

Iterating the recursively Mahlo operations

Toshiyasu Arai
 Graduate School of Science
 Chiba University
 1-33, Yayoi-cho, Inage-ku, Chiba, 263-8522, JAPAN

Abstract

In this paper we address a problem: How far can we iterate lower recursively Mahlo operations in higher reflecting universes? Or formally: How much can lower recursively Mahlo operations be iterated in set theories for higher reflecting universes?

It turns out that in Π_N -reflecting universes the lowest recursively Mahlo operation can be iterated along towers of Σ_1 -exponential orderings of height $N - 3$, and that all we can do is such iterations. Namely the set theory for Π_N -reflecting universes is proof-theoretically reducible to iterations of the operation along such a tower.

For set-theoretic formulas φ ,

$$P \models \varphi :\Leftrightarrow (P, \in) \models \varphi.$$

In what follows, let L denote a transitive set, which is a universe in discourse. P, Q, \dots denotes transitive sets in $L \cup \{L\}$ such that $\omega \in P$.

Let \mathcal{X} be a first-order class of transitive sets. This means that there exists a first-order sentence φ such that $P \in \mathcal{X} \Leftrightarrow P \models \varphi$. Then a set theory T is said to prove $L \in \mathcal{X}$ iff $T \vdash \varphi$.

A Π_i -recursively Mahlo operation for $2 \leq i < \omega$, is then defined through a universal Π_i -formula $\Pi_i(a)$:

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

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

Its iteration is defined by transfinite recursion on ordinals β :

$$M_i^\beta := \bigcap \{M_i(M_i^\nu) : \nu < \beta\}.$$

Observe that $M_i(\mathcal{X})$ is Π_{i+1} , i.e., there exists a Π_{i+1} -sentence $m_i(\mathcal{X})$ such that $P \in M_i(\mathcal{X})$ iff $P \models m_i(\mathcal{X})$ for any transitive (and admissible) set P .

A transitive set P is said to be Π_i -reflecting if $P \in M_i = M_i^1$.

Let us denote

$$\mathcal{X} \prec_i \mathcal{Y} :\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Y} \subseteq M_i(\mathcal{X}), \text{ i.e., } \forall P \in \mathcal{Y} (P \in M_i(\mathcal{X})).$$

$P \in M_{i+1}$ is much stronger than $P \in M_i$: Assume $P \in M_{i+1}$ and $P \models \Pi_i(b)$ for $b \in P$. Then $P \in M_i$ and $P \models m_i \wedge \Pi_i(b)$ for the Π_{i+1} -sentence m_i such that $P \in M_i$ iff $P \models m_i$. Hence there exists a $Q \in P$ such that $Q \models m_i \wedge \Pi_i(b)$, i.e., $Q \in M_i$ & $Q \models \Pi_i(b)$. This means $P \in M_i^2 = M_i(M_i)$, i.e., $M_i \prec_i M_{i+1}$. Moreover $P \in M_i^\Delta$, i.e., $P \in \bigcap \{M_i^\beta : \beta \in \text{ord}(P)\}$, $M_i^\Delta \prec_i M_{i+1}$, and so on.

In particular a set theory KPII_{i+1} for universes in M_{i+1} proves the consistency of a set theory for universes in M_i^Δ .

In this paper we address a problem: How far can we iterate lower recursively Mahlo operations in higher reflecting universes? Or formally: How much can lower recursively Mahlo operations be iterated in set theories for higher reflecting universes? Specifically: What kind of iterations of the lowest operations M_2 do we need to obtain equiconsistent theories for set theories for higher reflecting universes?

1 Iterations of the operation M_i in Π_{i+1} -reflectings

In this section we see that iterations of the operation M_i along Σ_1 -relations on ω are too short to resolve Π_{i+1} -reflecting universes provided that the Σ_1 -relations are provably wellfounded in KPII_{i+1} .

Definition 1.1 1. KPl denotes a set theory for limits of admissibles. KPII_N denotes a set theory for universes in M_N .

2. For a definable relation \prec and set-theoretic universe P (admissibility suffices) let

$$P \in M_i(a; \prec) :\Leftrightarrow P \in \bigcap \{M_i(M_i(b; \prec)) : b \prec^P a\},$$

where $b \prec^P a :\Leftrightarrow P \models b \prec a$.

Note that $M_i(a; \prec)$ is a Π_{i+1} -class for (set-theoretic) $\Sigma_{i+1} \prec$.

3. We say that a theory T is *proof-theoretically reducible* to another theory S if T is a Π_1^1 (on ω)-conservative extension of S , and the fact is provable in a weak arithmetic, e.g., the elementary recursive arithmetic EA.

4. For a relation \prec on ω , $TI(a, \prec)$ denotes the transfinite induction schema up to $a \in \omega$:

$$\{\forall x \in \omega [\forall y \prec x \varphi(y) \rightarrow \varphi(x)] \rightarrow \forall x \prec a \varphi(x) : \varphi \text{ is a set-theoretic formula}\}$$

and $TI(a, \prec, \Pi_n)$ its restriction to Π_n -formulas φ .

Using a universal Π_n -formula, $TI(a, \prec, \Pi_n)$ is equivalent to a single Π_{n+2} -formula.

5. A relation \prec on ω is said to be *almost wellfounded* in KPl if KPl proves the transfinite induction schema $TI(a, \prec)$ up to *each* $a \in \omega$.

It is easy to see the following lemma using the fact that $M_i(a; \prec)$ is Π_{i+1} .

Lemma 1.2 *Let \prec be a Σ_1 relation on ω . Then $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1}$ ($i \geq 2$) proves*

$$\forall a \in \omega [TI(a, \prec, \Pi_{i+1}) \rightarrow L \in M_i(a; \prec)].$$

A fortiori $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1}$ proves $\forall a \in \omega [TI(a, \prec, \Pi_{i+1}) \rightarrow L \in M_2(M_i(a; \prec))]$.

In other words, $\text{KP}\ell$ proves $P \in M_{i+1} \rightarrow \forall a \in \omega [TI(a, \prec^P, \Pi_{i+1}^P) \rightarrow P \in M_i(a; \prec)]$.

Therefore $\forall a \in \omega [L \in M_i(a; \prec)]$ is too weak to reduce $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1}$ proof-theoretically for any Σ_1 relation \prec on ω , for example $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1} \vdash \text{CON}(\forall a \in \omega [L \in M_i(a; \prec)])$ if $\forall a \in \omega [TI(a, \prec)]$ is provable in $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1}$.

Nonetheless Π_{i+1} -reflecting universes can be approximated by iterations of the operation M_i along well founded Σ_1 relations on ω .

Theorem 1.3 *For each i ($2 \leq i < \omega$) there exists a Σ_1 almost wellfounded relation \triangleleft_i in $\text{KP}\ell$ such that $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1}$ is proof-theoretically reducible to the theory*

$$\text{KP}\ell + \{L \in M_i(a; \triangleleft_i) : a \in \omega\}.$$

Theorem 1.3 follows from Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 3.5 below.

The case $i = 2$ means that the set theory $\text{KP}\Pi_3$ for Π_3 -reflecting universes can be resolved by iterations of the recursively Mahlo operations M_2 .

Remark. Although $\text{KP}\ell$ is weaker than $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1}$, $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1}$ does not prove the soundness of $\text{KP}\ell$: Let Fund denote the axiom schema for Foundation. Then for a $\varphi \in \Sigma_{i+2}$ and a standard provability predicate Pr_{Fund} of Fund

$$\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1} \not\vdash \forall n \in \omega [\text{Pr}_{\text{Fund}}(\ulcorner \varphi(\dot{n}) \urcorner) \rightarrow \varphi(n)]$$

since $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1} \setminus \text{Fund} \subseteq \Pi_{i+2}$ ($i \geq 2$).

Hence even if $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1} \vdash \forall a \in \omega [\text{Pr}_{\text{KP}\ell}(\ulcorner TI(a, \triangleleft_i, \Pi_{i+1}) \urcorner)]$, this does not imply $\text{KP}\Pi_{i+1} \vdash \forall a \in \omega TI(a, \triangleleft_i, \Pi_{i+1})$.

2 Π_3 -reflecting on Π_3 -reflectings

Our goal is to approximate Π_{i+1} -reflecting universes by iterations of the lowest recursively Mahlo operations M_2 . Let us consider first the simplest case: Π_3 -reflecting universes on Π_3 -reflectings, $M_3^2 = M_3(M_3)$. Universes in M_3^2 are seen to be resolved in terms of iterations of the operation M_2 along a *lexicographic ordering* on pairs.

Definition 2.1 1. For a Σ_1 relation \prec on ω , $W(\prec)$ denotes the *well-founded part* of \prec :

$$a \in W(\prec) :\Leftrightarrow \forall f \in {}^\omega \omega \exists n \in \omega [f(0) = a \rightarrow f(n+1) \not\prec f(n)].$$

$W(\prec)$ is Π_1 .

Note that $W(\prec^Q)$ is a set in limits of admissibles P for any transitive set $Q \in P$.

2. For two transitive relations $<_1, <_0$ on ω , $<_L \equiv L(<_1, <_0)$ denotes the lexicographic ordering:

$$\langle n_1, n_0 \rangle <_L \langle m_1, m_0 \rangle :\Leftrightarrow n_1 <_1 m_1 \text{ or } (n_1 = m_1 \ \& \ n_0 <_0 m_0).$$

$L(<_1, <_0)$ is Σ_1 if $<_1$ and $<_0$ are Σ_1 .

$<_{LW}$ denotes the restriction of $<_L$ to the wellfounded part in the second component:

$$\langle n_1, n_0 \rangle <_{LW} \langle m_1, m_0 \rangle :\Leftrightarrow \langle n_1, n_0 \rangle <_L \langle m_1, m_0 \rangle \ \& \ n_0, m_0 \in W(<_0).$$

$<_{LW}$ is Δ_2 if $<_1$ and $<_0$ are Σ_1 .

Proposition 2.2 *Let P be a limit of admissibles and $<$ be a Σ_1 relation on ω . Suppose $P \models a \in W(<)$. Then $a \in W^P(<^Q) = W(<^Q)$ and $Q \models TI(a, <)$ for any $Q \in P$, where*

$$a \in W^P(<^Q) :\Leftrightarrow \forall f \in {}^\omega\omega \cap P \exists n \in \omega [f(0) = a \rightarrow f(n+1) \not<^Q f(n)].$$

Proof. Since $<$ is Σ_1 and $Q \subseteq P$, we have $<^Q \subseteq <^P$. Hence $a \in W^P(<^P) \subseteq W^R(<^Q)$ for any $R \subseteq P$. Therefore $a \in W^P(<^Q) = W^{Q^+}(<^Q) = W(<^Q)$ for the set $<^Q$ in P , and the next admissible $Q^+ \in P$ above Q . This yields the transfinite induction schema $TI(a, <^Q)$ up to a . \square

$KPII_3(\Pi_3)$ denotes a set theory for universes in $M_3(M_3)$.

Lemma 2.3 *Let $<_1, <_0$ be two Σ_1 transitive relations on ω , and $<_{LW}$ the restriction of the lexicographic ordering defined from these to the wellfounded part in the second component.*

Then $KPII_3(\Pi_3)$ proves

$$\forall a, \alpha \in \omega [TI(a, <_1, \Pi_3) \rightarrow L \in M_2(\langle a, \alpha \rangle; <_{LW})].$$

Proof. Let $L \in M_3(M_3)$. By transfinite induction on a along $<_1$ we show

$$\forall \alpha \in \omega [L \in M_2(\langle a, \alpha \rangle; <_{LW})]$$

where

$$P \in M_2(\langle a, \alpha \rangle; <_{LW}) \Leftrightarrow P \in \bigcap \{M_2(M_2(\langle b, \beta \rangle; <_{LW})) : \langle b, \beta \rangle <_{LW}^P \langle a, \alpha \rangle\}$$

and

$$\langle b, \beta \rangle <_{LW}^P \langle a, \alpha \rangle \Leftrightarrow \langle b, \beta \rangle <_L^P \langle a, \alpha \rangle \ \& \ P \models \alpha, \beta \in W(<_0).$$

Suppose that $\forall b <_1 a \forall \beta \in \omega [L \in M_2(\langle b, \beta \rangle; <_{LW})]$, and $\langle b, \beta \rangle <_{LW} \langle a, \alpha \rangle$. We show $L \in M_2(M_2(\langle b, \beta \rangle; <_{LW}))$.

IH yields the case $b <_1 a$. Assume $b = a$ and $\beta <_0 \alpha \in W(<_0)$. Suppose a $\varphi \in \Pi_2$ holds in $L \in M_3(M_3)$. Pick a $Q \in L \cap M_3$ so that $Q \models \varphi$ and $Q \in \bigcap \{M_2(M_2(\langle b, \gamma \rangle; <_{LW})) : Q \models b <_1 a \wedge \gamma \in W(<_0)\}$ by IH.

We claim that $Q \in M_2(\langle a, \beta \rangle; <_{LW})$. By Proposition 2.2 we have $Q \models TI(\beta, <_0)$. Hence we have $Q \in M_2(\langle a, \beta \rangle; <_{LW})$ by transfinite induction on β . \square

Theorem 2.4 *There exist Σ_1 transitive relations $<_1, <_0$ on ω such that $<_1$ is almost wellfounded in KPl , and $KPII_3(\Pi_3)$ is proof-theoretically reducible to the theory*

$$KPl + \{L \in \bigcap \{M_2(M_2(\langle a, \alpha \rangle; <_{LW})) : \alpha \in W(<_0)\} : a \in \omega\}$$

for the restriction $<_{LW}$ of the lexicographic ordering $<_L = L(<_1, <_0)$ defined from these to the wellfounded part in the second components.

For a proof of Theorem 2.4, see [A ∞ b].

3 Π_N -reflection

As you expected, an *exponential* structure involves in resolving Π_N -reflecting universes L .

Definition 3.1 Let $<_1, <_0$ be two transitive relations on ω .

1. The relation $<_E = E(<_1, <_0)$ is on sequences $\langle (n_i^1, n_i^0) : i < \ell \rangle$ of pairs with $<_1$ -decreasing first components ($n_{i+1}^1 <_1 n_i^1$), and is defined by

$$\langle (n_i^1, n_i^0) : i < \ell_0 \rangle <_E \langle (m_i^1, m_i^0) : i < \ell_1 \rangle \text{ iff}$$

either

$$\exists k \forall i < k \forall j < 2 [n_i^j = m_i^j \ \& \ (n_k^1, n_k^0) <_L (m_k^1, m_k^0)]$$

or

$$\ell_0 < \ell_1 \ \& \ \forall i < \ell_0 \forall j < 2 [n_i^j = m_i^j]$$

where $<_L = L(<_1, <_0)$ in Definition 2.1.2.

Write $\sum_{i < \ell} \pi^{n_i^1} n_i^0$ for $\langle (n_i^1, n_i^0) : i < \ell \rangle$.

2. Let $dom(<_E)$ denote the domain of the relation $<_E$:

$$dom(<_E) := \left\{ \sum_{i < \ell} \pi^{n_i^1} n_i^0 : \forall i < \ell \neg 1(n_{i+1}^1 <_1 n_i^1) \ \& \ n_i^1, n_i^0, \ell \in \omega \right\}.$$

3. $<_{EW}$ denotes the restriction of $<_E$ to the wellfounded part in the second components:

$$\alpha = \sum_{i < \ell_0} \pi^{n_i^1} n_i^0 <_{EW} \sum_{i < \ell_1} \pi^{m_i^1} m_i^0 = \beta \text{ iff}$$

$$\alpha <_E \beta \ \& \ \{n_i^0 : i < \ell_0\} \cup \{m_i^0 : i < \ell_1\} \subseteq W(<_0).$$

Lemma 3.2 *Let $<_1, <_0$ be two transitive relations on ω , $<_1$ is Δ_2 , $<_0$ is Σ_1 , and $<_{EW}$ the restriction of the exponential ordering defined from these to the wellfounded part in the second components. Then KPl proves for each $i \geq 2$*

$$\forall P \in L \cup \{L\} \forall a \in \omega \forall \alpha <^P a [P \in M_{i+1}(M_{i+1}(a; <_1)) \rightarrow P \in M_i(\alpha; <_{EW})]$$

where for $\alpha = \sum_{i < \ell} \pi^{n_i^1} n_i^0 \in \text{dom}(<_{EW}^P)$, $\alpha <^P a :\Leftrightarrow n_0^1 <_1^P a$.

Proof. We show for any $a \in \omega$ and any $\beta \in \text{dom}(<_{EW}^P \uparrow a)$

$$P \in M_{i+1}(M_{i+1}(a; <_1)) \& P \in M_i(\beta; <_{EW}) \rightarrow \forall \alpha <^P a \{P \in M_i(\beta + \alpha; <_{EW})\}$$

by main induction on $P \in L \cup \{L\}$ with respect to the relation \in , where for $\beta = \sum_{i < \ell_1} \pi^{m_i^1} m_i^0$ and $\alpha = \sum_{i < \ell_0} \pi^{n_i^1} n_i^0$,

$$\beta \in \text{dom}(<_{EW}^P \uparrow a) :\Leftrightarrow \beta \in \text{dom}(<_{EW}^P) \& (\ell_1 > 0 \rightarrow a \leq_1^P m_{\ell_1-1}^1)$$

and $\beta + \alpha = \sum_{i < \ell_1} \pi^{m_i^1} m_i^0 + \sum_{i < \ell_0} \pi^{n_i^1} n_i^0$.

Suppose $\beta \in \text{dom}(<_{EW}^P \uparrow a)$, $P \in M_{i+1}(M_{i+1}(a; <_1))$ and $P \in M_i(\beta; <_{EW})$. Pick an $\alpha = \pi^b x + \alpha_0 \in \text{dom}(<_{EW}^P)$ so that $\alpha_0 <^P b <_1^P a$ and $x \in W^P(<_0^P)$. We show $P \in M_i(\beta + \alpha; <_{EW})$. It suffices to show $P \in M_i(M_i(\beta + \gamma; <_{EW}))$ for any $\gamma <_{EW}^P \alpha$ by $P \in M_i(\beta; <_{EW})$.

If γ is the empty sequence, then $P \in M_i(M_i(\beta; <_{EW}))$ follows from $P \in M_i(\beta; <_{EW})$, which is Π_{i+1} , and $P \in M_{i+1}(M_{i+1}(a; <_1)) \subseteq M_{i+1}$.

Let $\gamma = \pi^c y + \gamma_0$ with $\gamma_0 <^P c \leq_1^P b$, and $P \models \theta$ for a $\theta \in \Pi_i$. It suffices to find a $Q \in P$ so that $Q \in M_i(\beta + \gamma; <_{EW})$ and $Q \models \theta$.

First consider the case when $c <_1^P b$. By $P \in M_{i+1}(M_{i+1}(a; <_1))$, pick a $Q \in P$ so that $Q \in M_{i+1}(a; <_1)$, $Q \models \theta$, $\beta \in \text{dom}(<_{EW}^Q \uparrow a)$, $Q \in M_i(\beta; <_{EW})$ and $\text{dom}(<_{EW}^Q) \ni \gamma <^Q b <_1^Q a$.

Then $Q \in M_{i+1}(a; <_1) \subseteq M_{i+1}(M_{i+1}(b; <_1))$, and hence MIH yields $Q \in M_i(\beta + \gamma; <_{EW})$.

Thus we have shown $P \in \bigcap \{M_i(\beta + \delta; <_{EW}) : \delta <^P b\}$, which is Π_{i+1} , and hence

$$P \in M_i(M_{i+1}(a; <_1) \cap \bigcap \{M_i(\beta + \delta; <_{EW}) : \delta < b\}) \quad (1)$$

Second consider the case when $c = b$.

We can find a $Q \in P$ so that $Q \in M_{i+1}(a; <_1)$, $Q \models \theta$, $\beta \in \text{dom}(<_{EW}^Q \uparrow a)$, $Q \in \bigcap \{M_i(\beta + \delta; <_{EW}) : \delta <^Q b\}$ by (1) and $\text{dom}(<_{EW}^Q) \ni \gamma \& b <_1^Q a$. We have $x \in W^P(<_0^P) \subseteq W(<_0^Q)$ by Proposition 2.2.

Therefore it suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall x \in W(<_0^Q) \forall b \in \omega \forall \beta \in \text{dom}(<_{EW}^Q \uparrow b) [Q \in P \& Q \in M_{i+1}(M_{i+1}(b; <_1)) \& \\ & Q \in \bigcap \{M_i(\beta + \delta; <_{EW}) : \delta <^Q b\} \\ & \implies \forall \gamma_0 <^Q b \{Q \in M_i(\beta + \pi^b x + \gamma_0; <_{EW})\}] \end{aligned}$$

by subsidiary induction on $x \in W(<_0^Q)$.

First assume $\beta + \pi^b y + \delta_0 <_{EW}^Q \beta + \pi^b x + \gamma_0$ with $y <_0^Q x$. SIH yields $Q \in M_i(\beta + \pi^b y + \delta_0; <_{EW})$, and this implies $Q \in M_i(M_i(\beta + \pi^b y + \delta_0; <_{EW}))$ by $Q \in M_{i+1}$.

Therefore we have shown $Q \in M_i(\beta + \pi^b x; <_{EW})$ with $\gamma_0 = 0$. Now let $\gamma_0 = \pi^c y + \gamma_1$ with $c <_1^Q b$. We have $\beta + \pi^b x \in \text{dom}(<_{EW}^Q \uparrow c)$, $Q \in M_{i+1}(M_{i+1}(b; <_1))$ & $Q \in M_i(\beta + \pi^b x; <_{EW})$ and $Q \in P$. Hence MIH yields $Q \in M_i(\beta + \pi^b x + \gamma_0; <_{EW})$ for $\gamma_0 <^Q b$. \square

Definition 3.3 Let $<_i$ ($2 \leq i \leq N-1$) be Σ_1 relations on ω . Define a *tower* relation $<_T$ from these as follows.

Define inductively relations $<_{E_i}$ ($2 \leq i \leq N-1$).

1. $<_{E_{N-1}} := <_{N-1}$.
2. $<_{E_i} := E(<_{E_{i+1}}, <_i)$ for $2 \leq i \leq N-2$, cf. Definition 3.1.

Then let

$$<_T := <_{E_2}.$$

$<_{TW}$ denotes the restriction of $<_T$ to the wellfounded parts in the second components hereditarily. Namely $<_{TW} = <_{E_2W}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n < \ell} \pi^{\alpha_n} x_n \in \text{dom}(<_{E_iW}) &: \Leftrightarrow \\ \forall n < \ell - 1 (\alpha_{n+1} <_{E_{i+1}W} \alpha_n) &\& \forall n < \ell (x_n \in W(<_i)) \end{aligned}$$

with $<_{E_{N-1}W} = <_{N-1}$.

For $a \in \omega$ and $\alpha = \sum_{n < \ell} \pi^{\alpha_n} x_n \in \text{dom}(<_T)$, define inductively

$$\alpha < a : \Leftrightarrow \forall n < \ell (\alpha_n < a)$$

with $\alpha_n < a : \Leftrightarrow \alpha_n <_{N-1} a$ for $\alpha_n \in \omega$.

Lemmas 3.2 and 1.2 yield the following for the set theory KPII_N for universes in M_N .

Theorem 3.4 Let $<_i$ ($2 \leq i \leq N-1 < \omega$) be Σ_1 transitive relations on ω . Let $<_{TW}$ denote the restriction of the tower $<_T$ of the exponential orderings $<_{E_i}$ defined from these to the wellfounded parts in the second components hereditarily.

Then KPII_N proves that

$$\forall a \in \omega \forall \alpha < a [TI(a, <_{N-1}, \Pi_N) \rightarrow \text{L} \in M_2(\alpha; <_{TW})]$$

and hence

$$\forall a \in \omega \forall \alpha < a [TI(a, <_{N-1}, \Pi_N) \rightarrow \text{L} \in M_2(M_2(\alpha; <_{TW}))].$$

We see an optimality of this resolving of Π_N -reflecting universes in terms of the lowest recursively Mahlo operation M_2 .

Theorem 3.5 For each N ($2 < N < \omega$) there exist Σ_1 transitive relations $<_i$ ($2 \leq i \leq N-1$) on ω such that $<_{N-1}$ is almost wellfounded in KPl , and $K\Pi_N$ is proof-theoretically reducible to the theory

$$KPl + \{L \in \bigcap \{M_2(M_2(\alpha; <_{TW})) : \text{dom}(<_{TW}) \ni \alpha < a\} : a \in \omega\}$$

for the restriction $<_{TW}$ of the tower $<_T$ of the exponential orderings $<_{E_i}$ defined from these to the wellfounded parts in the second components hereditarily.

Theorem 3.5 is extracted from proof-theoretic analyses of $K\Pi_N$ in $[A\infty a]$ and $[A\infty b]$. Let me spend some words on *ordinal analyses*, an ordinal informative proof-theoretic investigations in generalities.

4 Background materials from proof theory

Let T be a recursive theory containing ACA_0 [the predicative (and hence conservative) extension of the first order arithmetic PA], and Π_1^1 -sound, i.e., any T -provable Π_1^1 -sentence is true in the standard model.

Then its *proof-theoretic ordinal* $|T|$ is defined to be the supremum of the order types of the provably recursive well orderings:

$$\begin{aligned} |T| &:= \sup\{\alpha < \omega_1^{CK} : T \vdash WO[<] \ \& \\ &\alpha = \text{order type } |<| \text{ of } < \text{ for a recursive ordering } <\} \end{aligned}$$

Remark. The ordinal $|T|$ is stable if we consider Σ_1^1 -orderings and/or add true Σ_1^1 -sentences to $T \supseteq ACA_0$, an analogue to the C. Spector's boundedness theorem. For a proof see [A98].

It is seen that $|T|$ is recursive, i.e., $|T| < \omega_1^{CK}$, and easy to cook up a recursive well ordering $<^T$ whose order type is equal to $|T|$.

For each $p \in \omega$ let $<_p$ denote a recursive well ordering defined as follows:

1. The case when p is a Gödel number of a proof in T whose endformula is $WO[<]$ for a recursive binary relation $<$: Then put $<_p := <$.
2. Otherwise, let $<_p$ denote an empty ordering, i.e., $\text{dom}(<_p) = \emptyset$.

Glue these orderings together to get a recursive ordering $<^T$:

$$\langle n, p \rangle <^T \langle m, q \rangle :\Leftrightarrow [p = q \ \& \ n <_p m] \vee p < q$$

for a bijective pairing function $\langle n, p \rangle$.

Then $<^T$ is a recursive well ordering by the assumptions, and $|<^T| \leq |T| = \sup\{|<_p| : p \in \omega\} \leq |<^T| < \omega_1^{CK}$ as desired.

Gentzen's celebrated pioneering work yields $|ACA_0| = \varepsilon_0$. The first achievement for proof theory of impredicative theory was done by G. Takeuti. He

designed a recursive notation system of ordinals, which describes the proof theoretic ordinal of, e.g., Π_1^1 -Comprehension Axiom. Nowadays Takeuti's proof is understood as for set theories of Π_2 -reflecting universes, i.e., for the Kripke-Platek set theory with the Axiom of Infinity, $KP\omega$.

Ordinal analyses for stronger theories are now obtained. Let $\langle O(T), <_T \rangle$ denote a notation system of proof-theoretic ordinal of $T = ACA_0, KP\omega, KPM, KP\Pi_N$, etc.

Ordinal analyses of theories T show not only the fact $|O(T)| = |T|$ but also more, i.e., some conservative extension results.

Theorem 4.1 *Let EA denote the elementary recursive arithmetic, a fragment $I\Delta_0 + \forall x\exists y(2^x = y)$ of PA.*

1. *If \prec is an irreflexive, transitive and provably well founded relation in T (not necessarily a total ordering), then there exists an ordinal term $\alpha \in O(T)$ and an elementary recursive function f so that $EA + \forall n, m, k [n \prec k \ \& \ (n \prec m \prec k \rightarrow n \prec k)]$ proves that*

$$\forall n, k [n \prec k \rightarrow f(n) <_T f(k)] \ \& \ f(n) <_T \alpha$$

2. *Over EA, $WO[<_T]$ is equivalent to the uniform reflection principle $RFN_{\Pi_1^1}(T)$ of T for Π_1^1 -formulas.*
3. *T is Π_1^1 -conservative over the theory $ACA_0 \cup \{WO[<_T \upharpoonright n] : n \in \omega\}$, which is an extension of ACA_0 by augmenting the wellfoundedness of each initial segment $<_T \upharpoonright n$ of the ordering $<_T$.*
4. *Over EA, the 1-consistency $RFN_{\Pi_2^0}(T)$ of T is equivalent to the fact $ERWO[<_T]$ that there is no elementary recursive descending chain of ordinals in $O(T)$.*
5. *T is Π_2^0 -conservative over the theory $EA \cup \{ERWO[<_T \upharpoonright n] : n \in \omega\}$. Therefore provably recursive functions in T are exactly the functions defined by ordinal recursions along initial segments $<_T \upharpoonright n$ ($n \in \omega$).*
6. *Over EA, finitely iterated consistency statements $CON^{(n)}(T)$ of T*

$$CON^{(0)}(T) :\Leftrightarrow \forall x(0 = 0); \quad CON^{(n+1)}(T) :\Leftrightarrow CON(T + CON^{(n)}(T))$$

is equivalent to the inference rule

$$\frac{[q(\alpha) <_T \alpha \rightarrow A(q(\alpha))]}{A(\alpha)}$$

where α denotes a variable ranging over $O(T)$, and $A[q]$ is an elementary recursive relation [function], resp.

For a proof of Theorem 4.1.1, see [A98]. Theorem 4.1.6 is seen from Theorem 4.1.4 through an Herbrand analysis and a result due to W. Tait[Tait65].

The rest of Theorem 4.1 is seen from Lemma 4.2 below, cf. [A96a], [A96b], [A97a], [A97b], [A99], [A00a], [A00b], [A03b], [A04a], [A04b], [A∞a] and [A∞b]. Also cf. [A02], [A03a], [A05a], [A05b] and [A06] for proof theory based on epsilon substitution method.

Lemma 4.2 1. *T proves that each initial segment $<_T \upharpoonright n$ is wellfounded. The proof is uniform in the sense that*

$$\text{EA} \vdash \text{Proof}_T(p(x), \text{WO}[<_T \upharpoonright x])$$

for an elementary recursive function $p(x)$ and a canonical proof predicate $\text{Proof}_T(x, y)$ (read: x is a (code of a) T-proof of a (code of a) formula y).

2. *We can define a rewrite rule (cut-elimination step) $r(p, n)$ on (finite) T-proofs p of Π_1^1 -formulas, and an ordinal assignment $o : p \mapsto o(p) \in O(T)$ so that EA proves*

$$\forall n[o(r(p, n)) <_T o(p) \rightarrow \text{Tr}_{\Pi_1^1}(\text{end}(r(p, n))) \rightarrow \text{Tr}_{\Pi_1^1}(\text{end}(p))]$$

where $\text{Tr}_{\Pi_1^1}$ denotes a partial truth definition for Π_1^1 -sentences, and $\text{end}(p)$ the end-formula of a proof p .

For proofs p of Σ_1^0 -sentences, the rewrite rule degenerates to be unary, $r(p, n) = r(p, m)$.

NB.

The size of proof-theoretic ordinals is by no means related to consistency strengths of theories. Only when we restrict to initial segments of notation systems $O(T)$, the sizes are relevant. Cf. [Beklemishev00] and [Beckmann02] for some pathological examples on provably well orderings.

Let $\text{CON}(T, n) :\Leftrightarrow \forall x \leq n \neg \text{Proof}_T(x, [0 = 1])$ denote a partial consistency of T up to n .

1. ([Kreisel77])

Let $n \prec m$ denote a recursive relation defined as follows:

$$n \prec m :\Leftrightarrow [\text{CON}(T, \min\{n, m\}) \& n < m] \vee [\neg \text{CON}(T, \min\{n, m\}) \& n > m].$$

Even though $|\prec| = \omega$ since T is assumed to be consistent, $\text{WO}[\prec]$ implies $\text{CON}(T)$ finitistically.

2. Modifying the above Kreisel's pathological example, one sees that for any recursive and $\text{Bool}(\Pi_1^1)$ -sound theory T ($\text{Bool}(\Pi_1^1)$ denotes the Boolean

combinations of Π_1^1 -sentences), there exists a recursive and $Bool(\Pi_1^1)$ -sound theory T' such that $|T| < |T'|$ but $T' \not\vdash CON(T)$: let $<_T$ be any recursive well ordering of type $|T|$, and let

$$n \prec' m := \text{CON}(T, \max\{n, m\}) \ \& \ n <_T m.$$

Although $|\prec'| = |<_T|$, \prec' is a finite ordering if T is inconsistent. A fortiori $EA \vdash \neg CON(T) \rightarrow WO[\prec']$. Hence $T \not\vdash WO[\prec'] \rightarrow CON(T)$ by the second incompleteness theorem. Therefore $T' := T \cup \{WO[\prec']\}$ is a desired one.

Note that if each initial segment of $<_T$ is provably wellfounded in T , then so is for \prec' .

5 Collapsing functions iterated

The essential step in cut-elimination for a set theory T is to analyse the axiom expressing an ordinal σ reflects any Π_2 -formula φ :

$$\varphi^{L_\sigma}(a) \wedge a \in L_\sigma \rightarrow \exists \beta < \sigma [\varphi^{L_\beta} \wedge a \in L_\beta].$$

This means that given a proof figure P of the premise, we have to find an ordinal term $\beta < \sigma$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \vdots P & & \vdots \\ \varphi^{L_\sigma}(a) \wedge a \in L_\sigma & \implies & \varphi^{L_\beta}(a) \wedge a \in L_\beta \end{array}$$

This is done by putting $\beta = d_\sigma \alpha < \sigma$ ($o(P) = \alpha \in Od(T)$) for a (Mostowski) collapsing function d .

Let $C(\alpha)$ ($\alpha = o(P)$) denote the set of ordinals which may occur in the reducts of P . Ordinals in $C(\alpha)$ are on the solid lines with gaps here and there in the following figure:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & & d_\sigma \alpha & & \sigma & & \sigma + d_\sigma \alpha \\ \hline \text{[-----)} & & & & \text{[-----)} & & \dots\dots\dots \end{array}$$

By stuffing the gap below σ in the set $C(\alpha)$ up, σ is collapsed down to the least indescribable ordinal $d_\sigma \alpha$. Then ordinals in $C(\alpha)$ cannot discriminate between σ and $d_\sigma \alpha$

$$\gamma < \sigma \Leftrightarrow \gamma < d_\sigma \alpha \ (\gamma \in C(\alpha)),$$

Thus the ordinal $\beta = d_\sigma \alpha$ can be a substitute for σ .

To analyse larger ordinals, e.g., Π_3 -reflecting ordinals, the collapsing process has to be iterated.

A Π_3 -reflecting ordinal K is understood to be $< \varepsilon_{K+1}$ -recursively Mahlo, $L_K \in \bigcap_{\mu < \varepsilon_{K+1}} M_2^\mu$. First K is collapsed to a μ_0 -recursively Mahlo ordinal for a $\mu_0 < \varepsilon_{K+1}$: $\kappa_1 = d_K^{\mu_0} \alpha_0 < K$. Then $L_{\kappa_1} \in M_2^{\mu_0}$ is collapsed to a μ_1 -recursively Mahlo ordinal: $\kappa_2 = d_{\kappa_1}^{\mu_1} \alpha_1 < \kappa_1$ ($\mu_1 < \mu_0$), etc. In this way a

possibly infinite collapsing process is generated: $K = \kappa_0 > d_K^{\mu_0} \alpha_0 = \kappa_1 > d_{\kappa_1}^{\mu_1} \alpha_1 = \kappa_2 > \dots (\varepsilon_{K+1} > \mu_0 > \mu_1 > \dots)$.

We have designed a recursive notation system $\langle Od(\Pi_N), < \rangle$ of ordinals for proof theoretical analysis of $K\Pi_N$, and showed in [A ∞ a] that $K\Pi_N$ is proof-theoretically reducible to the theory $ACA_0 + \{WO[<|\alpha|] : \Omega > \alpha \in Od(\Pi_N)\}$, where $\Omega \in Od(\Pi_N)$ denotes the least Π_2 -reflecting ordinal ω_1^{CK} and $<|\alpha|$ the restriction of the ordering $<$ in $Od(\Pi_N)$ to α . Thus $O(K\Pi_N) = Od(\Pi_N)|\Omega$.

On the other side in [A ∞ b] we have shown that $K\Pi_N$ proves $WO[<|\alpha|]$ for *each* $\alpha < \Omega$. Indeed, this wellfoundedness proof is essentially formalizable in a theory $KPl + \{L \in \cap \{M_2(M_2(\alpha; <_{TW})) : dom(<_{TW}) \ni \alpha < a\} : a \in \omega\}$ for some Σ_1 relations $<_i$ ($2 \leq i \leq N-1$) on ω such that $<_{N-1}$ is almost wellfounded in KPl . This shows Theorem 3.5.

In the next section we give a sketch of the wellfoundedness proof.

6 Wellfoundedness proof

Our wellfoundedness proof of $Od(\Pi_N)$ is based on the *maximal distinguished class* \mathcal{W} [Buchholz75], a Σ_1 -definable set of integers, and a proper *class* in $K\Pi_N$.

To formalize the proof *in* $K\Pi_N$, we have to show for each $\eta \in Od(\Pi_N)$ there exists an η -Mahlo set on which the maximal distinguished class enjoys the same closure properties as \mathcal{W} up to the given η . The η -Mahlo sets are defined through a ramification process to resolve the reflecting universes in terms of iterations of lower Mahlo operations[A ∞ b].

6.1 The notation system $Od(\Pi_N)$

The notation system $Od(\Pi_N)$ (an element of $Od(\Pi_N)$ is called an *ordinal diagram*, which is abbreviated o.d.) contains the constants Ω for ω_1^{CK} and π for the least Π_N -reflecting ordinal.

The main constructor is to form an o.d. $d_\sigma^q \alpha < \sigma$ from a symbol d and o.d.'s σ, q, α , where σ denotes a recursively regular ordinal and q a finite sequence of o.d.'s.

$\gamma \prec_2 \sigma$ denotes the transitive closure of $\{(\beta, \sigma) : \exists \alpha, q (\beta = d_\sigma^q \alpha)\}$. The set $\{\tau : \sigma \prec_2 \tau\}$ is finite and linearly ordered by \prec_2 for each σ , namely $\{\sigma : \sigma \preceq_2 \pi\}$ is a tree with its root π .

In the diagram $d_\sigma^q \alpha$, q includes some data telling us how the diagram $d_\sigma^q \alpha$ is constructed from $\{\tau : d_\sigma^q \alpha \prec_2 \tau\} = \{\tau : \sigma \preceq_2 \tau\}$.

The main task in wellfoundedness proofs is to show the tree $\{\sigma : \sigma \preceq_2 \pi\}$ to be wellfounded.

Specifically q in $\eta = d_\sigma^q \alpha$ includes some data $st_i(\eta), pd_i(\eta), rg_i(\eta)$ for $2 \leq i < N$. $st_{N-1}(\eta)$ is an o.d. less than $\varepsilon_{\pi+1}$, and $pd_2(\eta) = \sigma$.

A relation \prec_i is defined from $pd_i(\eta)$ as the transitive closure of $\{(\eta, \kappa) : \kappa = pd_i(\eta)\}$. This enjoys $\prec_{i+1} \subseteq \prec_i$. Therefore the diagram $pd_i(\eta)$ is a proper

subdiagram of η . $st_i(\eta)$ is an o.d. less than the next admissible κ^+ to a $\kappa = rg_i(\eta) \leq pd_{i+1}(\eta)$. $rg_{N-1}(\eta) = \pi$ for any such $\eta = d_\sigma^q \alpha$.

q determines a sequence $\{\eta_i^m : m < lh_i(\eta)\}$ of subdiagrams of η with its length $lh_i(\eta) = n + 1 > 0$. The sequence enjoys the following property:

$$\eta \preceq_{i+1} \eta_i^0 \prec_{i+1} \eta_i^1 \prec_{i+1} \cdots \prec_{i+1} \eta_i^n < \pi$$

with $st_i(\eta_i^m) < (rg_i(\eta_i^m))^+$.

6.2 Towers derived from ordinal diagrams

Define relations \ll_i for $2 \leq i \leq N - 1$ by

$$\eta \ll_i \rho := \eta \prec_i \rho \ \& \ rg_i(\eta) = rg_i(\rho) \ \& \ st_i(\eta) < st_i(\rho).$$

Extend \ll_i by augmenting the least element 1:

$$1 \ll_i \eta.$$

π^α denotes $\pi^\alpha \cdot 1$.

Let $\triangleleft_i := \ll_{E_i}$ be exponential ordering defined from \ll_i ($2 \leq i \leq N - 1$). Namely $\triangleleft_{N-1} := \ll_{N-1}$ and $\triangleleft_i := E(\triangleleft_{i+1}, \ll_i)$, cf. Definition 3.1.

Extend \triangleleft_i to \triangleleft_i^+ by adding the successor function $+1$. Namely the domain is expanded to $dom(\triangleleft_i^+) := dom(\triangleleft_i) \cup \{a + 1 : a \in dom(\triangleleft_i)\}$, and define for $a, b \in dom(\triangleleft_i)$

$$\begin{aligned} a + 1 \triangleleft_i^+ b + 1 & \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad a \triangleleft_i b \\ a + 1 \triangleleft_i^+ b & \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad a \triangleleft_i b \\ a \triangleleft_i^+ b + 1 & \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad a \triangleleft_i b \text{ or } a = b \end{aligned}$$

From the sequence $\{\eta_i^m : 2 \leq i < N - 1, m < lh_i(\eta)\}$ we define a tower $T(\eta) = E_2(\eta)$. The elements of the form $E_i(\eta)(+1)$ are understood to be ordered by \triangleleft_i^+ . Let $\triangleleft_T := \triangleleft_2^+$.

$$\begin{aligned} E_{N-1}(\eta) & \quad := \quad \eta \\ E_i(\eta) & \quad := \quad \sum_{1 \leq m < lh_i(\eta)} \pi^{E_{i+1}(\eta_i^m)} \eta_i^{m-1} + \pi^{E_{i+1}(\eta_i^0)+1} + \pi^{E_{i+1}(\eta)} \end{aligned}$$

The sequence $\{\eta_i^m : m < lh_i(\eta)\}$ is defined so that, cf. [A ∞ b] for a proof,

$$\gamma \prec_i \eta \Rightarrow E_i(\gamma) \triangleleft_i^+ E_i(\eta).$$

In particular

$$\gamma \prec_2 \eta \Rightarrow T(\gamma) \triangleleft_T T(\eta) \tag{2}$$

6.3 Distinguished classes

An elementary fact on the maximal distinguished class \mathcal{W} says that \mathcal{W} is well ordered by $<$ on $Od(\Pi_N)$, and $\mathcal{W}|\Omega$ is included in the wellfounded part of $Od(\Pi_N)$. Therefore it suffices to show $\eta \in \mathcal{W}$ for *each* $\eta \in Od(\Pi_N)$.

\mathcal{W} is defined to be the union of the distinguished sets,

$$\mathcal{W} = \bigcup \{X \subseteq Od(T) : D[X]\}$$

where $D[X]$ (read: X is a distinguished set) is a Δ_1 -formula on limits of admissible sets. Hence \mathcal{W} is a Σ_1 -definable set of integers, and a proper *class* in $K\Pi_N$.

Since $D[X]$ is Δ_1 on limits of admissibles, it is absolute: $D[X] \Leftrightarrow P \models D[X]$ for any $X \in P \cap \mathcal{P}(\omega)$. Let $\mathcal{W}^P = \bigcup \{X \in P : P \models D[X]\}$ denote the maximal distinguished class on P .

The following is a key on distinguished sets.

Lemma 6.1 *There exists a Π_2 -formula $g(\eta)$ ($\eta \in Od(\Pi_N)$) for which the following holds for any limits Q of admissibles: Assume $g(\eta)^Q$ and*

$$\forall \gamma \prec_2 \eta \{g(\gamma)^Q \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{W}^Q\} \quad (3)$$

Then there exists a distinguished class X such that $\eta \in X$ and X is definable in Q .

For some Σ_1 classes U_i on ω , the Σ_1 transitive relations on ω , $<_i$ mentioned in Theorem 3.5 are now defined to be

$$\eta <_i \rho :\Leftrightarrow \eta \ll_i \rho \ \& \ \eta, \rho \in U_i.$$

By definition $1 \in U_i$ for any i . $<_{N-1}$ is seen to be almost wellfounded in $KP\ell$.

Let $<_{TW}$ denote the restriction of the tower $<_T$ of the exponential orderings $<_{E_i}$ defined from these Σ_1 relations $<_i$ ($2 \leq i \leq N-1$) to the wellfounded parts in the second components hereditarily.

In other words,

$$T(\eta) <_T T(\rho) \Leftrightarrow T(\eta) \triangleleft_T T(\rho) \ \& \ \forall i [\mathcal{K}_i(\eta) \cup \mathcal{K}_i(\rho) \subseteq U_i]$$

and

$$T(\eta) <_{TW} T(\rho) \Leftrightarrow T(\eta) <_T T(\rho) \ \& \ \forall i > 0 [\mathcal{K}_i(\eta) \cup \mathcal{K}_i(\rho) \subseteq W(<_i)]$$

where

1. $\mathcal{K}_2(\eta) := \{\eta_2^m : m < lh_2(\eta)\}$.
2. For $2 < i < N-1$, $\mathcal{K}_i(\eta) := \{\rho_i^m : m < lh_i(\rho), \rho \in \mathcal{K}_{i-1}(\eta)\}$.

Lemma 6.2 *If $P \in M_2(M_2(T(\eta); <_{TW}))$, then $g(\eta)^P \rightarrow \eta \in \mathcal{W}^P$.*

Proof by induction on \in . Suppose $P \in M_2(M_2(T(\eta); <_{TW}))$ and $g(\eta)^P$. Pick a $Q \in P \cap M_2(T(\eta); <_{TW})$ so that $g(\eta)^Q$.

We show (3). Assume $\gamma \prec_2 \eta$ and $g(\gamma)^Q$. (2) yields $T(\gamma) \triangleleft_T T(\eta)$. On the other side the Π_2 formula $g(\gamma)$ is defined so that

$$g(\gamma)^Q \rightarrow \forall i[\mathcal{K}_i(\gamma) \subseteq U_i^Q] \ \& \ \forall i > 0[\mathcal{K}_i(\gamma) \subseteq W^Q(<_i^Q)].$$

Since $\bigcup_i \mathcal{K}_i(\eta)$ is finite, we can assume $\forall i[\mathcal{K}_i(\eta) \subseteq U_i^Q]$, and hence $T(\gamma) <_{TW}^Q T(\eta)$. Therefore $Q \in M_2(M_2(T(\gamma); <_{TW}))$. IH yields $\gamma \in \mathcal{W}^Q$. This shows (3).

By Lemma 6.1, let X be a distinguished class definable over Q such that $\eta \in X$. Thus $X \in P \ \& \ D[X]$, and $\eta \in \mathcal{W}^P$. \square

Assuming $L \in M_2(M_2(T(\eta); <_{TW}))$ for each η , we have $g(\eta)^L \rightarrow \eta \in \mathcal{W}^L = \mathcal{W}$ by Lemma 6.2. On the other side, it is not hard to show $g(\eta)^L$ for each η in KPl .

Therefore the wellfoundedness of $Od(\Pi_N)$ up to each $\eta < \Omega$ follows from $\{L \in M_2(M_2(T(\eta); <_{TW})) : \eta \in Od(\Pi_N)\}$ over KPl .

References

- [A96a] T. Arai, Systems of ordinal diagrams, draft, 1996.
- [A96b] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals I: Reflecting ordinals, draft, 1996.
- [A97a] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals II: Σ_1 -stability, draft, 1997.
- [A97b] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals III: Π_1 -collection, draft, 1997.
- [A98] T. Arai, Some results on cut-elimination, provable well-orderings, induction and reflection, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 95 (1998) 93-184.
- [A99] T. Arai, Introduction to finitary analyses of proof figures, In: *Sets and Proofs. Invited papers from Logic Colloquium '97-European Meeting of the Association for Symbolic Logic, Leeds, July 1997*. Ed. by S. B. Cooper and J. K. Truss, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes, vol. 258, Cambridge University Press (1999), pp.1-25.
- [A00a] T. Arai, Ordinal diagrams for recursively Mahlo universes, *Arch. Math. Logic* 39 (2000) 353-391.
- [A00b] T. Arai, Ordinal diagrams for Π_3 -reflection, *Jour. Symb. Logic* 65 (2000) 1375-1394.
- [A02] T. Arai, Epsilon substitution method for theories of jump hierarchies, *Arch. Math. Logic* 41 (2002) 123-153.

- [A03a] T. Arai, Epsilon substitution method for $ID_1(\Pi_1^0 \vee \Sigma_1^0)$, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 121 (2003) 163-208.
- [A03b] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals I:recursively Mahlo ordinals, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 122 (2003) 1-85.
- [A04a] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals II: Π_3 -Reflection, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 129 (2004) 39-92.
- [A04b] T. Arai, Wellfoundedness proofs by means of non-monotonic inductive definitions I: Π_2^0 -operators, Jour. Symb. Logic 69 (2004) 830-850.
- [A05a] T. Arai, Ideas in the epsilon substitution method for Π_1^0 -FIX, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 136 (2005) 3-21.
- [A05b] T. Arai, Epsilon substitution method for $[\Pi_1^0, \Pi_1^0]$ -FIX, Arch. Math. Logic 44 (2005) 1009-1043.
- [A06] T. Arai, Epsilon substitution method for Π_2^0 -FIX, Jour. Symb. Logic 71 (2006) 1155-1188.
- [A ∞ a] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals III: Π_N -reflection, submitted.
- [A ∞ b] T. Arai, Wellfoundedness proofs by means of non-monotonic inductive definitions II: first order operators, submitted.
- [Beckmann02] A. Beckmann, A non-well-founded primitive recursive tree provably well-founded for co-r.e. sets, Arch. Math. Logic 41(2002) 251-257.
- [Beklemishev00] L. Beklemishev, Another pathological well-ordering, in Logic Colloquium 98(Prague), 105-108, Lect. Notes Logic 13, Assoc. Symb. Logic, 2000.
- [Buchholz75] W. Buchholz, Normalfunktionen und konstruktive Systeme von Ordinalzahlen. In: Diller, J., Müller, G.H.(eds.) Proof Theory Symposium, Kiel 1974 (Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol.500, pp.4-25). Berlin: Springer 1975
- [Kreisel77] G. Kreisel, Wie die Beweistheorie zu ihren Ordinalzahlen kam und kommt, Jber. Deutsch. Math.-Verein 78(1977), 177-223.
- [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.
- [Tait65] W. W. Tait, Functionals defined by transfinite recursion, Jour. Symb. Logic 30 (1965) 155-174.