigma$ for $\beta = \alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi c$.*

Proof. We obtain $\sigma \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\beta))$ by Lemma 4.11. Since $\{\kappa < \sigma : \{\beta, a, \sigma\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa), \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \sigma \subset \kappa\}$ is a club subset of σ , we obtain $\psi_\sigma^{(\beta, 0)}(a) < \sigma$. \square

$OT(\Pi_4)$ denotes a computable notation system of ordinals with collapsing functions $\psi_\sigma^{(\alpha, \xi)}(a)$. Although in our well-foundedness proof in $KPII_4$, ordinal terms $\psi_\sigma^{(\beta, \nu)}(a)$ has to obey some restrictions such as (9) for $OT(\Pi_3)$, it is cumbersome to verify the conditions, and let us skip it.

Operator controlled derivations for $KPII_4$ are closed under the inference rules ($\text{rf}\Pi_4(\mathbb{K})$), ($\text{rf}\Pi_3(\alpha, \pi, \nu)$) and the following.

($\text{rf}\Pi_2(\alpha, \pi, \beta, \nu)$) There exist ordinals $\alpha < \pi \leq b < \mathbb{K}$, $(\beta, \nu) < \bar{m}_2(\pi) \leq m_2(\pi)$, $a_0 < a$, and a finite set Δ of $\Sigma_2(\pi)$ -sentences enjoying the following conditions:

1. $\{\alpha, \pi, \beta, \nu\} \cup \bar{m}(\pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$.
2. For each $\delta \in \Delta$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta$.
3. For each $\alpha < \rho \in Mh_2(\beta, \nu) \cap \pi$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)}$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)}\}_{\alpha < \rho \in Mh_2(\beta, \nu) \cap \pi}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rf}\Pi_2(\alpha, \pi, \beta, \nu))$$

This inference says that $\pi \in M_2(Mh_2^\gamma(\beta) \cap Mh_3^\gamma(\nu))$.

Lemma 4.13 *Let $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_2(\pi)$. Assume $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^a \Gamma$ for a $\pi < \mathbb{K}$, and $\{\xi, \alpha\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ for $\alpha = \bar{m}_2(\pi)$, $\xi = \bar{m}_3(\pi)$. Let η be the base for ($\text{rf}\Pi_3(\eta, \pi, \nu)$) in $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^a \Gamma$. Then for any $\eta < \kappa \in Mh_2(\alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a)) \cap \pi$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_\pi^{\kappa+\omega a} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}$ holds, where $\alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a) \leq \bar{m}_2(\kappa) \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$. Moreover when $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\kappa)$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_\kappa^{\kappa+\omega a} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}$ holds.*

Proof. By induction on a . Let $\pi' = \kappa$ if $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\kappa)$. Otherwise $\pi' = \pi$. Note that there exists a κ such that $\kappa \in Mh_2(\alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a)) \cap \pi$ if $\Theta \cup \{\pi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\pi)$.

F.e. $\kappa = \psi_\pi^{(\alpha + \Lambda^\xi(1+a), 0)}(\gamma + \max \Theta)$.

Let η be the base for $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\eta, \pi, \nu))$ in $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^a \Gamma$.

Case 1. $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\eta, \pi, \nu))$: Then $\eta < \pi$, $\{\eta, \pi, \nu\} \cup \bar{m}(\pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \pi$, and $\nu < \bar{m}_3(\pi) \leq m_3(\pi)$. Let $\Delta \subset \Sigma_3(\pi)$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_\pi^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)}\}_{\eta < \rho \in Mh_3(\nu) \cap \pi}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\eta, \pi, \nu))$$

Let $\alpha_0 = \alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a_0)$. Then $(\alpha_0, \nu) < \alpha_1 = \alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a)$. We obtain $\{\kappa, \alpha_1, \nu, \alpha_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}]$. In the following derivation $\alpha_1 \leq \bar{m}_2(\kappa)$ with $\bar{m}(\kappa) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$.

$$\frac{\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\sigma + \omega a_0 + 1} \Gamma^{(\sigma, \pi)}, \neg\delta^{(\sigma, \pi)}\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa + \omega a_0} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}, \Delta^{(\sigma, \pi)}}{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_0^{2d} \neg\theta^{(\kappa, \pi)}, \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}\}_{\theta \in \Gamma} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa + \omega a_0 + p} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}, \Gamma^{(\sigma, \pi)}\}_{\eta < \sigma \in Mh_2(\alpha_0, \nu) \cap \pi}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa + \omega a} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}} \quad (\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\eta, \kappa, \alpha_0, \nu))$$

Case 2. $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\mu, \pi, \beta, \nu))$: $(\beta, \nu) < \alpha = \bar{m}_2(\pi) \leq m_2(\pi)$, $\mu < \pi$, $\{\mu, \pi, \alpha, \beta, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ and $\Delta \subset \Sigma_2(\pi)$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_\pi^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)}\}_{\mu < \rho \in Mh_2(\beta, \nu) \cap \pi}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\pi, \beta, \nu))$$

Then $(\beta, \nu) < \alpha_1 = \alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a) \leq \bar{m}_2(\kappa)$ with the segment α of $\alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a)$.

We have $\Delta^{(\rho, \pi)} = (\Delta^{(\kappa, \pi)})^{(\rho, \kappa)}$ and $\{\kappa, \alpha_1, \beta, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}]$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa + \omega a_0 + 1} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}, \neg\delta^{(\kappa, \pi)}\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \rho\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa + \omega a_0} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)}\}_{\mu < \rho \in Mh_2(\beta, \nu) \cap \kappa}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa + \omega a} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}} \quad (\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\mu, \kappa, \beta, \nu))$$

Case 3. The last inference is a (*cut*) of a cut formula C : Then $\text{rk}(C) \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap \pi$ and $C \in \Delta_0(\pi)$. If $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\kappa)$, then $\text{rk}(C) < \kappa$.

Case 4. The last inference is either a $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\sigma, \nu))$ or a $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\sigma, \delta, \nu))$ with $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap \pi$: IH yields the lemma. If $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\kappa)$, then $\sigma < \kappa$. \square

We see from the above proof, if there is a base η for inferences $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\mu_3, \sigma, \nu))$ and simultaneously for $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\mu_2, \sigma, \delta, \nu))$ in $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^a \Gamma$ (in the sense that $\eta = \mu_3 = \mu_2$), then the same η is a base for inferences $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\mu_3, \sigma, \nu))$ and simultaneously for $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\mu_2, \sigma, \delta, \nu))$ in $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa + \omega a} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \pi)}$.

Lemma 4.14 *Let $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_1(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma$ with $a < \Lambda = \mathbb{K}$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \ni \lambda \leq b < \mathbb{K}$ and λ regular, and assume $\forall \kappa \in [\lambda, b)(\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\kappa(\gamma)))$.*

Let $\hat{a} = \gamma + \theta_b(a)$ and $\delta = \psi_\lambda^{(\beta, \nu)}(\hat{a})$ when $\lambda \in Mh_2^2(\alpha)$, $m_3(\lambda) = 0$ and $(\beta, \nu) < \alpha$ with $\{\beta, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta] \vdash_\delta^a \Gamma$ holds.

Proof. By main induction on b with subsidiary induction on a as in Lemma 2.6. Let η be a base for reflection inferences in $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma$.

Case 1. Consider the case when the last inference is a $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\eta, \sigma, \nu))$ with $b \geq \sigma$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \sigma)}\}_{\eta < \rho \in \text{Mh}_3(\nu) \cap \sigma}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\eta, \sigma, \nu))$$

where $\Delta \subset \Sigma_3(\sigma)$, $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(\nu) \subset \sigma$, $\nu < \xi = \bar{m}_3(\sigma) \leq m_3(\sigma)$, $\alpha = \bar{m}_2(\sigma) \leq m_2(\sigma)$, $\eta < \sigma$ and $\{\eta, \sigma, \xi, \alpha, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$. We may assume that $\sigma \geq \lambda$.

Case 1.1. There exists a regular $\pi \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ such that $\sigma < \pi \leq b$: Then $\Delta \subset \Delta_0(\pi)$ and $\sigma < b_0 = \psi_\pi(\hat{a}_0)$ for $\hat{a}_0 = \gamma + \theta_b(a_0)$. SIH yields $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1}[\Theta] \vdash_{b_0}^{b_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$, and $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1}[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_{b_0}^{b_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \sigma)}$ for each $\eta < \rho \in \text{Mh}_3(\nu) \cap \sigma$. A $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\eta, \sigma, \nu))$ yields $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1}[\Theta] \vdash_{b_0}^{b_0+1} \Gamma$, where $b_0 < b$. Let $\delta_0 = \psi_\lambda(\hat{a}_1)$ with $\hat{a}_1 = \hat{a}_0 + \theta_{b_0}(b_0 + 1) = \gamma + \theta_b(a_0) + \theta_{b_0}(b_0 + 1) < \gamma + \theta_b(a) = \hat{a}$. We obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_1+1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\delta_0}^{\delta_0} \Gamma$ by MIH, and the lemma follows.

Case 1.2. Otherwise: By Cut-elimination we obtain $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\sigma}^{\theta_b(a_0)} \Gamma, \neg\delta$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$, and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_{\sigma}^{\theta_b(a_0)} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \sigma)}$ for each $\eta < \rho \in \text{Mh}_3(\nu) \cap \sigma$. A $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_3}(\eta, \sigma, \nu))$ yields $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_{\sigma}^{a_1} \Gamma$ for $a_1 = \theta_b(a_0) + 1$. Let $\beta = \alpha + \lambda^\xi(1 + a_1)$ for $\alpha = \bar{m}_2(\sigma) \leq m_2(\sigma)$ and $\xi = \bar{m}_3(\pi) \leq m_3(\sigma)$, and $\kappa = \psi_\sigma^{(\beta, 0)}(\gamma)$. We obtain $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\kappa)$ by the assumption. Hence $\{\gamma, \sigma, \beta\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\kappa)$, and $\eta < \kappa \in \text{Mh}_2(\beta) \cap \sigma$, cf. Corollary 4.12. Moreover we have $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma+1}[\Theta]$.

Lemma 4.13 yields $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\kappa}^{\kappa + \omega a_1} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \sigma)}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\kappa}^{\kappa + \omega a_1} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \sigma)}$, where $\beta \leq \bar{m}_2(\kappa)$ with $\bar{m}(\kappa) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, and $\Gamma^{(\kappa, \sigma)} = \Gamma$ if $\lambda < \sigma$, and $\Gamma^{(\kappa, \sigma)} = \Gamma^{(\kappa, \lambda)}$ otherwise. In each case we obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\kappa}^{\kappa + \omega a_1} \Gamma$. MIH then yields $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_1+1}[\Theta] \vdash_{\delta_1}^{\delta_1} \Gamma$, where $\delta_1 = \psi_\lambda(\hat{a}_1)$ with $\hat{a}_1 = \gamma + \theta_\kappa(\kappa + \omega a_1) < \gamma + \theta_b(a) = \hat{a}$ by $\kappa < \sigma \leq b$ and $a_1 < \theta_b(a)$.

Case 2. Consider the case when the last inference is a $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\eta, \sigma, \beta, \nu))$ with $b \geq \sigma$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \sigma)}\}_{\eta < \rho \in \text{Mh}_2(\beta, \nu) \cap \sigma}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\eta, \sigma, \beta, \nu))$$

where $\Delta \subset \Sigma_2(\sigma)$, $(\beta, \nu) < \alpha = \bar{m}_2(\sigma) \leq m_2(\sigma)$, $\xi = \bar{m}_3(\sigma) \leq m_3(\sigma)$, $\eta < \sigma$ and $\{\eta, \sigma, \alpha, \xi, \beta, \nu\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$.

We may assume that $\sigma \geq \lambda$. For each $\delta \in \Delta$, let $\delta \simeq \bigvee (\delta_i)_{i \in J}$. We may assume $J = Tm(\sigma)$. Inversion yields $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+|i|}[\Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(i)] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta_i$, where $\Gamma \cup \{-\delta_i\} \subset \Sigma_1(\sigma)$. Let $\hat{a}_0 = \gamma + \theta_b(a_0)$ and $\rho = \psi_\sigma^{(\beta, \nu)}(\hat{a}_0)$, where $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho)$ by the assumption, $\{\eta, \sigma, \beta, \nu, \hat{a}_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ with $(\beta, \nu) < m_2(\sigma)$. Hence $\{\eta, \sigma, \beta, \nu, \hat{a}_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho) \cap \sigma \subset \rho$. Therefore $\eta < \rho \in \text{Mh}_2(\beta, \nu) \cap \sigma \cap \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1}[\Theta]$.

We see the lemma as in Lemma 2.6 by Inversion, picking the ρ -th branch from the right upper sequents, and then introducing several (*cut*)'s instead of $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\eta, \sigma, \beta, \nu))$. Use MIH when $\lambda < \sigma$.

Case 3. As in Lemma 2.6 we see the case when the last inference is a (*cut*) of a cut formula C with $d = \text{rk}(C) < b$. \square

Theorem 4.15 *Assume $\text{KPII}_4 \vdash \theta^{L_\Omega}$ for $\theta \in \Sigma$. Then there exists an $n < \omega$ such that $L_\alpha \models \theta$ for $\alpha = \psi_\Omega(\omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1))$ in $OT(\Pi_4)$.*

Proof. By Embedding there exists an $m > 0$ such that $\mathcal{H}_0[\emptyset] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}+m}^{\mathbb{K}+m} \theta^{L\Omega}$. By Cut-elimination, $\mathcal{H}_0[\emptyset] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^a \theta^{L\Omega}$ for $a = \omega_m(\mathbb{K} + m)$. By Lemma 4.2 we obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\omega^a+1}[\{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \theta^{L\Omega}$, where $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\omega^a)$, $\mathbb{K} + a = a$, $(\theta^{L\Omega})^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})} \equiv \theta^{L\Omega}$ and $\kappa \in Mh_2(a) \cap \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K})$. F.e. $\kappa = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}^{(0, a)}(0) \in \mathcal{H}_1[\emptyset]$. Hence $\mathcal{H}_{\omega^a+1}[\emptyset] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \theta^{L\Omega}$. Lemma 4.14 then yields $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+1}[\emptyset] \vdash_{\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \theta^{L\Omega}$ for $\gamma = \omega^a + \theta_{\beta}(\beta)$ and $\beta_1 = \psi_{\Omega}(\gamma) < \psi_{\Omega}(\omega^a + \mathbb{K}) < \psi_{\Omega}(\omega_{m+2}(\mathbb{K} + 1)) = \alpha$. Therefore $L_{\alpha} \models \theta$. \square

5 First order reflection

Having established an ordinal analysis for Π_4 -reflection in section 4, it is not hard to extend it to first-order reflection. As expected, an exponential ordinal structure emerges in resolving higher Mahlo classes.

Let $\mathbb{K} = \Lambda$ be either a Π_{N-2}^1 -inaccessible cardinal or a Π_N -reflecting ordinal for an integer $N \geq 3$. Let for $k > 0$, $\alpha \in M_{k+2}(A)$ iff A is Π_k^1 -inaccessible in α or α is Π_{k+2} -reflecting on A . Let $(\nu_k, \nu_{k+1}, \dots, \nu_{N-1})$ be a sequence of ordinals $\nu_i < \varepsilon_{\Lambda+1}$, and $\varepsilon_{\Lambda+1} > \alpha = \Lambda^{\beta_0} a_0 + \dots + \Lambda^{\beta_n} a_n$ with $\beta_0 > \dots > \beta_n$ and $0 < a_0, \dots, a_n < \Lambda$. Then $(\nu_k, \nu_{k+1}, \dots, \nu_{N-1}) < \alpha$ iff there exists a segment $\alpha_i = \Lambda^{\beta_0} a_0 + \dots + \Lambda^{\beta_i} a_i$ of α such that $\nu_k < \alpha_i$ and $(\nu_{k+1}, \dots, \nu_{N-1}) < \beta_i$.

Proposition 5.1 $\vec{\nu} < \alpha < \gamma \Rightarrow \vec{\nu} < \gamma$.

5.1 Mahlo classes for Π_N -reflection

As in subsection 4.1 $P \in M_i(\mathcal{X})$ designates that P is Π_i -reflecting on \mathcal{X} . Let

$$M_k(\alpha) := \bigcap \{M_k(M_k(\vec{\nu})) : \vec{\nu} = (\nu_k, \nu_{k+1}, \dots, \nu_{N-1}) < \alpha\}$$

where

$$M_k((\nu_k, \nu_{k+1}, \dots, \nu_{N-1})) := \bigcap_{i \geq k} M_i(\nu_i).$$

By Proposition 5.1 we obtain $\alpha_0 > \alpha \Rightarrow M_k(\alpha_0) \subset M_k(\alpha)$. Hence for $(\max\{\vec{\nu}, \vec{\mu}\})_i = \max\{\nu_i, \mu_i\}$, cf. **Case 1** in Lemma 5.8,

$$M_2(\vec{\nu}) \cap M_2(\vec{\mu}) = M_2(\max\{\vec{\nu}, \vec{\mu}\}).$$

Let $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_2, \dots, \nu_{N-1})$ and $\vec{\mu} = (\mu_2, \dots, \mu_{N-1})$. Then let

$$\vec{\nu} \prec_k \vec{\mu} := \Leftrightarrow M_2(\vec{\nu}) \prec_k M_2(\vec{\mu}).$$

Proposition 5.2 Let $\vec{\mu} = (\mu_2, \dots, \mu_{k-1})$, $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_{k+1}, \dots, \nu_{N-1})$, and $\vec{\xi} = (\xi_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_{N-1})$.

1. If $(\nu_k) * \vec{\nu} < \xi_k$, then $\vec{\mu} * (\nu_k) * \vec{\nu} \prec_k \vec{\mu} * (\xi_k) * \vec{\xi}$.
2. (Cf. Lemma 4.8) If $\xi_{k+1}, a > 0$, then $\vec{\mu} * (\xi_k \dot{+} \Lambda^{\xi_{k+1}} a) * \vec{0} \prec_k \vec{\mu} * (\xi_k) * \vec{\xi}$.

Proof. 5.2.1. Let $P \in M_2(\bar{\mu} * (\xi_k) * \bar{\xi}) \subset M_2(\bar{\mu} * \bar{0}) \cap M_k(\xi_k)$. By $(\nu_k) * \bar{\nu} < \xi_k$ we obtain $P \in M_k(M_k((\nu_k) * \bar{\nu}))$. Since $P \in M_2(\bar{\mu} * \bar{0})$ is Π_k on P , we conclude $P \in M_k(M_2(\bar{\mu} * \bar{0}) \cap M_k((\nu_k) * \bar{\nu})) = M_k(M_k(\bar{\mu} * (\nu_k) * \bar{\nu}))$.

5.2.2. It suffices to show that $M_k(\xi_k \dot{+} \Lambda^{\xi_{k+1}} a) \prec_k M_k(\xi_k) \cap M_{k+1}(\xi_{k+1})$, and this follows from $M_k(\xi_k) \cap M_{k+1}(\xi_{k+1}) \subset M_k(\xi_k \dot{+} \Lambda^{\xi_{k+1}} a)$. The latter is shown by induction on a as in Lemma 4.8 using the fact that $P \in M_k(\gamma) \cap M_{k+1}(\xi_{k+1}) \Rightarrow P \in M_k(M_k(\gamma) \cap M_{k+1}(\nu))$ for $\nu < \xi_{k+1}$. \square

5.2 Ordinals for first order reflection

Definition 5.3 Define simultaneously by recursion on ordinals $a < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ the classes $\mathcal{H}_a(X)$ ($X \subset \Gamma_{\mathbb{K}+1}$), $Mh_k^a(\vec{\nu})$ ($lh(\vec{\nu}) = N - k$), the ordinals $\psi_\sigma^{\vec{\nu}}(a)$ as follows.

1. $\mathcal{H}_a(X)$ denotes the Skolem hull of $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{K}\} \cup X$ under the functions $+$, φ , and the following.
Let $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_2, \dots, \nu_{N-1})$, $\{\sigma, b\} \cup \vec{\nu} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(X)$ and $b < a$. Then $\psi_\sigma^{\vec{\nu}}(b) \in \mathcal{H}_a(X)$.
2. For $2 \leq k < N$, $\pi \in Mh_k^a(\alpha)$ iff $\{a, \alpha\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$ and

$$\forall \vec{\nu} = (\nu_k, \dots, \nu_{N-1}) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) [\vec{\nu} < \alpha \rightarrow \pi \in M_k(Mh_k^a(\vec{\nu}))]$$

where

$$Mh_k^a(\vec{\nu}) = \bigcap_{i \geq k} Mh_i^a(\nu_i).$$

Note that $Mh_k^a(\alpha)$ is a Π_{k+1} -class.

3. $\psi_\sigma(a) = \min(\{\sigma\} \cup \{\kappa < \sigma : \{a, \sigma\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \ \& \ \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \sigma \subset \kappa\})$.
 $m_i(\psi_\sigma(a)) = 0$ for $i < N$.
4. Let $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\vec{\xi})$ for $\vec{\xi} = (\xi_2, \dots, \xi_{N-1})$ with $\xi_{k+1} > 0$, and $0 < c < \Lambda = \mathbb{K}$ with $c \in \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$. Let $\vec{\nu} = (\xi_2, \dots, \xi_{k-1}, \xi_k \dot{+} \Lambda^{\xi_{k+1}} c, 0, \dots, 0)$. Then
 $\psi_\sigma^{\vec{\nu}}(a) = \min(\{\sigma\} \cup \{\kappa \in Mh_2^a(\vec{\nu}) \cap \sigma : \{a\} \cup \vec{\nu} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \ \& \ \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \sigma \subset \kappa\})$.
 $m_i(\psi_\sigma^{\vec{\nu}}(a)) = \nu_i$ for $i < N$, cf. Proposition 5.2.2.
5. Let $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\bar{\mu} * \vec{\xi})$ with $\bar{\mu} = (\mu_2, \dots, \mu_{k-1})$ and $\vec{\xi} = (\xi_k, \dots, \xi_{N-1})$, and $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_k, \dots, \nu_{N-1}) < \xi_k$, cf. Proposition 5.2.1.

$$\psi_\sigma^{\bar{\mu} * \vec{\nu}}(a) = \min(\{\sigma\} \cup \{\kappa \in Mh_2^a(\bar{\mu} * \vec{\nu}) \cap \sigma : \{a\} \cup \bar{\mu} \cup \vec{\nu} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \ \& \ \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \sigma \subset \kappa\}).$$

$$m_i(\psi_\sigma^{\bar{\mu} * \vec{\nu}}(a)) = \mu_i \text{ for } i < k, \text{ and } m_i(\psi_\sigma^{\bar{\mu} * \vec{\nu}}(a)) = \nu_i \text{ for } i \geq k.$$

As in section 4 for Π_4 -reflection we see the following lemmas for Π_{N-2}^1 -indescribable cardinal \mathbb{K} .

Lemma 5.4 *Let $a \in \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{K}) \cap \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$. Then $\mathbb{K} \in M_{N-1}(Mh_{N-1}^a(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}))$, where $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ denotes the sequence $\vec{\nu} = \vec{0} * (\nu_{N-1})$ with $\nu_{N-1} = \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$. For every $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{K}) \cap \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$, $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}^{\vec{0}*(\xi)}(a) < \mathbb{K}$.*

Lemma 5.5 *Let $\vec{\nu} = (\xi_2, \dots, \xi_{k-1}, \xi_k + \Lambda^{\xi_{k+1}c}, 0, \dots, 0)$, where $\vec{\xi} = (\xi_2, \dots, \xi_{N-1})$ with $\xi_{k+1} > 0$, and $0 < c < \Lambda$ with $c \in \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$.*

Assume $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\vec{\xi})$. Then $\sigma \in M_2(Mh_2^a(\vec{\nu}))$ and $\psi_{\sigma}^{\vec{\nu}}(a) < \sigma$, cf. Proposition 5.2.2.

Lemma 5.6 *Let $\vec{\mu} = (\mu_2, \dots, \mu_{k-1})$ and $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_k, \dots, \nu_{N-1}) < \xi$. Assume $\vec{\nu} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\sigma)$ and $\sigma \in Mh_2^a(\vec{\mu} * (\xi))$. Then $\psi_{\sigma}^{\vec{\mu}*\vec{\nu}}(a) < \sigma$, cf. Proposition 5.2.1.*

5.3 Operator controlled derivations for first order reflection

Operator controlled derivations for $K\Pi_N$ are closed under the following inference rules. $\bar{m} : \pi \mapsto \bar{m}(\pi) = (\bar{m}_2(\pi), \dots, \bar{m}_{N-1}(\pi))$ is an additional data for the derivations, where $\bar{m}_i(\pi) \leq m_i(\pi)$ for $2 \leq i \leq N-1$.

($\text{rf}_{\Pi_N}(\mathbb{K})$) $b \geq \mathbb{K}$. There exist an ordinal $a_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \cap a$, and a $\Sigma_N(\mathbb{K})$ -sentence A enjoying the following conditions:

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg A \quad \{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, A^{(\rho, \mathbb{K})} : \rho < \mathbb{K}\}}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \text{ (rf}_{\Pi_N}(\mathbb{K}))$$

($\text{rf}_{\Pi_k}(\eta, \pi, \vec{\nu})$) for each $2 \leq k \leq N-1$, cf. Proposition 5.2.1.

There exist ordinals $\eta < \pi \leq b < \mathbb{K}$, $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_k, \dots, \nu_{N-1}) < \bar{m}_k(\pi) \leq m_k(\pi)$, $a_0 < a$, and a finite set Δ of $\Sigma_k(\pi)$ -sentences enjoying the following conditions:

1. $\{\eta, \pi\} \cup \vec{\nu} \cup \bar{m}(\pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta]$.
2. For each $\delta \in \Delta$, $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta$.
3. For any $\eta < \rho \in Mh_2(\bar{m}_{<k}(\pi) * \vec{\nu}) \cap \pi$, $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)}$, where $\bar{m}_{<k}(\pi) = (\bar{m}_2(\pi), \dots, \bar{m}_{k-1}(\pi))$ and $\rho \in Mh_k(\vec{\nu})$ iff $\nu_i \leq m_i(\rho)$ for every $k \leq i \leq N-1$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \pi)}\}_{\eta < \rho \in Mh_2(\bar{m}_{<k}(\pi) * \vec{\nu}) \cap \pi}}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \text{ (rf}_{\Pi_k}(\eta, \pi, \vec{\nu}))$$

Lemma 5.7 *Assume $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_{N-1}(\mathbb{K})$, $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma))$, and $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^a \Gamma$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\beta}^{\beta} \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}$ holds for any $\eta = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K}) < \kappa \in Mh_{N-1}(a) \cap \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma + \mathbb{K} \cdot \omega)$, where $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^{\mathbb{K}+a}$ and $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\hat{a})$.*

Lemma 5.8 Assume $\bar{m}(\pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, and there exists a $2 \leq k < N-1$ such that $\bar{m}_{k+1}(\pi) > 0$, and let $k = \max\{k : \bar{m}_{k+1}(\pi) > 0\}$ and $\alpha = \bar{m}_k(\pi)$, $\xi = \bar{m}_{k+1}(\pi)$. Moreover assume $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^a \Gamma$ for $a, \pi < \mathbb{K}$ and $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_k(\pi)$.

Then for any $\eta < \kappa \in Mh_2(\bar{m}_{<k}(\pi)) \cap Mh_k(\alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a)) \cap \pi$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_\pi^{\kappa+\omega a} \Gamma^{(\kappa,\pi)}$ holds, where η is a base, $\alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a) \leq \bar{m}_k(\kappa) \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ and $\bar{m}_{<k}(\kappa) = \bar{m}_{<k}(\pi)$. Moreover when $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\kappa)$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_\kappa^{\kappa+\omega a} \Gamma^{(\kappa,\pi)}$ holds.

Proof. This is seen as in Lemma 4.13 by induction on a . Let $\pi' = \kappa$ if $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\kappa)$. Otherwise $\pi' = \pi$. Consider the cases when the last inference is a $(\text{rf}\Pi_n(\eta, \pi, \vec{\nu}))$. We have $n \leq k+1$, $\eta < \pi$, $\{\eta, \pi\} \cup \vec{\nu} \cup \bar{m}(\pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_n, \dots, \nu_{N-1}) < \bar{m}_n(\pi) \leq m_n(\pi)$ and $\Delta \subset \Sigma_n(\pi)$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_\pi^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho,\pi)}\}_{\eta < \rho \in Mh_2(\bar{m}_{<n}(\pi) * \vec{\nu}) \cap \pi}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_\pi^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rf}\Pi_n(\eta, \pi, \vec{\nu}))$$

Case 1. $n = k+1$: Let $\alpha_0 = \alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a_0)$. Then $\vec{\mu} = (\alpha_0) * \vec{\nu} < \alpha_1 = \alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a)$ by $\vec{\nu} < \xi = \bar{m}_{k+1}(\pi)$. We obtain $\eta < \kappa$, $\{\eta, \kappa, \alpha_0\} \cup \bar{m}(\kappa) \cup \vec{\nu} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}]$. In the following derivation $\alpha_1 \leq \bar{m}_k(\kappa)$ with $\bar{m}(\kappa) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$. Note that $\bar{m}_{<k}(\kappa) * \vec{\mu} = \bar{m}_{<k}(\pi) * (\alpha_0) * \vec{\nu} = \max\{(\bar{m}_{<k}(\pi) * (\alpha_0) * \vec{0}), (\bar{m}_{<k}(\pi) * (\alpha) * \vec{\nu})\}$.

$$\frac{\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\sigma+\omega a_0+1} \Gamma^{(\sigma,\pi)}, \neg\delta^{(\sigma,\pi)}\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa+\omega a_0} \Gamma^{(\kappa,\pi)}, \Delta^{(\sigma,\pi)}}{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa+\omega a_0+p} \Gamma^{(\kappa,\pi)}, \Gamma^{(\sigma,\pi)}\}_{\eta < \sigma \in Mh_2(\bar{m}_{<k}(\kappa) * \vec{\mu}) \cap \kappa}} \quad (\text{rf}\Pi_k(\eta, \kappa, \vec{\mu}))}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa+\omega a} \Gamma^{(\kappa,\pi)}} \quad (\text{rf}\Pi_n(\eta, \pi, \vec{\nu}))$$

Case 2. $n \leq k$: If $n < k$, then $\vec{\nu} < \bar{m}_n(\pi) = \bar{m}_n(\kappa) \leq m_n(\kappa)$. If $n = k$, then $\vec{\nu} < \alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a) \leq \bar{m}_k(\kappa)$ with the segment α of $\alpha \dot{+} \Lambda^\xi(1+a)$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa+\omega a_0+1} \Gamma^{(\kappa,\pi)}, \neg\delta^{(\kappa,\pi)}\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \rho\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa+\omega a_0} \Gamma^{(\kappa,\pi)}, \Delta^{(\rho,\pi)}\}_{\eta < \rho \in Mh_2(\bar{m}_{<n}(\kappa) * \vec{\nu}) \cap \kappa}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash_{\pi'}^{\kappa+\omega a} \Gamma^{(\kappa,\pi)}} \quad (\text{rf}\Pi_n(\eta, \kappa, \vec{\nu}))$$

□

Lemma 5.9 Let $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_1(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma$ with $a < \mathbb{K}$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \ni \lambda \leq b < \mathbb{K}$ and λ regular. Assume $\forall \kappa \in [\lambda, b)(\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\kappa(\gamma)))$.

Let $\hat{a} = \gamma + \theta_b(a)$ and $\delta = \psi_\lambda^\gamma(\hat{a})$ when $\lambda \in Mh_k^\gamma(\alpha)$ and $\vec{\nu} < \alpha$ with $\vec{\nu} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta] \vdash_\delta \Gamma$ holds.

Proof. This is seen as in Lemma 4.14 by main induction on b with subsidiary induction on a . Let η be a base.

Case 1. Consider the case when the last inference is a $(\text{rf}\Pi_{k+1}(\eta, \sigma, \vec{\nu}))$ with $2 \leq k < N-1$ and $b \geq \sigma$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho,\sigma)}\}_{\eta < \rho \in Mh_2(\bar{m}_{\leq k}(\sigma) * \vec{\nu}) \cap \sigma}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \quad (\text{rf}\Pi_{k+1}(\eta, \sigma, \vec{\nu}))$$

where $\Delta \subset \Sigma_{k+1}(\sigma)$, $\vec{\nu} < \xi = \bar{m}_{k+1}(\sigma) \leq m_{k+1}(\sigma)$, $\eta < \sigma$ and $\{\eta, \sigma\} \cup \bar{m}(\sigma) \cup \vec{\nu} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$. We may assume that $\sigma \geq \lambda$ and there is no regular $\pi \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ such that $\sigma < \pi \leq b$.

We obtain the lemma by Cut-elimination, Lemma 5.8 for $\kappa = \psi_{\sigma}^{\bar{m}_{<k}(\sigma)*(\beta)*\vec{0}}(\gamma)$ with $\beta = \bar{m}_k(\sigma) \dot{+} \Lambda^{\bar{m}_{k+1}(\sigma)}(1 + a_1)$ and $a_1 = \theta_b(a_0) + 1$, and MIH.
Case 2. Next consider the case when the last inference is a $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\eta, \sigma, \vec{v}))$ with $b \geq \sigma$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^{\alpha_0} \Gamma, \neg\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash_b^{\alpha_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\rho, \sigma)}\}_{\eta < \rho \in Mh_2(\vec{v}) \cap \sigma}}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^{\alpha} \Gamma} \quad (\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\eta, \sigma, \vec{v}))$$

where $\Delta \subset \Sigma_2(\sigma)$, $\vec{v} < \xi = \bar{m}_2(\sigma) \leq m_2(\sigma)$, $\eta < \sigma$ and $\{\eta, \sigma\} \cup \bar{m}(\sigma) \cup \vec{v} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta]$. We may assume that $\sigma \geq \lambda$. Let $\rho = \psi_{\sigma}^{\vec{v}}(\hat{a}_0)$. We see $\eta < \rho \in Mh_2(\vec{v}) \cap \sigma \cap \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1}[\Theta]$ from the assumption $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}(\rho)$.

We see the lemma as in Lemma 2.6 by Inversion, picking the ρ -th branch from the right upper sequents, and then introducing several (*cut*)'s instead of $(\text{rfl}_{\Pi_2}(\sigma, \vec{v}))$. Use MIH when $\lambda < \sigma$. \square

$OT(\Pi_N)$ denotes a computable notation system of ordinals with collapsing functions $\psi_{\sigma}^{\vec{v}}(a)$.

Theorem 5.10 *Assume $\text{KPII}_N \vdash \theta^{L_{\alpha}}$ for $\theta \in \Sigma$. Then there exists an $n < \omega$ such that $L_{\alpha} \models \theta$ for $\alpha = \psi_{\Omega}(\omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1))$ in $OT(\Pi_N)$.*

Proof. This is seen from Lemmas 5.7 and 5.9. \square

6 Π_1^1 -reflection

Definition 6.1 σ is said to be α -stable for $\alpha > \sigma$ if $L_{\sigma} \prec_{\Sigma_1} L_{\alpha}$.

It is known that σ is $(\sigma + 1)$ -stable iff σ is Π_0^1 -reflecting, and σ is σ^+ -stable iff σ is Π_1^1 -reflecting, where σ^+ denotes the next admissible ordinal above σ , cf. [Richter-Aczel74].

Let S_1 denote the theory obtained from $\text{KP}\omega + (V = L)$ by adding the following axioms for an individual constant \mathbb{S} : \mathbb{S} is a limit ordinal and

$$L_{\mathbb{S}} \prec_{\Sigma_1} L.$$

The latter denotes a schema

$$\exists x B(x, v) \wedge v \in L_{\mathbb{S}} \rightarrow \exists x \in L_{\mathbb{S}} B(x, v)$$

for each Δ_0 -formula B . Let $L = L_{\mathbb{S}^+} \models S_1$.

An exponential structure emerges in iterating (recursively) Mahlo operations to resolve first-order reflections M_N in terms of Mahlo classes $Mh_k^{\alpha}(\alpha)$ and $Mh_k^{\alpha}(\vec{v})$. Viewing the vector $\vec{v} = (\nu_2, \nu_3, \dots, \nu_{N-1})$ as a function $\{2, 3, \dots, N-1\} \ni k \mapsto \nu_k$, each k in its domain designates the class of Π_k -formulas or the Mahlo operation M_k , while its value ν_k corresponds to the height of derivations, cf. **Case 1** in the proof of Lemma 5.8.

On the other side, the axiom $L_{\mathbb{S}} \prec_{\Sigma_1} L_{\mathbb{S}^+}$ says that \mathbb{S} ‘reflects’ $\Pi_{\mathbb{S}^+}$ -formulas in transfinite levels. In place of vectors in finite lengths, we need functions

$f : \mathbb{S}^+ \rightarrow ON$. Each c in the domain of the function f corresponds to formulas of ranks $< c$ in inference rules for higher reflections. Its support $\text{supp}(f) = \{c < \mathbb{S}^+ : f(c) \neq 0\}$ may be assumed to be *finite*, while its value $f(c) < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{S}^+ + 1}$. A Veblen function $\tilde{\theta}_b(\xi)$ is used to denote ordinals instead of the exponential function $\tilde{\theta}_1(\xi) = (\mathbb{S}^+)^{\xi}$. The relation $\vec{v} < \alpha$ in section 5 is replaced by a relation $f <^c \xi$ for ordinals c, ξ and finite function f . $f <^c \xi$ holds if $f(c) < \mu$ for a segment $\mu = \dots + \tilde{\theta}_b(\nu)$ of ξ , and $f(c+d) < \tilde{\theta}_{-d}(\tilde{\theta}_b(\nu))$ for $d = \min\{d > 0 : c+d \in \text{supp}(f)\}$, and so forth, where $\tilde{\theta}_{-d}(\xi)$ denotes an inverse of the function $\xi \mapsto \tilde{\theta}_d(\xi)$.

Mahlo classes $Mh_c^a(\xi)$ introduced in (32) reflects every fact $\pi \in Mh_0^a(g_c) = \bigcap \{Mh_d^a(g(d)) : c > d \in \text{supp}(g)\}$ on the ordinals $\pi \in Mh_c^a(\xi)$ in lower level, down to ‘smaller’ Mahlo classes $Mh_c^a(f) = \bigcap \{Mh_d^a(f(d)) : c \leq d \in \text{supp}(f)\}$, where $f <^c \xi$.

This apparatus would suffice to analyze reflections in transfinite levels. We need another for the axiom $L_{\mathbb{S}} \prec_{\Sigma_1} L_{\mathbb{S}^+}$ of Π_1^1 -reflection, i.e., a (formal) *Mostowski collapsing*: Assume that $B(u, v)$ with $v \in L_{\mathbb{S}}$ for a Δ_0 -formula B . We need to find a substitute $u' \in L_{\mathbb{S}}$ for $u \in L_{\mathbb{S}^+}$, i.e., $B(u', v)$. For simplicity let us assume that $v = \beta < \mathbb{S}$ and $u = \alpha < \mathbb{S}^+$ are ordinals. We may assume that $\alpha \geq \mathbb{S}$. Let $\rho < \mathbb{S}$ be an ordinal, which is bigger than every ordinal $< \mathbb{S}$ occurring in the ‘context’ of $B(\alpha, \beta)$. This means that if an ordinal $\delta < \mathbb{S}$ occurs in a ‘relevant’ branch of a derivation of $B(\alpha, \beta)$, $\delta < \rho$ holds. Then we can define a Mostowski collapsing $\alpha \mapsto \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ for ordinal terms α such that $\beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \beta$ for each relevant $\beta < \mathbb{S}$, $\mathbb{S}[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \rho$ and $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] < (\mathbb{S}^+)[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \rho^+ < \mathbb{S}$, cf. Definition 6.22. Then we see that $B(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}], \beta)$ holds.

Although the above scheme would seem to work, how to implement the plan? Let $E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$ denote the set of ordinal terms α such that every subterm $\beta < \mathbb{S}$ of α is smaller than ρ . It turns out that $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}(E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}) \subset E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$ if $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \rho$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma$, and assume that (3), $\{\gamma, a, b\} \cup \text{k}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta]$ holds in Definition 1.16. Moreover let us assume that $\Theta \subset E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$ holds. Then we obtain $\{\gamma, a, b\} \cup \text{k}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}(E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}) \subset E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$. This means that $\text{k}(\Gamma) \subset E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$ holds as long as $\Theta \subset E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$ holds, i.e., as long as we are concerned with branches for $\text{k}(\iota) \subset E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$ in, e.g., inferences (\wedge) : $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_{\iota})_{\iota \in J}$

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, A, A_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in J}}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma, A} (\wedge) \rightsquigarrow \frac{\{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, A, A_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in J, \text{k}(\iota) \subset E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}}}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma, A} (\wedge)$$

and dually $\text{k}(\iota) \subset E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$ for a minor formula A_{ι} of a (\vee) with the main formula $A \simeq \bigvee (A_{\iota})_{\iota \in J}$, provided that $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \rho$. The proviso means that $\gamma_1 \geq \rho$ when $\rho = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^f(\gamma_1)$. Such a $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta]$ only when $\rho \in \Theta$. Let us try to replace the inferences for the stability of \mathbb{S}

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta) \vdash \Gamma, B(u) \quad \{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash \Gamma, \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}\}_{\Theta \subset E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}}}{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta) \vdash \Gamma} \text{ (stbl)}$$

by inferences for reflection of ρ with $\Theta \subset E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$: If $B(u)^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$ holds, then $B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$

holds for some $\sigma < \rho$.

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\rho\}) \vdash \Gamma^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}, B(u)^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]} \quad \{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\rho, \sigma\}) \vdash \Gamma^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}, \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \}_{\Theta \subset E_\sigma^\mathbb{S}, \sigma < \rho}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\rho\}) \vdash \Gamma^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}} \text{ (rfl)}$$

However we need to eliminate the inferences for reflections in transfinite levels. In view of analysis in section 5 for first-order reflection, $\Gamma^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}, B(u)^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$ is replaced by $\Gamma^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}, B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$, and $\Gamma^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}, \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ by $\Gamma^{[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]}, \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ with $\sigma < \kappa < \rho$.

$$\frac{\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\rho, \sigma\}) \vdash \Gamma^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}, B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \quad (\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\kappa, \rho, \sigma\}) \vdash \Gamma^{[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]}, \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}}{\{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\kappa, \rho, \sigma\}) \vdash \Gamma^{[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]}, \Gamma^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \}_\sigma} \text{ (cut)}}{\frac{\{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\kappa\}) \vdash \Gamma^{[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]}, \neg \theta^{[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]} \}_{\theta \in \Gamma} \quad \{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\kappa, \rho, \sigma\}) \vdash \Gamma^{[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]}, \Gamma^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \}_\sigma}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\kappa, \rho\}) \vdash \Gamma^{[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]}} \text{ (rfl)}}$$

We are replacing formulas $\Gamma^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$ by $\Gamma^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ or by $\Gamma^{[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]}$. This means that $\alpha[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]$ is substituted for each $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$. Namely a composition of uncollapsing and collapsing $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \mapsto \alpha \mapsto \alpha[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]$ arises. Hence we need $\alpha \in E_\sigma^\mathbb{S} \subsetneq E_\rho^\mathbb{S}$ for $\sigma < \rho$. However we have $\Theta \cup \{\rho\} \not\subset E_\sigma^\mathbb{S}$, and the schema seems to be broken. Moreover the finite sets $\Theta \cup \{\rho\}$ becomes bigger to $\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \rho\}$. Is it remain finite in eliminating inferences of reflections in transfinite level?

Looking back at the proof of Lemma 4.13, for $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_2$ and $\Delta \subset \Pi_2$

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash \Gamma^{(\pi, \mathbb{K})}, \neg \delta^{(\pi, \mathbb{K})}\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \vdash \Gamma^{(\pi, \mathbb{K})}, \Delta^{(\rho, \mathbb{K})}\}_\rho}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash \Gamma^{(\pi, \mathbb{K})}} \text{ (rfl}_{\Pi_3})$$

is rewritten to

$$\frac{\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash \Gamma^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}, \neg \delta^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}, \Delta^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}}{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash \neg \theta^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}, \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}\}_{\theta \in \Gamma} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa, \sigma\}] \vdash \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}, \Gamma^{(\sigma, \mathbb{K})}\}_\sigma}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\kappa\}] \vdash \Gamma^{(\kappa, \mathbb{K})}} \text{ (rfl}_{\Pi_2})$$

This is done by replacing the restriction (π, \mathbb{K}) by (σ, \mathbb{K}) or (κ, \mathbb{K}) , and ordinals π, σ, κ enter derivations, but do we need to control these ordinals? Instead of the restriction (π, \mathbb{K}) , formulas could put on caps π, σ, κ in such a way that $k(A^{(\sigma)}) = k(A)$. This means that the cap σ does not ‘occur’ in a capped formula $A^{(\sigma)}$. If we choose an ordinal γ_0 big enough (depending on a given finite proof figure), every ordinal ‘occurring’ in derivations (including the subscript $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$ in the operators \mathcal{H}_γ) is in $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0} = \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}(\emptyset)$ for the ordinal γ_0 , while each cap ρ exceeds the *threshold* γ_0 in the sense that $\rho \notin \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \rho$. Then every ordinal ‘occurring’ in derivations is in the domain $E_\rho^\mathbb{S}$ of the Mostowski collapsing $\alpha \mapsto \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$. Now details follow.

6.1 Ordinals for one stable ordinal

For a while, \mathbb{S} denotes a weakly inaccessible cardinal.

Definition 6.2 Let $\Lambda = \omega_{\mathbb{S}+1}$ or $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}^+$. $\varphi_b(\xi)$ denotes the binary Veblen function on Λ^+ with $\varphi_0(\xi) = \omega^\xi$, and $\tilde{\varphi}_b(\xi) := \varphi_b(\Lambda \cdot \xi)$ for the epsilon number Λ .

Let $b, \xi < \Lambda^+$. $\theta_b(\xi)$ [$\tilde{\theta}_b(\xi)$] denotes a b -th iterate of $\varphi_0(\xi) = \omega^\xi$ [of $\tilde{\varphi}_0(\xi) = \Lambda^\xi$], resp.

Definition 6.3 Let $\xi < \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ be a non-zero ordinal with its normal form:

$$\xi = \sum_{i \leq m} \tilde{\theta}_{b_i}(\xi_i) \cdot a_i =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m) \cdot a_m + \cdots + \tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0) \cdot a_0 \quad (30)$$

where $\tilde{\theta}_{b_i}(\xi_i) > \xi_i$, $\tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m) > \cdots > \tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0)$, $b_i = \omega^{c_i} < \Lambda$, and $0 < a_0, \dots, a_m < \Lambda$. $SC_\Lambda(\xi) = \bigcup_{i \leq m} (\{a_i\} \cup SC_\Lambda(\xi_i))$.

$\tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0)$ is said to be the *tail* of ξ , denoted $\tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0) = tl(\xi)$, and $\tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m)$ the *head* of ξ , denoted $\tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m) = hd(\xi)$.

1. ζ is a *segment* of ξ iff there exists an n ($0 \leq n \leq m+1$) such that $\zeta =_{NF} \sum_{i \geq n} \tilde{\theta}_{b_i}(\xi_i) \cdot a_i = \tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m) \cdot a_m + \cdots + \tilde{\theta}_{b_n}(\xi_n) \cdot a_n$ for ξ in (30).
2. Let $\zeta =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_b(\xi)$ with $\tilde{\theta}_b(\xi) > \xi$ and $b = \omega^{b_0}$, and c be ordinals. An ordinal $\tilde{\theta}_{-c}(\zeta)$ is defined recursively as follows. If $b \geq c$, then $\tilde{\theta}_{-c}(\zeta) = \tilde{\theta}_{b-c}(\xi)$. Let $c > b$. If $\xi > 0$, then $\tilde{\theta}_{-c}(\zeta) = \tilde{\theta}_{-(c-b)}(\tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m))$ for the head term $hd(\xi) = \tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m)$ of ξ in (30). If $\xi = 0$, then let $\tilde{\theta}_{-c}(\zeta) = 0$.

Definition 6.4 1. A function $f : \Lambda \rightarrow \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ with a *finite* support $\text{supp}(f) = \{c < \Lambda : f(c) \neq 0\} \subset \Lambda$ is said to be a *finite function* if $\forall i > 0 (a_i = 1)$ and $a_0 = 1$ when $b_0 > 1$ in $f(c) =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m) \cdot a_m + \cdots + \tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0) \cdot a_0$ for any $c \in \text{supp}(f)$.

It is identified with the finite function $f \upharpoonright \text{supp}(f)$. When $c \notin \text{supp}(f)$, let $f(c) := 0$. $SC_\Lambda(f) := \bigcup \{\{c\} \cup SC_\Lambda(f(c))\} : c \in \text{supp}(f)\}$. f, g, h, \dots range over finite functions.

For an ordinal c , f_c and f^c are restrictions of f to the domains $\text{supp}(f_c) = \{d \in \text{supp}(f) : d < c\}$ and $\text{supp}(f^c) = \{d \in \text{supp}(f) : d \geq c\}$. $g_c * f^c$ denotes the concatenated function such that $\text{supp}(g_c * f^c) = \text{supp}(g_c) \cup \text{supp}(f^c)$, $(g_c * f^c)(a) = g_c(a)$ for $a < c$, and $(g_c * f^c)(a) = f^c(a)$ for $a \geq c$.

2. Let f be a finite function and c, ξ ordinals. A relation $f <^c \xi$ is defined by induction on the cardinality of the finite set $\{d \in \text{supp}(f) : d > c\}$ as follows. If $f^c = \emptyset$, then $f <^c \xi$ holds. For $f^c \neq \emptyset$, $f <^c \xi$ iff there exists a segment μ of ξ such that $f(c) < \mu$ and $f <^{c+d} \tilde{\theta}_{-d}(tl(\mu))$ for $d = \min\{c + d \in \text{supp}(f) : d > 0\}$.

Proposition 6.5 $f <^c \xi \leq \zeta \Rightarrow f <^c \zeta$.

6.2 Mahlo classes for Π_1^1 -reflection

In Lemma 4.8 and Proposition 5.2.2, it is crucial the fact that $P \in M_k(\gamma) \Rightarrow P \in M_k(M_k(\gamma) \cap M_{k+1}(\nu))$ if $P \in M_{k+1}(\xi_{k+1})$ and $\nu < \xi_{k+1}$. This means that if P is in a higher Mahlo class, then P reflects a fact on P in lower Mahlo classes.

$P \in M_c(\xi)$ is defined by main induction on c with subsidiary induction on P .

$$P \in M_c(\xi) :\Leftrightarrow \forall f <^c \xi \forall g [P \in M_0(g_c) \Rightarrow P \in M_2(M_0(g_c * f^c))] \quad (31)$$

where f, g range over finite functions and

$$M_c(f) := \bigcap \{M_d(f(d)) : d \in \text{supp}(f^c)\} = \bigcap \{M_d(f(d)) : c \leq d \in \text{supp}(f)\}.$$

From Proposition 6.5 we see $\xi < \zeta \Rightarrow M_c(\xi) \supset M_c(\zeta)$.

For classes \mathcal{X} let

$$P \in M_c(\mathcal{X}) :\Leftrightarrow \forall g [P \in M_0(g_c) \Rightarrow P \in M_2(M_0(g_c) \cap \mathcal{X})].$$

Then by $M_0(g_c * f^c) = M_0(g_c) \cap M_c(f^c)$, $P \in M_c(\xi) \Leftrightarrow \forall f <^c \xi [P \in M_c(M_c(f^c))]$, i.e., $M_c(\xi) = \bigcap_{f <^c \xi} M_c(M_c(f^c))$.

Proposition 6.6 *Suppose $P \in M_c(\xi)$.*

1. *Let $f <^c \xi$. Then $P \in M_c(M_c(f^c))$.*
2. *Let $P \in M_d(\mathcal{X})$ for $d > c$. Then $P \in M_c(M_c(\xi) \cap \mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. 6.6.1. Let g be a function such that $P \in M_0(g_c)$. By the definition (31) of $P \in M_c(\xi)$ we obtain $P \in M_2(M_0(g_c) \cap M_c(f^c))$.

6.6.2. Let $P \in M_d(\mathcal{X})$ for $d > c$. Let g be a function such that $P \in M_0(g_c)$. We obtain by $d > c$ with the function $g_c * h$, $P \in M_2(M_0(g_c) \cap M_c(\xi) \cap \mathcal{X})$, where $\text{supp}(h) = \{c\}$ and $h(c) = \xi$. \square

Lemma 6.7 *Assume $P \in M_d(\xi) \cap M_c(\xi_0)$, $\xi_0 \neq 0$, and $d < c$. Moreover let $\xi_1 \leq \tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(\xi_0)$. Then $P \in M_d(\xi \dot{+} \xi_1) \cap M_d(M_d(\xi \dot{+} \xi_1))$.*

Proof. This is seen as in Lemma 4.11.

We obtain $P \in M_c(\xi_0) \subset M_c(M_c(\emptyset))$ by Proposition 6.6.1. Let $P \in M_d(\xi \dot{+} \xi_1) \cap M_0(g_d)$ for a function g . We show $P \in M_2(M_0(g_d) \cap M_d(\xi \dot{+} \xi_1))$. Let $h = g_d \cup \{(d, \xi \dot{+} \xi_1)\}$. Then $P \in M_0(h_c)$ by $d < c$. $P \in M_c(M_c(\emptyset))$ yields $P \in M_2(M_0(h_c) \cap M_c(\emptyset))$, and hence $P \in M_2(M_0(g_d) \cap M_d(\xi \dot{+} \xi_1))$. Therefore $P \in M_d(M_d(\xi \dot{+} \xi_1))$.

Let f be a finite function such that $f <^d \xi + \xi_1$. We show $P \in M_d(M_d(f^d))$ by main induction on the cardinality of the finite set $\{e \in \text{supp}(f) : e > d\}$ with subsidiary induction on ξ_1 .

First let $f <^d \mu$ for a segment μ of ξ . We obtain $P \in M_d(\mu)$ and $P \in M_d(M_d(f^d))$.

In what follows let $f(d) = \xi \dot{+} \zeta$ with $\zeta < \xi_1$. By SIH we obtain $P \in M_d(f(d)) \cap M_d(M_d(f(d)))$. If $\{e \in \text{supp}(f) : e > d\} = \emptyset$, then $M_d(f^d) = M_d(f(d))$, and we are done. Otherwise let $e = \min\{e \in \text{supp}(f) : e > d\}$.

By SIH we can assume $f <^e \tilde{\theta}_{-(e-d)}(tl(\xi_1))$. By $\xi_1 \leq \tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(\xi_0)$, we obtain $f <^e \tilde{\theta}_{-(e-d)}(\tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(\xi_0)) = \tilde{\theta}_{-e}(\tilde{\theta}_c(\xi_0))$. We claim that $P \in M_{c_0}(M_{c_0}(f^{c_0}))$ for $c_0 = \min\{c, e\}$. If $c = e$, then the claim follows from the assumption $P \in M_c(\xi_0)$ and $f <^e \xi_0$. Let $e = c + e_0 > c$. Then $\tilde{\theta}_{-e}(\tilde{\theta}_c(\xi_0)) = \tilde{\theta}_{-e_0}(hd(\xi_0))$, and $f <^c \xi_0$ with $f(c) = 0$ yields the claim. Let $c = e + c_1 > e$. Then $\tilde{\theta}_{-e}(\tilde{\theta}_c(\xi_0)) = \tilde{\theta}_{c_1}(\xi_0)$. MIH yields the claim.

On the other hand we have $M_d(f^d) = M_d(f(d)) \cap M_{c_0}(f^{c_0})$. $P \in M_d(f(d)) \cap M_{c_0}(M_{c_0}(f^{c_0}))$ with $d < c_0$ yields by Proposition 6.6.2, $P \in M_d(M_d(f(d)) \cap M_{c_0}(f^{c_0}))$, i.e., $P \in M_d(M_d(f^d))$. \square

For finite functions f and g ,

$$M_0(g) \prec M_0(f) :\Leftrightarrow \forall P \in M_0(f) (P \in M_2(M_0(g))).$$

Corollary 6.8 *Let f, g be finite functions and $c \in \text{supp}(f)$. Assume that there exists an ordinal $d < c$ such that $(d, c) \cap \text{supp}(f) = (d, c) \cap \text{supp}(g) = \emptyset$, $g_d = f_d$, $g(d) < f(d) \dot{+} \tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(f(c)) \cdot \omega$, and $g <^c f(c)$. Then $M_0(g) \prec M_0(f)$ holds.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.7. \square

Definition 6.9 An *irreducibility* of finite functions f is defined by induction on the cardinality n of the finite set $\text{supp}(f)$. If $n \leq 1$, f is defined to be irreducible. Let $n \geq 2$ and $c < c + d$ be the largest two elements in $\text{supp}(f)$, and let g be a finite function such that $\text{supp}(g) = \text{supp}(f_c) \cup \{c\}$, $g_c = f_c$ and $g(c) = f(c) + \tilde{\theta}_d(f(c + d))$.

Then f is irreducible iff $tl(f(c)) > \tilde{\theta}_d(f(c + d))$ and g is irreducible.

Definition 6.10 Let f, g be irreducible finite functions, and b an ordinal. Let us define a relation $f <_{lx}^b g$ by induction on the cardinality $\#\{e \in \text{supp}(f) \cup \text{supp}(g) : e \geq b\}$ as follows. $f <_{lx}^b g$ holds iff $f^b \neq g^b$ and for the ordinal $c = \min\{c \geq b : f(c) \neq g(c)\}$, one of the following conditions is met:

1. $f(c) < g(c)$ and let μ be the shortest part of $g(c)$ such that $f(c) < \mu$. Then for any $c < c + d \in \text{supp}(f)$, if $tl(\mu) \leq \tilde{\theta}_d(f(c + d))$, then $f <_{lx}^{c+d} g$ holds.
2. $f(c) > g(c)$ and let ν be the shortest part of $f(c)$ such that $\nu > g(c)$. Then there exist a $c < c + d \in \text{supp}(g)$ such that $f <_{lx}^{c+d} g$ and $tl(\nu) \leq \tilde{\theta}_d(g(c + d))$.

Proposition 6.11 *If $f <_{lx}^0 g$, then $M_0(f) \prec M_0(g)$.*

Proof. This is seen from Corollary 6.8. \square

6.3 Skolem hulls and collapsing functions

Definition 6.12 Let $\mathbb{K} = \omega_{\mathbb{S}+1}$, $a < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ and $X \subset \Gamma_{\mathbb{K}+1}$.

1. $\mathcal{H}_a(X)$ denotes the Skolem hull of $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{K}\} \cup X$ under the functions $+, \varphi, \beta \mapsto \psi_\Omega(\beta)$ ($\beta < a$), $\mathbb{S} > \alpha \mapsto \alpha^+$ and $(\pi, b, f) \mapsto \psi_\pi^f(b)$, where $b < a$ and f is a finite function such that $f \in \mathcal{H}_a(X) :\Leftrightarrow SC_{\mathbb{K}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(X)$.
2. Let $c < \mathbb{K}$, $a < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ and $\xi < \varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(0)$. $\pi \in Mh_c^a(\xi)$ iff $\{a, c, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$ and

$$\forall f <^c \xi \forall g (SC_{\mathbb{K}}(f) \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(g) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \& \pi \in Mh_0^a(g_c) \Rightarrow \pi \in M_2(Mh_0^a(g_c * f^c))) \quad (32)$$

where

$$Mh_c^a(f) := \bigcap \{Mh_d^a(f(d)) : d \in \text{supp}(f^c)\} = \bigcap \{Mh_d^a(f(d)) : c \leq d \in \text{supp}(f)\}.$$

- 3.

$$\psi_\pi^f(a) := \min(\{\pi\} \cup \{\kappa \in Mh_0^a(f) \cap \pi : \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \pi \subset \kappa, \{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa)\}) \quad (33)$$

Shrewd cardinals are introduced by [Rathjen05b]. A cardinal κ is *shrewd* iff for any $\eta > 0$, $P \subset V_\kappa$, and formula $\varphi(x, y)$, if $V_{\kappa+\eta} \models \varphi[P, \kappa]$, then there are $0 < \kappa_0, \eta_0 < \kappa$ such that $V_{\kappa_0+\eta_0} \models \varphi[P \cap V_{\kappa_0}, \kappa_0]$. \tilde{T} denotes the extension of ZFC by the axiom stating that \mathbb{S} is a shrewd cardinal.

Lemma 6.13 \tilde{T} proves that $\mathbb{S} \in Mh_c^a(\xi) \cap M_2(Mh_c^a(\xi))$ for every $a < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$, $c < \mathbb{K}$, $\xi < \varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(0)$ such that $\{a, c, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$.

Proof. We show the lemma by induction on $\xi < \varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(0)$.

Let $\{a, c, \xi\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$ and $f <^c \xi$. We show $\mathbb{S} \in Mh_c^a(f^c)$, and $\mathbb{S} \in M_2(Mh_0^a(g_c) \cap Mh_c^a(f^c))$ assuming $\mathbb{S} \in Mh_0^a(g_c)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(g_c) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$.

For each $d \in \text{supp}(f^c)$ we obtain $f(d) < \xi$ by $\theta_{-\varepsilon}(\zeta) \leq \zeta$. IH yields $\mathbb{S} \in Mh_c^a(f^c)$.

We have to show $\mathbb{S} \in M_2(A \cap B)$ for $A = Mh_0^a(g_c) \cap \mathbb{S}$ and $B = Mh_c^a(f^c) \cap \mathbb{S}$. Let C be a club subset of \mathbb{S} .

We have $\mathbb{S} \in Mh_0^a(g_c) \cap Mh_c^a(f^c)$, and $\{a, c\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(g_c, f^c) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. Pick a $b < \mathbb{S}$ so that $\{a, c\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{K}}(g_c, f^c) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(b)$, and a bijection $F : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. Each $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S}) \cap \Gamma_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ is identified with its code, denoted by $F^{-1}(\alpha)$. Let P be the class $P = \{(\pi, d, \alpha) \in \mathbb{S}^3 : \pi \in Mh_{F(d)}^a(F(\alpha))\}$, where $F(d) < \mathbb{K}$ and $F(\alpha) < \varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(0)$ with $\{F(d), F(\alpha)\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$. For fixed a , the set $\{(d, \eta) \in \mathbb{K} \times \varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(0) : \mathbb{S} \in Mh_d^a(\eta)\}$ is defined from the class P by recursion on ordinals $d < \mathbb{K}$. Let φ be a formula such that $V_{\mathbb{S}+\mathbb{K}} \models \varphi[P, C, \mathbb{S}, b]$ iff $\mathbb{S} \in Mh_0^a(g_c) \cap Mh_c^a(f^c)$ and C is a club subset of \mathbb{S} . Since \mathbb{S} is shrewd, pick $b < \mathbb{S}_0 < \mathbb{K}_0 < \mathbb{S}$ such that $V_{\mathbb{S}_0+\mathbb{K}_0} \models \varphi[P \cap \mathbb{S}_0, C \cap \mathbb{S}_0, \mathbb{S}_0, b]$. We obtain $\mathbb{S}_0 \in A \cap B \cap C$. Therefore $\mathbb{S} \in Mh_c^a(\xi)$ is shown. $\mathbb{S} \in M_2(Mh_c^a(\xi))$ is seen from the shrewdness of \mathbb{S} . \square

Corollary 6.14 \tilde{T} proves that $\forall a < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1} \forall c < \mathbb{K}[\{a, c, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S}) \rightarrow \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^f(a) < \mathbb{S}]$ for every $\xi < \varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(0)$ and finite functions f such that $\text{supp}(f) = \{c\}$, $c < \mathbb{K}$ and $f(c) = \xi$.

Lemma 6.15 Assume $\mathbb{S} \geq \pi \in Mh_d^a(\xi) \cap Mh_c^a(\xi_0)$, $\xi_0 \neq 0$, and $d < c$. Moreover let $\xi_1 \in \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$ for $\xi_1 \leq \tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(\xi_0)$. Then $\pi \in Mh_d^a(\xi \dot{+} \xi_1) \cap M_d^a(Mh_d^a(\xi \dot{+} \xi_1))$.

Proof. As in Lemma 6.7. \square

Definition 6.16 For finite functions f and g ,

$$Mh_0^a(g) \prec Mh_0^a(f) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \pi \in Mh_0^a(f) (SC_{\mathbb{K}}(g) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \Rightarrow \pi \in M_2(Mh_0^a(g))).$$

Corollary 6.17 Let f, g be finite functions and $c \in \text{supp}(f)$. Assume that there exists an ordinal $d < c$ such that $(d, c) \cap \text{supp}(f) = (d, c) \cap \text{supp}(g) = \emptyset$, $g_d = f_d$, $g(d) < f(d) \dot{+} \tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(f(c)) \cdot \omega$, and $g <^c f(c)$. Then $Mh_0^a(g) \prec Mh_0^a(f)$ holds. In particular if $\pi \in Mh_0^a(f)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(g) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$, then $\psi_{\pi}^g(a) < \pi$.

Proposition 6.18 Let $f, g : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(0)$. If $f <_{lx}^0 g$, then $Mh_0^a(f) \prec Mh_0^a(g)$.

Proof. This is seen from Corollary 6.17. \square

6.4 A Mostowski collapsing

$OT(\Pi_1^1)$ denotes a computable notation system of ordinals with a constant \mathbb{S} for a stable ordinal, collapsing functions $\psi_{\sigma}^g(a)$ for finite functions g , where $\text{supp}(g) = \{d\}$ for a $d < \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{S}^+$ and $g(d) < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{K}+1}$ if $\sigma = \mathbb{S}$. Let $m(\alpha) = g$ for $\alpha = \psi_{\sigma}^g(a)$ and $\sigma < \mathbb{S}$. For $g \neq \emptyset$, $\alpha = \psi_{\sigma}^g(a) \in OT(\Pi_1^1)$ only when g is obtained from $f = m(\sigma)$ as follows, cf. Corollary 6.17. There are c and d such that $d < c \in \text{supp}(f)$, and $(d, c) \cap \text{supp}(f) = \emptyset$. Then $g_d = f_d$, $(d, c) \cap \text{supp}(g) = \emptyset$ $g(d) < f(d) + \theta_{c-d}(f(c)) \cdot \omega$, and $g <^c f(c)$.

In what follows, by ordinals we mean ordinal terms in $OT(\Pi_1^1)$. $\Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ denotes the set of ordinal terms $\psi_{\sigma}^f(a)$ for some a, f and $\sigma \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}$. Note that in $OT(\Pi_1^1)$, $\psi_{\sigma}^f(a) \geq \mathbb{S}$ only if $\sigma = \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{S}^+$ and $f = \emptyset$.

We define a Mostowski collapsing $\alpha \mapsto \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$, which is needed to replace inference rules for stability by ones of reflections. The domain of the collapsing $\alpha \mapsto \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ is a subset M_{ρ} of $E_{\rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$. For a reason of the restriction, see the beginning of subsection 6.5.

Definition 6.19 For ordinal terms $\psi_{\sigma}^f(a) \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}} \subset OT(\Pi_1^1)$, define $m(\psi_{\sigma}^f(a)) := f$ and $s(\psi_{\sigma}^f(a)) := \max(\text{supp}(f))$. Also $\mathbf{p}_0(\psi_{\sigma}^f(a)) = \mathbf{p}_0(\sigma)$ if $\sigma < \mathbb{S}$, and $\mathbf{p}_0(\psi_{\mathbb{S}}^f(a)) = a$.

Definition 6.20 $M_{\rho} := \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$ for $b = \mathbf{p}_0(\rho)$ and $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$.

$\alpha = \psi_{\sigma}^g(a) \in OT(\Pi_1^1)$ only when $\{\sigma, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(g) \subset M_{\alpha}$.

$OT(\Pi_1^1)$ is defined to be closed under $\alpha \mapsto \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ for $\alpha \in M_{\rho}$. Specifically if $\{\alpha, \rho\} \subset OT(\Pi_1^1)$ with $\alpha \in M_{\rho}$ and $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$, then $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \in OT(\Pi_1^1)$.

Proposition 6.21 *Let $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$.*

1. $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(M_\rho) \subset M_\rho$ if $\gamma \leq \mathbf{p}_0(\rho)$.
2. $M_\rho \cap \mathbb{S} = \rho$ and $\rho \notin M_\rho$.
3. If $\sigma < \rho$ and $\mathbf{p}_0(\sigma) \leq \mathbf{p}_0(\rho)$, then $M_\sigma \subset M_\rho$.

Definition 6.22 Let $\alpha \in M_\rho$ with $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$. We define an ordinal $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ recursively as follows. $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] := \alpha$ when $\alpha < \mathbb{S}$. In what follows assume $\alpha \geq \mathbb{S}$.

$\mathbb{S}[\rho/\mathbb{S}] := \rho$. $\mathbb{K}[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \equiv (\mathbb{S}^+)[\rho/\mathbb{S}] := \rho^+$. $(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(a))[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = (\psi_{\mathbb{S}^+}(a))[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \psi_{\rho^+}(a[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$. The map commutes with $+$ and φ .

Lemma 6.23 *For $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$, $\{\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] : \alpha \in M_\rho\}$ is a transitive collapse of M_ρ in the sense that $\beta < \alpha \Leftrightarrow \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}] < \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$, $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\gamma) \Leftrightarrow \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}(\gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$ for $\gamma > \mathbb{S}$, and $OT(\Pi_1^1) \cap \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \{\beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}] : \beta \in M_\rho \cap \alpha\}$ for $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in M_\rho$.*

Let $\rho \leq \mathbb{S}$, and ι an RS -term or an RS -formula such that $\mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\rho$, where $M_{\mathbb{S}} = \mathbb{K}$. Then $\iota^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$ denotes the result of replacing each unbounded quantifier Qx by $Qx \in L_{\mathbb{K}[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$, and each ordinal term $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}(\iota)$ by $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ for the Mostowski collapse in Definition 6.22.

Proposition 6.24 *Let $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}$.*

1. Let v be an RS -term with $\mathbf{k}(v) \subset M_\rho$, and $\alpha = |v|$. Then $v^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$ is an RS -term of level $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$, $|v^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}| = \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ and $\mathbf{k}(v^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}) = (\mathbf{k}(v))^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$.
2. Let $\alpha \leq \mathbb{K}$ be such that $\alpha \in M_\rho$. Then $(Tm(\alpha))^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]} := \{v^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]} : v \in Tm(\alpha), \mathbf{k}(v) \subset M_\rho\} = Tm(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$.
3. Assume $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \rho$. For an RS -formula A with $\mathbf{k}(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho)$, $A^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$ is an RS -formula such that $\mathbf{k}(A^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}) \subset \{\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] : \alpha \in \mathbf{k}(A)\} \cup \{\mathbb{K}[\rho/\mathbb{S}]\}$.

For each sentence A , either a disjunction is assigned as $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, or a conjunction is assigned as $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. In the former case A is said to be a \bigvee -formula, and in the latter A is a \bigwedge -formula.

Definition 6.25 Let $[\rho]Tm(\alpha) := \{u \in Tm(\alpha) : \mathbf{k}(u) \subset M_\rho\}$.

Proposition 6.26 *Let $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}$. For RS -formulas A , let $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ and assume $\mathbf{k}(A) \subset M_\rho$. Then $A^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]} \simeq \bigvee ((A_\iota)^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]})_{\iota \in [\rho]J}$. The case $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ is similar.*

6.5 Operator controlled derivations for Π_1^1 -reflection

We define a derivability relation $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ where \mathbb{Q}_Π is a finite set of ordinals in $\Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$, c is a bound of ranks of the inference rules (stbl) and of ranks of cut formulas. The relation depends on an ordinal γ_0 , and should be written as $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{c, \gamma_0}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. However the ordinal γ_0 will be fixed. So let us omit it.

The rôle of the calculus \vdash_c^{*a} is twofold: first finite proof figures are embedded in the calculus, and second the cut rank c in \vdash_c^{*a} is lowered to $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{S}^+$. In the next subsection 6.6 the relation \vdash_c^{*a} is embedded in another derivability relation $\vdash_{c, e, b_1}^a A^{(\rho)}$ with caps ρ . In the latter calculus, cut ranks c as well as the ranks of formulas to be reflected are lowered to \mathbb{S} , and the inferences for reflections are removed. For this we need to distinguish formulas with smaller ranks $< \mathbb{S}$ from higher ones.

As in Lemma 4.13, in eliminating of inferences for reflections,

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \neg\delta^{(\rho)}\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \Delta^{(\sigma)}\}_\sigma}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash^a \Gamma^{(\rho)}} \text{ (rfl}_\rho\text{)}$$

is rewritten to, cf. Recapping 6.47

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \rho \rightsquigarrow \sigma}{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash \Gamma^{(\sigma)}, \neg\delta^{(\sigma)}\}_{\delta \in \Delta}} \quad \frac{\vdots \rho \rightsquigarrow \kappa}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \Delta^{(\sigma)}}}{\{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash \neg\theta^{(\kappa)}, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}\}_{\theta \in \Gamma} \quad \{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \vdash \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \Gamma^{(\sigma)}\}_\sigma} \text{ (cut)}}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash \Gamma^{(\kappa)}} \text{ (rfl}_\kappa\text{)}$$

where $\sigma < \kappa < \rho$. In the rewriting, the inference (rfl $_\rho$) is replaced by (rfl $_\kappa$) for a smaller $\kappa < \rho$. This means that (rfl $_\rho$) is replaced by (rfl $_\sigma$) in the part $\rho \rightsquigarrow \sigma$. κ reflects Γ to some σ , and σ has to reflect Δ , where $\text{rk}(\Delta) > \text{rk}(\Gamma)$ is possible. Therefore the termination of the whole process of removing is seen to be by induction on reflecting ordinals ρ , cf. Lemma 6.48.

The Mahlo degree $g = m(\kappa)$ in $\kappa = \psi_\rho^g(\alpha)$ is obtained by (an iteration of) a stepping-down $(f, d, c) \mapsto g$, where $f = m(\rho)$, $d < c \in \text{supp}(f)$, $(d, c) \cap \text{supp}(f) = \emptyset$, $g_d = f_d$, $(d, c) \cap \text{supp}(g) = \emptyset$, $g(d) < f(d) + \hat{\theta}_{c-d}(f(c)) \cdot \omega$, and $g <^c f(c)$. g depends on a , ρ and $\text{rk}(\Gamma^{(\rho)}) := \text{rk}(\Gamma)$. In showing

$$SC_{\mathbb{K}}(g) \subset \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\kappa)$$

ρ and $\text{rk}(\Gamma^{(\rho)})$ are harmless since these relates to the given ordinal ρ , while the ordinal a causes trouble, since all of the reflecting ordinals ρ, \dots share the ordinal depth a of the derivation. We need $a \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\rho)$ if $\rho = \psi_\alpha^f(\alpha_0)$, and $a \in \mathcal{H}_\beta(\tau)$ if $\tau = \psi_\lambda^h(\beta)$, and so forth. This leads us to the set $M_\rho = \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$ for $b = \text{p}_0(\rho)$, where $\rho = \psi^f(\alpha_0)$, and the condition (35) that a as well as

ordinals occurring in the derivation should be in M_ρ for every reflecting ordinal ρ occurring in derivations. Note that $M_\rho = \mathcal{H}_b(\rho) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\rho)$ by $b \leq \alpha_0$, but $E_\rho^{\mathbb{S}} \not\subset \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\rho)$. This is the reason why we restrict the domain of the Mostowski collapsing $\alpha \mapsto \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ to $\alpha \in M_\rho \subsetneq E_\rho^{\mathbb{S}}$.

\mathbb{Q}_Π in $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, is the set of ordinals σ which is introduced in a right upper sequent $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}, \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ of an inference (stbl) for stability occurring below $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, while the set $\Pi^{[\cdot]} = \bigcup \{ \Pi_\sigma^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} : \sigma \in \mathbb{Q}_\Pi \}$ is the collection of formulas $\neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$.

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[\cdot]} \quad \{ (\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}, \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \}_\sigma}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}} \text{ (stbl)}$$

These motivates the following Definitions 6.27, 6.28 and 6.40.

Definition 6.27 Let $\mathbb{Q} \subset \Psi_\mathbb{S}$ be a finite set of ordinals, and $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. Define $M_\mathbb{Q} := \bigcap_{\sigma \in \mathbb{Q}} M_\sigma$,

$$[\mathbb{Q}]_A J := [\mathbb{Q}]_{-A} J := \{ \iota \in J : \text{rk}(A_\iota) \geq \mathbb{S} \Rightarrow \mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\mathbb{Q} \}$$

$$\mathbf{k}^\mathbb{S}(\Gamma) := \bigcup \{ \mathbf{k}(A) : A \in \Gamma, \text{rk}(A) \geq \mathbb{S} \}$$

Definition 6.28 Let Θ be a finite set of ordinals, $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$ and a, c ordinals², and $\mathbb{Q}_\Pi \subset \Psi_\mathbb{S}$ a finite set of ordinals such that $\mathbf{p}_0(\sigma) \geq \gamma_0$ for each $\sigma \in \mathbb{Q}_\Pi$. Let $\Pi = \bigcup \{ \Pi_\sigma : \sigma \in \mathbb{Q}_\Pi \} \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{K})$ be a set of formulas such that $\mathbf{k}(\Pi_\sigma) \subset M_\sigma$ for each $\sigma \in \mathbb{Q}_\Pi$, $\Pi^{[\cdot]} = \bigcup \{ \Pi_\sigma^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} : \sigma \in \mathbb{Q}_\Pi \}$, $\Theta^{(\sigma)} = \Theta \cap M_\sigma$ and $\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi} = \Theta \cap M_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi}$.

$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ holds for a set Γ of formulas if

$$\mathbf{k}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \ \& \ \forall \sigma \in \mathbb{Q}_\Pi \left(\mathbf{k}(\Pi_\sigma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\sigma)}] \right) \quad (34)$$

$$\{ \gamma, a, c \} \cup \mathbf{k}^\mathbb{S}(\Gamma) \cup \mathbf{k}^\mathbb{S}(\Pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi}] \quad (35)$$

and one of the following cases holds:

(V) ³ There exist $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ and an $\iota \in J$ such that $A \in \Gamma$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.

(V)^[\cdot] There exist $A \equiv B^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \in \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, $B \simeq \bigvee (B_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ and an $\iota \in [\sigma]J$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}, A_\iota$ with $A_\iota \equiv B_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$.

(\wedge) There exist $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, ordinals $a(\iota) < a$ such that $A \in \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota); \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ for each $\iota \in [\mathbb{Q}_\Pi]_A J$.

(\wedge)^[\cdot] There exist $A \equiv B^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \in \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, $B \simeq \bigwedge (B_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, ordinals $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota); \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma; A_\iota, \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ for each $\iota \in [\mathbb{Q}_\Pi]_B J \cap [\sigma]J$.

(cut) There exist an ordinal $a_0 < a$ and a formula C such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, \neg C; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} C, \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ with $\text{rk}(C) < c$.

²In this subsection 6.5 we can set $\gamma = \mathbb{S}$.

³The condition (4), $|\iota| < a$ is absent in the inference (V), cf. **Case 3** in Lemma 6.44.

(Σ -rfl) There exist ordinals $a_\ell, a_r < a$ and a formula $C \in \Sigma(\pi)$ for a $\pi \in \{\Omega, \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{S}^+\}$ such that $c \geq \pi$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_\ell} \Gamma, C; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_r} \neg \exists x < \pi C^{(x, \pi)}, \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.

(stbl) There exist an ordinal $a_0 < a$, a \wedge -formula $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$, and a $u \in Tm(\mathbb{K})$ for which the following hold: $\mathbb{S} \leq \text{rk}(B(u)) < c$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}, \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ holds for every ordinal $\sigma \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ such that $\Theta \subset M_\sigma$.

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[\cdot]} \quad \{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}, \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}\}_{\Theta \subset M_\sigma}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}} \text{ (stbl)}$$

Note that $(\Theta \cup \{\sigma\})_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi \cup \{\sigma\}} = \Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi}$ if $\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi} \subset M_\sigma$.

Proposition 6.29 (Tautology) *Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[k(A)]$ and $d = \text{rk}(A)$.*

1. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, k(A); \emptyset) \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg A, A; \emptyset$.
2. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, k(A) \cup \{\sigma\}; \{\sigma\}) \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ if $k(A) \subset M_\sigma$ and $\gamma \geq \mathbb{S}$.

Proof. Both are seen by induction on d . Consider Proposition 6.29.2.

We have $(k(A) \cup \{\sigma\}) \cap M_\sigma = k(A)$ for (34) and (35), and $k(A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{S}}((k(A) \cap \mathbb{S}) \cup \{\sigma\})$ for (34). Note that $\sigma \notin \mathcal{H}_\gamma[k(A)]$ since $\sigma \notin k(A) \subset M_\sigma$ and $\gamma \leq \gamma_0 \leq \mathfrak{p}_0(\sigma)$, and $\text{rk}(A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \notin \mathcal{H}_\gamma[(k(A) \cup \{\sigma\}) \cap M_\sigma]$.

Let $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. Then $A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]})_{\iota \in [\sigma]J}$ by Proposition 6.26 and $k(A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{S}}((k(A) \cap \mathbb{S}) \cup \{\sigma\})$. Let $I = \{\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} : \iota \in [\sigma]J\}$. Then $A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \simeq \bigvee (B_\nu)_{\nu \in I}$ with $B_\nu \equiv A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ for $\nu = \iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$, and $[\{\sigma\}]_{A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}} I = I$ by $\text{rk}(A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) < \mathbb{S}$. For $d_\iota = \text{rk}(A_\iota) \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[k(A, \iota)]$ with $\iota \in [\sigma]J = [\{\sigma\}]_{A^{(\sigma)}} J$ we obtain

$$\frac{\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, k(A, \iota) \cup \{\sigma\}; \{\sigma\}) \vdash_0^{*2d_\iota} \neg A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, k(A, \iota) \cup \{\sigma\}; \{\sigma\}) \vdash_0^{*2d_\iota+1} \neg A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}} (\bigvee)^{[\cdot]}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, k(A) \cup \{\sigma\}; \{\sigma\}) \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}} (\bigwedge)$$

and

$$\frac{\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, k(A) \cup k(\iota) \cup \{\sigma\}; \{\sigma\}) \vdash_0^{*2d_\iota} A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; \neg A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, k(A) \cup k(\iota) \cup \{\sigma\}; \{\sigma\}) \vdash_0^{*2d_\iota+1} A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; \neg A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}} (\bigvee)}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, k(A) \cup \{\sigma\}; \{\sigma\}) \vdash_0^{*2d} A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; \neg A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}} (\bigwedge)^{[\cdot]}$$

□

Lemma 6.30 (Embedding of Axioms) *For each axiom A in S_1 , there is an $m < \omega$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{S}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\mathbb{K}+m}^{*\mathbb{K}\cdot 2} A$; holds for $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{S}^+$.*

Proof. We show that the axiom $\exists x B(x, v) \wedge v \in L_{\mathbb{S}} \rightarrow \exists x \in L_{\mathbb{S}} B(x, v)$ ($B \in \Delta_0$) follows by an inference (stbl). In the proof let us omit the operator $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{S}}$. Let $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$ be a \wedge -formula and $u \in Tm(\mathbb{K})$. We may assume that $\mathbb{K} > d = \text{rk}(B(u)) \geq \mathbb{S}$. Let $k_0 = k(B(0))$ and $k_u = k(u)$. Let $k_0 \cup k_u \subset M_\sigma$.

Then for $\exists x \in L_{\mathbb{S}}B(x) \simeq \bigvee (B(v))_{v \in J}$, we obtain $u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \in J = Tm(\mathbb{S})$ by $\text{rk}(\exists x \in L_{\mathbb{S}}B(x)) = \mathbb{S}$. We have $B(u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \equiv B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$, $k_u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} = k(u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{S}}[k(u) \cup \{\sigma\}]$, $(k_0 \cup k_u)_\emptyset = k_0 \cup k_u$ and $(k_0 \cup k_u \cup \{\sigma\}) \cap M_\sigma = k_0 \cup k_u$.

$$\frac{k_0 \cup k_u; \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg B(u), B(u); \quad \frac{k_0 \cup k_u \cup \{\sigma\}; \{\sigma\} \vdash_0^{*2d} B(u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) ; \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}}{\{k_0 \cup k_u \cup \{\sigma\}; \{\sigma\} \vdash_0^{*2d+1} \exists x \in L_{\mathbb{S}}B(x); \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}\}_{k_0 \cup k_u \subset M_\sigma}} \quad (\vee)}{\frac{k_0 \cup k_u; \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{*\mathbb{K}} \neg B(u), \exists x \in L_{\mathbb{S}}B(x);}{k_0; \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{*\mathbb{K}+1} \neg \exists x B(x), \exists x \in L_{\mathbb{S}}B(x);} \quad (\wedge)} \quad (\text{stbl})$$

□

Proposition 6.31 (Inversion) *Let $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ with $A \in \Gamma$, $\iota \in [\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}]_AJ$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup k(\iota); \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.*

Proposition 6.32 *Let $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. Assume $\Theta \subset M_\sigma$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi} \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.*

Proof. By induction on a . We obtain $(\Theta \cup \{\sigma\})_{\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi} \cup \{\sigma\}} = \Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}}$ by the assumption. In an inference (stbl), the right upper sequents are restricted to τ such that $\sigma \in M_\tau$. Also we need to prune some branches at (\wedge) and $(\wedge)^{[\cdot]}$ since $[(\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi} \cup \{\sigma\})]_AJ \subset [\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}]_AJ$. □

Proposition 6.33 (Reduction) *Let $C \simeq \bigvee (C_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ and $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{S}^+ \leq \text{rk}(C) \leq c$. Assume $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma, \neg C; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_c^{*b} C, \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_c^{*a+b} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.*

Proof. By induction on b using Inversion 6.31 and Proposition 6.32.

Note that if $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_c^{*b(\iota)} C_\iota, \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ for an $\iota \in J$ such that $\text{rk}(C_\iota) \geq \mathbb{K}$, we obtain $k(C_\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{S})}] \subset M_{\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{S})}$ by (35) and Proposition 6.21 with $\gamma \leq \gamma_0 \leq p_0(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}$. Hence $\iota \in [\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}]_CJ$ if $k(\iota) \subset k(C_\iota)$. □

Proposition 6.34 (Cut-elimination) *Assume $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_{c+1}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ with $c \geq \mathbb{S}^+ = \mathbb{K}$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_c^{*\omega^a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.*

Proof. This is seen by induction on a using Reduction 6.33. □

Lemma 6.35 (Collapsing) *Let $\Gamma \subset \Sigma$ be a set of formulas, and $\Pi \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{K})$. Suppose $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma))$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. Let $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\hat{a})$ with $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^a$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_{\beta}^{*\beta} \Gamma^{(\beta, \mathbb{K})}; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ holds.*

Proof. By induction on a as in Theorem 1.22. We have $\{\gamma, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}}]$ by (35), and $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}}]$.

When the last inference is a (stbl), let $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$ be a \bigwedge -formula and a term $u \in Tm(\mathbb{K})$ such that $\mathbb{S} \leq \text{rk}(B(u)) < \mathbb{K}$, $k(B(u)) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ for an ordinal $a_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}}] \cap a$. Then we obtain $\text{rk}(B(u)) < \beta$.

Consider the case when the last inference is a $(\Sigma\text{-rfl})$ on \mathbb{K} . We have ordinals $a_\ell, a_r < a$ and a formula $C \in \Sigma$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{*a_\ell} \Gamma, C; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{*a_r} \neg \exists x C(x, \mathbb{K}), \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.

Let $\beta_\ell = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\widehat{a}_\ell) \in \mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_\ell+1}[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi}] \cap \beta$ with $\widehat{a}_\ell = \gamma + \omega^{a_\ell}$. IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_\ell+1}, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{\beta}^{*\beta_\ell} \Gamma^{(\beta, \mathbb{K})}, C^{(\beta_\ell, \mathbb{K})}; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. On the other, Inversion 6.31 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_\ell+1}, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{*a_r} \neg C^{(\beta_\ell, \mathbb{K})}, \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. For $\beta_r = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\widehat{a}_r) \in \mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_r+1}[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi}] \cap \beta$ with $\widehat{a}_r = \widehat{a}_\ell + \omega^{a_r}$, IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_r+1}, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{\beta}^{*\beta_r} \neg C^{(\beta_\ell, \mathbb{K})}, \Gamma^{(\beta, \mathbb{K})}; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a}_\ell+1}, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{\beta}^{*\beta} \Gamma^{(\beta, \mathbb{K})}; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ by a *(cut)*.

Note that since $\Pi \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{K})$, inferences $(\wedge)^{[\cdot]}$ are harmless for the condition $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\gamma))$. \square

6.6 Operator controlled derivations with caps

In this subsection we introduce another derivability relation $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, e, b_1}^a \Gamma$, which depends again on an ordinal γ_0 , and should be written as $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, e, \gamma_0, b_1}^a \Gamma$. However the ordinal γ_0 will be fixed, and specified in the proof of Theorem 6.51. So let us omit it.

The inference rules (stbl) are replaced by inferences $(\text{rfl}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$ by putting a cap ρ on formulas in Lemma 6.44. In $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, e, b_1}^a \Gamma$, c is a bound for cut ranks and e a bound for ordinals ρ in the inferences $(\text{rfl}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$ occurring in the derivation. b_1 is a bound such that $s(\rho) = \max(\text{supp}(m(\rho))) \leq b_1$. Although the capped formula $A^{(\rho)}$ in Definition 6.36, is intended to denote the formula $A^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$, we need to distinguish it from $A^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$. Our main task is to eliminate inferences $(\text{rfl}(\rho, d, f))$ from a resulting derivation \mathcal{D}_1 . In Recapping 6.47 the cap ρ in inferences $(\text{rfl}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$ are replaced by another cap $\kappa < \rho$. In this process new inferences $(\text{rfl}(\sigma, d_1, f_1, b_1))$ arise with $\sigma < \kappa$. Iterating this process, we arrive at a derivation \mathcal{D}_2 such that $s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S}$, i.e., $\text{supp}(m(\rho)) \subset \mathbb{S} + 1$. Then caps play no rôle, i.e., $A^{(\rho)}$ is ‘equivalent’ to A for $A \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$. Finally inferences $(\text{rfl}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$ are removed from \mathcal{D}_2 by throwing up caps and replacing these by a series of *(cut)*’s, cf. Lemma 6.48.

The ordinal, i.e., the threshold γ_0 will be specified in the end of this section.

Definition 6.36 By a *capped formula* we mean a pair (A, ρ) of *RS*-sentence A and an ordinal $\rho < \mathbb{S}$ such that $\text{k}(A) \subset M_\rho$. Such a pair is denoted by $A^{(\rho)}$. A *sequent* is a finite set of capped formulas, denoted by $\Gamma_0^{(\rho_0)}, \dots, \Gamma_n^{(\rho_n)}$, where each formula in the set $\Gamma_i^{(\rho_i)}$ puts on the cap $\rho_i \in \mathbb{S}$. When we write $\Gamma^{(\rho)}$, we tacitly assume that $\text{k}(\Gamma) \subset M_\rho$. A capped formula $A^{(\rho)}$ is said to be a $\Sigma(\pi)$ -formula if $A \in \Sigma(\pi)$. Let $\text{k}(A^{(\rho)}) := \text{k}(A)$.

Definition 6.37 Let f be a non-empty (and irreducible) finite function. Then f is said to be *special* if there exists an ordinal α such that $f(c_{\max}) = \alpha + \mathbb{K}$ for $c_{\max} = \max(\text{supp}(f))$. For a special finite function f , f' denotes a finite function such that $\text{supp}(f') = \text{supp}(f)$, $f'(c) = f(c)$ for $c \neq c_{\max}$, and $f'(c_{\max}) = \alpha$ with $f(c_{\max}) = \alpha + \mathbb{K}$.

The ordinal \mathbb{K} in $f(c_{\max}) = \alpha + \mathbb{K}$ is a ‘room’ to be replaced by a smaller ordinal, cf. Definition 6.45.

Definition 6.38 A finite set $\mathbf{Q} \subset \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ is said to be a *finite family* for ordinals γ_0 and b_1 if $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0+\mathbb{S}} = \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0+\mathbb{S}}(0)$, $m(\rho) : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(0)$ is special such that $s(\rho) = \max(\text{supp}(m(\rho))) \leq b_1$ and $\mathfrak{p}_0(\rho) \geq \gamma_0$ for each $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}$.

The resolvent class $H_\rho(f, b_1, \gamma_0, \Theta)$ in the following Definition 6.39 is the set of ordinals $\sigma < \rho$, which are candidates of substitutes for ρ in the inference $(\text{rfl}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$ for reflection. Note that if $\mathfrak{p}_0(\sigma) \leq \mathfrak{p}_0(\rho)$ and $\sigma < \rho$, then $M_\sigma \subset M_\rho = \mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{p}_0(\rho)}(\rho)$. Moreover if $\mathfrak{p}_0(\sigma) \geq \gamma_0 \geq \gamma$ and $\Theta \subset M_\sigma$, then $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \subset M_\sigma$ by Proposition 6.21.

Definition 6.39 $H_\rho(f, b_1, \gamma_0, \Theta)$ denotes the *resolvent class* for finite functions f , ordinals ρ, b_1, γ_0 and finite sets Θ of ordinals defined by $\sigma \in H_\rho(f, b_1, \gamma_0, \Theta)$ iff $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0+\mathbb{S}} \cap \rho$, $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(m(\sigma)) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}[\Theta]$, $\Theta \subset M_\sigma$, $\mathfrak{p}_0(\sigma) = \mathfrak{p}_0(\rho) \geq \gamma_0$, and $m(\sigma)$ is special such that $s(f) = \max(\text{supp}(f)) \leq s(\sigma) \leq b_1$ and $f' \leq (m(\sigma))'$, where $f \leq g \Leftrightarrow \forall i(f(i) \leq g(i))$.

We define a derivability relation $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c,e}^a \Gamma$, where $\mathbb{S} \leq \gamma \leq \gamma_0$ is an ordinal, Θ a finite set of ordinals, \mathbf{Q} a finite family for γ_0, b_1 , and $a, c < \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{S}^+$. c a bound of cut ranks, e a bound of ρ in inference rules $(\text{rfl}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$, and b_1 a bound on $s(\rho)$. The relation $\vdash_{c,e}^a$ depends on fixed ordinals γ_0 and b_1 .

For $d = \text{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S}$, it may be $\mathfrak{k}(A) \cup \{d\} \not\subset M_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Let us avoid deriving the tautology $\neg A, A$ by a standard derivation to show $\vdash^{2d} \neg A, A$.

Definition 6.40 Let $\Theta^{(\rho)} = \Theta \cap M_\rho$, $[\mathbf{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}} J = [\mathbf{Q}]_A J \cap [\rho] J$, $\mathbb{S} \leq \gamma \leq \gamma_0$ and $e \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0+\mathbb{S}}(0)$.

$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c,e,\gamma_0,b_1}^a \Gamma$ holds for a set $\Gamma = \bigcup \{\Gamma_\rho^{(\rho)} : \rho \in \mathbf{Q}\}$ of formulas if

$$\forall \rho \in \mathbf{Q} \left(\mathfrak{k}(\Gamma_\rho) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\rho)}] \right) \quad (36)$$

$$\{\gamma, a, c, b_1\} \cup \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}}] \quad (37)$$

and one of the following cases holds:

(Taut) $\{\neg A^{(\rho)}, A^{(\rho)}\} \subset \Gamma$ for a $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}$ and a formula A such that $\text{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S}$.

(\vee) There exist $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, a cap $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}$, an ordinal $a_\iota < a$ and an $\iota \in [\rho] J$ such that $A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c,e,\gamma_0,b_1}^{a_\iota} \Gamma, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$.

Note that if $\text{rk}(A_\iota) \geq \mathbb{S}$, then $\mathfrak{k}(A_\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}}] \subset M_{\mathbf{Q}}$ by (37). Hence $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}]_A J = \{\iota \in J : \text{rk}(A_\iota) \geq \mathbb{S} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{k}(\iota) \subset M_{\mathbf{Q}}\}$.

(\wedge) There exist $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, a cap $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}$, ordinals $a_\iota < a$ for each $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}} J$ such that $A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathfrak{k}(\iota), \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c,e,\gamma_0,b_1}^{a_\iota} \Gamma, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$.

Note that if $\text{rk}(A_\iota) \geq \mathbb{S}$, then $\mathfrak{k}(\iota) \subset M_{\mathbf{Q}}$ by $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}} J$. Hence $\mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(A_\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[(\Theta \cup \mathfrak{k}(\iota))_{\mathbf{Q}}]$ for (37), where $(\Theta \cup \mathfrak{k}(\iota))_{\mathbf{Q}} = \Theta_{\mathbf{Q}} \cup \mathfrak{k}(\iota)$.

(cut) There exist a cap $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}$, an ordinal $a_0 < a$ and a formula C such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c,e,\gamma_0,b_1}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg C^{(\rho)}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c,e,\gamma_0,b_1}^{a_0} C^{(\rho)}, \Gamma$ with $\text{rk}(C) < c$.

(Σ -rfl(Ω)) There exist a cap $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}$, ordinals $a_\ell, a_r < a$, and an uncapped formula $C \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ such that $c \geq \Omega$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c,e,\gamma_0,b_1}^{a_\ell} \Gamma, C^{(\rho)}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c,e,\gamma_0,b_1}^{a_r} \neg(\exists x < \pi C^{(x,\Omega)})^{(\rho)}, \Gamma$.

(rfl(ρ, d, f, b_1)) There exist a cap $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\Theta \subset M_\rho$, ordinals $d \in \text{supp}(m(\rho))$, and $a_0 < a$, a special finite function f , and a finite set Δ of uncapped formulas enjoying the following conditions.

(r0) $\rho < e$ if $s(\rho) > \mathbb{S}$.

(r1) $\Delta \subset \bigvee(d) := \{\delta : \text{rk}(\delta) < d, \delta \text{ is a } \bigvee\text{-formula}\} \cup \{\delta : \text{rk}(\delta) < \mathbb{S}\}$.

(r2) For the special finite function $g = m(\rho)$, $s(f) \leq b_1$, $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(f, g) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$ and $f_d = g_d \& f^d <^d g'(d)$.

(r3) For each $\delta \in \Delta$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c,e,\gamma_0,b_1}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg \delta^{(\rho)}$.

(r4) $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_{c,e,\gamma_0,b_1}^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$ holds for every $\sigma \in H_\rho(f, b_1, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$.

$$\frac{\{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c,e}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg \delta^{(\rho)}\}_{\delta \in \Delta} \quad \{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_{c,e}^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\sigma)}\}_{\sigma \in H_\rho(f, b_1, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c,e}^a \Gamma} \text{ (rfl}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$$

Note that $(\Theta \cup \{\sigma\})_{\mathbb{Q} \cup \{\sigma\}} = \Theta_{\mathbb{Q} \cup \{\sigma\}} = \Theta_{\mathbb{Q}}$ by $\Theta^{(\rho)} \subset M_\sigma$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}$.

$\{e\} \cup \mathbb{Q} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ need not to hold.

Suppose $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c,e}^a \Gamma$ holds with $A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}$. By (36) we have $\mathbf{k}(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$. We obtain $\mathbf{k}(A) \subset M_\rho$ by Proposition 6.21.

In this subsection the ordinals γ_0 and b_1 will be fixed, and we write $\vdash_{c,e}^a$ for $\vdash_{c,e,\gamma_0,b_1}^a$.

Proposition 6.41 (Tautology) *Let $\{\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}}]$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\mathbf{k}(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\sigma)}]$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{0,0}^{2d} \neg A^{(\sigma)}, A^{(\sigma)}$ holds for $d = \max\{\mathbb{S}, \text{rk}(A)\}$.*

Proof. By induction on d . Let $A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ with $\text{rk}(A) \geq \mathbb{S}$. For $\iota \in [\mathbb{Q}]_{A^{(\sigma)}} J \subset [\sigma] J$, let $d_\iota = 0$ if $\text{rk}(A_\iota) < \mathbb{S}$. Otherwise $d_\iota = \max\{\mathbb{S}, \text{rk}(A_\iota)\}$. In each case we have $d_\iota < d$. IH yields

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{0,0}^{2d_\iota} \neg A_\iota^{(\sigma)}, A_\iota^{(\sigma)}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{0,0}^{2d_\iota+1} \neg A_\iota^{(\sigma)}, A_\iota^{(\sigma)}} \text{ (}\bigvee\text{)}$$

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{0,0}^{2d_\iota+1} \neg A_\iota^{(\sigma)}, A_\iota^{(\sigma)}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{0,0}^{2d} \neg A^{(\sigma)}, A^{(\sigma)}} \text{ (}\bigwedge\text{)}$$

□

Proposition 6.42 (Inversion) *Let $A \simeq \bigwedge(A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ with $A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma$ and $\text{rk}(A) \geq \mathbb{S}$, $\iota \in [\mathbb{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}} J$ with $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c,e}^a \Gamma$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c,e}^a \Gamma, A_\iota$.*

Proposition 6.43 (Cut-elimination) *Let $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c+d,e}^a \Gamma$ with $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}}] \ni c \geq \mathbb{S}$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c,e}^{\varphi^a(a)} \Gamma$.*

Proof. By main induction on d with subsidiary induction on a using an analogue to Reduction 6.33 with (37). Note that $\text{rk}(C) \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}}]$ when $\text{rk}(C) \geq \mathbb{S}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c,e}^a \Gamma, C$. \square

Lemma 6.44 (Capping) *Let $\Gamma \cup \Pi \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{K})$ with $\Pi = \bigcup\{\Pi_\sigma : \sigma \in \mathbf{Q}_\Pi\}$. Suppose $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{c,\gamma_0}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ for $a, c < \mathbb{K}$ and $\Pi^{[\cdot]} = \bigcup\{\Pi_\sigma^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} : \sigma \in \mathbf{Q}_\Pi\}$. Let $\rho = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^g(\gamma_1)$ be an ordinal such that $\mathbf{Q}_\Pi \subset \rho$,*

$$\Theta \subset M_\rho \tag{38}$$

and $g = m(\rho)$ a special finite function such that $\text{supp}(g) = \{c\}$ and $g(c) = \alpha_0 + \mathbb{K}$, where $\mathbb{K}(2a+1) \leq \alpha_0 + \mathbb{K} \leq \gamma_0 \leq \gamma_1$ with $\{\gamma_1, c, \alpha_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \cap \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}$, and $\mathfrak{p}_0(\sigma) \leq \mathfrak{p}_0(\rho) = \gamma_1$ for each $\sigma \in \mathbf{Q}_\Pi$. Let $\widehat{\Gamma} = \bigcup\{A^{(\rho)} : A \in \Gamma\}$, $\widehat{\Pi} = \bigcup\{\Pi_\sigma^{(\rho)} : \sigma \in \mathbf{Q}_\Pi\}$ and $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{\rho\}$.

Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c,\rho+1,\gamma_0,c}^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \widehat{\Pi}$ holds holds for $\Theta_\Pi = \Theta \cup \mathbf{Q}_\Pi$.

Proof. By induction on a . Let us write \vdash_c^a for $\vdash_{c,\rho+1,\gamma_0,c}^a$ in the proof. By assumptions we have $\Theta \subset M_\rho$ and $\mathbf{Q}_\Pi \subset \rho$. Hence $\Theta = \Theta^{(\rho)}$ and $\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi} = \Theta_{\mathbf{Q}}$. On the other hand we have $\mathfrak{k}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ and for $\sigma \in \mathbf{Q}_\Pi$, $\mathfrak{k}(\Pi_\sigma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\sigma)}]$ by (34). Therefore (36) is enjoyed. We have $\{\gamma, a, c\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi}]$ by (35). Hence (37) is enjoyed. Moreover we have $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(g) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \subset M_\rho$.

Case 1. First consider the case when the last inference is a (stbl):

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[\cdot]} \quad \{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}, \Pi^{[\cdot]}\}_{\Theta \subset M_\sigma}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}} \text{ (stbl)}$$

Note that it may be the formula $B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ is in Γ , cf. Embedding 6.30. σ in $\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}$ ensures us $\mathfrak{k}(B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}]$ in (34). This explains the additional set \mathbf{Q}_Π in $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \widehat{\Pi}$, and the addition would be an obstacle to $a \in \Theta_{\mathbf{Q}}$ in (37).

We have an ordinal $a_0 < a$, a \wedge -formula $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$, and a term $u \in Tm(\mathbb{K})$ such that $\mathbb{S} \leq \text{rk}(B(u)) < c$. We have $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, (B(u))^{(\rho)}, \widehat{\Pi}$ follows from IH.

On the other hand we have $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}, \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ for every ordinal σ such that $\Theta \subset M_\sigma$.

Let h be a special finite function such that $\text{supp}(h) = \{c\}$ and $h(c) = \mathbb{K}(2a_0+1)$. Then $h_c = g_c = \emptyset$ and $h^c <^c g'(c)$ by $h(c) = \mathbb{K}(2a_0+1) < \mathbb{K}(2a) \leq \alpha_0 = g'(c)$. Let $\sigma \in H_\rho(h, c, \gamma_0, \Theta)$. For example $\sigma = \psi_\rho^h(\gamma_1 + \eta)$ with $\eta = \max(\{1\} \cup E_{\mathbb{S}}(\Theta))$, where $E_{\mathbb{S}}(\Theta) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Theta} E_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$ with the set $E_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$ of subterms $< \mathbb{S}$ of α . We obtain $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}(\sigma) = M_\sigma$ by $\Theta \subset M_\rho$, and $\{\gamma_1, c, a_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}(\sigma)$.

We have $\mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(B(u)) = \mathfrak{k}(B(u)) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}}] \subset M_\sigma$ for (37), and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbf{Q} \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, \neg B(u)^{(\sigma)}, \widehat{\Pi}$ follows from IH with $\sigma \in M_\rho$. Since this holds

for every such σ , we obtain $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c, \rho+1}^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \widehat{\Pi}$ by an inference $(\text{rfl}(\rho, c, h, c))$ with $\text{rk}(B(u)) < c \in \text{supp}(m(\rho))$. In the following figure let us omit the operator \mathcal{H}_γ .

$$\frac{(\Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, B(u)^{(\rho)}, \widehat{\Pi} \quad \{(\Theta_\Pi \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbf{Q} \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, \neg B(u)^{(\sigma)}, \widehat{\Pi}\}_\sigma}{(\Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \widehat{\Pi}} \quad (\text{rfl}(\rho, c, h, c))$$

Case 2. Second the last inference introduces a \bigvee -formula A .

Case 2.1. First let $A \in \Gamma$ be introduced by a (\bigvee) , and $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. There are an $\iota \in J$ an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. Let $\mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset \mathbf{k}(A_\iota)$. We obtain $\mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \subset M_\rho$ by (34), $\Theta \subset M_\rho$ and $\gamma \leq \gamma_0 \leq \gamma_1$. Hence $\iota \in [\rho]J$. IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^{a(\iota)} \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Gamma}, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Gamma}$ follows from a (\bigvee) .

Case 2.2. Second $A \equiv B^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \in \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ is introduced by a $(\bigvee)^{[\cdot]}$ with $B^{(\sigma)} \in \widehat{\Pi}$ and $\sigma \in \mathbf{Q}_\Pi$. Let $B \simeq \bigvee (B_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. Then $A \simeq \bigvee (B_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]})_{\iota \in [\sigma]J}$ by Proposition

6.26. There are an $\iota \in [\sigma]J$ and an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{a(\iota)} \Gamma; B_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}, \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ for $A_\iota \equiv B_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$. IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^{a(\iota)} \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Gamma}, (B_\iota)^{(\sigma)}$. We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Gamma}$ by a (\bigvee) .

Case 3. Third the last inference introduces a \bigwedge -formula A .

Case 3.1. First let $A \in \Gamma$ be introduced by a (\bigwedge) , and $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. For every $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}_\Pi]_A J$ there exists an $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota); \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.

IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^{a(\iota)} \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Gamma}, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$ for each $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}} J \subset [\mathbf{Q}_\Pi]_A J$, where $\mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\rho$. We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Gamma}$ by a (\bigwedge) .

Case 3.2. Second $A \equiv B^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \in \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ is introduced by a $(\bigwedge)^{[\cdot]}$ with $B^{(\sigma)} \in \widehat{\Pi}$ and $\sigma \in \mathbf{Q}_\Pi$. Let $B \simeq \bigwedge (B_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ with $A \simeq \bigwedge (B_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]})_{\iota \in [\sigma]J}$. For each $\iota \in$

$[\mathbf{Q}_\Pi]_B J \cap [\sigma]J$ there is an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota); \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma; A_\iota, \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ for $A_\iota \equiv B_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$. IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^{a(\iota)} \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Gamma}, (B_\iota)^{(\sigma)}$ for each $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}]_{B^{(\sigma)}} J \subset [\mathbf{Q}_\Pi]_B J \cap [\sigma]J$, where $\mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\sigma \subset M_\rho$. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Gamma}$ follows from a (\bigwedge) .

The other cases (*cut*) or $(\Sigma\text{-rfl})$ on Ω are seen from IH. \square

6.7 Eliminations of inferences (rfl)

In this subsection, $(\text{rfl}(\rho, c, \gamma))$ are removed from operator controlled derivations of Σ_1 -sentences θ^{L_Ω} over Ω .

Definition 6.45 For a special finite function g and ordinals $a < \mathbb{K}$, $b < c_{\max} = \max(\text{supp}(g)) < \mathbb{K}$, let us define a special finite function $h = h^b(g; a)$ as follows. $\max(\text{supp}(h)) = b$, and $h_b = g_b$. To define $h(b)$, let $\{b = b_0 < b_1 < \dots < b_n = c_{\max}\} = \{b, c_{\max}\} \cup ((b, c_{\max}) \cap \text{supp}(g))$. Define recursively ordinals α_i by $\alpha_n = \alpha + a$ with $g(c_{\max}) = \alpha + \mathbb{K}$. $\alpha_i = g(b_i) + \tilde{\theta}_{c_i}(\alpha_{i+1})$ for $c_i = b_{i+1} - b_i$. Finally put $h(b) = \alpha_0 + \mathbb{K}$.

Proposition 6.46 *Let f and g be special finite functions with $c_{\max} = \max(\text{supp}(g))$.*

1. *Let $b < e < c_{\max}$ and $a_0, a_1 < a$. Then $h^b(h^e(g; a_0); a_1) \leq (h^b(g; a))'$.*
2. *Suppose $f <^d g'(d)$ for a $d \in \text{supp}(g)$. Let $b < d$. Then $f_b = (h^b(g; a))_b$ and $f <^b (h^b(g; a))'(b)$.*

Recall that $s(\rho) = \max(\text{supp}(m(\rho)))$.

Lemma 6.47 (Recapping)

Let $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c_1, e, \gamma_0, b_2}^a \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}$ for a finite family \mathbb{Q} for $\gamma_0, b_2, \mathbb{Q}^t \subset \mathbb{Q}, \forall \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t (s(\rho) > \mathbb{S})$ and $\mathbb{Q}^f = \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Q}^t, \Gamma \cup \Pi \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{K}), \widehat{\Gamma} = \bigcup \{\Gamma_\rho^{(\rho)} : \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t\}$, where each $\theta \in \Gamma$ is either a \bigvee -formula or $\text{rk}(\theta) < \mathbb{S}$, and Π a set of formulas such that $\tau \in \mathbb{Q}^f$ for every $A^{(\tau)} \in \Pi$.

Let $\max\{s(\rho) : \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t\} \leq b_1$. For each $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t$, let $\mathbb{S} \leq b^{(\rho)} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$ with $\text{rk}(\Gamma_\rho) < b^{(\rho)} < s(\rho)$, and $\kappa(\rho) \in H_\rho(h^{b^{(\rho)}}(m(\rho); \omega(b_1, a)), b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$ with $\omega(b, a) = \omega^{\omega^b} a$. Assume $b_1 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}}]$.

Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\kappa, \gamma_0, b_2}^{\omega(b_1, a)} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}_\kappa$ holds, where $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa) = \mathbb{Q}^f \cup \{\kappa(\rho) : \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t\}$, $c_{b_1} = \max\{c_1, b_1\}$, $e^\kappa = \max(\{\tau \in \mathbb{Q}^f : s(\tau) > \mathbb{S}\} \cup \{\kappa(\rho) : \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t\}) + 1$, $\widehat{\Gamma}_\kappa = \bigcup \{\Gamma_\rho^{\kappa(\rho)} : \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t\}$.

$e^\kappa < e$ holds when $\mathbb{Q}^t = \{\rho \in \mathbb{Q} : s(\rho) > \mathbb{S}\} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. We show the lemma by main induction on b_1 with subsidiary induction on a . The subscripts γ_0, b_2 are omitted in the proof. We obtain $\{\gamma, b_1, a, c_1\} \cup \mathbb{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Pi, \Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}}]$ by the assumption and (37). Then $\{\gamma, \omega(b_1, a), c_{b_1}\} \cup \mathbb{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Pi, \Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)}]$ since $\Theta^{(\rho)} \subset M_{\kappa(\rho)}$ for each $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t$. Hence (37) is enjoyed in $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e, \gamma_0, b_2}^{\omega(b_1, a)} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}_\kappa$.

Let $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t$. We have $b^{(\rho)} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$, $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(m(\rho)) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$ and $\Theta^{(\rho)} \subset M_{\kappa(\rho)}$. $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(h^{b^{(\rho)}}(m(\rho); \omega(b_1, a))) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$ follows. Moreover we have $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(m(\kappa(\rho))) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}[\Theta^{(\rho)}] \subset M_{\kappa(\rho)}$.

Consider the case when the last inference is a $(\text{rfl}(\rho, d, f, b_2))$ for a $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}$. The case $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}^f$ is seen from SIH. Assume $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t$. Let $b = b^{(\rho)}, g = m(\rho), b_1 \geq s(\rho) \geq d \in \text{supp}(g), \kappa = \kappa(\rho), \Gamma = \Gamma_\rho, \widehat{\Lambda} = \bigcup_{\rho \neq \tau \in \mathbb{Q}^t} \{\Gamma_\tau^{(\tau)}\}$, and $\widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa = \bigcup_{\rho \neq \tau \in \mathbb{Q}^t} \{\Gamma_\tau^{\kappa(\tau)}\}$. We have a sequent $\Delta \subset \bigvee(d)$ such that $\text{rk}(\Delta) < d \leq s(\rho) \leq b_1$ and $\mathbb{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Delta) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}}] \subset M_{\mathbb{Q}}$ by (37) and $\mathbb{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Delta) \subset M_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)}$ by $\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}} = \Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)}$. There is an ordinal $a_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}}] \cap a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c_1, e}^{a_0} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \neg \delta^{(\rho)}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$. For each $\delta \in \Delta \subset \bigvee(d)$ with $\text{rk}(\delta) \geq \mathbb{S}$, we have $\delta \simeq \bigvee(\delta_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. Let $b_0 = \max(\{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \{\text{rk}(\delta) : \delta \in \Delta\})$. Then $s(\rho) > b_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}}]$. Inversion 6.42 yields for $\text{rk}(\delta) \geq \mathbb{S}$

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbb{k}(\iota), \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c_1, e}^{a_0} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \neg(\delta_\iota)^{(\rho)} \quad (39)$$

for each $\iota \in [\mathbb{Q}]_{\delta^{(\rho)}} J$, where $J \subset Tm(b_0)$ and $\neg \delta_\iota \in \bigvee(b_0)$ by $\text{rk}(\delta_\iota) < \text{rk}(\delta)$.

On the other side for each $\sigma \in H_\rho(f, b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbf{Q} \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_{c_1, e}^{a_0} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \Delta^{(\sigma)} \quad (40)$$

f is a special finite function such that $s(f) \leq b_2$, $f_d = g_d$, $f^d <^d g'(d)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$. Let $(\mathbf{Q} \cup \{\sigma\})^f = \mathbf{Q}^f \cup \{\sigma\}$.

Case 1. $b_0 < b$: Then $\text{rk}(\Delta) < b$. Let $\text{rk}(\delta) \geq \mathbb{S}$. From (39) we obtain by SIH with $b > b_0 \geq \mathbb{S}$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbf{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\kappa}^{\omega(b_1, a_0)} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \neg(\delta_\iota)^{(\kappa)}$ for each $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}(\kappa)]_{\delta^{(\kappa)}} J \subset [\mathbf{Q}]_{\delta^{(\rho)}} J$. An inference (\wedge) yields

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\kappa}^{\omega(b_1, a_0)+1} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \neg\delta^{(\kappa)} \quad (41)$$

Moreover SIH yields (41) for $\text{rk}(\delta) < \mathbb{S}$. Let $d_1 = \min\{b, d\}$. Then $\Delta \subset \vee(d_1)$ by $b > b_0$.

We claim for the special finite function $h = h^b(g; \omega(b_1, a))$ that

$$f_{d_1} = h_{d_1} \ \& \ f^{d_1} <^{d_1} h'(d_1) \quad (42)$$

If $d_1 = d \leq b$, then $h_d = g_d$ and $g'(d) = g(d) \leq h'(d)$. Proposition 6.5 yields the claim. If $d_1 = b < d$, then Proposition 6.46.2 yields the claim.

On the other hand, for each $\sigma \in H_\kappa(f, b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)}) \subset H_\rho(f, b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$ we have by (40) and SIH,

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbf{Q}(\kappa) \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\kappa}^{\omega(b_1, a_0)} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \Delta^{(\sigma)} \quad (43)$$

We have $\kappa = \kappa(\rho) < \kappa(\rho) + 1 \leq e^\kappa$ for (r0). An inference (rf1(κ, d_1, f, b_2)) with (42), (41) and (43) yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\kappa}^{\omega(b_1, a)} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}$, where $d_1 \in \text{supp}(m(\kappa))$ and $\mathbf{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Delta) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}(\kappa)}]$.

Case 2. $b \leq b_0$: When $b = b_0$, let $\tau = \kappa$. When $b < b_0$, let $\tau \in H_\rho(h, b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$ be such that $\kappa < \tau$ and $m(\tau) = h = h^{b_0}(g; a_1)$ with $a_1 = \omega(b_1, a_0) + 1$.

Let $\sigma \in H_\tau(f, b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$. SIH with (40) and $b_0 < s(\rho)$ yields

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbf{Q}_\tau \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\tau}^{\omega(b_1, a_0)} \Delta^{(\sigma)}, \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma^{(\tau)} \quad (44)$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_\tau = \mathbf{Q}^f \cup \{\kappa(\lambda) : \rho \neq \lambda \in \mathbf{Q}^t\} \cup \{\tau\}$, and $e^\tau = \max(\{\lambda \in \mathbf{Q}^f : s(\lambda) > \mathbb{S}\} \cup \{\kappa(\lambda) : \rho \neq \lambda \in \mathbf{Q}^t\} \cup \{\tau\}) + 1$. Let $\sigma \in R := \{\sigma \in H_\tau(f, b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)}) : (m(\sigma))' \geq (h^{b_0}(g; \omega(b_1, a_0)))'\}$. We see $\sigma \in H_\rho(h^{b_0}(g; \omega(b_1, a_0)), b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$. Moreover $\text{rk}(\neg\delta_\iota) < b_0$ if $\text{rk}(\delta) \geq \mathbb{S}$, and $\text{rk}(\neg\delta) < b_0$ if $\text{rk}(\delta) < \mathbb{S} \leq b_0$.

For each $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}]_{\delta^{(\rho)}} J$ and $\text{rk}(\delta) \geq \mathbb{S}$, we obtain $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbf{Q}_\sigma) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\sigma}^{\omega(b_1, a_0)} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma^{(\sigma)}, \neg(\delta_\iota)^{(\sigma)}$ by $\text{rk}(\neg\delta_\iota) < b_0$, SIH and (39), where $\mathbf{Q}_\sigma \cup \{\tau\} = \mathbf{Q}_\tau \cup \{\sigma\}$. A (\wedge) yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_\sigma) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\sigma}^{\omega(b_1, a_0)+1} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma^{(\sigma)}, \neg\delta^{(\sigma)}$. When $\text{rk}(\delta) < \mathbb{S}$, this follows from SIH. Also $M_{\mathbf{Q}_\sigma} = M_{\mathbf{Q}_\sigma \cup \{\tau\}}$ and $e^\sigma \leq e^\tau$ by $\tau > \sigma$. Therefore

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_\tau \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\tau}^{\omega(b_1, a_0)+1} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma^{(\sigma)}, \neg\delta^{(\sigma)} \quad (45)$$

From (44) and (45) by several (*cut*)'s of δ with $\text{rk}(\delta) < d \leq b_1 \leq c_{b_1}$ we obtain for a $p < \omega$,

$$\forall \sigma \in R \left[(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbf{Q}_\tau \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\tau}^{\omega(b_1, a_0) + p} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma^{(\sigma)}, \Gamma^{(\tau)} \right] \quad (46)$$

On the other hand we have $r = \max\{\mathbb{S}, \text{rk}(\Gamma)\} \leq b < b_1$ and $\mathbf{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}}] = \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_r}] \subset M_{\mathbf{Q}_r}$ by (37), where $\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}} = \Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_r}$ by $\Theta^{(\rho)} \subset M_\tau$. Tautology 6.41 yields for each $\theta \in \Gamma$

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_\tau) \vdash_{0,0}^{2r} \Gamma^{(\tau)}, -\theta^{(\tau)} \quad (47)$$

Let us define a finite function h by $\text{supp}(h) = \text{supp}(g_{b_0}) \cup \text{supp}(f^{b_0+1}) \cup \{b_0\}$, $h_{b_0} = g_{b_0}$ and $h^{b_0+1} = f^{b_0+1}$. Let $(h^{b_0}(g; \omega(b_1, a_0)))(b_0) = \alpha + \mathbb{K}$. Then $h(b_0) = \alpha$ if $f^{b_0+1} \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise $h(b_0) = \alpha + \mathbb{K}$. We see that $R = H_\tau(h, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$, and $h^{b_0} <^{b_0} (m(\tau))'(b_0)$.

By an inference ($\text{rfI}(\tau, b_0, h, b_2)$) with its resolvent class $R = H_\tau(h, b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$ and $\Gamma \subset \bigvee(b_0)$ we conclude from (47) and (46) for $\text{rk}(\Gamma) < b \leq b_0 \leq s(\tau)$

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_\tau) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\tau}^{a_2} \Pi, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma^{(\tau)} \quad (48)$$

where $a_2 = \max\{2r, \omega(b_1, a_0) + p\} + 1 < \omega(b_1, a) = \omega^{\omega^{b_1}} a$. If $b_0 = b$, we are done. In what follows assume $b < b_0$. We have $a_1 < \omega(b_1, a)$ and $\omega(b_0, a_2) = \omega^{\omega^{b_0}} a_2 < \omega(b_1, a)$ by $b_0 < b_1$. Moreover Proposition 6.46.1 for $m(\tau) = h^{b_0}(g; a_1)$ yields $(h^b(m(\tau); \omega(b_0, a_2)))' = (h^b(h^{b_0}(g; a_1); \omega(b_0, a_2)))' \leq (h^b(g; \omega(b_1, a)))'$.

Let $(\mathbf{Q}_\tau)^t = \{\tau\}$ and $\kappa(\tau) = \kappa(\rho) = \kappa$. Then $(e^\tau)^\kappa = \max\{\lambda \in (\mathbf{Q}_\tau)^f : s(\lambda) > \mathbb{S} \cup \{\kappa\}\} + 1 = e^\kappa$. We have $\mathbf{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma) \cup \{b_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_r}]$, $\text{rk}(\Gamma_\rho) < b^{(\rho)} = b < b_0 = s(\tau) < b_1$ for $\Gamma = \Gamma_\rho$ and $b \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\tau)}]$, $\omega(b_0, a_2) < \omega(b_1, a)$ and $\max\{c_{b_1}, b_0\} = c_{b_1}$. Also $\kappa \in H_\rho(h^b(g; \omega(b_1, a)), b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)}) \cap \tau \subset H_\tau(h^b(m(\tau); \omega(b_1, a_2)), b_2, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$. MIH with (48) yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\kappa}^{\omega(b_1, a)} \Pi, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}$.

Second consider the case when the last inference (\bigvee) introduces a \bigvee -formula B : If $B \in \Pi$, SIH yields the lemma. Assume that $B \equiv A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma_\rho^{(\rho)}$ with $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ and $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}$. We may assume $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}^t$. We have $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c_1, e}^{a_0} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$, where $a_0 < a$, $\iota \in [\rho]J$. We claim that $\iota \in [\kappa(\rho)]J$. We may assume $\mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset \mathbf{k}(A_\iota)$. We have $\mathbf{k}(A_\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$ by (36). $\Theta^{(\rho)} \subset M_{\kappa(\rho)}$ yields $\mathbf{k}(A_\iota) \subset M_{\kappa(\rho)}$.

Let $A_\iota \simeq \bigwedge (B_\nu)_{\nu \in I}$ for \bigvee -formulas B_ν , and assume $\text{rk}(A_\iota) \geq \mathbb{S}$. Inversion 7.25 yields for each $\nu \in [\mathbf{Q}]_{A_\iota^{(\rho)}} I$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\nu), \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c_1, e}^{a_0} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}, (B_\nu)^{(\rho)}$.

SIH yields for each $\nu \in [\mathbf{Q}(\kappa)]_{A_\iota^{(\rho)}} I \subset [\mathbf{Q}]_{A_\iota^{(\rho)}} I$ that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\nu), \mathbf{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\kappa}^{\omega(b_1, a_0)} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}_\kappa, (B_\nu)^{(\kappa)}$. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\kappa}^{\omega(b_1, a_0) + 1} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}_\kappa, (A_\iota)^{(\kappa)}$ follows from a (\bigwedge). An inference (\bigvee) yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{c_{b_1}, e^\kappa}^{\omega(b_1, a)} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}_\kappa$.

Other cases are seen from SIH. \square

For $c \leq \mathbb{S}$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma$ denotes $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \emptyset) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \emptyset$. Since $\Theta_\emptyset = \Theta$, (34) and (35) amount to (3) $\{\gamma, a, c\} \cup \mathbf{k}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, and there occurs no inferences

$(\vee)^{[\cdot]}$, $(\wedge)^{[\cdot]}$ nor (stbl). The inference $(\Sigma\text{-rfl})$ is only on Ω . This means that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \vdash_c^a \Gamma$ in Definition 1.16.

Lemma 6.48 (Elimination of inferences (rfl))

Let \mathbf{Q} be a finite family for γ_0 and $b_1 \geq \mathbb{S}$. Let $\max(\text{rk}(\Gamma)) < \mathbb{S}$, $\widehat{\Gamma} = \bigcup\{\Gamma_\rho^{(\rho)} : \rho \in \mathbf{Q}\}$ and $\Gamma = \bigcup\{\Gamma_\rho : \rho \in \mathbf{Q}\}$, where $k(\Gamma_\rho) \subset M_\rho$. Suppose $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, e, \gamma_0, b_1}^a \widehat{\Gamma}$.

Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{*\tilde{a}} \Gamma$ holds for $\gamma_1 = \gamma_0 + \mathbb{S}$, $\tilde{a} = \varphi_e(b_1 + a)$.

Proof. By main induction on e with subsidiary induction on a . We have $\{e\} \cup \mathbf{Q} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}$ by Definitions 6.40 and 6.38, $b_1 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}}]$ by (37), and $\emptyset = k^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}}]$.

Case 1. First let $\{\neg A^{(\sigma)}, A^{(\sigma)}\} \subset \widehat{\Gamma}$ with $\text{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S}$ by (Taut). Then $(\mathcal{H}_0, k(A)) \vdash_0^{\mathbb{S}} \neg A, A$ by Tautology 6.29.1 and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{*\tilde{a}} \Gamma$ by $\tilde{a} > \mathbb{S}$.

Case 2. Second consider the case when the last inference is a $(\text{rfl}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$ for a $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}$. Let $\mathbf{Q}^t = \{\tau \in \mathbf{Q} : s(\tau) > \mathbb{S}\}$, $\mathbf{Q}^f = \mathbf{Q} \setminus \mathbf{Q}^t$, and $\kappa(\tau) \in H_\tau(h^{\mathbb{S}}(m(\tau); \omega(b, a)), b_1, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\tau)})$ for each $\tau \in \mathbf{Q}^t$. Let $g = m(\rho)$, $s(\rho) \geq d \in \text{supp}(g)$, $\kappa = \kappa(\rho)$ when $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}^t$, $\widehat{\Pi} = \bigcup_{\rho \neq \tau \in \mathbf{Q}^f} \Gamma_\tau^{(\tau)}$, $\widehat{\Lambda} = \bigcup_{\rho \neq \tau \in \mathbf{Q}^t} \Gamma_\tau^{(\tau)}$, and $\widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa = \bigcup_{\rho \neq \tau \in \mathbf{Q}^t} \Gamma_\tau^{\kappa(\tau)}$. We have a sequent $\Delta \subset \vee(d)$ and an ordinal $a_0 < a$ such that $\text{rk}(\Delta) < d \leq s(\rho)$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, e, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_0} \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Lambda}, \Gamma_\rho^{(\rho)}, \neg \delta^{(\rho)}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$. On the other hand we have $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbf{Q} \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, e, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_0} \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Lambda}, \Gamma_\rho^{(\rho)}, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$, where $\sigma \in H_\rho(f, b_1, \gamma_0, \Theta^{(\rho)})$, f is a special finite function such that $s(f) \leq b_1$, $f_d = g_d$, $f^d <^d g'(d)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{K}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$.

Case 2.1 $s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S}$: We have $\text{rk}(\Delta) < d \leq s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S}$. Let $\tilde{a}_0 = \varphi_e(b_1 + a_0)$. By SIH we obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{*\tilde{a}_0} \Pi, \Lambda, \Gamma_\rho, \neg \delta$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$, and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{*\tilde{a}_0} \Pi, \Lambda, \Gamma_\rho, \Delta$, where $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0 + \mathbb{S}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}[\Theta]$. Several (cut)'s of $\text{rk}(\delta) < \mathbb{S}$ yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{*\tilde{a}} \Pi, \Lambda, \Gamma_\rho$ for $\Gamma = \Pi \cup \Lambda \cup \Gamma_\rho$.

Case 2.2. $s(\rho) > \mathbb{S}$: Then $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}^t \neq \emptyset$. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{b_1, e^\kappa, \gamma_0, b_1}^{\omega(b_1, a)} \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma_\rho^{(\kappa)}$ follows by Recapping 6.47, where $b_1 \geq \mathbb{S}$ and $e^\kappa < e$. Cut-elimination 6.43 yields for $a_1 = \varphi_{b_1}(\omega(b_1, a))$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}(\kappa)) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, e^\kappa, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_1} \widehat{\Pi}, \widehat{\Lambda}_\kappa, \Gamma_\rho^{(\kappa)}$. MIH then yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{*\tilde{a}_1} \Gamma$, where $\Gamma = \Pi \cup \Lambda \cup \Gamma_\rho$ and $\tilde{a}_1 = \varphi_{e^\kappa}(b_1 + a_1) < \varphi_e(b_1 + a) = \tilde{a}$ by $e^\kappa < e$ and $a, b_1 < \tilde{a}$.

Case 3. The last inference is a (\wedge) : We have $a(\iota) < a$, $A^{(\rho)} \in \widehat{\Gamma}$ with $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup k(\iota), \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, e, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a(\iota)} \widehat{\Gamma}, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$ for each $\iota \in [Q]_{A^{(\rho)}} J$. Since $A \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$, we obtain $[Q]_{A^{(\rho)}} J = [\rho] J = J$. SIH yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{*\tilde{a}(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota$ for each $\iota \in J$, where $\tilde{a}(\iota) = \varphi_e(b_1 + a(\iota)) < \tilde{a}$. A (\wedge) yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{*\tilde{a}} \Gamma$.

Other cases are seen from SIH. \square

Proposition 6.49 (Collapsing) Suppose $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\Omega(\gamma))$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta) \vdash_\Omega^{*a} \Gamma$ and $\Gamma \subset \Sigma(\Omega)$. Then for $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^a$ and $\beta = \psi_\Omega(\hat{a})$, $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \Theta) \vdash_\beta^{*\beta} \Gamma^{(\beta, \Omega)}$ holds.

Proposition 6.50 (Cut-elimination) Suppose $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta) \vdash_{c+d}^{*a} \Gamma$ with $c + d \leq \mathbb{S}$ and $\neg(c < \Omega \leq c + d)$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta) \vdash_c^{*\theta_d(a)} \Gamma$.

Theorem 6.51 Assume $S_1 \vdash \theta^{L_\Omega}$ for $\theta \in \Sigma$. Then there exists an $n < \omega$ such that $L_\alpha \models \theta$ for $\alpha = \psi_\Omega(\omega_n(\mathbb{K} + 1))$ in $OT(\Pi_1^1)$.

Proof. Let $S_1 \vdash \theta^{L\Omega}$ for a Σ -sentence θ . By Embedding 6.30 pick an m so that $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{S}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\mathbb{K}+m}^{*\mathbb{K}\cdot 2+m} \theta^{L\Omega}; \emptyset$. Cut-elimination 6.34 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{S}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{*a} \theta^{L\Omega}$ for $a = \omega_m(\mathbb{K} \cdot 2 + m) < \omega_{m+1}(\mathbb{K} + 1)$. Now let $\gamma_0 = \omega_{m+2}(\mathbb{K} + 1)$. Let $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\omega^a) > \mathbb{S}$, where $\omega^a < \gamma_0 = \omega_{m+2}(\mathbb{K} + 1)$. Collapsing 7.18 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\omega^{a+1}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\beta}^{*\beta} \theta^{L\Omega}; \emptyset$.

Let $\rho = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^g(\gamma_0)$ with $g = \{(\beta, \beta + \mathbb{K})\}$, where $\mathbb{K}(\beta + 1) = \beta + \mathbb{K}$. We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\omega^{a+1}}, \emptyset, \{\rho\}) \vdash_{\beta, \rho+1, \gamma_0, \beta}^{\beta} (\theta^{L\Omega})^{(\rho)}$ by Capping 6.44. Cut-elimination 6.43 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\omega^{a+1}}, \emptyset, \{\rho\}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \rho+1, \gamma_0, \beta}^{a_1} (\theta^{L\Omega})^{(\rho)}$ for $a_1 = \varphi_{\beta}(\beta)$.

We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \emptyset) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{*a_2} \theta^{L\Omega}$ by Lemma 6.48, where $a_2 = \varphi_{\rho+1}(\beta + a_1)$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_0 + \mathbb{S}$. Cut-elimination 6.50 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \emptyset) \vdash_{\Omega}^{*a_3} \theta^{L\Omega}$ for $a_3 = \theta_{\mathbb{S}}(a_2)$. Collapsing 6.49 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1+a_3+1}, \emptyset) \vdash_{\eta}^{*\eta} \theta^{L\Omega}$ for $\eta = \psi_{\Omega}(\gamma_1 + a_3) < \psi_{\Omega}(\omega_{m+3}(\mathbb{K} + 1))$. Cut-elimination 6.50 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1+a_3+1}, \emptyset) \vdash_0^{*\theta_{\eta}(\eta)} \theta^{L\Omega}$. We then see $L_{\eta} \models \theta$ by induction up to $\theta_{\eta}(\eta)$. \square

Actually the bound is shown to be tight.

Theorem 6.52 [A ∞ d]

$\text{KP}\omega + (M \prec_{\Sigma_1} V)$ proves the well-foundedness up to $\psi_{\Omega}(\omega_n(\mathbb{S}^+ + 1))$ for each n .

$\text{KP}\omega + (M \prec_{\Sigma_1} V)$ proves an axiom of Σ_1 -Separation with parameters from M . $\exists b [b = \{x \in a : \varphi(x, c)\} = \{x \in a : M \models \varphi(x, c)\}]$, where $c \in M$, $a \in M \cup \{M\}$ and $\varphi \in \Sigma_1$. However it is open for us whether the parameter-free Σ_2^1 -Comprehension Axiom holds in $\text{KP}\omega + (M \prec_{\Sigma_1} V)$.

7 Π_1 -Collection

The axioms of the set theory $\text{KP}\omega + \Pi_1\text{-Collection} + (V = L)$ consist of those of $\text{KP}\omega + (V = L)$ plus the axiom schema $\Pi_1\text{-Collection}$: for each Π_1 -formula $A(x, y)$ in the language of set theory, $\forall x \in a \exists y A(x, y) \rightarrow \exists b \forall x \in a \exists y \in b A(x, y)$. It is easy to see that the second order arithmetic $\Sigma_3^1\text{-DC} + \text{BI}$ is interpreted to $\text{KP}\omega + \Pi_1\text{-Collection} + (V = L)$ canonically.

Next we show that $\text{KP}\omega + \Pi_1\text{-Collection} + (V = L)$ is contained in a set theory $S_{\mathbb{I}}$. The language of the theory $S_{\mathbb{I}}$ is $\{\in, St, \Omega\}$ with a unary predicate constant St and an individual constant Ω . $\Delta_0(St)$ denotes the set of bounded formulas in the language $\{\in, St, \Omega\}$, in which atomic formulas $St(t)$ may occur. Similarly $\Sigma_1(St)$ the set of Σ_1 -formulas in the expanded language. $St(\alpha)$ is intended to denote the fact that α is a stable ordinal, $L_{\alpha} \prec_{\Sigma_1} L$, and $\Omega = \omega_1^{CK}$. The axioms of $S_{\mathbb{I}}$ are obtained from those ⁴ of $\text{KP}\omega$ by adding the following axioms. Let ON denote the class of all ordinals. For ordinals α , α^{\dagger} denotes the least stable ordinal above α . A *successor stable ordinal* is an ordinal α^{\dagger} for an α . Note that the least stable ordinal 0^{\dagger} is a successor stable ordinal.

⁴In the axiom schemata $\Delta_0\text{-Separation}$ and $\Delta_0\text{-Collection}$, Δ_0 -formulas remain to mean a Δ_0 -formula in which St does not occur, while the axiom of foundation may be applied to a formula in which St may occur.

1. $V = L$, and the axioms for recursively regularity of Ω .
2. $\Delta_0(St)$ -collection:

$$\forall x \in a \exists y \theta(x, y) \rightarrow \exists b \forall x \in a \exists y \in b \theta(x, y)$$

for each $\Delta_0(St)$ -formula θ in which the predicate St may occur.

3. $L = \bigcup \{L_\sigma : St(\sigma)\}$, i.e.,

$$\forall \alpha \in ON \exists \sigma (\alpha < \sigma \wedge St(\sigma)) \quad (49)$$

4. For a successor stable ordinal $\sigma < \mathbb{I}$, $L_\sigma \prec_{\Sigma_1} L = L_{\mathbb{I}}$:

$$SSt(\sigma) \wedge \varphi(u) \wedge u \in L_\sigma \rightarrow \varphi^{L_\sigma}(u) \quad (50)$$

for each Σ_1 -formula φ in the language of set theory, i.e., the constant St does not occur in φ .

Lemma 7.1 $S_{\mathbb{I}}$ is an extension of $KP\omega + \Pi_1$ -Collection + $(V = L)$. Namely $S_{\mathbb{I}}$ proves Π_1 -Collection.

Proof. Argue in $S_{\mathbb{I}}$. Let $A(x, y)$ be a Π_1 -formula in the language of set theory. We obtain by the axioms (49) and (50)

$$A(x, y) \leftrightarrow \exists \beta (St(\beta^\dagger) \wedge x, y \in L_{\beta^\dagger} \wedge A^{L_{\beta^\dagger}}(x, y)) \quad (51)$$

Assume $\forall x \in a \exists y A(x, y)$. Then we obtain $\forall x \in a \exists y \exists \beta (St(\beta^\dagger) \wedge x, y \in L_{\beta^\dagger} \wedge A^{L_{\beta^\dagger}}(x, y))$ by (51). Since $St(\beta^\dagger) \wedge x, y \in L_{\beta^\dagger} \wedge A^{L_{\beta^\dagger}}(x, y)$ is a $\Sigma_1(St)$ -formula, pick a set c such that $\forall x \in a \exists y \in c \exists \beta \in c (St(\beta^\dagger) \wedge x, y \in L_{\beta^\dagger} \wedge A^{L_{\beta^\dagger}}(x, y))$ by $\Delta_0(St)$ -Collection. Again by (51) we obtain $\forall x \in a \exists y \in c A(x, y)$. \square

Conversely in $KP\omega + \Pi_1$ -Collection + $(V = L)$, the predicate $St(\alpha)$ is defined by a Π_1 -formula $st(\alpha)$ so that (50) is provable, and $\Delta_0(St)$ -collection follows from Π_1 -Collection.

Lemma 7.2 $KP\omega + \Pi_1$ -Collection proves each of Σ_1 -Separation, Δ_2 -Separation and Σ_2 -Replacement.

Proof. We show that $\{x \in a : \varphi(x)\}$ exists as a set for a Σ_1 -formula $\varphi \equiv \exists y \theta(x, y)$ with a Δ_0 matrix θ . We have by logic $\forall x \in a \exists y (\exists z \theta(x, z) \rightarrow \theta(x, y))$. By Π_1 -Collection pick a set b so that $\forall x \in a \exists y \in b (\varphi(x) \rightarrow \theta(x, y))$. In other words, $\{x \in a : \varphi(x)\} = \{x \in a : \exists y \in b \theta(x, y)\}$. \square

Let $\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}(\alpha)$ denote the Σ_1 -Skolem hull $\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}(\alpha)$ of an ordinal α . $\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}(\alpha)$ is the collection of Σ_1 -definable elements from parameters $< \alpha$ in the universe.

Specifically let $\{\varphi_i : i \in \omega\}$ denote an enumeration of Σ_1 -formulas. Each is of the form $\varphi_i \equiv \exists y \theta_i(x, y; u)$ ($\theta \in \Delta_0$) with fixed variables x, y, u . Set for $b \in \alpha$

$$\begin{aligned} r(i, b) &\simeq \text{the } <_L \text{-least } c \in L \text{ such that } L \models \theta_i((c)_0, (c)_1; b) \\ h(i, b) &\simeq (r(i, b))_0 \\ \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}(\alpha) &= \{h(i, b) \in L : i \in \omega, b \in \alpha\} \end{aligned}$$

The domain of the partial Δ_1 -map r is a Σ_1 -subset of $\omega \times \alpha$, and from Lemma 7.2 (Σ_1 -Separation) we see that the domain exists as a set, and so does $\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}(\alpha)$. Therefore its Mostowski collapse⁵ ordinal $\beta \geq \alpha$. This shows (49).

Note that a limit of admissible ordinals need not to be admissible since there exists a Π_3^- -formula ad such that for any transitive set x , x is admissible iff ad^x holds. On the other side every limit κ of stable ordinals is stable: for $c \in L_\kappa$, pick a stable ordinal $\sigma < \kappa$ such that $c \in L_\sigma$. Then for Σ_1 -formula A , $L \models A(c) \Rightarrow L_\sigma \models A(c) \Rightarrow L_\kappa \models A(c)$.

7.1 Ordinals for Π_1 -Collection

In this subsection up to subsection 7.2 we work in a set theory $\text{ZFC}(St)$, where St is a unary predicate symbol. We assume that St is an unbounded class of ordinals below \mathbb{I} such that the least element \mathbb{S}_0 of St is larger than Ω . α^\dagger denotes the least ordinal $> \alpha$ in the class St when $\alpha < \mathbb{I}$. $\alpha^\dagger := \mathbb{I}$ if $\alpha \geq \mathbb{I}$. Then $\mathbb{S}_0 = \Omega^\dagger$. Let $SSt := \{\alpha^\dagger : \alpha \in ON\}$ and $LS = St \setminus SSt$. For natural numbers k , $\alpha^{\dagger k}$ is defined recursively by $\alpha^{\dagger 0} = \alpha$ and $\alpha^{\dagger(k+1)} = (\alpha^{\dagger k})^\dagger$.

$\varphi_b(\xi)$ denotes the binary Veblen function on $\mathbb{I}^+ = \omega_{\mathbb{I}+1}$ with $\varphi_0(\xi) = \omega^\xi$. Let $\Lambda \leq \mathbb{I}$ be a strongly critical number. As in Definition 6.2, $\tilde{\varphi}_b(\xi) := \varphi_b(\mathbb{I} \cdot \xi)$. Let $b, \xi < \mathbb{I}^+$. $\theta_b(\xi)$ [$\tilde{\theta}_b(\xi)$] denotes a b -th iterate of $\varphi_0(\xi) = \omega^\xi$ [of $\tilde{\varphi}_0(\xi) = \mathbb{I}^\xi$], resp.

Definition 7.3 A finite function $f : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ is said to be a *finite function* if $\forall i > 0 (a_i = 1)$ and $a_0 = 1$ when $b_0 > 1$ in $f(c) =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m) \cdot a_m + \dots + \tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0) \cdot a_0$ for any $c \in \text{supp}(f)$. Let $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) := \bigcup \{ \{c\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f(c)) : c \in \text{supp}(f) \}$.

For a finite function f , $c < \mathbb{I}$ and $\xi < \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$. A relation $f <_{\mathbb{I}}^c \xi$ is defined by induction on the cardinality of the finite set $\{d \in \text{supp}(f) : d > c\}$ as in Definition 6.4.2.

Definition 7.4 Let $A \subset \mathbb{I}$ be a set, and $\alpha \leq \mathbb{I}$ a limit ordinal.

$$\alpha \in M(A) :\Leftrightarrow A \cap \alpha \text{ is stationary in } \alpha \Leftrightarrow \text{every club subset of } \alpha \text{ meets } A.$$

Classes $\mathcal{H}_a(X) \subset \Gamma_{\mathbb{I}+1}$, $Mh_c^a(\xi) \subset (\mathbb{I}+1)$, and ordinals $\psi_\kappa^f(a) \leq \kappa$ are defined simultaneously as follows.

$\mathcal{H}_a(X)$ denotes the closure of $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}\} \cup X$ under $+$, φ , $a \mapsto \psi_\Omega(a)$, $a \mapsto \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) \in LS$, $\alpha \mapsto \alpha^\dagger \in SSt$, and $(\pi, b, f) \mapsto \psi_\pi^f(b)$.

⁵The collapse coincides with L_β for the least ordinal β not in $\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}(\alpha)$.

$\pi \in Mh_c^a(\xi)$ iff $\{a, c, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$ and the following condition is met for any finite functions $f, g : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ such that $f <_{\mathbb{I}}^c \xi$

$$SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f, g) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \ \& \ \pi \in Mh_0^a(g_c) \Rightarrow \pi \in M(Mh_0^a(g_c * f^c))$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Mh_c^a(f) &:= \bigcap \{Mh_d^a(f(d)) : d \in \text{supp}(f^c)\} \\ &= \bigcap \{Mh_d^a(f(d)) : c \leq d \in \text{supp}(f)\} \end{aligned}$$

Let a, π ordinals and $f : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ a finite function. Then $\psi_{\pi}^f(a)$ denotes the least ordinal $\kappa < \pi$ such that

$$\kappa \in Mh_0^a(f) \ \& \ \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \pi \subset \kappa \ \& \ \{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \quad (52)$$

if such a κ exists. Otherwise set $\psi_{\pi}^f(a) = \pi$.

$$\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) := \min(\{\mathbb{I}\} \cup \{\kappa \in LS : \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{I} \subset \kappa\}) \quad (53)$$

For classes $A \subset \mathbb{I}$, let $\alpha \in M_c^a(A)$ iff $\alpha \in A$ and for any finite functions $g : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$

$$\alpha \in Mh_0^a(g_c) \ \& \ SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g_c) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha \in M(Mh_0^a(g_c) \cap A) \quad (54)$$

Proposition 7.5 *Each of $x \in \mathcal{H}_a(y)$, $x \in Mh_c^a(f)$ and $x = \psi_{\kappa}^f(a)$ is a $\Delta_1(St)$ -predicate in ZFC(St).*

7.2 A small large cardinal hypothesis

It is convenient for us to assume the existence of a small large cardinal in justification of the above definition.

Subtle cardinals are introduced by R. Jensen and K. Kunen. It is shown in Lemma 2.7 of [Rathjen05b] that the set of shrewd cardinals in V_{π} is stationary in a subtle cardinal π . From this fact we see that the set of shrewd limits of shrewd cardinals in V_{π} is also stationary in a subtle cardinal π , where for a shrewd cardinal κ in V_{π} , κ is a shrewd limit iff κ is a limit of shrewd cardinals in V_{π} .

Let C be a closed subset of π , and $C_0 \subset C$ be a subset defined by $\kappa \in C_0$ iff $\kappa \in C$ and κ is a limit of shrewd cardinals. Since the set of shrewd cardinals is stationary in V_{π} , C_0 is a club subset of π . Hence there exists a shrewd cardinal in C_0 .

In this subsection we work in an extension T of ZFC by adding the axiom stating that there exists a regular cardinal \mathbb{I} such that the set St of shrewd cardinals in $V_{\mathbb{I}}$ is stationary in \mathbb{I} . In this subsection Ω denotes the least uncountable ordinal ω_1 , and LS denotes the set of shrewd limits in $V_{\mathbb{I}}$. The class LS is stationary in \mathbb{I} . A *successor shrewd cardinal* is a shrewd cardinal in $V_{\mathbb{I}}$, not in LS .

Lemma 7.6 $\forall a[\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) < \mathbb{I}]$.

Proof. The set $C = \{\kappa < \mathbb{I} : \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{I} \subset \kappa\}$ is a club subset of the regular cardinal \mathbb{I} . This shows the existence of a $\kappa \in LS \cap C$, and hence $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) < \mathbb{I}$ by the definition (53). \square

Lemma 7.7 *Let \mathbb{S} be a shrewd cardinal, $a < \varepsilon(\mathbb{I})$, $h : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ a finite function with $\{a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(h) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. Then $\mathbb{S} \in Mh_0^a(h) \cap M(Mh_0^a(h))$.*

Proof. By induction on $\xi < \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ we show $\mathbb{S} \in Mh_c^a(\xi)$ for $\{a, c, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$ as in Lemma 6.13. \square

Lemma 7.8 *Let \mathbb{S} be a shrewd cardinal, a an ordinal, and $f : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ a finite function such that $\{a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. Then $\psi_{\mathbb{S}}^f(a) < \mathbb{S}$ holds.*

Corollary 7.9 *Let $f, g : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ be finite functions and $c \in \text{supp}(f)$. Assume that there exists an ordinal $d < c$ such that $(d, c) \cap \text{supp}(f) = (d, c) \cap \text{supp}(g) = \emptyset$, $g_d = f_d$, $g(d) < f(d) + \tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(f(c); \mathbb{I}) \cdot \omega$, and $g <_{\mathbb{I}}^c f$.*

Then $Mh_0^a(g) \prec Mh_0^a(f)$ holds. In particular if $\pi \in Mh_0^a(f)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$, then $\psi_{\pi}^g(a) < \pi$.

Proof. This is seen as in Corollary 6.17. \square

An *irreducibility* of finite functions $f : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ is defined as in Definition 6.9, and a lexicographic order $f <_{lx}^b g$ on finite functions f, g as in Definition 6.10. Then $f <_{lx}^0 g \Rightarrow Mh_0^a(f) \prec Mh_0^a(g)$ is seen as in Proposition 6.18.

A computable notation system $OT(\mathbb{I})$ for Π_1 -collection is defined so as to be closed under Mostowski collapsings. A new constructor $\mathbb{I}[\cdot]$ is used to generate terms in $OT(\mathbb{I})$. Note that there is no clause for constructing $\kappa = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}(a)$ from a for $\mathbb{S} \in LS$.

Definition 7.10 1. $\{(\rho, \sigma) : \rho \prec \sigma\}$ denotes the transitive closure of the relation $\{(\rho, \sigma) : \exists f, a(\rho = \psi_{\sigma}^f(a))\}$. Let $\rho \preceq \sigma :\Leftrightarrow \rho \prec \sigma \vee \rho = \sigma$.

2. Let $\alpha \prec \mathbb{S}$ for an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ and $b = \mathbf{p}_0(\alpha)$. Then let

$$M_{\alpha} := \mathcal{H}_b(\alpha).$$

3. For $\alpha \in \Psi$ an ordinal $\mathbf{p}_0(\alpha)$ is defined.

- (a) Let $\alpha \preceq \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^g(b)$ for an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. Then $\mathbf{p}_0(\alpha) = b$.
- (b) There exists an $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^{\dagger} \in SSt$ and a $\mathbb{T} < \tau < \mathbb{S}$ such that $\alpha \prec \tau^{\dagger k}$ for a $k > 0$. Let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ be such that $\alpha = \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ for a $\beta \in M_{\rho}$. Let $\mathbf{p}_0(\alpha) = \mathbf{p}_0(\beta)$.
- (c) $\mathbf{p}_0(\alpha) = 0$ otherwise.

$\alpha = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^f(a) \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ only if

$$SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(a)) \quad (55)$$

where $a = \mathbf{p}_0(\alpha)$.

Let $\{\pi, a, d\} \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ with $\pi \prec \mathbb{S} \in SSt$, $m(\pi) = f$, $d < c \in \text{supp}(f)$, and $(d, c) \cap \text{supp}(f) = \emptyset$.

When $g \neq \emptyset$, let g be an irreducible finite function such that $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$, $g_d = f_d$, $(d, c) \cap \text{supp}(g) = \emptyset$, $g(d) < f(d) + \tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(f(c); \mathbb{I}) \cdot \omega$, and $g <_{\mathbb{I}}^c f(c)$.

Then $\alpha = \psi_{\pi}^g(a) \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ only if

$$SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset M_{\alpha} \quad (56)$$

The Mostowski collapsing $\alpha \mapsto \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ ($\alpha \in M_{\rho}$) is defined as follows. $(\mathbb{S})[\rho/\mathbb{S}] := \rho$, $(\mathbb{S}^{\dagger})[\rho/\mathbb{S}] := \rho^{\dagger}$, and $(\mathbb{I})[\rho/\mathbb{S}] := \mathbb{I}[\rho]$. $(\tau^{\dagger})[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = (\tau[\rho/\mathbb{S}])^{\dagger}$, where $\mathbb{S} < \tau^{\dagger}$. $(\mathbb{I}[\tau])[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \mathbb{I}[\tau[\rho/\mathbb{S}]]$, where $\mathbb{I}[\tau] \neq \mathbb{I}$.

A relation $\alpha < \beta$ for $\alpha, \beta \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ is defined so that $\psi_{\kappa}^f(a) < \kappa$ and $\rho < \psi_{\rho^{\dagger}}^g(b) < \rho^{\dagger} < \tau = \psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(c) < \psi_{\tau^{\dagger}}^h(d) < \tau^{\dagger} < \mathbb{I}[\rho]$ for every κ, ρ, a, b, c, d and f, g, h .

Proposition 7.11 *There is no $\psi_{\sigma}^f(a) \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ such that $\rho < \psi_{\sigma}^f(a) \leq \rho^{\dagger} < \sigma$.*

Lemma 7.12 *For $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$, $\{\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] : \alpha \in M_{\rho}\}$ is a transitive collapse of M_{ρ} as in Lemma 6.23.*

7.3 Operator controlled derivations for Π_1 -Collection

We consider *RS*-formulas in a language with a unary predicate $St(a)$, where $a = L_{\kappa}$ for a stable ordinal κ . Specifically $St(a) := \bigvee((\forall x \in \iota(x \in a)) \wedge (\forall x \in a(x \in \iota)))_{\iota \in J}$ with $J = \{L_{\kappa} : \kappa \in St \cap (|a| + 1)\}$ for $St \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$.

Definition 7.13 A *finite family* is a finite function $\mathbb{Q} \subset \coprod_{\mathbb{S}} \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ such that its domain $dom(\mathbb{Q})$ is a finite set of successor stable ordinals, and $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})$ is a finite set of ordinals in $\Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ for each $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathbb{Q})$. Let $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T}) = \emptyset$ for $\mathbb{T} \notin dom(\mathbb{Q})$ and $\bigcup \mathbb{Q} = \bigcup_{\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathbb{Q})} \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})$. Define $M_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})} = \bigcap_{\sigma \in \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})} M_{\sigma}$.

For $A \simeq \bigvee(A_{\iota})_{\iota \in J}$ and $\iota \in J$

$$\iota \in [\mathbb{Q}]_A J = [\mathbb{Q}]_{\neg A} J := \Leftrightarrow \forall \mathbb{U} \in dom(\mathbb{Q}) (\text{rk}(A_{\iota}) \geq \mathbb{U} \Rightarrow \mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset M_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{U})})$$

We define a derivability relation $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\lceil}$ where c is a bound of ranks of the inference rules (stbl) and of ranks of cut formulas. The relation depends on an ordinal γ_0 , and should be written as $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_{c, \gamma_0}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\lceil}$. However the ordinal γ_0 will be fixed. So let us omit it.

Definition 7.14 Let Θ a finite set of ordinals, a, c ordinals, and \mathbb{Q}_{Π} a finite family such that $\gamma_0 \leq \mathbf{p}_0(\sigma)$ for each $(\mathbb{S}, \sigma) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}$. Let $\Pi = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \bigcup \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}} \Pi_{\sigma} \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{I})$ be a set of formulas such that $\mathbf{k}(\Pi_{\sigma}) \subset M_{\sigma}$ for each $(\mathbb{S}, \sigma) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}$. Let $\Pi^{\lceil} = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \bigcup \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}} \Pi_{\sigma}^{\lceil \sigma/\mathbb{S} \rceil}$ and $\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{S})} = \Theta \cap M_{\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}(\mathbb{S})}$.

$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ holds for a set Γ of formulas if $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$

$$\mathbf{k}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \ \& \ \forall \sigma \in \bigcup \mathbf{Q}_\Pi \left(\mathbf{k}(\Pi_\sigma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\sigma)}] \right) \quad (57)$$

$$\forall \mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \left(\{\gamma, a, c, \gamma_0\} \cup \mathbf{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma, \Pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})}] \right)^6 \quad (58)$$

$$\forall \{\mathbb{U} \leq \mathbb{S}\} \subset \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \left(\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{U})}] \right) \quad (59)$$

and one of the following cases holds:

- (V) ⁷ There exist $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ and an $\iota \in J$ such that $A \in \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.
- (V)^[\cdot] There exist $\sigma \in \bigcup \mathbf{Q}_\Pi$, $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ and an $\iota \in [\sigma]J$ such that $A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \in \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma; (A_\iota)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$, $\Pi^{[\cdot]}$.
- (\wedge) There exist $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, ordinals $a(\iota) < a$ such that $A \in \Gamma$ and for each $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}_\Pi]_A J$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota); \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.
- (\wedge)^[\cdot] There exist $\sigma \in \bigcup \mathbf{Q}_\Pi$, $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, ordinals $a(\iota) < a$ such that $A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \in \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota); \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, $(A_\iota)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ for each $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}_\Pi]_A J \cap [\sigma]J$.
- (cut) There exist an ordinal $a_0 < a$ and a formula C such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, -C; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} C, \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ with $\text{rk}(C) < c$.
- ($\Sigma(St)$ -rfl) There exist ordinals $a_\ell, a_r < a$ and a formula $C \in \Sigma(St)$ such that $c \geq \mathbb{I}$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_\ell} \Gamma, C; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_r} \neg \exists x C^{(x, \mathbb{I})}$, $\Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.
- ($\Sigma(\Omega)$ -rfl) There exist ordinals $a_\ell, a_r < a$ and a formula $C \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ such that $c \geq \Omega$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_\ell} \Gamma, C; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_r} \neg \exists x < \Omega C^{(x, \Omega)}$, $\Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.
- (stbl(\mathbb{S})) There exist an ordinal $a_0 < a$, a successor stable ordinal \mathbb{S} , a \wedge -formula $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$ and a $u \in Tm(\mathbb{I})$ for which the following hold:

$$\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})}] \ \& \ \forall \mathbb{U} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \cap \mathbb{S} \left(\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{U})}] \right) \quad (60)$$

$\mathbb{S} \leq \text{rk}(B(u)) < c$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$, $\Pi^{[\cdot]}$ holds for every ordinal $\sigma \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ such that $\text{p}_0(\sigma) \geq \gamma_0$ and

$$\Theta \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_\sigma \quad (61)$$

where $\text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) = \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}$, and $(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\})(\mathbb{S}) = \mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\sigma\}$.

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[\cdot]} \quad \{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}, \Pi^{[\cdot]}\}_\sigma}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}}$$

Assume (60) and (61). Then $(\Theta \cup \{\sigma\})_{(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\})(\mathbb{S})} = \Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})}$, and $(\Theta \cup \{\sigma\})_{(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\})(\mathbb{U})} = (\Theta \cup \{\sigma\})_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{U})} \supset \Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{U})}$ for $\mathbb{U} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \cap \mathbb{S}$.

⁶(58) means $\{\gamma, a, c, \gamma_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ when $\text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi) = \emptyset$.

⁷The condition $|\iota| < a$ is absent in the inference (V).

Lemma 7.15 (Tautology) *Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\mathbf{k}(A)]$ and $d = \text{rk}(A)$.*

1. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \mathbf{k}(A); \emptyset) \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg A, A; \emptyset$.
2. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \mathbf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ if $\mathbf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_\sigma$ and $\gamma \geq \mathbb{S}$.

Proof. Each is seen by induction on $d = \text{rk}(A)$. For example consider the lemma 7.15.2. We have $\text{rk}(A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) < \mathbb{S}$ and $(\mathbf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}) \cap M_\sigma = \mathbf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}$ for (58) and (59), and $\mathbf{k}(A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \subset \mathcal{H}_\mathbb{S}((\mathbf{k}(A) \cap \mathbb{S}) \cup \{\sigma\})$ for (57). \square

Lemma 7.16 (Embedding of Axioms) *For each axiom A in $S_{\mathbb{I}}$ there is an $m < \omega$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{I}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\mathbb{I}+m}^{*\mathbb{I}-2} A; \emptyset$ holds.*

Proof. Let us suppress the operator $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{I}}$. We show first that the axiom (50), $SSt(\sigma) \wedge \varphi(u) \wedge u \in L_\sigma \rightarrow \varphi^{L_\sigma}(u)$ by an inference (stbl(\mathbb{S})) for successor stable ordinals $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{I}$. Let $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$ be a \wedge -formula, and $u \in Tm(\mathbb{I})$.

We may assume that $\mathbb{I} > d = \text{rk}(B(u)) \geq \mathbb{S}$. Let $\mathbf{k}_0 = \mathbf{k}(B(0))$ and $\mathbf{k}_u = \mathbf{k}(u)$. Then $\mathbf{k}(B(0)) \subset \mathcal{H}_0(\mathbf{k}_0)$. Let $\sigma \in \Psi_\mathbb{S}$ be an ordinal such that $\mathbf{k}_0 \cup \mathbf{k}_u \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_\sigma$ and $\gamma_0 \leq \mathbf{p}_0(\sigma)$.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathbf{k}_0 \cup \mathbf{k}_u \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\} \vdash_0^{*2d} B(u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) ; \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}}{\mathbf{k}_0 \cup \mathbf{k}_u ; \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg B(u), B(u); \quad \{\mathbf{k}_0 \cup \mathbf{k}_u \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\} \vdash_0^{*2d+1} \exists x \in L_\mathbb{S} B(x); \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \}_\sigma} (\text{V})}{\frac{\mathbf{k}_0 \cup \mathbf{k}_u \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}; \vdash_{\mathbb{I}}^{*\mathbb{I}} \neg B(u), \exists x \in L_\mathbb{S} B(x);}{\mathbf{k}_0 \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}; \vdash_{\mathbb{I}}^{*\mathbb{I}+1} \neg \exists x B(x), \exists x \in L_\mathbb{S} B(x);} (\text{A})} (\text{stbl}(\mathbb{S}))$$

Therefore $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{I}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\mathbb{I}}^{*\mathbb{I}+\omega} \forall \mathbb{S}, v [SSt(\mathbb{S}) \wedge A(v) \wedge v \in L_\mathbb{S} \rightarrow A^{(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{I})}(v)]; \emptyset$, where $SSt(\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (St(\alpha) \wedge \exists \beta < \alpha \forall \gamma < \alpha (St(\gamma) \rightarrow \gamma \leq \beta))$.

Next we show the axiom (49). Let α be an ordinal such that $\alpha < \mathbb{I}$. We obtain for $\alpha < \alpha^\dagger < \mathbb{I}$ with $d_0 = \text{rk}(\alpha < \alpha^\dagger)$ and $\alpha^\dagger \leq d_1 = \text{rk}(St(\alpha^\dagger)) < d_2 = \omega(\alpha^\dagger + 1)$ with $\alpha^\dagger \in \mathcal{H}_0[\{\alpha\}]$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\{\alpha\}; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*d_0} \alpha < \alpha^\dagger; \emptyset \quad \{\alpha\}; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*2d_1} St(\alpha^\dagger); \emptyset}{\{\alpha\}; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*d_2} \alpha < \alpha^\dagger \wedge St(\alpha^\dagger); \emptyset} (\text{A})}{\{\alpha\}; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*d_2+1} \exists \sigma (\alpha < \sigma \wedge St(\sigma)); \emptyset} (\text{V})}{\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*\mathbb{I}} \forall \alpha \in ON \exists \sigma (\alpha < \sigma \wedge St(\sigma)); \emptyset} (\text{A})$$

\square

Lemma 7.17 (Cut-elimination) *Assume $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{c+1}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ with $c \geq \mathbb{I}$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*\omega^a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$.*

Proof. Use the fact: if $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ and $\Theta \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_\sigma$, then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. \square

Lemma 7.18 (Collapsing) *Let $\Gamma \subset \Sigma(St)$ be a set of formulas. Suppose $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\gamma))$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{\mathbb{I}}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. Let $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\hat{a})$ with $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^a$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_\beta^{*\beta} \Gamma^{(\beta, \mathbb{I})}; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ holds.*

Proof. By induction on a . We have $\{\gamma, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})}]$ by (58), and $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})}]$ for $\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi)$

When the last inference is a $(\text{stbl}(\mathbb{S}))$, let $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$ be a \wedge -formula and a term $u \in \text{Tm}(\mathbb{I})$ such that $\mathbb{S} \leq \text{rk}(B(u)) < \mathbb{I}$, $\mathbf{k}(B(u)) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{\mathbb{I}}^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ for an ordinal $a_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi}] \cap a$. Then we obtain $\mathbb{S} \leq \text{rk}(B(u)) < \beta$. \square

7.4 Operator controlled derivations with caps

Let $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ in the calculus for Π_1^1 -reflection in subsection 6.5. In Capping 6.44, each formula $A \in \Gamma$ puts on a cap ρ such that $\mathbf{Q}_\Pi \subset \rho$ and (38), $\Theta \subset M_\rho$. (38) is needed in **Case 3.1** of the proof. Namely when $\Gamma \ni A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ is introduced by a (\bigvee) such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{\mathbb{K}}^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, we need $\iota \in [\rho]J$, i.e., $\mathbf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\rho$, which follows from $\mathbf{k}(A_\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \subset M_\rho$ by (34) and $\Theta \subset M_\rho$.

We are concerned here with several stable ordinals $\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}, \dots$. It is convenient for us to regard *uncapped formulas* A as capped formulas $A^{(\mathbf{u})}$ with its cap \mathbf{u} . Let $M_{\mathbf{u}} = OT(\mathbb{I})$.

In Capping 7.29 Γ is classified into $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathbf{u}} \cup \bigcup_{\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi)} \Gamma_{\mathbb{S}}$. $\Gamma_{\mathbb{S}}$ is the set of formulas $B(u)$ in inferences for the stability of a successor stable ordinal \mathbb{S} .

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[\cdot]} \quad \{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}, \Pi^{[\cdot]}\}_\sigma}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}}$$

Each formula $A \in \Gamma_{\mathbb{S}}$ puts on a cap $\rho_{\mathbb{S}}$ for the stable ordinal \mathbb{S} . Then (38) runs $\Theta \subset M_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}$ for every $\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi)$. This means $\Theta \subset M_{\partial \mathbf{Q}} := \bigcap_{\kappa \in \partial \mathbf{Q}} M_\kappa$, where

$$\partial \mathbf{Q} = \{\max(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S})) : \mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Ordinals occurring in derivations are restricted to the set $M_{\partial \mathbf{Q}}$.

In section 6 for Π_1^1 -reflection, an ordinal γ_0 is a threshold, which means that every ordinal occurring in derivations is in $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}(0)$ and the subscript $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$ in \mathcal{H}_γ , while each $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}$ exceeds γ_0 in such a way that $\mathbf{p}_0(\rho) \geq \gamma_0$. This ensures us that $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(M_\rho) \subset M_\rho$. In the end, inferences $(\text{rfl}(\rho, d, f))$ are removed in Lemma 6.48 by moving outside $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}(0)$. Specifically $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0 + \mathbb{S}}(0)$.

Now we have several (successor) stable ordinals $\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}, \dots \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q})$. Inferences $(\text{stbl}(\mathbb{S}))$ and their children $(\text{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f))$ are eliminated first for bigger $\mathbb{S} > \mathbb{T}$, and then smaller ones $(\text{stbl}(\mathbb{T}))$. Therefore we need assignment $\text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}) \ni \mathbb{S} \mapsto \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}}$ for thresholds so that $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} < \gamma_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbf{Q}}$ if $\mathbb{S} > \mathbb{T}$. This is done by gapping, i.e., a gap $\mathbb{I} \cdot 2^a$ between $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}}$ and $\gamma_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbf{Q}}$ in advance, when $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ is embedded to $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c, c, \gamma_0}^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \widehat{\Pi}$, cf. Capping 7.29.

Definition 7.19 A triple $(\mathbf{Q}, \gamma^{\mathbf{Q}}, e^{\mathbf{Q}})$ is said to be a *finite family for ordinals* γ_0 and b_1 if \mathbf{Q} is a finite family in the sense of Definition 7.13 and the following conditions are met:

1. $\gamma^{\mathbf{Q}}$ is a map $dom(\mathbf{Q}) \ni \mathbb{S} \mapsto \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}}$ such that $\gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}^2 > \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} \geq \gamma_0$, $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} \geq \gamma_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbf{Q}} + \mathbb{I}$ for $\{\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{T}\} \subset dom(\mathbf{Q})$ and $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} + \mathbb{I}}$ for $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathbf{Q})$.
 \mathbf{Q} is said to have *gaps* η if $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} \geq \gamma_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbf{Q}} + \mathbb{I} \cdot \eta$ holds for $\{\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{T}\} \subset dom(\mathbf{Q})$, and $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} \geq \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I} \cdot \eta$ for $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathbf{Q})$.
2. For each $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S})$, $m(\rho) : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ is special, $s(\rho) \leq b_1$, $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} + \mathbb{I}}(0)$, and $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} \leq p_0(\rho)$.
3. $e^{\mathbf{Q}}$ assigns an ordinal $e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} + \mathbb{I}} \cap (\mathbb{S} + 1)$ to each $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathbf{Q})$ such that

$$\max(\{0\} \cup \{\rho \in \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S}) : s(\rho) > \mathbb{S}\}) < e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} \quad (62)$$

Let $e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbb{S}$ when $\mathbb{S} \notin dom(\mathbf{Q})$.

Definition 7.20 For a finite family \mathbf{Q} , and for $A \simeq \bigvee (A_i)_{i \in J}$

$$[\mathbf{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}} J = [\mathbf{Q}]_{\neg A^{(\rho)}} J = [\mathbf{Q}]_A J \cap [\partial \mathbf{Q}] J \cap [\rho] J$$

where $[\mathbf{u}] J = J$ and

$$[\partial \mathbf{Q}] J = \bigcap_{\kappa \in \partial \mathbf{Q}} [\kappa] J.$$

- Definition 7.21**
1. For a finite family \mathbf{Q} , let $\partial \mathbf{Q} = \{\max(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S})) : \mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \neq \emptyset\}$ and $M_{\partial \mathbf{Q}} = \bigcap_{\kappa \in \partial \mathbf{Q}} M_{\kappa}$.
 - 2.

$$[\mathbf{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}} J = [\mathbf{Q}]_{\neg A^{(\rho)}} J = [\mathbf{Q}]_A J \cap [\partial \mathbf{Q}] J \cap [\rho] J$$

where $[\mathbf{u}] J = J$ and $[\partial \mathbf{Q}] J = \bigcap_{\kappa \in \partial \mathbf{Q}} [\kappa] J$.

Definition 7.22 $H_{\rho}^{\mathbf{Q}}(f, b_1, \gamma, \Theta)$ denotes the *resolvent class* for \mathbf{Q} , ρ , special functions f , ordinals b_1, γ , and finite sets Θ of ordinals defined as follows: $\sigma \in H_{\rho}^{\mathbf{Q}}(f, \gamma, \Theta)$ iff $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma + \mathbb{I}}(0) \cap \rho \cap M_{\partial \mathbf{Q}}$, $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(m(\sigma)) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta]$, $\Theta \subset M_{\sigma}$, $\gamma \leq p_0(\sigma) \leq p_0(\rho)$ and $m(\sigma)$ is special such that $s(f) \leq s(m(\sigma)) \leq b_1$, $f' \leq (m(\sigma))'$, where $\sigma, \rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ and $f \leq g \Leftrightarrow \forall i (f(i) \leq g(i))$.

We define another derivability relation $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^a \Gamma$, where c is a bound of ranks of cut formulas, and ξ a bound of ordinals \mathbb{S} in the inference rules ($\text{rf}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f, b_1)$).

Definition 7.23 Let $\Theta^{(\rho)} = \Theta \cap M_{\rho}$ and $\Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}} = \Theta \cap M_{\partial \mathbf{Q}}$. Let $a, b, c, \xi < \mathbb{I}$, a finite set $\Theta \subset \mathbb{I}$, and \mathbf{Q} be a finite family for γ_0, b_1 such that $dom(\mathbf{Q}) \subset (\xi + 1)$.

$(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^a \Gamma$ holds for a sequent $\Gamma = \bigcup \{\Gamma_{\rho}^{(\rho)} : \rho \in \{\mathbf{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathbf{Q}\}$ if $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$

$$\forall \rho \in \{\mathbf{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathbf{Q} \left(\mathbf{k}(\Gamma_{\rho}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta^{(\rho)}] \cap \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}}] \right) \quad (63)$$

$$\forall \mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}) \left(\{\gamma, a, c, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}}] \right)^8 \quad (64)$$

$$\forall \{\mathbb{U} \leq \mathbb{S}\} \subset \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}) \left(\{\mathbb{S}, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{U})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}}] \right) \quad (65)$$

$$\forall \rho \in \{\mathbf{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathbb{Q} \forall \mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}) \left(\mathbf{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma_\rho) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}}] \right) \quad (66)$$

$$\forall (\mathbb{S}, \rho) \in \mathbb{Q} \left(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(m(\rho)) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[\Theta^{(\rho)} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}} \right] \right) \quad (67)$$

and one of the following cases holds:

(Taut) $\{\neg A^{(\rho)}, A^{(\rho)}\} \subset \Gamma$ for a $\rho \in \{\mathbf{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathbb{Q}$ and a formula A such that $\text{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S} \leq \xi$ for some successor stable ordinal \mathbb{S} .

If $\text{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S}$, then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{0, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_1}^0 \neg A^{(\sigma)}, A^{(\sigma)}$ by (Taut) provided that (64) and (66) are met.

(\vee) There exist $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, a cap $\rho \in \{\mathbf{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathbb{Q}$, an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ and an $\iota \in [\rho]J \cap [\partial\mathbb{Q}]J$ such that $A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a(\iota)} \Gamma, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$.

(\wedge) There exist $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, a cap $\rho \in \{\mathbf{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathbb{Q}$, ordinals $a(\iota) < a$ for each $\iota \in [\mathbb{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}}J$ such that $A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a(\iota)} \Gamma, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$.

(cut) There exist a cap $\rho \in \{\mathbf{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathbb{Q}$, ordinals $a_0 < a$ and a formula C such that $\text{rk}(C) < c$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg C^{(\rho)}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_0} C^{(\rho)}, \Gamma$.

($\Sigma(\Omega)$ -rfl) There exist ordinals $a_\ell, a_r < a$ and an uncapped formula $C \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ such that $c \geq \Omega$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_\ell} \Gamma, C$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_r} \neg \exists x < \pi C^{(x, \Omega)}, \Gamma$.

($\text{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f, b_1)$) There exist a successor stable ordinal $\mathbb{S} \leq \xi$ and an ordinal $\rho < \mathbb{S}$ such that

$$\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}} \subset M_\rho \quad (68)$$

and $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})$ if $\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q})$. Let $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{Q}$ if $\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q})$. Otherwise $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{Q} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \rho)\}$, where $\mathbb{Q} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \rho)\}$ is a finite family for γ_0 extending \mathbb{Q} such that $\text{dom}(\mathbb{R}) = \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}$, $\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\rho\}$, $e_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbb{R}} = e_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ for $\mathbb{S} \neq \mathbb{T} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q})$, $\gamma_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbb{Q}} \geq \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{R}} + \mathbb{I}$ for every $\mathbb{S} > \mathbb{T} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q})$ and $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{R}} \geq \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}$.

Also there exist an ordinal $d \in \text{supp}(m(\rho))$, a special function f , an ordinal $a_0 < a$, and a finite set Δ of uncapped formulas enjoying the following conditions.

(r0) $\rho < e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{R}}$ if $s(\rho) = \max(\text{supp}(m(\rho))) > \mathbb{S}$.

(r1) $\Delta \subset \bigvee_{\mathbb{S}}(d) := \{\delta : \text{rk}(\delta) < d, \delta \text{ is a } \bigvee\text{-formula}\} \cup \{\delta : \text{rk}(\delta) < \mathbb{S}\}$.

⁸(64) means $\{\gamma, a, c, \xi, \gamma_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ when $\text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}) = \emptyset$.

- (r2) For $g = m(\rho)$, $s(f) \leq b_1$, $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}}[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$ and $f_d = g_d \& f^d <_{\mathbb{I}}^d g'(d)$.
- (r3) For each $\delta \in \Delta$, $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \mathbb{R}) \vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg \delta^{(\rho)}$.
- (r4) Let $\gamma^{\mathbb{R} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}} = \gamma^{\mathbb{R}}$, $e^{\mathbb{R} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}} = e^{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\sigma \in H_{\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(f, b_1, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{R}}, \Theta^{(\rho)} \cup \Theta_{\partial \mathbb{Q}})$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbb{R} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0}^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$ holds. In particular $\sigma < e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{R}}$ if $s(\sigma) > \mathbb{S}$ by (62).

Note that $\bigcup \mathbb{Q} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta]$ need not to hold. Moreover $(\Theta \cup \{\sigma\})_{(\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\sigma\})} = \Theta_{\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{S})} = \Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})}$ and $\Theta_{\partial \mathbb{R}} = \Theta_{\partial \mathbb{Q}}$ by $\Theta^{(\rho)} \subset M_{\sigma}$ and (68).

In this subsection the ordinals γ_0 and b_1 will be fixed, and we write $\vdash_{c, \xi}^a$ for $\vdash_{c, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^a$.

Lemma 7.24 (Tautology) *Let $\{\gamma, \gamma_0, \mathbb{S}\} \cup \mathbb{k}^{\mathbb{T}}(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta_{\partial \mathbb{Q}}]$ for every $\mathbb{T} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}) \subset (\mathbb{S}+1)$, $\sigma \in \{\mathbf{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{k}(A) \subset M_{\sigma}$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{0, \mathbb{S}}^{2d} \neg A^{(\sigma)}$, $A^{(\sigma)}$ holds for $d = \max\{\mathbb{S}, \text{rk}(A)\}$.*

Lemma 7.25 (Inversion) *Let $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_{\iota})_{\iota \in J}$ and $(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi}^a \Gamma$ with $A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma$ and there is no $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ such that $\text{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S} \leq \xi$. Then for any $\iota \in [\mathbb{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}} J$, $(\mathcal{H}, \Theta \cup \mathbb{k}(\iota), \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi}^a \Gamma, (A_{\iota})^{(\rho)}$.*

Proof. We need to assume that there is no $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ such that $\text{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S} \leq \xi$ due to (Taut). \square

Lemma 7.26 (Reduction) *Let $C \simeq \bigvee (C_{\iota})_{\iota \in J}$ and $\Omega \leq \text{rk}(C) \leq c$. Assume $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi}^a \Gamma, \neg C^{(\tau)}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi}^b C^{(\tau)}, \Gamma$ with $SSt \cap (c, \xi] = \emptyset$.*

Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi}^{a+b} \Gamma$.

Lemma 7.27 (Cut-elimination) *If $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c+c_1, \xi}^a \Gamma$ with $\Omega \leq c < \mathbb{I}$, $\forall \mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q})(c \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta_{\partial \mathbb{Q}}])$ and $SSt \cap (c, \xi] = \emptyset$, then $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c, \xi}^{\varphi_{c_1}(\hat{a})} \Gamma$.*

Lemma 7.28 (Collapsing) *Let $\Gamma \subset \Sigma(\Omega)$ be a sets of uncapped formulas. Suppose $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}(\psi_{\Omega}(\gamma))$ and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \emptyset) \vdash_{\Omega, 0}^a \Gamma$. Let $\beta = \psi_{\Omega}(\hat{a})$ with $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^a < \gamma_0$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \Theta, \emptyset) \vdash_{\beta, 0}^{\beta} \Gamma^{(\beta, \Omega)}$ holds.*

7.5 Eliminations of stable ordinals

Lemma 7.29 (Capping) *Let $\Gamma \cup \Pi \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{I})$ be a set of uncapped formulas. Suppose $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \vdash_{c, \gamma_0}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$, where $a, c < \mathbb{I}$, $\text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}) \subset c$, $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathbf{u}} \cup \bigcup_{\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi})} \Gamma_{\mathbb{S}}$, $\Pi^{[\cdot]} = \bigcup_{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}} \Pi_{\sigma}^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$.*

For each $\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi})$, let $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^{g_{\mathbb{S}}}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}})$ be an ordinal with an ordinal $\delta_{\mathbb{S}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta]$ and a special finite function $g_{\mathbb{S}} = m(\rho_{\mathbb{S}}) : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ such that $\text{supp}(g_{\mathbb{S}}) = \{c\}$ with $g_{\mathbb{S}}(c) = \alpha_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}$, $\mathbb{I}(2a+1) \leq \alpha_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}$, $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g_{\mathbb{S}}) = SC_{\mathbb{I}}(c, \alpha_{\mathbb{S}}) \subset \mathcal{H}_0(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}})) \cap \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta]$, cf. (55) and (67). Also let $\hat{\Pi} = \bigcup_{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\Pi}} \Pi_{\sigma}^{(\sigma)}$, $\hat{\Gamma} = \Gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{u})} \cup \bigcup_{\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}_{\Pi})} \Gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})}$.

Let \mathbf{Q} be a finite family for $\gamma_0 \geq \gamma$ such that $\mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}\}$ for $\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi) = \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q})$, $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} + \mathbb{I}}(0)$ for $\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q})$, and $\alpha_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I} \leq \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} \leq \delta_{\mathbb{S}} < \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} + \mathbb{I}$. Also $e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} = \rho_{\mathbb{S}} + 1$.

Assume $\forall \mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi) (\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta])$, $\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \subset \rho_{\mathbb{S}}$, $\Theta \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}$, $\mathbf{p}_0(\sigma) \leq \mathbf{p}_0(\rho_{\mathbb{S}}) = \delta_{\mathbb{S}}$ and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(m(\sigma)) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}}[\Theta \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}]$ for each $(\mathbb{S}, \sigma) \in \mathbf{Q}_\Pi$, $\forall \{\mathbb{U} < \mathbb{S}\} \subset \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi) (\rho_{\mathbb{S}} \in M_{\rho_{\mathbb{U}}})$, and \mathbf{Q} has gaps 2^a .

Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{c,c,\gamma_0,c}^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \widehat{\Pi}$ holds for $\Theta_\Pi = \Theta \cup \bigcup \mathbf{Q}_\Pi$.

Remark 7.30 When $\alpha_{\mathbb{S}} = \mathbb{I}(2a)$ and $\Theta = \emptyset$, $\delta_{\mathbb{S}} < \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} + \mathbb{I}$ denotes the natural sum $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} \# a \# c$. Then $\Theta \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}$ and $\{a, c\} \subset \mathcal{H}_0(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}}))$. Hence (55) is enjoyed for $\rho_{\mathbb{S}}$. Namely $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g_{\mathbb{S}}) = \{c, \alpha_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}\} \subset \mathcal{H}_0(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}})) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\delta_{\mathbb{S}}}(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}}))$ holds.

Let $\mathbb{U} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \cap \mathbb{S}$. We have $\{\gamma_0, \mathbb{S}, a, c\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{U})}]$ by (58). We intend to be $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} = \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I} \cdot 2^a \cdot n$ for $n = \#\{\mathbb{T} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}) : \mathbb{T} \geq \mathbb{S}\}$. Then $\{\mathbb{S}, a, c, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{U})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}}]$ for (64) and (65).

On the other hand we have $\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \subset \rho_{\mathbb{S}}$, and $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} = \max(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S}))$, i.e., $\partial \mathbf{Q} = \{\rho_{\mathbb{S}} : \mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi)\}$. Also $\{\mathbb{S}, \delta_{\mathbb{S}}\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g_{\mathbb{S}}) \subset \mathcal{H}_0(\{\mathbb{S}, a, c, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}\} \cup \Theta) \subset M_{\rho_{\mathbb{U}}} = \mathcal{H}_{\delta_{\mathbb{U}}}(\rho_{\mathbb{U}})$ for $\mathbb{U} \leq \mathbb{S}$. Therefore $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} \in M_{\rho_{\mathbb{U}}}$ for $\mathbb{U} < \mathbb{S}$ by $\delta_{\mathbb{S}}, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} + \mathbb{I} \leq \gamma_{\mathbb{U}}^{\mathbb{Q}}$. Moreover $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} \in M_{\rho_{\mathbb{U}}}$ for $\mathbb{U} > \mathbb{S}$ since $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} < \mathbb{S} < \rho_{\mathbb{U}}$.

Proof of Lemma 7.29. This is seen by induction on a as in Capping 6.44. Let us write \vdash_c^a for $\vdash_{c,c,\gamma_0,c}^a$ in the proof. By assumptions we have $\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \subset \rho_{\mathbb{S}}$ and $\Theta \subset M_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}$. Hence $\Theta = \Theta^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})} = \Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}}$ and $\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})} = \Theta_{\mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S})}$. On the other hand we have $\mathbf{k}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ and for $\sigma \in \bigcup \mathbf{Q}_\Pi$, $\mathbf{k}(\Pi_\sigma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\sigma)}]$ by (57). Therefore (63) and (66) are enjoyed. We have $\{\gamma, a, c, \gamma_0, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{S}\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{U})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}}]$ for every $\{\mathbb{U} \leq \mathbb{S}\} \subset \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}) = \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_\Pi)$ by the assumption, (58) and (59). Hence (64) and (65) are enjoyed. Moreover for (67) we have $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(m(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ and $\gamma \leq \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Case 1. First consider the case when the last inference is a (stbl(\mathbb{S})): We have a successor stable ordinal \mathbb{S} , an ordinal $a_0 < a$, a \wedge -formula $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$, and a term $u \in Tm(\mathbb{I})$ with $\mathbb{S} \leq \text{rk}(B(u)) < c$.

For every ordinal σ such that $\Theta \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_\sigma$ and $\mathbf{p}_0(\sigma) \geq \gamma_0$

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{[1]} \quad (\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \neg B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}, \Pi^{[1]}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbf{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{[1]}}$$

Let h be a special finite function such that $\text{supp}(h) = \{c\}$ and $h(c) = \mathbb{I}(2a_0 + 1)$. Then $h_c = (g_{\mathbb{S}})_c = \emptyset$ and $h^c <_{\mathbb{I}}^c (g_{\mathbb{S}})'(c)$ by $h(c) = \mathbb{I}(2a_0 + 1) < \mathbb{I}(2a) \leq \alpha_0 = (g_{\mathbb{S}})'(c)$. Let $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \rho_{\mathbb{S}})\}$ and $\sigma \in H_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}^{\mathbf{R}}(h, c, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}}, \Theta^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}})$, where $\Theta^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})} \cup \Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}} = \Theta$.

For example let $\sigma = \psi_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}^h(\delta_{\mathbb{S}} + \eta)$ with $\eta = \max(\{1\} \cup E_{\mathbb{S}}(\Theta))$. We obtain $\Theta \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\delta_{\mathbb{S}}}(\sigma) = M_\sigma$ by $\Theta \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_\rho$, and $\{\delta_{\mathbb{S}}, a_0, c\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$. Let $\rho_{\mathbb{U}} \in \partial \mathbf{R}$. We claim that $\sigma \in M_{\rho_{\mathbb{U}}}$. If $\mathbb{U} \geq \mathbb{S}$, then $\sigma < \rho_{\mathbb{U}}$. Let $\mathbb{U} < \mathbb{S}$. Then we have $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} \in M_{\rho_{\mathbb{U}}}$ by the assumption, and $\sigma \in M_{\rho_{\mathbb{U}}}$ follows from $\{c, a_0, \delta_{\mathbb{S}}\} \cup \Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \subset \mathcal{H}_{\delta_{\mathbb{U}}}(\rho_{\mathbb{U}})$ and $\delta_{\mathbb{S}} + \eta < \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}} + \mathbb{I} \leq \gamma_{\mathbb{U}}^{\mathbf{R}} \leq \delta_{\mathbb{U}}$. Therefore $\sigma \in H_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}^{\mathbf{R}}(h, c, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}}, \Theta^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}})$.

Since \mathbb{Q} is assumed to have gaps 2^a , we may assume that $\mathbb{R} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}$ as well as \mathbb{R} has gaps 2^{a_0} .

IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbb{R}) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, B(u)^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})}, \widehat{\Pi}$, and for $u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \in Tm(\mathbb{S})$ and $B(u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \equiv B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}, \mathbb{R} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, \neg B(u)^{(\sigma)}, \widehat{\Pi}$ follows, where $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} > \sigma \in M_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}$ and we have by (59), $k(B(u)) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{T})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}}]$ if $\text{rk}(B(u)) \geq \mathbb{T}$. Hence $k(B(u)) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{T})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}}]$ by $\Theta_{\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{T})} = \Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{T})}$ for (59). Moreover we have $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ for every $\mathbb{T} < c$, $\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})} \cup \Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}} \subset M_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}$ for (68), $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} < e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ for (r0), $\text{rk}(B(u)) < c$ and $s(\rho_{\mathbb{S}}) \leq c$ for (r1).

We obtain by an inference ($\text{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho_{\mathbb{S}}, c, h, c)$)

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbb{R}) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, B(u)^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})}, \widehat{\Pi} \quad (\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}, \mathbb{R} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, \neg B(u)^{(\sigma)}, \widehat{\Pi}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \widehat{\Pi}}$$

in the right upper sequents σ ranges over the resolvent class $\sigma \in H_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}^{\mathbb{R}}(h, c, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{R}}, \Theta^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}})$.

Case 2. When the last inference is a (*cut*): There exist $a_0 < a$ and C such that $\text{rk}(C) < c$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, -C; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, C; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. IH followed by a (*cut*) with an uncapped cut formula $C^{(\text{u})}$ yields the lemma.

Case 3. Third the last inference introduces a \bigvee -formula A in Γ . Let $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. Then $A^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})} \in \Gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})}$. There are an $\iota \in J$, an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathbb{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{[\cdot]}$. We can assume $k(\iota) \subset k(A_\iota)$, and claim that $\iota \in [\partial\mathbb{Q}]J$ with $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} \in \partial\mathbb{Q}$. We obtain $k(\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}}] \subset M_{\partial\mathbb{Q}}$ by (57) for $\Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}} = \Theta$ and $\gamma \leq \gamma_0 \leq \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} \leq \delta_{\mathbb{S}} \leq \text{po}(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})$.

IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_c^{a(\iota)} \widehat{\Gamma}, (A_\iota)^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})}, \widehat{\Pi}$. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \widehat{\Pi}$ follows from a (\bigvee).

Other cases are seen from IH as in Capping 6.44. \square

Lemma 7.31 (Recapping)

Let \mathbb{S} be a successor stable ordinal, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \vdash_{c_1, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_2}^a \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}$ with a finite family \mathbb{Q} for γ_0, b_2 , $\Gamma \cup \Pi \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{I})$, and $\widehat{\Gamma} = \bigcup \{\Gamma_\rho^{(\rho)} : \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t(\mathbb{S})\}$, where each $\theta \in \widehat{\Gamma}$ is either a \bigvee -formula or $\text{rk}(\theta) < \mathbb{S}$, $\mathbb{Q}^t \subset \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\mathbb{Q}^t(\mathbb{S}) \subset \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S})$ with $\text{dom}(\mathbb{Q}^t) \subset \{\mathbb{S}\}$ and $\forall \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t(\mathbb{S})(s(\rho) > \mathbb{S})$, and \mathbb{Q}^f is a family such that $\mathbb{Q}^f(\mathbb{S}) = \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \setminus \mathbb{Q}^t(\mathbb{S})$ and $\mathbb{Q}^f(\mathbb{T}) = \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\mathbb{T} \neq \mathbb{S}$. Π is a set of formulas such that $\tau \in \{\text{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathbb{Q}^f$ for every $A^{(\tau)} \in \Pi$.

Let $\max\{s(\rho) : \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t(\mathbb{S})\} \leq b_1$ and $\omega(b, a) = \omega^{\omega^b} a$. For each $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t(\mathbb{S})$, let $\mathbb{S} \leq b^{(\rho)} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\rho)}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}}]$ with $\text{rk}(\Gamma_\rho) < b^{(\rho)} < s(\rho)$, and $\kappa(\rho)$ be ordinals such that $\kappa(\rho) \in H_{\rho}^{\mathbb{Q}}(h^{b^{(\rho)}}(m(\rho); \omega(b_1, a)), b_2, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}, \Theta^{(\rho)} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}})$. Assume $\forall \mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}(b_1 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial\mathbb{Q}}])$.

Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}^\kappa) \vdash_{c_{b_1, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_2}}^{\omega(b_1, a)} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}_\kappa$ holds, where $\widehat{\Gamma}_\kappa = \bigcup \{\Gamma_\rho^{(\kappa(\rho))} : \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t(\mathbb{S})\}$, $c_{b_1} = \max\{c_1, b_1\}$, $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa = \mathbb{Q}^f \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \kappa(\rho)) : \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t(\mathbb{S})\}$, $\gamma_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbb{Q}^\kappa} = \gamma_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbb{Q}}$, $e_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbb{Q}^\kappa} = e_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ for $\mathbb{T} \neq \mathbb{S}$ and $e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}^\kappa} = \max\{\tau \in \mathbb{Q}^f(\mathbb{S}) : s(\tau) > \mathbb{S}\} \cup \{\kappa(\rho) : \rho \in \mathbb{Q}^t(\mathbb{S})\} + 1$.

$e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}^\kappa} < e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ holds when $\mathbb{Q}^t = \{(\mathbb{S}, \rho) \in \mathbb{Q} : s(\rho) > \mathbb{S}\} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. This is shown by main induction on b_1 with subsidiary induction on a as in Recapping 6.47. \square

Lemma 7.32 (Elimination of one stable ordinal)

Let $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger$ be a successor stable ordinal and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_1}^a \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}$ with a finite family \mathbf{Q} for γ_0 and $b_1 \geq \mathbb{S}$, $\Pi \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{I})$, $\Gamma \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$, $\widehat{\Gamma} = \bigcup \{\Gamma_\rho^{(\rho)} : \rho \in \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S})\}$, and $\mathbf{Q}^t = \{(\mathbb{S}, \tau) \in \mathbf{Q} : s(\tau) > \mathbb{S}\}$, $\mathbf{Q}^f = \mathbf{Q} \setminus \mathbf{Q}^t$. Π is a set of formulas such that for each $A^{(\tau)} \in \Pi$, $\tau \in \{\mathbf{u}\} \cup \bigcup_{\mathbb{U} < \mathbb{S}} \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{U})$.

Let $\tilde{a} = \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{S}}}(a)$, $\mathbf{Q}_1 = \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \mathbb{S} = \{(\mathbb{T}, \rho) \in \mathbf{Q} : \mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}\}$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} + \mathbb{I} < \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}^2$.

Then \mathbf{Q}_1 is a finite family for γ_1, b_1 and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{\tilde{a}} \Pi, \Gamma^{(\mathbf{u})}$ holds for $\Gamma^{(\mathbf{u})} = \bigcup \{\Gamma_\rho^{(\mathbf{u})} : \rho \in \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S})\}$.

Proof. This is seen by main induction on $e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ with subsidiary induction on a as in Lemma 6.48. When $\mathbb{S} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q})$, we have $\mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}$ and $e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}$ for $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} + \mathbb{I}$ by Definition 7.19. \mathbf{Q}_1 is a finite family for γ_1, b_1 . Then $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}_1}(\mathbb{T})] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}}]$ for every $\mathbb{T} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_1)$ by (64).

First assume $\mathbf{Q}^t(\mathbb{S}) \neq \emptyset$. For each $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}^t(\mathbb{S})$, let $\kappa(\rho)$ be an ordinal such that $\kappa(\rho) \in H_\rho^{\mathbb{Q}}(h^{\mathbb{S}}(m(\rho); \omega(b_1, a)), b_1, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}, \Theta^{(\rho)} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}})$ with $\omega(b, a) = \omega^{\omega^b} a$. We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}^\kappa) \vdash_{b_1, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_1}^{\omega(b_1, a)} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}_\kappa$ by Recapping 7.31. Cut-elimination 7.27 with $SSt \cap (\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}) = \emptyset$ yields for $a_1 = \varphi_{b_1}(\omega(b_1, a))$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}^\kappa) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_1} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}_\kappa$, where $e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}^\kappa} = \max\{\kappa(\rho) : \rho \in \mathbf{Q}^t(\mathbb{S})\} + 1 < e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}$. MIH yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{\tilde{a}_1} \Pi, \Gamma^{(\mathbf{u})}$, where $\tilde{a}_1 = \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}^\kappa}}(a_1) < \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}}}(a)$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbb{Q}} + \mathbb{I}$.

In what follows assume $\mathbf{Q}^t(\mathbb{S}) = \emptyset$.

Case 1. First let $\{\neg A^{(\sigma)}, A^{(\sigma)}\} \subset \Pi \cup \widehat{\Gamma}$ with $\sigma \in \{\mathbf{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathbf{Q}$ and $d = \text{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S}$ by (Taut). If $d < \mathbb{T}$, then $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{\tilde{a}} \Pi, \Gamma^{(\mathbf{u})}$ by (Taut).

Let $\mathbb{T} \leq d < \mathbb{S}$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{0, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{2d} \Pi, \Gamma^{(\mathbf{u})}$ by Tautology 7.24 and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{0, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{\tilde{a}} \Pi, \Gamma^{(\mathbf{u})}$ by $\tilde{a} > \mathbb{S} > d$.

Case 2. Second consider the case when the last inference is a $(\text{rfl}_{\mathbb{U}}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$. If $\mathbb{U} \leq \mathbb{T}$, then SIH followed by a $(\text{rfl}_{\mathbb{U}}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$ yields the lemma. Let $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{S}$.

Let $g = m(\rho)$ and $s(\rho) \geq d \in \text{supp}(g)$. Let $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \rho)\}$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}} + \mathbb{I}$. We have a sequent $\Delta \subset \bigvee_{\mathbb{S}}(d)$ and an ordinal $a_0 < a$ such that $\text{rk}(\Delta) < d \leq s(\rho)$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{R}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_0} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}, -\delta^{(\rho)}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$. On the other hand we have $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbf{R} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_0} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$, where $\sigma \in H_\rho^{\mathbb{Q}}(f, b_1, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}}, \Theta^{(\rho)} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}})$, f is a special finite function such that $s(f) \leq b_1$, $f_d = g_d$, $f^d <^d g^d(d)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}}}[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$.

Case 2.1. $s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S}$: Then $\Delta \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$. Let $\tilde{a}_0 = \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}}}(a_0)$. SIH yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{\tilde{a}_0} \Pi, \Gamma^{(\mathbf{u})}, -\delta^{(\mathbf{u})}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$, and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{\tilde{a}_0} \Pi, \Gamma^{(\mathbf{u})}, \Delta^{(\mathbf{u})}$ for $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}} + \mathbb{I}} = \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}$. We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{\tilde{a}_0 + p} \Pi, \Gamma^{(\mathbf{u})}$ by several (cut)'s for a $p < \omega$. Cut-elimination 7.27 with $SSt \cap (\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}) = \emptyset$ yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{\varphi_{\mathbb{S}}(\tilde{a}_0 + p)} \Pi, \Gamma^{(\mathbf{u})}$, where $\varphi_{\mathbb{S}}(\tilde{a}_0 + p) < \tilde{a} = \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}}}(a)$ by $b_1 + e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}} > \mathbb{S}$.

Case 2.2. $s(\rho) > \mathbb{S}$: Then $\mathbb{S} \notin \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q})$ and $\Gamma = \emptyset$. We have $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{R}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_1}^a \Pi$. Let $\mathbf{R}^t = \{(\mathbb{S}, \rho)\}$. Recapping 7.31 yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{R}^\kappa) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_1}^{\omega(b_1, a)} \Pi$ and $e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}^\kappa} = \kappa + 1 < \rho < e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}}$. MIH yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{a_1} \Pi$ with $a_1 = \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}^\kappa}}(\omega(b_1, a)) < \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}}}(a) = \tilde{a}$ by $e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{R}^\kappa} < \mathbb{S} = e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}}$.

Case 3. The last inference is a (\wedge) : We have $a(\iota) < a$, $A^{(\rho)} \in \widehat{\Gamma}$ and for each $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}}J$ with $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, we have $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a(\iota)} \Pi, \widehat{\Gamma}, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$. Since $A \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$, we obtain $\mathbf{k}(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\rho)}] \cap \mathbb{S} \subset M_\rho \cap \mathbb{S} = \rho$ for $\rho \in \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{S})$. This means $A \in \Delta_0(\rho)$, and $[\rho]J = J$. Hence $[\mathbf{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}}J = [\mathbf{Q}_1]_{A^{(u)}}J$. SIH yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta \cup \mathbf{k}(\iota), \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{\tilde{a}(\iota)} \Pi, \Gamma^{(u)}, (A_\iota)^{(u)}$ for each $\iota \in [\mathbf{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}}J$, where $\tilde{a}(\iota) = \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathbf{Q}}}(b + a(\iota)) < \tilde{a}$. A (\wedge) yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_1, b_1}^{\tilde{a}} \Pi, \Gamma^{(u)}$.

Other cases are seen from SIH. \square

Definition 7.33 We define the S -rank $\text{srk}(A^{(\rho)})$ of a capped formula $A^{(\rho)}$ as follows. Let $\text{srk}(A^{(u)}) = 0$, and $\text{srk}(A^{(\rho)}) = \mathbb{S}$ for $\rho \prec \mathbb{S} \in SSt$.

$$\text{srk}(\Gamma) = \max\{\text{srk}(A^{(\rho)}) : A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma\}.$$

Lemma 7.34 (Elimination of stable ordinals)

Suppose $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{\xi, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^a \Gamma$ and $\text{srk}(\Gamma) \leq \mathbb{S} < \xi \leq b_1 < \mathbb{I}$, where \mathbb{S} is either a stable ordinal or $\mathbb{S} = \Omega$ such that $\forall \mathbb{U} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{S}})(\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{U})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}}])$ for $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{S}} = \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \mathbb{S}$.

Then there exists an ordinal $\gamma_0 \leq \gamma_S < \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}^2$ such that $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{S}}$ is a finite family for γ_S, b_1 and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_S}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{S}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_S, b_1}^{f(\xi, a)} \Gamma$ holds for $f(\xi, a) = \varphi_{b_1 + \xi + 1}(a)$.

Proof. By main induction on ξ with subsidiary induction on a . (64) in

$(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_S}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{S}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_S, b_1}^{f(\xi, a)} \Gamma$ follows from (64) and (65) in $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{\xi, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^a \Gamma$.

Case 1. Consider the case when the last inference is a $(\text{rf}_{\mathbb{T}}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$ for a $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{U}^\dagger \leq \xi$. If $\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}$, then SIH yields the lemma. Let $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{T} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{R})$ for $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q} \cup \{(\mathbb{T}, \rho)\}$. We have $\forall \mathbb{U} \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{T}})(\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{U})}] \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}}])$ by (64). Let Δ be a finite set of sentences such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{R}) \vdash_{\xi, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg \delta^{(\rho)}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$, and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{R} \cup \{(\mathbb{T}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_{\xi, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_0} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$ for each $\sigma \in H_\rho^{\mathbf{Q}}(f, b_1 \gamma_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbf{R}}, \Theta^{(\rho)} \cup \{\mathbb{T}\} \cup \Theta_{\partial \mathbf{Q}})$, and $a_0 < a$. We have $\text{srk}(\delta^{(\rho)}) = \text{srk}(\Delta^{(\sigma)}) = \mathbb{T}$. By SIH there exists a $\gamma_{\mathbb{T}} < \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}^2$ such that for $a_1 = f(\xi, a_0) = \varphi_{b_1 + \xi + 1}(a_0)$, $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{T}}}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{T}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_{\mathbb{T}}, b_1}^{a_1} \Gamma, \neg \delta^{(\rho)}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$, and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{T}}}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{T}} \cup \{(\mathbb{T}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_{\mathbb{T}}, b_1}^{a_1} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$. $(\text{rf}_{\mathbb{T}}(\rho, d, f, b_1))$ yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{T}}}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{T}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}, \gamma_{\mathbb{T}}, b_1}^{a_2} \Gamma$ for $a_2 = a_1 + 1$.

On the other hand we have $\text{srk}(\Gamma) \leq \mathbb{S} < \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{U}^\dagger \leq \xi$. By Lemma 7.32 pick a $\gamma_{\mathbb{U}} < \gamma_{\mathbb{T}} + \mathbb{I}^2 = \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}^2$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{U}}}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{U}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U}, \gamma_{\mathbb{U}}, b_1}^{a_3} \Gamma$, where $a_3 = \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbf{Q}_1}}(a_2) = \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbf{Q}_1}}(f(\xi, a_0) + 1) < \varphi_{b_1 + \xi + 1}(a) = f(\xi, a)$ by $e_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbf{Q}_1} \leq \mathbb{T} \leq \xi$. If $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{U}$, then we are done. Let $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{U}$ with $\mathbb{U} < \xi$. Then by MIH pick a $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{S}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}, b_1}^{a_4} \Gamma$ for $a_4 = f(\mathbb{U}, a_3) = \varphi_{b_1 + \mathbb{U} + 1}(a_3) < \varphi_{b_1 + \xi + 1}(a) = f(\xi, a)$ by $\mathbb{U} < \xi$.

Case 2. Next consider the case when the last inference is a (cut) of a cut formula $C^{(\sigma)}$ with $\text{rk}(C) < \xi$ and $\mathbb{T} = \text{srk}(C^{(\sigma)}) \leq \xi$. We have an ordinal $a_0 < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{\xi, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg C^{(\sigma)}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}) \vdash_{\xi, \xi, \gamma_0, b_1}^{a_0} C^{(\sigma)}, \Gamma$.

Let $\mathbb{U} = \max\{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}\}$. First assume $\mathbb{U} < \xi$. By SIH pick a $\gamma_{\mathbb{U}}$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{U}}}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{U}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U}, \gamma_{\mathbb{U}}, b_1}^{a_1} \Gamma, \neg C^{(\sigma)}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{U}}}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{U}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U}, \gamma_{\mathbb{U}}, b_1}^{a_1} C^{(\sigma)}, \Gamma$, where $a_1 = f(\xi, a_0) = \varphi_{b_1 + \xi + 1}(a_0)$. A (cut) yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{U}}}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{U}}) \vdash_{\xi, \mathbb{U}, \gamma_{\mathbb{U}}, b_1}^{a_1 + 1} \Gamma$. Cut-elimination 7.27 with $SSt \cap (\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U}) = \emptyset$ yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{U}}}, \Theta, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{U}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U}, \gamma_{\mathbb{U}}, b_1}^{a_2} \Gamma$, where $a_2 = \varphi_\xi(a_1 + 1) < \varphi_{b_1 + \xi + 1}(a) = f(\xi, a)$ by $\xi < b_1 + \xi + 1$. If $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{S}$, then we are done. Let

$\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{T} > \mathbb{S}$. By MIH with $\mathbb{U} < \xi$ we obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{S}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}, b_1}^{a_3} \Gamma$ for a $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}$, where $a_3 = f(\mathbb{U}, a_2) = \varphi_{b_1 + \mathbb{U} + 1}(a_2) < \varphi_{b_1 + \xi + 1}(a) = f(\xi, a)$ by $\mathbb{U} < \xi$.

Second let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{U} = \xi = \mathbb{W}^\dagger > \mathbb{S}$. Then $C \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{T})$. By Lemma 7.32 pick a $\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{W}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{W}, \mathbb{W}, \gamma_{\mathbb{W}}, b_1}^{\tilde{a}_0} \Gamma, \neg C^{(u)}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{W}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{W}, \mathbb{W}, \gamma_{\mathbb{W}}, b_1}^{\tilde{a}_0} C^{(u)}, \Gamma$, where $\tilde{a}_0 = \varphi_{b_1 + e_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbb{a}}}(a_0)$. A (cut) yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{W}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{W}, \gamma_{\mathbb{W}}, b_1}^{\tilde{a}_0 + 1} \Gamma$, and we obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{W}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{W}, \mathbb{W}, \gamma_{\mathbb{W}}, b_1}^{a_4} \Gamma$ by Cut-elimination 7.27, where $a_4 = \varphi_{\mathbb{T}}(\tilde{a}_0 + 1)$ and $SSt \cap (\mathbb{W}, \mathbb{W}) = \emptyset$. By MIH pick a $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{S}}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}, b_1}^{a_5} \Gamma$ for $\mathbb{W} < \xi$ and $a_5 = f(\mathbb{W}, a_4) = \varphi_{b_1 + \mathbb{W} + 1}(a_4) < \varphi_{b_1 + \xi + 1}(a)$ by $\mathbb{W} < \xi$, $\mathbb{T} = \xi < b_1 + \xi + 1$, $e_{\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbb{a}} \leq \mathbb{T} = \xi < \xi + 1$ and $a_0 < a$.

Case 3. There exists an A such that $\{-A^{(\rho)}, A^{(\rho)}\} \subset \Gamma$ with $\text{srk}(A^{(\rho)}) \leq \mathbb{S}$ and $d = \text{rk}(A) < \mathbb{T} \leq \xi$ for a $\mathbb{T} \in SSt$ by (Taut). We may assume $d \geq \mathbb{S}$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \Theta, \mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{S}}) \vdash_{0, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_0, b_1}^{2d} \Gamma$ by Tautology 7.24 and the lemma follows from $d < \xi < f(\xi, a)$.

Other cases are seen from SIH. \square

Theorem 7.35 *Suppose $KP\omega + \Pi_1$ -Collection + $(V = L) \vdash \theta^{L\Omega}$ for a Σ_1 -sentence θ . Then $L_{\psi_{\Omega}(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})} \models \theta$ holds.*

Proof. Let $S_{\mathbb{I}} \vdash \theta^{L\Omega}$ for a Σ -sentence θ . By Embedding 7.16 pick an $m > 0$ so that $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{I}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\mathbb{I}+m}^{*\mathbb{I} \cdot 2 + m} \theta^{L\Omega}$. Cut-elimination 7.17 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{I}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\mathbb{I}}^{*a} \theta^{L\Omega}$ for $a = \omega_m(\mathbb{I} \cdot 2 + m) < \omega_{m+1}(\mathbb{I} + 1)$. Then Collapsing 7.18 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\beta}^{*\beta} \theta^{L\Omega}$ for $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\hat{a}) \in LS$ with $\hat{a} = \omega^{\mathbb{I}+a} = \omega_{m+1}(\mathbb{I} \cdot 2 + m) > \beta$. Capping 7.29 then yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \emptyset, \emptyset) \vdash_{\beta, \beta, \gamma_0, \beta}^{\beta} \theta^{L\Omega}$ where $\gamma_0 = \hat{a} + 1$ and $\theta^{L\Omega} \equiv (\theta^{L\Omega})^{(u)}$.

Let $\alpha = \varphi_{\beta \cdot 2 + 1}(\beta)$. By Lemma 7.34 we obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\Omega}}, \emptyset, \emptyset) \vdash_{\Omega, \Omega, \gamma_{\Omega}, \beta}^{\alpha} \theta^{L\Omega}$ for a $\gamma_{\Omega} < \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}^2$. This means $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\Omega}}, \emptyset, \emptyset) \vdash_{\Omega, 0, \gamma_{\Omega}, \beta}^{\alpha} \theta^{L\Omega}$. $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\Omega} + \alpha + 1}, \emptyset, \emptyset) \vdash_{\delta, 0, \gamma_{\Omega}, \beta}^{\delta} \theta^{L\Omega}$ follows from Collapsing 7.28 for $\delta = \psi_{\Omega}(\gamma_{\Omega} + \alpha)$ with $\omega^{\alpha} = \alpha$. Cut-elimination 7.27 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\Omega} + \alpha + 1}, \emptyset, \emptyset) \vdash_{0, 0, \gamma_{\Omega}, \beta}^{\varphi_{\delta}(\delta)} \theta^{L\Omega}$. We see that $\theta^{L\Omega}$ is true by induction up to $\varphi_{\delta}(\delta)$, where $\delta < \psi_{\Omega}(\omega_{m+2}(\mathbb{I} + 1)) < \psi_{\Omega}(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})$.

7.6 Well-foundedness proof in Σ_3^1 -DC+BI

Theorem 7.36 [A ∞ c]

Σ_3^1 -DC+BI $\vdash Wo[\alpha]$ for each $\alpha < \psi_{\Omega}(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})$.

To prove Theorem 7.36, let us introduce 1-distinguished sets $D_1[X]$, which is obtained from Definition 3.5.1 of distinguished sets $D[X]$, first by replacing the next regular α^+ by the next stable α^\dagger , and second by changing the well-founded part $W(C^\alpha(X))$ to the maximal distinguished set $\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(X) = \bigcup\{P : D_0^\alpha[P; X]\}$ relative to α and X , where $P \cap \alpha = X \cap \alpha$ if $D_0^\alpha[P; X]$ and α is stable. We see that $\mathcal{W} = \bigcup\{X : D_1[X]\}$ is the maximal 1-distinguished and Σ_3^1 -class.

In this subsection let us sketch a part of a well-foundedness proof in Σ_3^1 -DC+BI by pinpointing the lemma for which we need Σ_3^1 -DC.

An ordinal term σ in $OT(\mathbb{I})$ is said to be *regular* if $\psi_\sigma^f(a)$ is in $OT(\mathbb{I})$ for some f and a . *Reg* denotes the set of regular terms. In this section we need the next

regular ordinal above an ordinal α in defining distinguished sets. Although it is customarily denoted by α^+ , it is hard to discriminate α^+ from the next stable ordinal α^\dagger . Therefore let us write for $\alpha < \mathbb{I}$, $\alpha^{+1} = \min\{\sigma \in SSt : \sigma > \alpha\}$ for the next stable ordinal α^\dagger , and $\alpha^{+0} = \min\{\sigma \in Reg : \sigma > \alpha\}$ for the next regular ordinal α^+ . Let $\alpha^{+1} := \alpha^{+0} := \infty$ if $\alpha \geq \mathbb{I}$. Let $\alpha^{-1} := \max\{\sigma \in St_{\mathbb{I}} \cup \{0\} : \sigma \leq \alpha\}$ when $\alpha < \mathbb{I}$, and $\alpha^{-1} := \mathbb{I}$ if $\alpha \geq \mathbb{I}$. Since $SSt \subset Reg$, we obtain $\alpha^{+0} \leq \alpha^{+1}$ and $\beta^{+0} < \sigma$ if $\beta < \sigma \in St$ since each $\sigma \in St$ is a limit of regular ordinals.

Definition 7.37 $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ is the closure of $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}\} \cup (X \cap \alpha)$ under $+$, φ , $\{\sigma, \beta\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \mapsto \psi_\sigma^f(\beta)$ for $\sigma > \alpha$, and $\rho \mapsto \mathbb{I}[\rho], \rho^\dagger$ for $\mathbb{I}[\rho], \rho^\dagger \geq \alpha$ in $OT(\mathbb{I})$.

Definition 7.38 For $P, X \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ and $\gamma \in OT(\mathbb{I}) \cap \mathbb{I}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} W_0^\alpha(P) &:= W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)) \\ D_0^\gamma[P; X] &:\Leftrightarrow P \cap \gamma^{-1} = X \cap \gamma^{-1} \ \& \ Wo[X \cap \gamma^{-1}] \ \& \\ &\quad \forall \alpha \left(\gamma^{-1} \leq \alpha \leq P \rightarrow W_0^\alpha(P) \cap \alpha^{+0} = P \cap \alpha^{+0} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X) &:= \bigcup \{P \subset OT(\mathbb{I}) : D_0^\gamma[P; X]\} \\ D_1[X] &:\Leftrightarrow Wo[X] \ \& \ \forall \gamma \left(\gamma \leq X \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{+1} = X \cap \gamma^{+1} \right) \quad (70) \\ \mathcal{W}_2 &:= \bigcup \{X \subset OT(\mathbb{I}) : D_1[X]\} \end{aligned}$$

A set P is said to be a 0-distinguished set for γ and X if $D_0^\gamma[P; X]$, and a set X is a 1-distinguished set if $D_1[X]$.

Observe that in Σ_2^1 -AC, $W_0^\alpha(P)$ is Π_1^1 , $D_0^\gamma[P; X]$ is Δ_2^1 , $\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X)$ is Σ_2^1 , and $D_1[X]$ is Δ_3^1 . Hence \mathcal{W}_2 is a Σ_3^1 -class.

Let $\alpha \in P$ for a 0-distinguished set P for $\gamma < \mathbb{I}$ and X . If $\alpha < \gamma^{-1}$, then $\alpha \in X$ with $Wo[X]$. Otherwise $W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)) \cap \alpha^{+0} = W_0^\alpha(P) \cap \alpha^{+0} = P \cap \alpha^{+0}$ with $\alpha < \alpha^{+0}$. Hence P is a well order.

Lemma 7.39 (Σ_2^1 -CA)

Suppose $Wo[X \cap \gamma^{-1}]$. Then $\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X)$ is the maximal 0-distinguished set for γ and X , i.e., $D_0^\gamma[\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X); X]$ and $\exists Y (Y = \mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X))$.

Proof. This is seen as in Proposition 3.9. □

Lemma 7.40 1. Let X and Y be 1-distinguished sets.

$$\text{Then } \gamma \leq X \ \& \ \gamma \leq Y \Rightarrow X \cap \gamma^{+1} = Y \cap \gamma^{+1}.$$

2. \mathcal{W}_2 is the 1-maximal distinguished class, i.e., $D_1[\mathcal{W}_2]$.

3. For a family $\{Y_j\}_{j \in J}$ of 1-distinguished sets, the union $Y = \bigcup_{j \in J} Y_j$ is also a 1-distinguished set.

Lemma 7.41 1. $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}_2) \cap \mathbb{I} = \mathcal{W}_2 \cap \mathbb{I} = W(\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}_2)) \cap \mathbb{I}$.

2. (BI) For each $n < \omega$, $TI[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}_2) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I} + 1)]$, i.e., for each class \mathcal{X} , $\text{Pr}_g[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}_2), \mathcal{X}] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}_2) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I} + 1) \subset \mathcal{X}$.
3. For each $n < \omega$, $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}_2) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I} + 1) \subset W(\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}_2))$. In particular $\{\mathbb{I}, \omega_n(\mathbb{I} + 1)\} \subset W(\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}_2))$.

As in Definition 3.10, $\mathcal{G}^X := \{\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I}) : \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \& \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cap \alpha \subset X\}$.

Lemma 7.42 (Σ_2^1 -CA)

Suppose $D_1[Y]$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^Y$. Let $X = \mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha^{+1}$. Assume that one of the following conditions (71) and (72) is fulfilled. Then $\alpha \in X$ and $D_1[X]$. In particular $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_2$ holds. Moreover if $\alpha^{-1} \leq Y$, then $\alpha \in Y$ holds.

$$\forall \beta \left(Y \cap \alpha^{+1} < \beta \& \beta^{+0} < \alpha^{+0} \rightarrow W_0^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+0} \subset Y \right) \quad (71)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \beta \geq \alpha^{-1} \left(Y \cap \alpha^{+1} < \beta \& \beta^{+0} < \alpha^{+0} \rightarrow W_0^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+0} \subset Y \right) \\ \& \forall \beta < \alpha^{-1} \exists \gamma (\beta < \gamma^{+1} \& \gamma^{-1} \leq Y) \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Proof. This is seen as in Lemma 3.15 by showing that $D_0^\alpha[P; Y]$, $\alpha \in X$ and $D_1[X]$ for $P = W_0^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha^{+0} = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)) \cap \alpha^{+0}$. \square

Lemma 7.43 Assume $D_1[Y]$, $\mathbb{I} > \mathbb{S} \in Y \cap (St \cup \{0\})$ and $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Y$. Then $\mathbb{S}^{+1} = \mathbb{S}^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_2$.

Proof. Since the condition (72) in Lemma 3.15 is fulfilled with $(\mathbb{S}^{+1})^{-0} = (\mathbb{S}^{+1})^{-1} = \mathbb{S}^{+1}$ and $\mathbb{S}^{-1} = \mathbb{S}$, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{S}^{+1} \in \mathcal{G}^Y$. Let $\alpha = \mathbb{S}^{+1}$. $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)$ follows from $\mathbb{S} \in Y \cap \alpha$. Moreover $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha \Rightarrow \gamma \in Y$ is seen by induction on $\ell\gamma$ using the assumption $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Y$. Therefore $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^Y$. \square

Lemma 7.44 (Σ_3^1 -DC)

If $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{W}_2}$, then there exists a 1-distinguished set Z such that $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Z$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^Z$ and $\forall \mathbb{S} \in Z \cap (St \cup \{\Omega\})[\mathbb{S}^\dagger \in Z]$.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{W}_2}$. We have $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}_2)$. Pick a 1-distinguished set X_0 such that $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X_0)$. We can assume $\{0, \Omega\} \subset X_0$. On the other hand we have $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}_2) \cap \alpha \subset \mathcal{W}_2$ and $\forall \mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{W}_2 \cap (St_{\mathbb{I}} \cup \{\Omega\})[\mathbb{S}^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_2]$ by Lemma 7.43. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall n \forall X \exists Y \{D_1[X] \rightarrow D_1[Y] \\ \wedge & \forall \beta \in OT(\mathbb{I}) (\ell\beta \leq n \wedge \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cap \alpha \rightarrow \beta \in Y) \\ \wedge & \forall \mathbb{S} \in (St \cup \{\Omega\}) (\ell\mathbb{S} \leq n \wedge \mathbb{S} \in X \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^\dagger \in Y) \} \end{aligned}$$

Since $D_1[X]$ is Δ_3^1 , Σ_3^1 -DC yields a set Z such that $Z_0 = X_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall n \{ D_1[Z_n] \rightarrow D_1[Z_{n+1}] \\ \wedge & \quad \forall \beta \in OT(\mathbb{I}) (\ell\beta \leq n \wedge \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Z_n) \cap \alpha \rightarrow \beta \in Z_{n+1}) \\ \wedge & \quad \forall \mathbb{S} \in (St \cup \{\Omega\}) (\ell\mathbb{S} \leq n \wedge \mathbb{S} \in Z_n \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^\dagger \in Z_{n+1}) \} \end{aligned}$$

Let $Z = \bigcup_n Z_n$. We see by induction on n that $D_1[Z_n]$ for every n . Lemma 7.40.3 yields $D_1[Z]$. Let $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Z) \cap \alpha$. Pick an n such that $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Z_n)$ and $\ell\beta \leq n$. We obtain $\beta \in Z_{n+1} \subset Z$. Therefore $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^Z$. Furthermore let $\mathbb{S} \in Z \cap (St \cup \{\Omega\})$. Pick an n such that $\mathbb{S} \in Z_n$ and $\ell\mathbb{S} \leq n$. We obtain $\mathbb{S}^\dagger \in Z_{n+1} \subset Z$. \square

Remark 7.45 Lemma 7.44 is a Σ_4^1 -statement, which is proved in Σ_3^1 -DC. Alternatively we could prove the lemma in Σ_3^1 -AC if we assign fundamental sequences to limit ordinals as in [Jäger83].

References

- [A04] T. Arai, Wellfoundedness proofs by means of non-monotonic inductive definitions I: Π_2^0 -operators, *Jour. Symb. Logic* **69** (2004) 830–850.
- [A09] T. Arai, Iterating the recursively Mahlo operations, in *Proceedings of the thirteenth International Congress of Logic Methodology, Philosophy of Science*, eds. C. Glymour, W. Wei and D. Westerstahl (College Publications, King’s College, London, 2009), pp. 21–35.
- [A10] T. Arai, Wellfoundedness proofs by means of non-monotonic inductive definitions II: first order operators, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **162** (2010) 107–143.
- [A12] T. Arai, A sneak preview of proof theory of ordinals, *Ann. Japan Asso. Phil. Sci.* **20**(2012), 29–47.
- [A13] T. Arai, Proof theory of weak compactness, *Jour. Math. Logic* **13** (2013), 1350003.
- [A14a] T. Arai, Conservations of first-order reflections, *Jour. Symb. Logic* **79** (2014), pp. 814–825.
- [A14b] T. Arai, Lifting up proof theory to the countable ordinals: Zermelo-Fraenkel’s set theory, *Jour. Symb. Logic* **79** (2014), pp. 325–354.
- [A19] T. Arai, Wellfoundedness proof for first-order reflection, draft. posted to the arxiv.
- [A20] T. Arai, A simplified ordinal analysis of first-order reflection, *Jour. Symb. Logic*, **85** (2020), 1163–1185.

- [A ∞ a] T. Arai, Wellfoundedness proof with the maximal distinguished set, to appear in *Arch. Math. Logic*.
- [A ∞ b] T. Arai, An ordinal analysis of a single stable ordinal, submitted.
- [A ∞ c] T. Arai, An ordinal analysis of Π_1 -collection, draft.
- [A ∞ d] T. Arai, Well-foundedness proof for Π_1^1 -reflection, draft.
- [Buchholz75] W. Buchholz, Normalfunktionen und konstruktive Systeme von Ordinalzahlen. In: Diller, J., Müller, G. H. (eds.) *Proof Theory Symposium Keil 1974*, Lect. Notes Math. vol. 500, pp. 4-25, Springer (1975)
- [Buchholz86] W. Buchholz, A new system of proof-theoretic ordinal functions. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 32, 195-208 (1986)
- [Buchholz92] W. Buchholz, A simplified version of local predicativity, in *Proof Theory*, eds. P. H. G. Aczel, H. Simmons and S. S. Wainer (Cambridge UP, 1992), pp. 115–147.
- [Buchholz00] W. Buchholz, Review of the paper: A. Setzer, Well-ordering proofs for Martin-Löf type theory, *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 6 (2000) 478-479.
- [Jäger82] G. Jäger, Zur Beweistheorie der Kripke-Platek Mengenlehre über den natürlichen Zahlen, *Archiv f. math. Logik u. Grundl.*, 22(1982), 121-139.
- [Jäger83] G. Jäger, A well-ordering proof for Feferman's theory T_0 , *Archiv f. math. Logik u. Grundl.*, 23(1983), 65-77.
- [Rathjen94] M. Rathjen, Proof theory of reflection, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **68** (1994) 181–224.
- [Rathjen05a] M. Rathjen, An ordinal analysis of stability, *Arch. Math. Logic* **44** (2005) 1-62.
- [Rathjen05b] M. Rathjen, An ordinal analysis of parameter free Π_2^1 -comprehension, *Arch. Math. Logic* **44** (2005) 263-362.
- [Richter-Aczel74] W.H. Richter and P. Aczel, Inductive definitions and reflecting properties of admissible ordinals, *Generalized Recursion Theory, Studies in Logic*, vol.79, North-Holland, 1974, pp.301-381.