

# Feferman Interpretability

Joost J. Joosten, Luka Mikec, and Albert Visser

June 27, 2024

## Abstract

We present an interpretability logic **FIL** or *Feferman Interpretability Logic*. The  $\Box$  provability modality can occur in **FIL** with a label, as in  $\Box^a$ . Likewise the  $\triangleright$  interpretability modality can occur in **FIL** with a label, as in  $\triangleright^a$ . The labels indicate that in the arithmetical interpretation, the axiomatisation of the base theory will be tweaked/customised. The base theory  $T$  will always contain the minimum of  $S_2^1$  of arithmetic and  $T$  will be approximated by  $T^a$  in such a way that  $T$  is extensionally the same as  $T^a$ . However,  $T^a$  will inherit certain properties reminiscent of finitely axiomatised theories.

After providing the logic **FIL** and proving the arithmetical soundness, we set the logic to work to prove various interpretability principles to be sound in a large variety of (weak) arithmetical theories. In particular, we prove the two series of principles from [GJ20] to be arithmetically sound using **FIL**. Up to date, the arithmetical soundness of these series had only been proven using the techniques of definable cuts.

## 1 Preludium

Interpretability Logic is an approach to the study of interpretability. Unlike the study of interpretability degrees and categories of theories and interpretations, the distinctive feature of interpretability logic is the internalisation and nesting of interpretability viewed as a modal connective. For example, interpretability logic allows us to study what the *internal* verification of the model existence lemma means in formal theories (Principle  $J_5$ ; see Section 2.4).

In the case of classical theories, for the primary reading of the modal connectives, there is a marked difference between provability logic and interpretability logic. Where provability logic is remarkable stable: no arithmetical theories with significantly different provability logics have been discovered, substantially different interpretability logics are realised in different (classes of) theories.

Interpretability Logic turns out to be a land of two streams. Its Euphrates is the logic **ILM** and its Tigris the logic **ILP**. The logic **ILM** is the logic of *essentially reflexive sequential theories*, alternatively characterised as sequential theories with full induction w.r.t. a designated interpretation

of a theory of the natural numbers.<sup>1</sup> The theory consists of the base logic IL, given in Section 2.4 plus the principle M:  $A \triangleright B \rightarrow (A \wedge \Box C) \triangleright (B \wedge \Box C)$ . The logic ILP is the interpretability logic of finitely axiomatised theories that interpret  $EA^+$ , a.k.a.  $I\Delta_0 + \text{supexp}$ . The logic is given by IL plus the principle P:  $A \triangleright B \rightarrow \Box(A \triangleright B)$ .

Both logics we introduced around 1987 by Albert Visser. A modal semantics for the theories was discovered soon after by Frank Veltman. See, e.g., [dJV90] and [dJV99]. The arithmetical completeness of ILM was proved by Alessandro Berarducci in [Ber90] and by Volodya Shavrukov in [Sha88]. The arithmetical completeness of ILP was proved by Albert Visser in his paper [Vis90]. For more information, see e.g. [Vis97], [JdJ98], [AB04].

But what happens if we distance ourselves from the rivers? There is a scarcity of results for specific theories. We do have a Kripke model characterisation of the interpretability logic of EA, aka  $I\Delta_0 + \text{exp}$ , however, we do not have an axiomatisation. See [Kal91]. Another case is Primitive Recursive Arithmetic. This is a theory that is neither finitely axiomatisable nor essentially reflexive. Some modest results have been obtained towards its interpretability logic but the full characterisation is still open ([IJ12, BJJ09]).

The most salient question is: what is the interpretability logic of all reasonable theories? This is a koan-like question since *what is reasonable?* is part of the question. A preliminary study was done in [JV00]. See also [GJ20] where a list of principles is given and verified. The principles valid in all reasonable theories will certainly be in the intersection of ILM and ILP. An example of such a principle is W:  $A \triangleright B \rightarrow A \triangleright (B \wedge \Box \neg A)$ . This principle has both an ILM- and an ILP-proof. Interestingly, we can generalise the ILM-proof to a wide class of theories, to wit sequential theories where the interpretation of the theory of numbers satisfies  $S_2^1$ . The basic idea here is that we can view the ILM-proof as using the insight that, for all models  $m$  of our sequential essentially reflexive theory  $T$ , any internal model is an end-extension of the  $m$ -internal  $T$ -models. This insight has a trace in all sequential theories (as discovered by Pavel Pudlák), to wit that  $m$  and its internal model  $n$  share a definable cut (modulo internally definable isomorphism).

We can also generalise the ILP-proof. To do that we use a trick due to Feferman ([Fef60]) to make a theory behave as if it were finitely axiomatised by modifying the representation of the axiom set. The P-style proof of W has even wider scope: it holds for all theories (with decent axiom sets) that interpret  $S_2^1$ . In analogy to W, many other principles can be given M-style proofs and P-style proofs with wider scope.

The aim of the present paper is to systematically study the P-style methodology and Feferman's trick. We do this by developing a modal logic that is specifically built to implement this methodology. Our present paper is a genuine extension of an earlier paper by Joost Joosten and Albert Visser, to wit [JV04].

---

<sup>1</sup>We think that the class of theories realising ILM can be extended to a class of *essentially sentimentally reflexive sequential theories*. We probably need our arithmetical base to be  $I\Sigma_1$ . However, this possibility has not been studied. See [BV05] for some relevant results.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section we revisit the basic definitions and results needed in the rest of the paper; definitions and results from arithmetic, formalised meta-mathematics and modal interpretability logics. NB: I only used the macros where the wrong variable was used and I did this only for Sections 1–4.

### 2.1 Arithmetic

In this paper we will be using reasoning in and over weak arithmetics. To this end, let us start by describing the theory  $S_2^1$ , introduced by Buss in [Bus86]. This is a finitely axiomatisable and weak first-order theory of arithmetic. The signature of  $S_2^1$  is

$$(0, s, |\cdot|, \lfloor \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rfloor, +, \times, \#, =, \leq).$$

The intended interpretation of  $|\cdot|$  is the length of its argument when expressed in the binary number system. In other words,  $|n|$  is (in the intended interpretation) equal to  $\lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil$ . The intended interpretation of  $\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rfloor$  is precisely the one suggested by the notation: dividing the argument by two and rounding the result downward. The symbol  $\#$  is pronounced ‘smash’ and has the following intended interpretation (“the smash function”):

$$n \# m = 2^{|n||m|}.$$

The remaining symbols are to be interpreted in the expected way.

The motivation for the smash function is that it gives an upper bound to Gödel numbers of formulas obtained by substitution: Suppose  $\varphi$  is a formula,  $x$  a variable and  $t$  a term. Given the Gödel numbers of  $\varphi$  and  $t$  (denoted with  $\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner$  and  $\ulcorner t \urcorner$ , as usual), the Gödel number of  $\varphi(x \mapsto t)$  will not surpass  $\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner \# \ulcorner t \urcorner$ . Of course, we need a ‘natural’ Gödel numbering to make this happen. See below.

Here and in the remainder of this paper, the assumption is that both the numeral representation and the Gödel numbers we work with are efficient. For example, we can take the Gödel number of a string of symbols to be its ordinal number in an arbitrary computationally very easy but otherwise fixed enumeration of all strings in the language of  $S_2^1$ . As for the numerals, we use *efficient numerals*, defined recursively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{0} &\mapsto 0; \\ \underline{2n+1} &\mapsto s(ss0 \times \underline{n}); \\ \underline{2n+2} &\mapsto ss(ss0 \times \underline{n}). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, efficient numerals have about the same growth rate as the corresponding binary representations.

We also require that the code of a subterm is always smaller than the entire term, and, similarly, for formulas. We will consider such codings to be *natural*. See [Bus98] for details.

An example of such a natural coding is the Smullyan coding where we code a string of letters (in a given alphabet of prime cardinality) as its number in the length-first ordering.

Before introducing (some of) the axioms of  $S_2^1$ , we will first define a certain hierarchy of formulas in the language of  $S_2^1$ . We will say that a quantifier is *bounded* if it is of the form  $(Qx \leq t)$  where  $t$  is a term<sup>2</sup> that does not involve  $x$ .

A quantifier is *sharply bounded* if it is of the form  $(Qx \leq |t|)$  where  $t$  is a term that does not involve  $x$ .

**Definition 2.1** ([Bus98]). Let  $\Delta_0^b$ ,  $\Sigma_0^b$ , and  $\Pi_0^b$  stand for the set of formulas all of whose quantifiers are sharply bounded. We define  $\Delta_i^b$ ,  $\Sigma_i^b$ , and  $\Pi_i^b$  for  $i > 0$  as the minimal sets satisfying the following conditions:

1. If  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are  $\Sigma_i^b$ -formulas, then  $(\varphi \wedge \psi)$  and  $(\varphi \vee \psi)$  are  $\Sigma_i^b$ -formulas.
2. If  $\varphi$  is a  $\Pi_i^b$ -formula and  $\psi$  is a  $\Sigma_i^b$ -formula, then  $\neg \varphi$  and  $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$  are  $\Sigma_i^b$ -formulas.
3. If  $\varphi$  is a  $\Pi_{i-1}^b$ -formula, then  $\varphi$  is a  $\Sigma_i^b$ -formula.
4. If  $\varphi$  is a  $\Sigma_i^b$ -formula,  $x$  a variable and  $t$  is a term not involving  $x$ , then  $(\forall x \leq |t|) \varphi$  is a  $\Sigma_i^b$ -formula.
5. If  $\varphi$  is a  $\Sigma_i^b$ -formula,  $x$  a variable and  $t$  is a term not involving  $x$ , then  $(\exists x \leq t) \varphi$  and  $(\exists x \leq |t|) \varphi$  are  $\Sigma_i^b$ -formulas.
6. The first five conditions are to be repeated in the dual form: with the roles of  $\Sigma$  and  $\Pi$ , and  $\exists$  and  $\forall$ , swapped in all places.
7. A formula  $\varphi$  is a  $\Delta_i^b$ -formula if it is equivalent over predicate logic both to a  $\Sigma_i^b$ -formula and to a  $\Pi_i^b$ -formula.

Thus, this hierarchy is analogous to the standard arithmetical hierarchy, with bounded quantifiers in the role of unbounded quantifiers, and sharply bounded quantifiers in the role of bounded quantifiers.

**Definition 2.2** (The polynomial induction schema [Bus98]). Let  $\Phi$  be a set of formulas which may contain zero or more free variables. We define  $\Phi$ -PIND axioms to be the formulas

$$\varphi(x := 0) \wedge (\forall x) (\varphi(x := \lfloor \frac{1}{2}x \rfloor) \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow (\forall x)\varphi,$$

for all  $\varphi \in \Phi$  and all variables  $x$ .

Thus, when proving facts using the schema of polynomial induction, in the inductive step we are allowed to refer to the property obtained for  $\lfloor \frac{1}{2}n \rfloor$ . This is, of course, faster than the standard schema of mathematical induction where we can use the property obtained for  $n - 1$ . The price we pay is a stronger antecedent in the induction principle.

We obtain  $S_2^1$  by extending a certain list of 32 quantifier-free formulas (dubbed BASIC, see e.g. [Bus98]) with all  $\Sigma_1^b$ -PIND axioms.

This somewhat unusually axiomatised theory has a nice connection to computational complexity, as the next theorem shows.

**Theorem 2.3** ([Bus86]). *We have the following.*

- Suppose  $S_2^1 \vdash (\forall x)(\exists y) \varphi(x, y)$  for some  $\Sigma_1^b$ -formula  $\varphi$ . Then there is a PTIME-computable function  $f_\varphi$  such that if  $f_\varphi(x) = y$  then  $\varphi(x, y)$  holds ( $f_\varphi$  is a witnessing function for  $\varphi$ ), and  $S_2^1 \vdash (\forall x) \varphi(x, f_\varphi(x))$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>By “ $(Qx \leq t)$ ” we mean “ $(\exists x)(x \leq t \wedge \dots)$ ”, if  $Q$  is  $\exists$ , and “ $(\forall x)(x \leq t \rightarrow \dots)$ ” if  $Q$  is  $\forall$ .

- *Conversely, suppose  $f$  is a  $PTIME$ -computable function. Then there is a  $\Sigma_1^b$ -formula  $\varphi_f$  such that  $\varphi_f(x, y)$  holds if and only if  $f(x) = y$ , and  $S_2^1 \vdash (\forall x)(\exists y)\varphi_f(x, y)$ .*

Theories in this paper will be  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised theories (i.e. having  $PTIME$ -decidable axiomatisations). Moreover, we will always assume that any theory we consider comes with a designated interpretation of  $S_2^1$ .

That is, when we say “a theory”, we mean a pair of an actual theory together with some singled-out and fixed interpretation of  $S_2^1$ .

A principle similar to induction is that of *collection*, in particular  $\Sigma_1$ -collection.

**Definition 2.4** ( $\Sigma_1$ -collection). The schema

$$(\forall n) \left( (\forall x < n)(\exists y)\varphi(x, y) \rightarrow (\exists m)(\forall x < n)(\exists y < m)\varphi(x, y) \right)$$

where  $\varphi$  is restricted to  $\Sigma_1$ -formulas possibly with parameters, is the  $\Sigma_1$ -collection schema.

Collection is occasionally useful, however we will have to find ways to avoid it as it is not available in  $S_2^1$ .

## 2.2 Interpretability

We refer the reader to [Vis91] or [Vis18] for the definitions of translation and interpretation.

There is one point specific to this paper. We want to treat a translation  $k$  as an interpretation, in a given theory  $T$ , of an unspecified target theory in a given target signature  $\Theta$ . To fulfill this role,  $T$  needs to prove at least the  $k$ -translations of the axioms of identity for signature  $\Theta$ . However, generally, this may fail. The reason is that, even if identity as a logical connective, we treat it in translation simply as a symbol from the signature. In other words, we translate identity not necessarily to identity. Also, we need the guarantee that the domain is non-empty to satisfy the axiom  $\exists x x = x$ . In fact, the usual treatment of interpretations fits free logic without identity best.

We consider only finite signatures, so the theory of identity for signature  $\Theta$  will be given by a single axiom, say  $\text{id}_\Theta$ . Thus, what we need for the translation  $k$  to carry an interpretation at all is that  $T \vdash \text{id}_\Theta^k$ .

We implement a simple hack to ensure that every translation carries an interpretation to some theory. We fix a default translation  $m$  that interprets  $\text{id}_\Theta$  in  $T$ . We can take as the domain of  $m$  the full domain of  $T$  and translate identity to identity. The translation of the predicate symbols can be arbitrarily chosen. We can now replace  $k$  by the disjunctive interpretation  $k^*$  that is  $k$  in case  $\text{id}_\Theta^k$  and  $m$  otherwise. Clearly, we will always have  $T \vdash \text{id}_\Theta^{k^*}$ . Moreover, if  $T \vdash \text{id}_\Theta^k$ , then  $k$  and  $k^*$  coincide modulo  $T$ -provable equivalence. The idea is now simply that the translation we quantify over are really the  $k^*$ , so that they always carry some interpretation.

We note that, in the context of interpretability logics, we are interested in translations from a signature  $\Theta$  to itself. In that context, we can take as the default translation  $m$  simply the identity translation on  $\Theta$ .

In Section 5.1, we will strengthen our demand on translations somewhat to ensure that we do have coding in all theories we consider.

### 2.3 Formalised provability and interpretability

Before introducing formalised interpretability, let us say a few words on formalised provability. For a given signature, we fix a natural formalisation  $\mathbf{proof}(p, x)$  of proof from assumptions. We usually leave the signature implicit. We assume that a proof from assumptions is given, Hilbert-style, as a sequence of pairs of a number giving the status of the inference step and a formula.<sup>3</sup> Say  $\mathbf{a}$  tells us that the formula is an assumption. We can make  $\mathbf{proof}$  a  $\Delta_1^b$ -predicate. A theory  $T$  comes equipped with a representation  $\alpha$  of its axiom set. We will write  $\mathbf{axioms}_T$  for  $\alpha$ . The default is that  $\alpha$  is  $\Delta_1^b$ . We write:

- $\mathbf{proof}_T(p, x)$  for:  
 $\mathbf{proof}(p, x) \wedge (\forall i < \mathbf{length}(p)) ((p)_{i0} = \mathbf{a} \rightarrow \mathbf{axioms}_T((p)_{i1}))$ .
- $\mathbf{Pr}_T(x)$  for  $\exists p \mathbf{proof}_T(p, x)$

We note that, if  $\alpha$  is  $\Delta_1^b$ , then so is  $\mathbf{prf}_T(p, x)$ .

Let us denote the efficient numeral of the (natural) Gödel number of  $A$  by  $\ulcorner A \urcorner$ . Sufficiently strong theories (such as  $S_2^1$ ) prove the *Hilbert–Bernays–Löb derivability conditions* ([HB13]):

1. for all  $\varphi$ , if  $T \vdash \varphi$ , then  $T \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner)$ ;
2. for all  $\varphi, \psi$ ,  $T \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \varphi \rightarrow \psi \urcorner) \rightarrow (\mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \psi \urcorner))$ ;
3. for all  $\varphi$ ,  $T \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner) \urcorner)$ .

These conditions, in combination with the Fixed Point Lemma, suffice to show that  $T \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner 0 = 1 \urcorner)$  and, consequently,  $T \vdash 0 = 1$  follows from  $T \vdash \neg \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner 0 = 1 \urcorner)$ , i.e. Gödel’s second incompleteness theorem. These conditions also suffice to show that the following holds:

$$\text{if } T \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner) \rightarrow \varphi, \text{ then } T \vdash \varphi.$$

Thus  $T$  is only “aware” that  $\mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner)$  implies  $\varphi$  in case the conditional is trivially satisfied by the provability of its consequent. This entailment is known as *Löb’s rule*. In fact,  $T$  is “aware” of this limitation (*formalised Löb’s rule*):

$$T \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner) \rightarrow \varphi \urcorner) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner).$$

We can read e.g. the formulised Löb’s rule as a propositional scheme by replacing  $\mathbf{Pr}_T$  with  $\Box$  and the variable  $\varphi$  that ranges over  $T$ -formulas by the variable  $A$  that ranges over propositional modal formulas. The provability logic GL is the extension of the basic modal logic K with an additional axiom schema representing Löb’s formalised rule:

$$\Box(\Box A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow A.$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Of course, we do not really need the Hilbert format. However, the definition would be somewhat more complicated for, say, Natural Deduction.

In his well-known result, Solovay [Sol76] established arithmetical completeness for this logic. Upon inspection, this result works for all c.e. extensions of EA, a.k.a.  $\text{I}\Delta_0 + \text{exp}$ , that are  $\Sigma_1$ -sound.<sup>4</sup>

The predicate  $\text{Pr}_T$  satisfies the following property, which is known as the Kreisel Condition, for  $\exists\Sigma_1^b$ -sound theories:

$$T \vdash \varphi \text{ if and only if } \mathbb{N} \models \text{Pr}_T(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner). \quad (1)$$

We can find alternative axiomatisations of  $\text{Pr}_T$ , that satisfy Property (1), but behave differently w.r.t. consistency. One such axiomatisation is given in [Fef60]. Say the original axiomatisation is  $\alpha$ . We write  $\alpha_x(y)$  for  $\alpha(y) \wedge y \leq x$ . Let the theory axiomatised by  $\alpha_x$  be  $T_x$ . We take:  $F(x)$  iff  $\alpha(x) \wedge \text{Con}(T_x)$ .

We note that we diverge from our default here:  $F$  is  $\Pi_1$ . We take  $T^F$  to be the theory axiomatised by  $F$ . We need that the theory  $T$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -sound and reflexive to make (1) work for  $\text{Pr}_{T^F}$ .

Let us call this notion *Feferman-provability*. As we are interested only in consistent theories, clearly this predicate has the same extension as the predicate  $\text{Pr}_T$ . However, it is provable within PA that  $0 = 1$  is not Feferman-provable. This is, of course, not the case with  $\text{Pr}_{\text{PA}}$ , as that would contradict Gödel's second incompleteness theorem.

If we are dealing with a theory  $T$  with a poly-time decidable axiom set, by Theorem 2.3, there is a  $\Sigma_1^b$ -predicate (actually  $\Delta_1^b$ ) verifying whether a number codes a  $T$ -proof of a formula. This implies that the provability predicate, claiming that a proof exists for some given formula, is a  $\exists\Sigma_1^b$ -predicate. This is convenient because for  $\text{S}_2^1$  we have provable  $\exists\Sigma_1^b$ -completeness:

**Theorem 2.5.** *For any  $\exists\Sigma_1^b$ -formula  $\sigma$  we have*

$$\text{S}_2^1 \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \Box_T \sigma.$$

We now move on and consider interpretability. There are various notions of formalised interpretability<sup>5</sup> Here we are interested in *theorems-interpretability*, i.o.w. we say that  $k$  is an interpretation of  $V$  in  $U$  (we write  $k : U \triangleright V$ ) if and only if,  $(\forall\varphi) (\Box_V \varphi \rightarrow \Box_U \varphi^k)$ . Here  $\Box_V$  and  $\Box_U$  are the provability predicates of  $V$  and  $U$ , respectively. We remind the reader that theorems-interpretability is  $\text{S}_2^1$ -provably transitive —unlike axioms-interpretability.

The  $k$ -translation of  $\varphi$  is denoted as  $\varphi^k$ . If  $V$  is a finitely axiomatisable theory, then  $U \triangleright V$  is in fact a  $\exists\Sigma_1^b$  sentence. This is due to the fact that, for finitely axiomatised theories  $V$ , their interpretability in  $U$  boils down to the provability of the translation of the conjunction of their axioms and the fact that the translation function is P-TIME. As the theories studied in this paper are all  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatisable, the aforementioned statement is  $\exists\Delta_1^b$ , in particular  $\exists\Sigma_1^b$ .

<sup>4</sup>In a wide range of cases, we can, given the theory, redefine the representation of the axiom set in such a way that one can drop the demand of  $\Sigma_1$ -soundness. See, e.g., [Vis21].

<sup>5</sup>see Theorem 1.2.10. of [Joo04, Joo16a] for a discussion on their relationships.

## 2.4 Modal interpretability logics

There are many different interpretability logics in the literature. The language of interpretability logics is that of propositional logic together with a unary modal operator  $\Box$  and a binary modal operator  $\triangleright$ . We adhere to the binding convention that the Boolean operators bind as usual and that  $\Box$  binds as strong as  $\neg$  with all Boolean operators except  $\rightarrow$  binding stronger than  $\triangleright$  and  $\triangleright$  binding stronger than  $\rightarrow$ . Thus, for example,  $A \triangleright B \rightarrow \Diamond A \wedge \Box C \triangleright B \wedge \Box C$  will be short for:

$$(A \triangleright B) \rightarrow \left( (\Diamond A \wedge \Box C) \triangleright (B \wedge \Box C) \right).$$

Most interpretability logics extend a core logic called **IL**.

**Definition 2.6.** The logic **IL** has as axioms all tautologies in the modal propositional language containing  $\Box$  and  $\triangleright$  together with all instances of the following axioms.

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 & \vdash \Box(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\Box A \rightarrow \Box B) \\ L_2 & \vdash \Box A \rightarrow \Box \Box A \\ L_3 & \vdash \Box(\Box A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow \Box A \\ J_1 & \vdash \Box(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A \triangleright B \\ J_2 & \vdash (A \triangleright B) \wedge (B \triangleright C) \rightarrow A \triangleright C \\ J_3 & \vdash (A \triangleright C) \wedge (B \triangleright C) \rightarrow A \vee B \triangleright C \\ J_4 & \vdash A \triangleright B \rightarrow (\Diamond A \rightarrow \Diamond B) \\ J_5 & \vdash \Diamond A \triangleright A \end{aligned}$$

The only rules are Necessitation **Nec** :  $\vdash A \Rightarrow \vdash \Box A$  and Modus ponens.

We will consider extensions of **IL** by adding axiom schemes to **IL**. These logics will be named by appending the names of the new schemes to **IL**. For example, the principle **P** is given by  $\vdash A \triangleright B \rightarrow \Box(A \triangleright B)$  and the logic **ILP** arises by adding this scheme/principle to **IL**. Likewise, the principle **P<sub>0</sub>** is given by  $\vdash A \triangleright \Diamond B \rightarrow \Box(A \triangleright B)$  and the logic **ILP<sub>0</sub>** arises by adding this scheme/principle to **IL**.

For later use, we prove the following easy observation.

**Lemma 2.7.** *If we replace in **IL** the axiom schema  $J_5 : \vdash \Diamond A \triangleright A$  by  $J_5' : \vdash B \triangleright \Diamond C \rightarrow B \triangleright C$ , then the resulting logic will be equivalent to the original logic **IL**.*

*Proof.* Any formula  $\Diamond A \triangleright A$  is obtained from  $B \triangleright \Diamond C \rightarrow B \triangleright C$  by instantiating in the latter formula  $B$  by  $\Diamond A$  and  $C$  by  $A$ . Thus, we get  $\Diamond A \triangleright \Diamond A \rightarrow \Diamond A \triangleright A$  since the antecedent is clearly provable without using  $J_5'$ .

For the other direction, we reason in **IL** and assume  $B \triangleright \Diamond C$ . Now, by  $J_5$  we get  $\Diamond C \triangleright C$  so that by the transitivity axiom  $J_2$  we obtain the required  $B \triangleright C$ .  $\dashv$



### 3 Tweaking the axiom set

For finitely axiomatised theories  $V$ , we have:

$$S_2^1 \vdash U \triangleright V \rightarrow \Box_{S_2^1}(U \triangleright V),$$

by  $\exists\Sigma_1^b$  completeness because  $U \triangleright V$  is a  $\exists\Sigma_1^b$ -sentence. Recall that, in this paper, as a default, all theories are assumed to be  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised. If this were not the case,  $U \triangleright V$  need not, of course, be a  $\exists\Sigma_1^b$ -sentence, even for finitely axiomatised theories  $V$ . To mimic the  $\mathbf{P}$ -style behaviour for an arbitrary theory  $V$ , we will modify  $V$  to a new theory  $V'$  that approximates  $V$  to obtain  $S_2^1 \vdash U \triangleright V \rightarrow \Box_{S_2^1}(U \triangleright V')$ . Of course, the new theory  $V'$  should be sufficiently like  $V$  to be useful. Thus, we define a theory  $V'$  that is extensionally the same as  $V$ , but for which  $U \triangleright V'$  is a statement that is so simple that under the assumption that  $U \triangleright V$ , we can easily infer  $\Box_{S_2^1}(U \triangleright V')$ .

#### 3.1 The approximating theory defined

We start with a first approximation. Given some translation  $k$ , let us *define* the set of axioms  $V'$  as consisting of just those axioms  $\varphi$  of  $V$  such that  $U \vdash \varphi^k$ . Note that, if  $k : U \triangleright V$ , then  $V$  and  $V'$  have the same axioms. However, when  $V$  is not finitely axiomatisable, in general, we cannot take the insight  $V \equiv V'$  with us when we proceed to reason inside a box. In formulas: we do have  $k : U \triangleright V \Rightarrow V \equiv V'$  but in general we do not have  $k : U \triangleright V \Rightarrow \Box(V \equiv V')$ .

Notwithstanding, defining  $V'$  as above is useful and works modulo some trifling details. Firstly, the definition of the new axiom set does not have the right complexity. Secondly, if the argument is not set up in a careful way, we may seem to need both  $\Sigma_1$ -collection and  $\mathbf{exp}$ . We shall use a variation of Craig's trick so that the axiom sets that we consider will remain to be  $\Delta_1^b$ -definable. The same trick makes the use of strong principles, like  $\Sigma_1$ -collection and  $\mathbf{exp}$ , superfluous.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $U$  and  $V$  be  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised theories. Moreover, let  $k$  be a translation of the language of  $V$  into the language of  $U$  that includes a domain specifier.

We remind the reader of Smoryński's dot notation. e.g.,  $\ulcorner \dot{p} = \dot{p} \urcorner$  functions as a term that is the arithmetisation of the map  $p \mapsto \underline{p} = \underline{\dot{p}}$ . Here is our definition of  $V^{[U,k]}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{axioms}_{V^{[U,k]}}(x) &:= (\exists p, \varphi < x) \left( x = \text{conj}(\varphi, \ulcorner \dot{p} = \dot{p} \urcorner) \wedge \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{axioms}_V(\varphi) \wedge \text{proof}_U(p, \varphi^k) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We note that this is a  $\Sigma_1^b$ -formula. We can see that is equivalent to a  $\Delta_1^b$ -formula by describing a procedure for deciding whether  $\psi$  is a  $V^{[U,k]}$ -axiom.

**step 1.** Is  $\psi$  a conjunction? If not,  $\psi$  does not qualify. Otherwise, proceed to the next step.

step 2. Is the first conjunct of  $\psi$ , say  $\chi$ , a  $V$ -axiom? If not,  $\psi$  does not qualify. Otherwise, proceed to the next step.

step 3. Is the second conjunct of the form  $\underline{p} = \underline{p}$  and do we have  $\mathbf{proof}_U(p, \chi^k)$ ? If not,  $\psi$  does not qualify. If so,  $\psi$  will indeed be a  $V^{[U,k]}$ -axiom.

The following lemma tells us that  $\mathbf{S}_2^1$  verifies that  $k : U \triangleright V$  implies that  $V$  and  $V^{[U,k]}$  are *extensionally equal*. Actually,  $V \triangleright V^{[U,k]}$  always holds and does not depend on the assumption  $k : U \triangleright V$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $U$  and  $V$  be  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised theories. We have*

1.  $\mathbf{S}_2^1 \vdash (\forall k) (\text{id} : V \triangleright V^{[U,k]})$ .
2.  $\mathbf{S}_2^1 \vdash (\forall k) (k : U \triangleright V \rightarrow \text{id} : V^{[U,k]} \triangleright V)$ .

*Proof.* Ad (1). Reason in  $\mathbf{S}_2^1$ . We have to show:  $\Box_{V^{[U,k]}} \varphi \rightarrow \Box_V \varphi$ . This is easily seen to be true, since we can replace every axiom  $\varphi \wedge (\underline{p} = \underline{p})$  of  $V^{[U,k]}$  by a proof of  $\varphi \wedge (\underline{p} = \underline{p})$  from the  $V$ -axiom  $\varphi$ . The resulting transformation is clearly p-time.

Ad (2). Reason in  $\mathbf{S}_2^1$ . Suppose  $k : U \triangleright V$  and  $\Box_V \varphi$ . We set out to prove  $\Box_{V^{[U,k]}} \varphi$ . Let  $p$  be a proof of  $\varphi$  from  $V$ -axioms  $\tau_0, \dots, \tau_n$ . (Note that  $n$  need not be standard.) We would be done, if we could replace every axiom occurrence of  $\tau_i$  in  $p$  by

$$\frac{\tau_i \wedge (\underline{q}_i = \underline{q}_i)}{\tau_i} \wedge \mathbf{E}, l$$

where  $q_i$  would be a  $U$ -proof of  $\tau_i^k$ , so that we would obtain a  $V^{[U,k]}$ -proof  $r$  of  $\varphi$ . Clearly, for each  $\tau_i$  we have that  $\Box_V \tau_i$ , so that by our assumption  $k : U \triangleright V$  we indeed obtain a  $U$  proof  $q_i$  of  $\tau_i^k$ . However, these proofs  $q_i$  may be cofinal and, thus, we would need a form of collection to exclude that possibility to keep the resulting syntactical object  $r$  finite.

It turns out that we can perform a little trick to avoid the use of collection. To this end, let  $\tau$  be the (possibly non-standard) conjunction of these axioms  $\tau_i$ . Note that, by the naturality conditions on our coding,  $\tau$  is bounded by  $p$ . Since, clearly, we have  $\Box_V \tau$  we may find, using  $k : U \triangleright V$ , a  $U$ -proof  $q$  of  $\tau^k$ . Here it is essential that we employ *theorems interpretability* in this paper! We may use  $q$  to obtain  $U$ -proofs of  $q_i$  of  $\tau_i^k$ . Clearly, we can extract appropriate  $q_i$  from  $q$  in such a way that  $|q_i|$  is bounded by a term of order  $|q|^2$ . We can now follow our original plan and replace every axiom occurrence of  $\tau_i$  in  $p$  by

$$\frac{\tau_i \wedge (\underline{q}_i = \underline{q}_i)}{\tau_i} \wedge \mathbf{E}, l$$

and obtain a  $V^{[U,k]}$ -proof  $r$  of  $\varphi$ . We find that  $|r|$  is bounded by a term of order  $|p| \cdot |q|^2$ . So,  $r$  can indeed be found in p-time from the given  $p$  and  $q$ .  $\dashv$

For the previous lemma to hold it is essential that we work with efficient numerals  $\underline{p}$ . The reader may find it instructive to rephrase the lemma in terms of provability.

**Corollary 3.3.** *For  $U$  and  $V$  being  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised theories we have*

1.  $S_2^1 \vdash (\forall k) (\forall \varphi) (\Box_{V^{[U,k]}} \varphi \rightarrow \Box_V \varphi)$ ;
2.  $S_2^1 \vdash (\forall k) (k : U \triangleright V \rightarrow \forall \varphi (\Box_{V^{[U,k]}} \varphi \leftrightarrow \Box_V \varphi))$ .

As mentioned before, even though we have extensional equivalence of  $V$  and  $V^{[U,k]}$  under the assumption that  $k : U \triangleright V$ , we do not necessarily have this under a provability predicate. That is, although we do have  $\Box_{S_2^1} (\Box_{V^{[U,k]}} \varphi \rightarrow \Box_V \varphi)$  we shall, in general, not have  $k : U \triangleright V \rightarrow \Box_{S_2^1} (\Box_V \varphi \rightarrow \Box_{V^{[U,k]}} \varphi)$ .

### 3.2 A P-like principle for the approximated theory

The theory  $V^{[U,k]}$  is defined precisely so that it being interpretable in  $U$  is true almost by definition. This is even independent on  $k$  being or not an interpretation of  $V$  in  $U$ . The following lemma reflects this insight.

**Lemma 3.4.** *For  $U$  and  $V$ ,  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised theories we have*

$$S_2^1 \vdash (\forall k) (k : U \triangleright V^{[U,k]}).$$

*Proof.* Reason in  $S_2^1$ . Suppose  $p$  is a  $V^{[U,k]}$ -proof of  $\varphi$ . We want to construct a  $U$ -proof of  $\varphi^k$ . As a first step we transform  $p$  into a  $V$ -proof  $p'$  of  $\varphi$  as we did in the proof of Lemma 3.2,(1): replacing all axioms  $\varphi \wedge (\underline{s} = \underline{s})$  of  $V^{[U,k]}$  by a proof of  $\varphi \wedge (\underline{s} = \underline{s})$  from the  $V$ -axiom  $\varphi$ .

Next we transform  $p'$ , using  $k$ , into a predicate logical proof  $q$  of  $\varphi^k$  from assumptions  $\tau_i^k$ , where each  $\tau_i$  is a  $V$ -axiom. It is well known that this transformation is p-time.

Finally, each axiom  $\tau_i$  extracted from  $p$ , comes from a  $V^{[U,k]}$ -axiom  $\tau_i \wedge (\underline{x}_i = \underline{x}_i)$ , where  $r_i$  is a  $U$ -proof of  $\tau_i^k$ . So our final step is to extend  $q$  to a  $U$ -proof  $q'$  by prepending the  $U$ -proofs  $r_i$  above the corresponding  $\tau_i^k$ . This extension will at most double the number of symbols of  $q$ , so  $q' \approx q^2$ .  $\dashv$

As a direct consequence of this lemma, we see via necessitation that  $S_2^1 \vdash \Box_{S_2^1} (\forall k) (k : U \triangleright V^{[U,k]})$  so that in a trivial way we obtain something that comes quite close to the P-schema:

$$S_2^1 \vdash U \triangleright V \rightarrow \Box_{S_2^1} (\forall k) (k : U \triangleright V^{[U,k]}). \quad (2)$$

However, Equation 2, is somewhat strange, since the antecedent of the implication does no work at all. In this paper, we are interested in finite extensions. Fortunately, a minor modification of Equation 2 does give information about finite extensions.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $U$  and  $V$  be  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised theories. We have:*

$$S_2^1 \vdash (\forall k) (\forall \varphi) k : U \triangleright (V + \varphi) \rightarrow \Box_{S_2^1} (k : U \triangleright (V^{[U,k]} + \varphi)).$$

*Proof.* We reason in  $\mathbb{S}_2^1$ . Suppose  $U \triangleright (V + A)$ . It follows that  $\Box_U A^k$ , and, hence,  $\Box_U \Box_U A^k$ .

We reason inside the  $\Box_U$ . We have both  $\Box_U \varphi^k$  and  $k : U \triangleright V^{[U,k]}$ . We prove  $U \triangleright (V^{[U,k]} + \varphi)$ . Consider any  $V$ -sentence  $B$  and suppose  $\Box_{V^{[U,k]} + \varphi} \psi$ . It follows that  $\Box_{V^{[U,k]}} (\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$ . Hence,  $\Box_U (\varphi \rightarrow \psi)^k$ . We may conclude that  $\Box_U \psi^k$ , so we are done.  $\dashv$

We will need the following thinned version of Theorem 3.5, which shall be the final version of our approximation of the principle P.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $T$  be a  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised theory and let  $\chi$  and  $\alpha$  be  $T$ -sentences. We have:*

- a.  $\mathbb{S}_2^1 \vdash (\forall k) (k : (T + \alpha) \triangleright (T + \beta) \rightarrow \Box_{\mathbb{S}_2^1} k : (T + \alpha) \triangleright (T^{[T+\alpha,k]} + \beta))$ ,
- b.  $\mathbb{S}_2^1 \vdash (\forall k) (k : (T + \alpha) \triangleright (T + \beta) \rightarrow \Box_{\mathbb{S}_2^1} k : (T + \alpha) \triangleright (T^{[T,k]} + \beta))$ .

*Proof.* For (a), we apply Theorem 3.5 to  $T + \alpha$  in the role of  $U$ ,  $T$  in the role of  $V$ , and  $\beta$  in the role of  $\varphi$ . Claim (b) follows from (a), since, clearly,  $T^{[T+\alpha,k]}$  extends  $T^{[T,k]}$   $\dashv$

### 3.3 Iterated approximations

We will need to apply our technique of approximating theories to theories that themselves are already approximations<sup>6</sup>. To this end we generalise the definition of approximated theories to sequences of interpretations as follows.

**Definition 3.7.** Let  $V^{[\langle U, k \rangle]} := V^{[U, k]}$ . We recursively define

$$V^{[\langle U_0, k_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle U_n, k_n \rangle, \langle U_{n+1}, k_{n+1} \rangle]}$$

for  $n \geq 0$  to stand for  $\left( V^{[\langle U_0, k_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle U_n, k_n \rangle]} \right)^{[\langle U_{n+1}, k_{n+1} \rangle]}$ , i.e.:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{axioms}_{V^{[\langle U_0, k_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle U_n, k_n \rangle, \langle U_{n+1}, k_{n+1} \rangle]}}(x) := \\ (\exists p, \varphi < x) \left( x = \ulcorner \varphi \wedge (\dot{p} = \dot{p}) \urcorner \wedge \right. \\ \left. \text{axioms}_{V^{[\langle U_0, k_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle U_n, k_n \rangle]}}(\varphi) \wedge \right. \\ \left. \text{proof}_{U_{n+1}}(p, \varphi^{k_{n+1}}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

If  $x$  denotes a finite sequence  $\langle U_0, k_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle U_n, k_n \rangle$ , then we understand  $V^{[x, \langle U_{n+1}, k_{n+1} \rangle]}$  as  $V^{[\langle U_0, k_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle U_n, k_n \rangle, \langle U_{n+1}, k_{n+1} \rangle]}$ .

Theorem 3.6(a) can be adapted to this new setting, so that we get the following.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $T$  be a  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised theory and let  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  be  $T$ -sentences. Let the variable  $x$  range over codes of sequences of pairs  $\langle U_i, k_i \rangle$ . We have:*

$$\mathbb{S}_2^1 \vdash (\forall x) (\forall k) (k : (T + \alpha) \triangleright (T^{[x]} + \beta) \rightarrow \Box_{\mathbb{S}_2^1} ((T + \alpha) \triangleright T^{[x, \langle T+\alpha, k \rangle]} + \beta)).$$

<sup>6</sup>An example can be found in the proof of Lemma 7.3.

*Proof.* This is immediate from Theorem 3.5, noting that the parameter  $x$  does not affect the proof of that theorem.  $\dashv$

Again, it seems that there is no need to keep track of the formulas  $\gamma$  in the  $T^{[T+\gamma,k]}$  definition. Therefore, we shall, in the sequel, simply work with sequences of interpretations of  $T$  in  $T$  rather than sequences of pairs of theory and interpretation. The corresponding definition is as follows where  $\langle \rangle$  denotes the empty sequence and for a sequence  $x$ , we use  $x \star k$  or sometimes simply  $x, k$  to denote the concatenation of  $x$  with  $\langle k \rangle$ .

**Definition 3.9.** For  $T$  a  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised theory we define  $T^{\langle \rangle} := T$  and  $T^{[x \star k]} := \left( T^{[x]} \right)^{[T,k]}$ .

From now on, we shall write  $T^{[k]}$  instead of  $T^{\langle k \rangle}$ . With the simplified notion of iteration we can formulate a friendlier  $\mathbf{P}$ -flavoured principle.

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $T$  be a  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatised theory and let  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  be  $T$ -sentences. Let  $x$  range over sequences of interpretations. We have:*

$$\mathcal{S}_2^1 \vdash (\forall x)(\forall k) \left( (T + \alpha) \triangleright (T^{[x]} + \beta) \rightarrow \Box_{\mathcal{S}_2^1} (k : (T + \alpha) \triangleright (T^{[x,k]} + \beta)) \right).$$

## 4 A modal logic for approximation

In this section, we will present a modal logical system to reason about interpretations and approximations based on them.

### 4.1 The logic FIL

We proceed to articulate modal principles reflecting facts about approximations. The main idea is to label our modalities with sequences  $\mathbf{a}$  of interpretation variables. Of course, in the arithmetical part, these sequences  $\mathbf{a}$  will indeed be interpreted via some map  $\kappa$  as a sequence  $\kappa(\mathbf{a})$  of translations from the language of  $T$  to the language of  $T$ . In the next subsection we shall make the arithmetical reading precise but the idea is that  $A \triangleright^{\mathbf{a}} B$  will stand for  $T + \alpha \triangleright T^{[\kappa(\mathbf{a})]} + \beta$ , whenever  $A$  is interpreted by the  $T$ -sentence  $\alpha$  and  $B$  by  $\beta$ . Likewise,  $\Box^{\mathbf{a}} A$  will be interpreted as  $\Box_{T^{[\kappa(\mathbf{a})]}} \alpha$ . In the next section, we will see how we can avoid nonsensical interpretations  $k$  so that the theories  $T^k$  will always contain a minimum of arithmetic.

As in [JV04], we will call our modal system FIL even though the system presented here slightly deviates from the one in [JV04]. We first specify the language. We have propositional variables  $p_0, p_1, p_2, \dots$ . We will use  $p, q, r, \dots$  to range over them. Moreover, we have interpretation variables  $k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots$ . We have one interpretation constant  $\text{id}$ . The meta-variables  $k, \ell, m, \dots$  will range over the interpretation terms (i.e. interpretation variables and  $\text{id}$ ). The meta-variables  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \dots$  will range over finite sequences of interpretation variables.

The modal language of FIL is the smallest language containing the propositional variables, closed under the propositional connectives, including  $\top$  and  $\perp$ , and, given an interpretation term  $k$ , the modal operators  $\Box^k$  and  $\triangleright^k$ , and closed under the following rule.

- If  $A \triangleright^a B$  is in the language and  $k$  is an interpretation term not contained in  $\mathfrak{a}$ , then  $A \triangleright^{a,k} B$  is in the language. Similarly, for  $\Box^{a,k} A$ .

We let  $\diamond^a A$  abbreviate  $\neg \Box^a \neg A$ . We write  $\triangleright$  for  $\triangleright^{\text{id}}$ , and analogously for  $\Box$  and  $\diamond$ . The logic **FIL** has axioms  $\vdash A$  for any propositional logical tautology  $A$  in the extended language. Moreover, **FIL** has the obvious interchange rules to govern interaction between both sides of the turnstyle  $\vdash$  based on the deduction theorem so that  $\Delta, \Gamma \vdash C \Leftrightarrow \Delta \vdash \bigwedge \Gamma \rightarrow C$ . Apart from modus ponens, **FIL** has the following axioms and rules.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
L_1^a & \vdash \Box^a(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\Box^a A \rightarrow \Box^a B) \\
L_2^{a,b} & \vdash \Box^b A \rightarrow \Box^a \Box^{svt} A \\
L_3^a & \vdash \Box^a(\Box^a A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow \Box^a A \\
\\ 
J_1^a & \vdash \Box^a(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A \triangleright^a B \\
J_2^a & \vdash (A \triangleright B) \wedge (B \triangleright^a C) \rightarrow A \triangleright^a C \\
J_2^b & \vdash (A \triangleright^a B) \wedge \Box^a(B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow A \triangleright^a C \\
J_3^a & \vdash (A \triangleright^a C) \wedge (B \triangleright^a C) \rightarrow A \vee B \triangleright^a C \\
J_4^a & \vdash A \triangleright^a B \rightarrow (\diamond A \rightarrow \diamond^a B) \\
J_5^{a,b} & \vdash A \triangleright^a \diamond^b B \rightarrow A \triangleright^b B \\
\\ 
(\rightarrow \Box)^{a,k} & \vdash \Box^{a,k} A \rightarrow \Box^a A \\
(\rightarrow \triangleright)^{a,k} & \vdash A \triangleright^a B \rightarrow A \triangleright^{a,k} B \\
\\ 
\text{Nec}^a & \vdash A \Rightarrow \vdash \Box^a A \\
P^{a,b,k} & \Gamma, \Delta, \Box^b(A \triangleright^{a,k} B) \vdash C \Rightarrow \Gamma, A \triangleright^a B \vdash C
\end{array}$$

In the above, the rule  $P^{a,b,k}$  is subject to the following conditions:

1.  $k$  is an interpretation variable;
2.  $k$  does not occur in  $\mathfrak{a}, \Gamma, A, B, C$ ;
3.  $\Delta$  consists of formulas of the form  $E \triangleright^{a,k} F \rightarrow E \triangleright^a F$  and  $\Box^a E \rightarrow \Box^{a,k} E$ .

## 4.2 Basic observations on FIL

The first group of axioms  $L_1^a$ - $L_3^a$  express the straightforward generalisation of the regular provability axioms. The second group of axioms  $J_1^a$ - $J_5^{a,b}$  are the straightforward generalisations of the interpretability axioms. In particular, taking all interpretations to be the identity we retrieve all the regular axioms.

The third group of axioms tells us how we can vary the interpretability parameters. The Necessitation rule is as usual, and the  $P^{a,b,k}$  encodes the essential behaviour of approximations.

The following derivation shows how the  $P^{a,b,k}$  rules implies the axiom version CHANGE THIS WORD:

$$\frac{\frac{\Box(A \triangleright^{a,k} B) \vdash \Box(A \triangleright^{a,k} B)}{A \triangleright^a B \vdash \Box(A \triangleright^{a,k} B)}}{\vdash (A \triangleright^a B) \rightarrow \Box(A \triangleright^{a,k} B)}.$$

The use of a P-flavoured rule instead of an axiom is suggested since it better allocates flexibility in collecting all applications of Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 3.3 in our reasoning. To be on the safe side, we consider that FIL is presented using multi-sets so that we can allocate for applications of Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 3.3 *after* a  $P^{a,b,k}$  rule is applied. Often we shall not mention all parameters of an axiom and, for example, just speak of the  $P^k$  rule instead of the  $P^{a,b,k}$  rule.

From Section 6 onwards we shall put the logic FIL to work. Rather than giving formal proofs as a sequence of turnstyle statements we will describe such formal proofs. In doing so, we will call the licence to use  $\Box^a E \rightarrow \Box^{a,k} E$  provided by  $P^{a,b,k}$ :  $(E\Box)^k$ , and we will call <sup>7</sup> the licence to use  $E \triangleright^{a,k} F \rightarrow E \triangleright^a F$ :  $(E\triangleright)^k$ .

We observe that by taking the empty sequence we get various special cases of our axioms. For example, a special case of  $(\rightarrow \Box)^{x,k}$  would be  $\vdash \Box^k A \rightarrow \Box A$ . Furthermore, successive applications of  $(\rightarrow \Box)^{a,k}$  yield  $\vdash \Box^a A \rightarrow \Box A$ . Likewise, a special case of  $(\rightarrow \triangleright)^{a,k}$  gives us  $\vdash A \triangleright B \rightarrow A \triangleright^k B$ .

We observe that repeatedly applying  $(\rightarrow \Box)^{a,k}$  yields a generalisation of  $J_2^a$ :  $(A \triangleright^a B) \wedge \Box^{a*x} (B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow A \triangleright^a C$ .

Furthermore, we observe that  $J_1^a$  follows from the classical  $J_1$  principle since

$$\begin{aligned} \Box^a(A \rightarrow B) &\rightarrow \Box(A \rightarrow B) \\ &\rightarrow A \triangleright B \\ &\rightarrow A \triangleright^a B. \end{aligned}$$

We also observe that, if we drop the superscripts in  $J_5^{a,b}$ , we get the formula  $A \triangleright \diamond B \rightarrow A \triangleright B$  that is equivalent over  $J_1, J_2$  to the ordinary version  $\diamond A \triangleright A$  of  $J_5$  as we saw in Lemma 2.7.

As a first and simple derivation in our system we have the following strengthening of the principle  $P_0$  in FIL (recall that  $P_0$  is the scheme  $A \triangleright \diamond B \rightarrow \Box(A \triangleright B)$ ).

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  be arbitrary sequences of interpretations. Let  $\Delta$  consist of formulas of the form  $E \triangleright^{a,k} F \rightarrow E \triangleright^a F$  and  $\Box^a E \rightarrow \Box^{a,k} E$  for some  $k$  that does not occur in  $\mathbf{a}, \Gamma, A, B, C$ . We have the following rule to be derivable over FIL:*

$$\Gamma, \Delta, \Box^b(A \triangleright B) \vdash C \Rightarrow \Gamma, A \triangleright^a \diamond B \vdash C$$

*Proof.* We assume  $\Gamma, \Delta, \Box^b(A \triangleright B) \vdash C$ . By  $J_5^{a,k,\text{id}}$  we know that

$$\vdash A \triangleright^{a,k} \diamond B \rightarrow A \triangleright B,$$

so that we get  $\Gamma, \Delta, \Box^b(A \triangleright^{a,k} \diamond B) \vdash C$ . An application of  $P^{a,b,k}$  yields the required  $\Gamma, A \triangleright^a \diamond B \vdash C$ .  $\dashv$

---

<sup>7</sup>A possible strengthening of  $P^{a,b,k}$  is:

$$\Gamma, \Delta, \{\Box^b(A_i \triangleright^{a,k} B_i \mid i < n + 1)\} \vdash C \Rightarrow \Gamma, \{A_i \triangleright^a B_i \mid i < n + 1\} \vdash C$$

putting the obvious conditions on occurrences of  $k$  and on  $\Delta$ . We will not consider this strengthening in the paper.

## 5 Arithmetical semantics

In order to set up arithmetical semantics, we would like to quantify over sensible translations. For example, a translation should at least map a minimum of arithmetic to provable sentences. However, how are we to separate the sensible from the non-sensical translations? In the first subsection we shall provide a construction to guarantee that we only use sensible translations. Then we shall define arithmetical semantics and prove a soundness theorem.

### 5.1 A further modification of translations

To do interpretability logic we need that we have sufficient coding possibilities in each theory we consider. Suppose we already have a theory with coding and translation  $k$  from the signature of  $T$  to the signature of  $T$ . We want to insure that  $T^{[T,k]}$  also has coding. To do this we simply have to produce an improved version of the modification trick we introduced in Section 2.2.

We fix our base theory  $T$  of signature  $\Theta$ . Our coding will always be implemented via an interpretation of  $S_2^1$  in  $T$ . We also fix such an interpretation, say  $N$ . Let  $\alpha^*$  be a conjunction of  $T$ -axioms that implies both  $\text{id}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ , where  $\mathfrak{A}$  is the signature of arithmetic, and  $(S_2^1)^N$ . We fix  $\alpha^*$  for the remainder of this section.

We can now specify our standard modification. Define, for any translation  $k$  of the signature of  $T$  to the signature of  $T$ , the disjunctive interpretation  $\mathfrak{n}(k)$  that is  $k$  if  $(\alpha^*)^k$  and  $\text{id}_{\Theta}$ , otherwise. Over predicate logic, we have, by a simple induction, that, for any  $\Theta$ -sentence  $\varphi$ ,

$$\varphi^{\mathfrak{n}(k)} \leftrightarrow \left( (\alpha^*)^k \wedge \varphi^k \right) \vee \left( \neg(\alpha^*)^k \wedge \varphi \right). \quad (3)$$

Since the needed induction to prove this is on the *length* of  $\varphi$  and since the proof can be uniformly constructed in p-time from  $\varphi$ , we have access to (3) when reasoning inside  $S_2^1$ .

We observe that, for example, in the formula  $\exists k \Box_U \varphi^{s(k)}$ , the choice of whether  $s(k)$  will be equivalent to  $\text{id}_{\Theta}$  or to  $k$  will depend on whether  $(\alpha^*)^k$  holds under the  $\Box_U$ . In contrast, in the expression  $\exists k \Box_{U^{[s(k)]}} \varphi$ , the nature of  $U^{[s(k)]}$  depends on whether  $(\alpha^*)^k$  holds outside the box.

Let us proceed by making some easy observations on  $\mathfrak{n}(k)$ . In the following lemma, we start by observing that regardless of the nature of  $k$ , the derived  $s(k)$  provides us an interpretation of  $\alpha^*$  in  $T$ . Next, we see that any other interpretation of  $\alpha^*$  in  $T$  will also occur as an image of  $s$ . Thus, modulo  $T$ -provable equivalence,  $\mathfrak{n}(k)$  ranges precisely over all interpretations of  $\alpha^*$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *We have, verifiably in  $S_2^1$ , that, for all good translations  $k$  and  $j$ ,*

1.  $T \vdash (\alpha^*)^{\mathfrak{n}(k)}$ ,
2. for any formula  $\varphi$  we have  $T \vdash (\alpha^*)^k \rightarrow (\varphi^{\mathfrak{n}(k)} \leftrightarrow \varphi^k)$ ,
3.  $T \vdash \varphi^{\mathfrak{n}(\text{id}_{\Theta})} \leftrightarrow \varphi$   
(i.o.w.,  $\mathfrak{n}(\text{id}_{\Theta})$  is  $T$ -equivalent to  $\text{id}_{\Theta}$ ),



4.  $T \vdash \varphi^{n(k \circ j)} \leftrightarrow \varphi^{n(k) \circ n(j)}$   
*(i.o.w.,  $n$   $T$ -provably commutes with composition of translations).*

*Proof.* Let us prove the first claim. Reason in  $\mathbf{S}_2^1$  and let  $k$  be arbitrary. Now reason in  $T$  or more formally, under the  $\Box_T$ . We distinguish cases. If  $(\alpha^*)^k$ , then  $s(k) = k$ , and  $(\alpha^*)^k$  holds by the case assumption. Otherwise,  $s(k) = \text{id}_\Theta$ . The choice of  $T$  and  $\alpha^*$  (see beginning of the subsection) implies  $T \vdash \alpha^*$ , as required.

The second claim is immediate by the induction we already discussed. The third and fourth claims are easy.  $\dashv$

We recall that where the lemma mentions the theory  $T^{[T, n(k)]}$  we really mean the theory axiomatised by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{axioms}_{T^{[T, n(k)]}}(x) = (\exists p, \varphi < x) \left( x = \ulcorner \varphi \wedge (\underline{p} = \underline{p}) \urcorner \wedge \right. \\ \left. \text{axioms}_T(\varphi) \wedge \text{proof}_T(p, \varphi^{n(k)}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In this formula we can expand  $\varphi^{n(k)}$  as in (3).

**Lemma 5.2.**  $\mathbf{S}_2^1 \vdash \forall k \Box_{T^{[T, n(k)]}} (\mathbf{S}_2^1)^N$ .

*Proof.* Reason in  $\mathbf{S}_2^1$ . Consider any translation  $k$  from the language of  $T$  to the language of  $T$ . Lemma 5.1 tells us there is a proof in  $T$  of  $(\alpha^*)^{n(k)}$ . Hence, we have proofs  $p_i$  of  $(\alpha_i)^{s(k)}$ , for (standardly) finitely many  $T$ -axioms  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ . We would like to show that  $T^{[T, n(k)]}$  proves each of these  $\alpha_i$ , since then  $T^{[T, n(k)]}$  proves  $(\mathbf{S}_2^1)^N$ . We take arbitrary  $\alpha_i$  and put  $x = \ulcorner \alpha_i \wedge (\underline{p}_i = \underline{p}_i) \urcorner$ . Clearly, this  $x$  witnesses (4), the first two conjuncts of the body of (4). Furthermore,  $T$  proves  $(\alpha_i)^{n(k)}$  because  $p_i$  is a proof of this formula in  $T$ . So,  $\alpha_i \wedge (\underline{p}_i = \underline{p}_i)$  is an axiom of  $T^{[T, n(k)]}$ , whence  $T^{[T, n(k)]}$  proves  $\alpha_i$ .  $\dashv$

Recall that we work with the theories  $T$  that interpret  $\mathbf{S}_2^1$  and that we fix a designated interpretation  $N : T \triangleright \mathbf{S}_2^1$ . We defined a variety of other theories of the form  $T^{[x]}$ , but we did not specify what interpretation of  $\mathbf{S}_2^1$  we are supposed to bundle them with. The preceding lemma tells us that we can reuse  $N$ . Thus, we will take  $N$  as the designated interpretation of  $\mathbf{S}_2^1$  in the  $T^{[x]}$ .

## 5.2 Arithmetical soundness

As before, we fix our base theory  $T$  of signature  $\Theta$ , the interpretation  $N$  of  $\mathbf{S}_2^1$  in  $T$ , the sentence  $\alpha^*$ , and the mapping on translations  $n$ . Let us say that translations in the range of  $n$  are *good translation*. We call the formalised predicate of being good: *good*.

As usual, the modal logics are related to arithmetic via *realisations*. Realisations map the propositional variables to sentences in the language of arithmetic. However, we now also have to deal with the interpretation sequences. Thus, our realisations for the arithmetical interpretation are pairs  $(\sigma, \kappa)$ , where:

- $\sigma$  maps the propositional variables to  $T$ -sentences, and

- $\kappa$  maps the interpretation variables to good translations from the language of  $T$  to the language of  $T$ .

We stipulate that the  $\sigma$  maps all but finitely many arguments to  $\top$  and, likewise, that the  $\kappa$  maps all but finitely many arguments to  $\mathfrak{n}(\text{id}_\Theta)$ . The realisations are lifted to the arithmetical language in the obvious way by having them commute with the logical connectives and by taking:

$$(\Box^{k_1, \dots, k_n} A)^{\sigma, \kappa} := \Box_{T[\langle \kappa(k_1), \dots, \kappa(k_n) \rangle]} A^{\sigma, \kappa}, \text{ and}$$

$$(A \triangleright^{k_1, \dots, k_n} B)^{\sigma, \kappa} := (T + A^{\sigma, \kappa}) \triangleright (T[\langle \kappa(k_1), \dots, \kappa(k_n) \rangle] + B^{\sigma, \kappa}).$$

Here, in the context of  $T$ , we suppress the relativisation to  $N$ , it being the silent understanding that all coding is done inside  $N$ . We observe that the nested modalities make sense because of Lemma 5.2. *A central point here is that we allow  $\kappa$  to be an internal variable.* The transformation  $T \mapsto T[\langle \kappa(k_1), \dots, \kappa(k_n) \rangle]$  is, in essence, a transformation of indices of theories and can, thus, be represented internally.

We note that the formula  $(\Box^{k_1, \dots, k_n} A)^{\sigma, \kappa}$  will *not* be generally equivalent to  $((\neg A) \triangleright^{k_1, \dots, k_n} \perp)^{\sigma, \kappa}$ .

A modal formula  $A$  will be arithmetically valid in  $T$  and  $N$ , w.r.t. our choice of  $\alpha^*$ , iff, for all  $\sigma$ , we have  $T \vdash \forall \kappa A^{\sigma, \kappa}$ . We note that it is necessary that the quantifier over  $\sigma$  is external, since the substitutions are at the sentence level. However, the internal quantification over the  $\kappa$  makes sense since these program transformations of of indices for theories.

**Theorem 5.3** (Arithmetical Soundness). *Let  $T$  be a  $\Delta_1^b$ -axiomatisable theory containing  $\mathcal{S}_2^1$  via  $N$ . We have, relative to a fixed  $\alpha^*$ ,*

$$\Gamma \vdash_{\text{FIL}} A \Rightarrow \text{for all } \sigma, T \vdash \forall \kappa \left( \bigwedge \Gamma^{\sigma, \kappa} \rightarrow A^{\sigma, \kappa} \right).$$

*Proof.* We use induction on **FIL** proofs.

The axiom  $(\rightarrow \Box)^{a, k}: \vdash \Box^{a, k} A \rightarrow \Box^a A$  is directly obtained by Corollary 3.3.1. and  $(\rightarrow \triangleright)^{a, k}$  are immediate from Lemma 3.2. The principles  $\mathbb{L}_1^a$  to  $\mathbb{J}_4^a$  are simple.

The principle  $\mathbb{J}_2^a \mathbf{b}$  is immediate from the observation that  $(T + \alpha) \triangleright (T^{[a]} + \beta)$  and  $\Box_{T^{[a]}}(\beta \rightarrow \gamma)$  imply  $(T + \alpha) \triangleright (T^{[a]} + \gamma)$ .

The validity of  $\mathbb{J}_5^{a, b}$  follows from the observation that,

$$\mathcal{S}_2^1 \vdash \forall j, k \in \text{good} (T^{[U, k]} + \text{con}(T^{[V, j]} + B)) \triangleright (T^{[V, j]} + B).$$

This follows by the usual formalisation of Henkin's Theorem (see e.g., [Vis91, Joo16b, Vis18]).

We now consider  $\mathbb{P}^{a, b, k}$  which tells us that from  $\Gamma, \Delta, \Box^b(A \triangleright^{a, k} B) \vdash C$  we may derive  $\Gamma, A \triangleright^a B \vdash C$ .

Consequently, for the closure of arithmetical validity under this rule we assume that

$$\text{for all } \sigma, T \vdash (\forall \kappa) \left( \bigwedge \Gamma^{\sigma, \kappa} \wedge \bigwedge \Delta^{\sigma, \kappa} \wedge (\Box^b(A \triangleright^{a, k} B))^{\sigma, \kappa} \rightarrow C^{\sigma, \kappa} \right) \quad (5)$$

and will need to prove

$$\text{for all } \sigma, T \vdash \forall \kappa \left( \bigwedge \Gamma^{\sigma, \kappa} \wedge (A \triangleright^a B)^{\sigma, \kappa} \rightarrow C^{\sigma, \kappa} \right). \quad (6)$$

To this end, we fix  $\sigma$ . We reason in  $T$ . We fix some  $\kappa'$  and assume

$$\bigwedge \Gamma^{\sigma, \kappa'} \wedge (A \triangleright^a B)^{\sigma, \kappa'}. \quad (7)$$

We remind the reader that the modal interpretation variable  $k$  is supposed to be fresh. Let  $\kappa$  be as  $\kappa'$  with the sole exception that

$$\kappa(k) : A^{\sigma, \kappa'} \triangleright^{\kappa'(a)} B^{\sigma, \kappa'} \text{ whence also } \kappa(k) : A^{\sigma, \kappa} \triangleright^{\kappa(a)} B^{\sigma, \kappa}.$$

Note that we can that the existence of a desired choice for  $\kappa(k)$  is guaranteed by Assumption (7). By Lemma 3.10 we get  $\Box \left( A^{\sigma, \kappa} \triangleright^{\kappa(a, k)} B^{\sigma, \kappa} \right)$ . Moreover, by Lemma 3.2(2) and by Corollary 3.3 we may conclude  $\bigwedge \Delta^{\sigma, \kappa}$  so that by (5) we conclude  $C^{\sigma, \kappa}$ . Since  $k$  does not occur in  $C$  we may thus conclude  $C^{\sigma, \kappa'}$  which finishes the proof of (6) and hence the soundness of  $\mathfrak{P}^{a, b, k}$ .  $\dashv$

## 6 On principles in IL(All)

In this section, we give arithmetical soundness proofs for some well-known interpretability principles that hold in all reasonable arithmetical theories. For this purpose we will employ the system FIL.

To avoid repeating too much content from [JV04], here we study only the following principles, but with proofs written in more detail compared to [JV04]. For other well-known principles we refer to [JV04].

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{W} \quad \vdash A \triangleright B \rightarrow A \triangleright (B \wedge \Box \neg A) \\ \text{M}_0 \quad \vdash A \triangleright B \rightarrow (\Diamond A \wedge \Box C) \triangleright (B \wedge \Box C) \\ \text{R} \quad \vdash A \triangleright B \rightarrow \neg(A \triangleright \neg C) \triangleright B \wedge \Box C \end{array}$$

### 6.1 The principle W

We start with the ILP-proof of the principle W, which we will later convert to an FIL proof of W.

**Fact 6.1.**  $\text{ILP} \vdash \text{W}$ .

*Proof.* We reason in ILP. Suppose  $A \triangleright B$ . Then,  $\Box(A \triangleright B)$ . Hence, (\*)  $\Box(\Diamond A \rightarrow \Diamond B)$ , and, thus, (\*\*)  $\Box(\Box \neg B \rightarrow \Box \neg A)$ .

Moreover, from  $A \triangleright B$ , we have  $A \triangleright (B \wedge \Box \neg A) \vee (B \wedge \Diamond A)$ . So it is sufficient to show:  $B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright B \wedge \Box \neg A$ .

We have:

$$\begin{array}{lll} B \wedge \Diamond A & \triangleright & \Diamond B & \text{by (*)} \\ & \triangleright & \Diamond(B \wedge \Box \neg B) & \text{by } \mathsf{L}_3 \\ & \triangleright & B \wedge \Box \neg B & \text{by } \mathsf{J}_5 \\ & \triangleright & B \wedge \Box \neg A & \text{by (**).} \end{array}$$

$\dashv$

To prove arithmetical soundness of  $W$  we will essentially replicate the modal proof of  $W$  in ILP. We first give a more formal version of the proof that uses the rule  $P^{x,y,k}$  in the way we formally defined it. Afterwards we will give a more natural proof.

**Lemma 6.2.** *The following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \Box(A \triangleright^{[k]} B), \\ & (B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright^{[k]} B \wedge \Box^{[k]} \neg B) \rightarrow (B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright B \wedge \Box^{[k]} \neg B) \\ & \vdash_{\text{FIL}} B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright B \wedge \Box \neg A. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Reason in FIL. Some simple uses of rules and axiom schemas of FIL are left implicit.

$$\begin{aligned} & \Box(A \triangleright^{[k]} B) && \text{assump.} && (1) \\ & (B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright^{[k]} B \wedge \Box^{[k]} \neg B) \rightarrow (B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright B \wedge \Box^{[k]} \neg B) && \text{assump.} && (2) \\ & \Box(\Diamond A \rightarrow \Diamond^{[k]} B) && \text{by (1), } J_4^k && (3) \\ & \Box(\Box^{[k]} \neg B \rightarrow \Box \neg A) && \text{by (3)} && (4) \\ & \Diamond A \triangleright \Diamond^{[k]} B && \text{by (3), } J_1 && (5) \\ & B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright \Diamond^{[k]} B && \text{by (5), } J_1, J_2 && (6) \\ & B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright \Diamond^{[k]} (B \wedge \Box^k \neg B) && \text{by (6), } L_3^k, J_1, J_2 && (7) \\ & B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright^{[k]} B \wedge \Box^k \neg B && \text{by (7), } J_5^k && (8) \\ & B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright B \wedge \Box^{[k]} \neg B && \text{by (2), (8)} && (9) \\ & B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright B \wedge \Box \neg A && \text{by (4), (9)} && (10) \end{aligned}$$

⊢

**Proposition 6.3.** *The principle  $W$  is arithmetically valid.*

$$\text{FIL} \vdash A \triangleright B \rightarrow A \triangleright B \wedge \Box \neg A.$$

*Proof.* Reason in FIL. By  $P^k$  and Lemma 6.2 we get

$$A \triangleright B \vdash_{\text{FIL}} B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright B \wedge \Box \neg A. (*)$$

Now assume  $A \triangleright B$ . Combining  $A \triangleright B$  with (\*) we get

$$B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright B \wedge \Box \neg A. (**)$$

Clearly  $A \triangleright B$  implies

$$A \triangleright (B \wedge \Box \neg A) \vee (B \wedge \Diamond A). (***)$$

From (\*\*) and (\*\*\*) by  $J_3$  we obtain  $A \triangleright B \wedge \Box \neg A$ . Thus

$$\text{FIL} \vdash A \triangleright B \rightarrow A \triangleright B \wedge \Box \neg A,$$

as required. ⊢

The proof presented in Proposition 6.3 (and Lemma 6.2) resembles the proof we gave earlier demonstrating that  $\text{ILP} \vdash \text{W}$ . However, the resemblance is not exactly obvious; we had to turn our proof “inside-out” in order to use the rule  $\text{P}^k$  (resulting in the contrived statement of Lemma 6.2). This can be avoided by applying the rule  $\text{P}^k$  in a different way.

When we want to conclude something starting from  $A \triangleright^x B$ , we introduce a fresh interpretation variable  $k$  and get  $\Box^y(A \triangleright^{x,k} B)$  (for whichever  $y$  we find suitable). Now we have to be a bit more careful; we can’t end the proof before we eliminate this  $k$ . We also have to be careful in how we use the rules  $(\text{E}\Box)^k$  and  $(\text{E}\triangleright)^k$ . Essentially, any proof in the new form must be formalisable in the system  $\text{FIL}$  as it was defined earlier. Let us demonstrate this with the principle  $\text{W}$ .

Reason in  $\text{FIL}$ . Suppose that  $A \triangleright B$ . By  $\text{P}^k$  we have for some  $k$  that  $\Box(A \triangleright^{[k]} B)$ . Hence, by  $\text{J}_4^k$ , we have  $(*) \Box(\Diamond A \rightarrow \Diamond^{[k]} B)$  and, so,  $(**)$   $\Box(\Box^{[k]} \neg B \rightarrow \Box \neg A)$ .

Moreover, from  $A \triangleright B$ , we have  $A \triangleright (B \wedge \Box \neg A) \vee (B \wedge \Diamond A)$ . So it is sufficient to show  $B \wedge \Diamond A \triangleright B \wedge \Box \neg A$ . We have:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
B \wedge \Diamond A & \triangleright & \Diamond^{[k]} B & \text{by } (*) \\
& \triangleright & \Diamond^{[k]}(B \wedge \Box^{[k]} \neg B) & \text{by } \text{L}_3^k \\
& \triangleright & B \wedge \Box^{[k]} \neg B & \text{by } \text{J}_5^k \text{ and } (\text{E}\triangleright)^k \\
& \triangleright & B \wedge \Box \neg A & \text{by } (**).
\end{array}$$

## 6.2 The principle $\text{M}_0$

Another good test case is the principle  $\text{M}_0$ , since both  $\text{ILW} \not\vdash \text{M}_0$  and  $\text{ILM}_0 \not\vdash \text{W}$ . Although we will later demonstrate the method for the principle  $\text{R}$  too and  $\text{ILR} \vdash \text{M}_0$ , the proof for  $\text{R}$  is more complex. For this reason we include the principle  $\text{M}_0$ .

We start with the  $\text{ILP}$ -proof of  $\text{M}_0$ :  $A \triangleright B \rightarrow (\Diamond A \wedge \Box C) \triangleright (B \wedge \Box C)$ .

**Fact 6.4.**  $\text{ILP} \vdash \text{M}_0$ .

*Proof.* Reason in  $\text{ILP}$ .

$$\begin{array}{lll}
A \triangleright B & \rightarrow & \Box(A \triangleright B) & \text{by } \text{P} \\
& \rightarrow & \Box(\Diamond A \rightarrow \Diamond B) & \text{by } \text{J}_4 \\
& \rightarrow & \Box(\Diamond A \wedge \Box C \rightarrow \Diamond B \wedge \Box C) & \\
& \rightarrow & \Diamond A \wedge \Box C \triangleright \Diamond B \wedge \Box C & \text{by } \text{J}_1 \\
& \rightarrow & \Diamond A \wedge \Box C \triangleright \Diamond(B \wedge \Box C) & \\
& \rightarrow & \Diamond A \wedge \Box C \triangleright B \wedge \Box C & \text{by } \text{J}_5.
\end{array}$$

□

Now we adapt this proof to fit  $\text{FIL}$ . We will not write the more formal version of the proof (see the commentary in Subsection 6.1).

**P-style soundness proof of  $\text{M}_0$**  Reason in  $\text{FIL}$ .

$$\begin{array}{lll}
A \triangleright B & \rightarrow & \Box(A \triangleright^{[k]} B) & \text{by } P^k \\
& \rightarrow & \Box(\Diamond A \rightarrow \Diamond^{[k]} B) & \text{by } J_4^k \\
& \rightarrow & \Box(\Diamond A \wedge \Box C \rightarrow \Diamond^{[k]} B \wedge \Box C) & \\
& \rightarrow & \Diamond A \wedge \Box C \triangleright \Diamond^{[k]} B \wedge \Box C & \text{by } J_1 \\
& \rightarrow & \Diamond A \wedge \Box C \triangleright \Diamond^{[k]} B \wedge \Box^{[k]} \Box C & \text{by } L_2^k \\
& \rightarrow & \Diamond A \wedge \Box C \triangleright \Diamond^{[k]} (B \wedge \Box C) & \\
& \rightarrow & \Diamond A \wedge \Box C \triangleright^{[k]} B \wedge \Box C. & \text{by } J_5^k \\
& \rightarrow & \Diamond A \wedge \Box C \triangleright B \wedge \Box C & \text{by } (E \triangleright)^k.
\end{array}$$

### 6.3 The principle R

As a final example, we will prove that the principle R:  $A \triangleright B \rightarrow \neg(A \triangleright \neg C) \triangleright B \wedge \Box C$  is arithmetically valid.

Before we see that  $\text{ILP} \vdash \text{R}$ , we first prove an auxiliary lemma.

**Lemma 6.5.**  $\text{IL} \vdash \neg(A \triangleright \neg C) \wedge (A \triangleright B) \rightarrow \Diamond(B \wedge \Box C)$ .

*Proof.* We prove the  $\text{IL}$ -equivalent formula  $(A \triangleright B) \wedge \Box(B \rightarrow \Diamond \neg C) \rightarrow A \triangleright \neg C$ . But this is clear, as  $\text{IL} \vdash (A \triangleright B) \wedge \Box(B \rightarrow \Diamond \neg C) \rightarrow A \triangleright \Diamond \neg C$  and  $\text{IL} \vdash \Diamond \neg C \triangleright \neg C$ .  $\dashv$

**Fact 6.6.**  $\text{ILP} \vdash \text{R}$ .

*Proof.* We reason in  $\text{ILP}$ . Suppose  $A \triangleright B$ . It follows that  $\Box(A \triangleright B)$ . Using this we get:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\neg(A \triangleright \neg C) & \triangleright & \neg(A \triangleright \neg C) \wedge (A \triangleright B) \\
& \triangleright & \Diamond(B \wedge \Box C) & \text{by Lemma 6.5} \\
& \triangleright & B \wedge \Box C & \text{by } J_5.
\end{array}$$

$\dashv$

**P-style soundness proof of R** Reason in  $\text{FIL}$ . We first show that  $(A \triangleright^{[k]} B) \wedge \neg(A \triangleright \neg C) \rightarrow \Diamond^{[k]}(B \wedge \Box C)$ . We show an equivalent claim  $(A \triangleright^{[k]} B) \wedge \Box^{[k]}(B \rightarrow \Diamond \neg C) \rightarrow A \triangleright \neg C$ .

Suppose that  $A \triangleright^{[k]} B$  and  $\Box^{[k]}(B \rightarrow \Diamond \neg C)$ . Thus,  $A \triangleright^{[k]} \Diamond \neg C$  by  $J_2^k$ . By  $J_5^k$  we get  $A \triangleright \neg C$ , as required. By necessitation,

$$\Box((A \triangleright^{[k]} B) \wedge \neg(A \triangleright \neg C) \rightarrow \Diamond^{[k]}(B \wedge \Box C)). \quad (11)$$

We now turn to the main proof. Suppose  $A \triangleright B$ . Then, for some  $k$ , we have  $\Box(A \triangleright^{[k]} B)$  and, thus,

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\neg(A \triangleright \neg C) & \triangleright & \neg(A \triangleright \neg C) \wedge (A \triangleright^{[k]} B) \\
& \triangleright & \Diamond^{[k]}(B \wedge \Box C) & \text{by (11)} \\
& \triangleright & B \wedge \Box C. & \text{by } J_5^k \text{ and } (E \triangleright)^k
\end{array}$$

## 7 Two series of principles

In [GJ20] two series of interpretability principles are presented. One series is called the *broad series*, denoted  $R^n$  (for  $n \in \omega$ ). The other series is called the *slim hierarchy*, denoted  $R_n$  (for  $n \in \omega$ ). The latter is actually a hierarchy of principles of increasing logical strength.

Both series of principles are proven to be arithmetically sound in any reasonable arithmetical theory. The methods used to prove this soundness in [GJ20] involve definable cuts and in essence can be carried out in the system called CuL. In the next two sections we will see how both series admit a soundness proof based on the method of finite approximations of target theories as embodied in our logic FIL.

### 7.1 Arithmetical soundness of the slim hierarchy

As already mentioned, the slim hierarchy  $R_n$  defined in [GJ20] is actually a hierarchy. Thus, to prove arithmetical soundness it suffices to study a cofinal sub-series. In our case we will study the certain sub-series  $\tilde{R}_n$ . Let us define the original sequence first; even though we will use the sub-series for the most part. Let  $a_i, b_i, c_i$  and  $e_i$  denote different propositional variables, for all  $i \in \omega$ . We define a series of principles as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 &:= a_0 \triangleright b_0 \rightarrow \neg(a_0 \triangleright \neg c_0) \triangleright b_0 \wedge \Box c_0 \\ R_{2n+1} &:= R_{2n}[\neg(a_n \triangleright \neg c_n)/\neg(a_n \triangleright \neg c_n) \wedge (e_{n+1} \triangleright \Diamond a_{n+1}); \\ &\quad b_n \wedge \Box c_n / b_n \wedge \Box c_n \wedge (e_{n+1} \triangleright a_{n+1})] \\ R_{2n+2} &:= R_{2n+1}[b_n / b_n \wedge (a_{n+1} \triangleright b_{n+1}); \\ &\quad \Diamond a_{n+1} / \neg(a_{n+1} \triangleright \neg c_{n+1}); \\ &\quad (e_{n+1} \triangleright a_{n+1}) / (e_{n+1} \triangleright a_{n+1}) \wedge (e_{n+1} \triangleright b_{n+1} \wedge \Box c_{n+1})] \end{aligned}$$

We proceed with defining the sub-series  $\tilde{R}_n$  (see [GJ20], below Lemma 3.1) where the  $\tilde{R}_n$  hierarchy exhausts the even entries of the original  $R_n$  hierarchy:

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &:= A_0 \triangleright B_0 \\ X_{n+1} &:= A_{n+1} \triangleright B_{n+1} \wedge (X_n) \\ Y_0 &:= \neg(A_0 \triangleright \neg C_0) \\ Y_{n+1} &:= \neg(A_{n+1} \triangleright \neg C_{n+1}) \wedge (E_{n+1} \triangleright Y_n) \\ Z_0 &:= B_0 \wedge \Box C_0 \\ Z_{n+1} &:= B_{n+1} \wedge (X_n) \wedge \Box C_{n+1} \wedge (E_{n+1} \triangleright A_n) \wedge (E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n) \\ \tilde{R}_n &:= X_n \rightarrow Y_n \triangleright Z_n. \end{aligned}$$

For convenience, define  $X_{-1} = \top$ . With this we have  $X_n \equiv_{\text{IL}} A_n \triangleright B_n \wedge (X_{n-1})$  for all  $n \in \omega$ . The first two schemas are:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_0 &:= A_0 \triangleright B_0 \rightarrow \neg(A_0 \triangleright \neg C_0) \triangleright B_0 \wedge \Box C_0; \\ \tilde{R}_1 &:= A_1 \triangleright B_1 \wedge (A_0 \triangleright B_0) \rightarrow \neg(A_1 \triangleright \neg C_1) \wedge (E_1 \triangleright \neg(A_0 \triangleright \neg C_0)) \triangleright \\ &\quad B_1 \wedge (A_0 \triangleright B_0) \wedge \Box C_1 \wedge (E_1 \triangleright A_0) \wedge (E_1 \triangleright B_0 \wedge \Box C_0). \end{aligned}$$

In the proof that  $\text{FIL} \vdash \tilde{R}_n$  (Theorem 7.2) we use the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.1.** For all  $n \in \omega$ , and all interpretation variables  $k$ :

$$\text{FIL} \vdash (A_n \triangleright^k B_n \wedge X_{n-1}) \wedge Y_n \rightarrow \diamond^k Z_n.$$

*Proof.* Let  $n = 0$  and fix  $k$ . We are to prove

$$\text{FIL} \vdash (A_0 \triangleright^k B_0 \wedge \top) \wedge \neg(A_0 \triangleright \neg C_0) \rightarrow \diamond^k (B_0 \wedge \square C_0).$$

Equivalently,

$$\text{FIL} \vdash (A_0 \triangleright^k B_0) \wedge \square^k (B_0 \rightarrow \diamond \neg C_0) \rightarrow A_0 \triangleright \neg C_0.$$

Assume  $(A_0 \triangleright^k B_0) \wedge \square^k (B_0 \rightarrow \diamond \neg C_0)$ . By  $J_2^k \mathbf{b}$ , this yields  $A_0 \triangleright^k \diamond \neg C_0$ , whence by  $J_5^k$ ,  $A_0 \triangleright \neg C_0$ .

Let us now prove the claim for  $n + 1$ . Fix  $k$ . Unpacking, we are to show that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FIL} \vdash & (A_{n+1} \triangleright^k B_{n+1} \wedge X_n) \wedge \neg(A_{n+1} \triangleright \neg C_{n+1}) \wedge (E_{n+1} \triangleright Y_n) \\ & \rightarrow \diamond^k \left( B_{n+1} \wedge X_n \wedge \square C_{n+1} \wedge (E_{n+1} \triangleright A_n) \wedge (E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, we are to show that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FIL} \vdash & (A_{n+1} \triangleright^k B_{n+1} \wedge X_n) \wedge (E_{n+1} \triangleright Y_n) \\ & \wedge \square^k \left( (B_{n+1} \wedge X_n) \rightarrow \diamond \neg C_{n+1} \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright A_n) \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n) \right) \\ & \rightarrow A_{n+1} \triangleright \neg C_{n+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Assume the conjunction on the left-hand side of (12). The first and the third conjunct imply

$$A_{n+1} \triangleright^k B_{n+1} \wedge X_n \wedge \left( \diamond \neg C_{n+1} \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright A_n) \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n) \right),$$

whence by weakening,

$$A_{n+1} \triangleright^k X_n \wedge \left( \diamond \neg C_{n+1} \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright A_n) \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n) \right). \tag{13}$$

We now aim to get  $A_{n+1} \triangleright^k \diamond \neg C_{n+1}$ . To this end, we set out to eliminate the last two disjuncts within (13).

From  $E_{n+1} \triangleright Y_n$  (the second conjunct on the left-hand side of (12)) we have  $E_{n+1} \triangleright \neg(A_n \triangleright \neg C_n)$ , thus  $E_{n+1} \triangleright \diamond A_n$ , whence  $\square^k (E_{n+1} \triangleright A_n)$  by the generalised  $\mathbf{P}_0$  (Lemma 4.1). We now combine  $\square^k (E_{n+1} \triangleright A_n)$  with (13), simplify and weaken to obtain

$$A_{n+1} \triangleright^k X_n \wedge (\diamond \neg C_{n+1} \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n)). \tag{14}$$

Thus, we have eliminated the second disjunct within (13), and we are left to eliminate  $\neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n)$ . We will now use the second conjunct on the left-hand side of (12),  $E_{n+1} \triangleright Y_n$ , again. We wish to apply the rule  $\mathbf{P}^{\langle \cdot \rangle, k, j}$ , so assume  $\square^k (E_{n+1} \triangleright^j Y_n)$ . Combining  $\square^k (E_{n+1} \triangleright^j Y_n)$  with (14) and unpacking  $X_n$ , we obtain

$$A_{n+1} \triangleright^k (A_n \triangleright B_n \wedge X_{n-1}) \wedge (E_{n+1} \triangleright^j Y_n) \wedge (\diamond \neg C_{n+1} \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n)). \tag{15}$$



Reason under  $\Box^k$ . We wish to apply the rule  $\mathsf{P}^{(\cdot),j,\ell}$  with  $A_n \triangleright B_n \wedge X_{n-1}$ , so assume  $\Box^j(A_n \triangleright^\ell B_n \wedge X_{n-1})$ . Combining  $\Box^j(A_n \triangleright^\ell B_n \wedge X_{n-1})$  with  $E_{n+1} \triangleright^j Y_n$  we obtain (still under the  $\Box^k$ ) that  $E_{n+1} \triangleright^j (A_n \triangleright^\ell B_n \wedge X_{n-1}) \wedge Y_n$ . Applying this to (15) we may conclude

$$A_{n+1} \triangleright^k \left( E_{n+1} \triangleright^j (A_n \triangleright^\ell B_n \wedge X_{n-1}) \wedge Y_n \right) \wedge (\Diamond \neg C_{n+1} \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n)).$$

The induction hypothesis allows us to replace  $A_n \triangleright^\ell B_n \wedge X_{n-1} \wedge Y_n$  with  $\Diamond^\ell(Z_n)$ .

$$A_{n+1} \triangleright^k (E_{n+1} \triangleright^j \Diamond^\ell(Z_n)) \wedge (\Diamond \neg C_{n+1} \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n)).$$

By  $\mathsf{J}_5^{j,\ell}$ ,

$$A_{n+1} \triangleright^k (E_{n+1} \triangleright^\ell Z_n) \wedge (\Diamond \neg C_{n+1} \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n)).$$

By our last application of  $\mathsf{P}^{(\cdot),j,\ell}$  and  $(\mathsf{E}\triangleright)^\ell$ , we can substitute  $\triangleright$  for  $\triangleright^\ell$ :

$$A_{n+1} \triangleright^k (E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n) \wedge (\Diamond \neg C_{n+1} \vee \neg(E_{n+1} \triangleright Z_n)).$$

Finally, we can simplify, weaken and apply  $\mathsf{J}_5^{k,(\cdot)}$  to obtain  $A_{n+1} \triangleright \neg C_{n+1}$ .  $\dashv$

We can now prove soundness for the slim hierarchy. It suffices to do this for the cofinal sub-hierarchy  $\tilde{\mathsf{R}}_n$ .

**Theorem 7.2.** *For all  $n \in \omega$ ,  $\text{FIL} \vdash \tilde{\mathsf{R}}_n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $n \in \omega$  be arbitrary. Assume  $\Box(A_n \triangleright^k B_n \wedge X_{n-1})$ . Clearly

$$Y_n \triangleright (A_n \triangleright^k B_n \wedge X_{n-1}) \wedge Y_n.$$

Now Lemma 7.1 implies

$$Y_n \triangleright \Diamond^k Z_n,$$

whence by  $\mathsf{J}_5^{(\cdot),k}$ ,

$$Y_n \triangleright^k Z_n.$$

By the rule  $\mathsf{P}^k$ , we can replace our assumption  $\Box^k(A_n \triangleright B_n \wedge X_{n-1})$  with  $X_n$ . Furthermore, by the same application of  $\mathsf{P}^k$ , and by  $(\mathsf{E}\triangleright)^k$ , we have  $Y_n \triangleright Z_n$ . Thus,  $X_n \rightarrow Y_n \triangleright Z_n$ , i.e.  $\tilde{\mathsf{R}}_n$ .  $\dashv$

## 7.2 Arithmetical soundness of the broad series

In order to define the second series we first define a series of auxiliary formulas. For any  $n \geq 1$  we define the schemata  $\mathsf{U}_n$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{U}_1 &:= \Diamond \neg(D_1 \triangleright \neg C), \\ \mathsf{U}_{n+1} &:= \Diamond((D_n \triangleright D_{n+1}) \wedge \mathsf{U}_n). \end{aligned}$$

Now, for  $n \geq 0$  we define the schemata  $\mathsf{R}^n$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{R}^0 &:= A \triangleright B \rightarrow \neg(A \triangleright \neg C) \triangleright B \wedge \Box C, \\ \mathsf{R}^{n+1} &:= A \triangleright B \rightarrow (\mathsf{U}_{n+1} \wedge (D_{n+1} \triangleright A)) \triangleright B \wedge \Box C. \end{aligned}$$

As an illustration we present the first three principles.

$$\begin{aligned} R^0 &:= A \triangleright B \rightarrow \neg(A \triangleright \neg C) \triangleright B \wedge \Box C; \\ R^1 &:= A \triangleright B \rightarrow \diamond \neg(D_1 \triangleright \neg C) \wedge (D_1 \triangleright A) \triangleright B \wedge \Box C; \\ R^2 &:= A \triangleright B \rightarrow \diamond \left[ (D_1 \triangleright D_2) \wedge \diamond \neg(D_1 \triangleright \neg C) \right] \wedge (D_2 \triangleright A) \triangleright B \wedge \Box C. \end{aligned}$$

When working with this series it is convenient to also have the following schemas:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &:= \Box(D_1 \triangleright \neg C), \\ V_{n+1} &:= \Box(D_n \triangleright D_{n+1} \rightarrow V_n) \text{ for } n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, we could have defined  $V_n := \neg U_n$  for  $n \geq 1$ .

**Lemma 7.3.** *For all  $n \in \omega \setminus \{0\}$ , and all finite sequences  $\mathbf{a}$  consisting of interpretation variables:*

$$\text{FIL} \vdash D_n \triangleright^{\mathbf{a}} \diamond \neg C \rightarrow V_n.$$

*Proof.* Let  $n = 1$  and  $\mathbf{a}$  be arbitrary. We want to prove that  $\text{FIL} \vdash D_1 \triangleright^{\mathbf{a}} \diamond \neg C \rightarrow \Box(D_1 \triangleright \neg C)$ . This is an instance of the generalised  $P_0$  schema as we stated in Lemma 4.1.

Let us now prove the claim for  $n+1$ . Thus, we fix an arbitrary sequence of interpretations  $\mathbf{a}$ . We are to show that

$$\text{FIL} \vdash D_{n+1} \triangleright^{\mathbf{a}} \diamond \neg C \rightarrow \Box(D_n \triangleright D_{n+1} \rightarrow V_n).$$

Thus, reasoning in  $\text{FIL}$ , we assume  $D_{n+1} \triangleright^{\mathbf{a}} \diamond \neg C$ . We now wish to apply the rule  $P^k$  with this formula, where  $k$  is an arbitrary variable not used in its left or right side or  $\mathbf{a}$ . So, assume  $\Box(D_{n+1} \triangleright^{\mathbf{a},k} \diamond \neg C)$ . Reason under a box. Assume  $D_n \triangleright D_{n+1}$ . Now  $D_n \triangleright D_{n+1}$  and  $D_{n+1} \triangleright^{\mathbf{a},k} \diamond \neg C$  imply  $D_n \triangleright^{\mathbf{a},k} \diamond \neg C$ . By the necessitated induction hypothesis, this implies  $V_n$ . Thus, we find  $\Box(D_n \triangleright D_{n+1} \rightarrow V_n)$ , as required.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 7.4.** *For all interpretation variables  $k$  we have the following:*

$$\text{FIL} \vdash U_n \wedge (D_n \triangleright A) \wedge (A \triangleright^k B) \triangleright^k B \wedge \Box C.$$

*Proof.* It is clear that the claim to be proved follows by necessitation,  $J_1$ , and  $J_5^{(\cdot),k}$  from the following:

$$\text{FIL} \vdash U_n \wedge (D_n \triangleright A) \wedge (A \triangleright^k B) \rightarrow \diamond^k (B \wedge \Box C).$$

This formula is equivalent to

$$(D_n \triangleright A) \wedge (A \triangleright^k B) \wedge \Box^k (B \rightarrow \diamond \neg C) \rightarrow V_n.$$

Assuming the left-hand side, we get  $D_n \triangleright^k \diamond \neg C$ , whence  $V_n$  by Lemma 7.3.  $\dashv$

**Theorem 7.5.** *For all  $n \in \omega$ ,  $\text{FIL} \vdash R^n$ .*

*Proof.* Case  $n = 0$  is clear. Let  $n > 0$  be arbitrary and let us prove  $\mathbf{R}^n$ . Reason in **FIL**. Assume  $A \triangleright B$ . We wish to apply the rule  $\mathbf{P}^k$  here. So, assume  $\Box(A \triangleright^k B)$ . We have:

$$\mathbf{U}_n \wedge (D_n \triangleright A) \triangleright \mathbf{U}_n \wedge (D_n \triangleright A) \wedge (A \triangleright^k B).$$

Lemma 7.4 and the rule  $\mathbf{J}_2$  imply

$$\mathbf{U}_n \wedge (D_n \triangleright A) \triangleright^k B \wedge \Box C,$$

and by  $(\mathbf{E}\triangleright)^k$ ,

$$\mathbf{U}_n \wedge (D_n \triangleright A) \triangleright B \wedge \Box C.$$

So we are done.  $\dashv$

## References

- [AB04] S. Artemov and L. Beklemishev. Provability logic. In D. Gabbay and F. Guenther, editors, *Handbook of Philosophical Logic, 2nd ed.*, volume 13, pages 229–403. Springer, Dordrecht, 2004.
- [Ber90] A. Berarducci. The Interpretability Logic of Peano Arithmetic. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 55(3):1059–1089, 1990.
- [BJJ09] M. Bílková, D. de Jongh, and J. Joosten. Interpretability in PRA. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 161(2):128–138, 2009.
- [Bus86] S. Buss. *Bounded arithmetic*. Bibliopolis, Napoli, 1986.
- [Bus98] S. Buss. Chapter 1: An introduction to proof theory & chapter 2: Firstorder proof theory of arithmetic. In S. R. Buss, editor, *Handbook of Proof Theory*. Elsevier, 1998.
- [BV05] L. Beklemishev and A. Visser. On the limit existence principles in elementary arithmetic and  $\Sigma_n^0$ -consequences of theories. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 136(1–2):56–74, 2005.
- [dJV90] D. de Jongh and F. Veltman. Provability logics for relative interpretability. In P. Petkov, editor, *Mathematical Logic, Proceedings of the Heyting 1988 Summer School in Varna, Bulgaria*, pages 31–42. Plenum Press, Boston, New York, 1990.
- [dJV99] D. de Jongh and F. Veltman. Modal completeness of ILW. In J. Gerbrandy, M. Marx, M. Rijke, and Y. Venema, editors, *Essays dedicated to Johan van Benthem on the occasion of his 50th birthday*. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 1999.
- [Fef60] S. Feferman. Arithmetization of metamathematics in a general setting. *Fundamenta mathematicae*, 49(1):35–92, 1960.
- [GJ20] E. Goris and J. Joosten. Two new series of principles in the interpretability logic of all reasonable arithmetical theories. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 85(1):1–25, 2020.
- [HB13] D. Hilbert and P. Bernays. *Grundlagen der Mathematik II*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.

- [IJ12] T. Icard and J. Joosten. Provability and interpretability logics with restricted substitutions. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 53(2):133–154, 2012.
- [JdJ98] G. Japaridze and D. de Jongh. The logic of provability. In S. Buss, editor, *Handbook of proof theory*, pages 475–546. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1998.
- [Joo04] J. Joosten. *Interpretability Formalized*. PhD thesis, Utrecht University, 2004.
- [Joo16a] J. Joosten. Characterizations of interpretability in bounded arithmetic. In P. Cegielski, A. Enayat, and R. Kossak, editors, *Studies in Weak Arithmetics*, volume 3, pages 57–90. CSLI Publications, Stanford, 2016.
- [Joo16b] J. Joosten. On formalizations of the Orey-Hájek characterization for interpretability. In P. Cegielski, A. Enayat, and R. Kossak, editors, *Studies in Weak Arithmetics*, pages 57–90. CSLI Publications, Stanford, 2016.
- [JV00] J. Joosten and A. Visser. The interpretability logic of all reasonable arithmetical theories. The new conjecture. *Erkenntnis*, 53(1-2):3–26, 2000.
- [JV04] J. Joosten and A. Visser. How to derive principles of interpretability logic, A toolkit. In J. van Benthem, F. Troelstra, A. Veltman, and A. Visser, editors, *Liber Amicorum for Dick de Jongh*. Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, 2004. Electronically published, ISBN: 90 5776 1289.
- [Kal91] M. Kalsbeek. Towards the interpretability logic of  $\text{ID}_0 + \text{EXP}$ . Logic Group Preprint Series 61, Faculty of Humanities, Philosophy, Utrecht University, <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/26517>, 1991.
- [Sha88] V. Shavrukov. The logic of relative interpretability over Peano arithmetic. Preprint, Steklov Mathematical Institute, Moscow, 1988. In Russian.
- [Sol76] R. Solovay. Provability interpretations of modal logic. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 28:33–71, 1976.
- [Vis90] A. Visser. Interpretability logic. In P.P. Petkov, editor, *Mathematical Logic, Proceedings of the Heyting 1988 summer school in Varna, Bulgaria*, pages 175–209. Plenum Press, Boston, New York, 1990.
- [Vis91] A. Visser. The formalization of interpretability. *Studia Logica*, 50(1):81–106, 1991.
- [Vis97] A. Visser. An overview of interpretability logic. In M. Kracht, M. de Rijke, and H. Wansing, editors, *Advances in modal logic '96*, pages 307–359. CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA, 1997.
- [Vis18] A. Visser. The interpretation existence lemma. In *Feferman on Foundations*, number 13 in Outstanding Contributions to Logic, pages 101–144, New York, 2018. Springer.

- [Vis21] A. Visser. The absorption law: Or: how to Kreisel a Hilbert–Bernays–Löb. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 60(3):441–468, 2021.