Axiomatic Potentialism

Chris Scambler

All Souls College,
Oxford University

chris.scambler@all-souls.ox.ac.uk

January 17, 2022

Overview

Table of Contents

Potentialism

Potentialism

Potentialism

is the idea that a mathematical object (e.g. a set) is the sort of thing that may *merely possibly* exist.

Potentialism

Potentialism

is the idea that a mathematical object (e.g. a set) is the sort of thing that may *merely possibly* exist.

- E.g. a geometric object as a figure one can construct

Potentialism

Potentialism

is the idea that a mathematical object (e.g. a set) is the sort of thing that may *merely possibly* exist.

- E.g. a geometric object as a figure one can construct
- A set as a certain sort of data structure one could assemble

Potentialism

Potentialism

is the idea that a mathematical object (e.g. a set) is the sort of thing that may *merely possibly* exist.

- E.g. a geometric object as a figure one can construct
- A set as a certain sort of data structure one could assemble
- Or perhaps a structure that is instantiated given enough objects.

Potentialism

Potentialism

is the idea that a mathematical object (e.g. a set) is the sort of thing that may *merely possibly* exist.

- E.g. a geometric object as a figure one can construct
- A set as a certain sort of data structure one could assemble
- Or perhaps a structure that is instantiated given enough objects.
- Ideas like this have deep roots in set theory, e.g. Zermelo and even Cantor

Potentialism

Potentialism

is the idea that a mathematical object (e.g. a set) is the sort of thing that may *merely possibly* exist.

- E.g. a geometric object as a figure one can construct
- A set as a certain sort of data structure one could assemble
- Or perhaps a structure that is instantiated given enough objects.
- Ideas like this have deep roots in set theory, e.g. Zermelo and even Cantor
- Still deeper roots in mathematics in general.

Potentialism

- The recent literature has seen two branches of study here:

Potentialism

- The recent literature has seen two branches of study here:
  1. Model-theoretic: study Kripke models whose worlds are structures with the accessibility relation (some refinement of) the substructure relation.

Potentialism

- The recent literature has seen two branches of study here:
  1. Model-theoretic: study Kripke models whose worlds are structures with the accessibility relation (some refinement of) the substructure relation.
  2. Axiomatic: Develop axiom systems designed to characterize this or that form of potentialism directly, without appeal to models.

Potentialism

- The recent literature has seen two branches of study here:
  1. Model-theoretic: study Kripke models whose worlds are structures with the accessibility relation (some refinement of) the substructure relation.
  2. Axiomatic: Develop axiom systems designed to characterize this or that form of potentialism directly, without appeal to models.
- In each case interesting questions arise concerning the relation between assertions in the modal framework and in first order set theory.

Potentialism

- The recent literature has seen two branches of study here:
  1. Model-theoretic: study Kripke models whose worlds are structures with the accessibility relation (some refinement of) the substructure relation.
  2. Axiomatic: Develop axiom systems designed to characterize this or that form of potentialism directly, without appeal to models.
- In each case interesting questions arise concerning the relation between assertions in the modal framework and in first order set theory.
- The model-theoretic side has seen thorough examination in the recent literature

Potentialism

- The recent literature has seen two branches of study here:
  1. Model-theoretic: study Kripke models whose worlds are structures with the accessibility relation (some refinement of) the substructure relation.
  2. Axiomatic: Develop axiom systems designed to characterize this or that form of potentialism directly, without appeal to models.
- In each case interesting questions arise concerning the relation between assertions in the modal framework and in first order set theory.
- The model-theoretic side has seen thorough examination in the recent literature
- Here we will be focused on axiomatic potentialism, and on relations between potentialist axiom systems and their first order counterparts.

Table of Contents

Motivation

Motivation

- Imagine one has the ability to take things and make a set containing them.

Motivation

- Imagine one has the ability to take things and make a set containing them.
- Imagine one is able to do this arbitrarily many times.

Motivation

- Imagine one has the ability to take things and make a set containing them.
- Imagine one is able to do this arbitrarily many times.
- Axiomatize this conception and work out its non-modal counterpart.

Language

The Language $\mathcal{L}_0$

- object variables x, y, z

Language

The Language $\mathcal{L}_0$

- object variables x, y, z
- plural variables X, Y, Z

Language

The Language $\mathcal{L}_0$

- object variables x, y, z
- plural variables X, Y, Z
- $\wedge, \neg, \forall, =$

Language

The Language $\mathcal{L}_0$

- object variables x, y, z
- plural variables X, Y, Z
- $\wedge, \neg, \forall, =$
- $\Box$

Language

The Language $\mathcal{L}_0$

- object variables x, y, z
- plural variables X, Y, Z
- $\wedge, \neg, \forall, =$
- $\Box$
- $\in$

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF (or free S5)

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF (or free S5)
3. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \rightarrow X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF (or free S5)
3. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \rightarrow X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF (or free S5)
3. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \rightarrow X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF (or free S5)
3. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \rightarrow X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation
2. $\Box\forall X \Diamond\exists x[Set(x, X)]$

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF (or free S5)
3. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \rightarrow X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation
2. $\Box\forall X \Diamond\exists x[Set(x, X)]$
3. $\Diamond\exists X \Box\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}x]$

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF (or free S5)
3. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \rightarrow X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation
2. $\Box\forall X \Diamond\exists x[Set(x, X)]$
3. $\Diamond\exists X \Box\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}x]$
4. $\Diamond\exists X \Box\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow x \subseteq y]$

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF (or free S5)
3. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \rightarrow X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation
2. $\Box \forall X \Diamond \exists x[Set(x, X)]$
3. $\Diamond \exists X \Box \forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}x]$
4. $\Diamond \exists X \Box \forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow x \subseteq y]$
5. A modal translation of replacement

Inconsistency?

Standard modal model theory validates the rule

$$\frac{\varphi \to \Box\psi}{\varphi \to \Box\forall x\psi}$$

Inconsistency?

Standard modal model theory validates the rule

$$\frac{\varphi \to \Box\psi}{\varphi \to \Box\forall x\psi}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \forall y \Box \neg Set(y, X) \tag{1}$$

Inconsistency?

Standard modal model theory validates the rule

$$\frac{\varphi \to \Box\psi}{\varphi \to \Box\forall x\psi}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \forall y\Box\neg Set(y, X) \tag{1}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \Box\neg Set(y, X) \tag{2}$$

Inconsistency?

Standard modal model theory validates the rule

$$\frac{\varphi \rightarrow \Box\psi}{\varphi \rightarrow \Box\forall x\psi}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \rightarrow \forall y \Box \neg Set(y, X) \tag{1}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \rightarrow \Box \neg Set(y, X) \tag{2}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \rightarrow \Box \forall y \neg Set(y, X) \tag{3}$$

Inconsistency?

Standard modal model theory validates the rule

$$\frac{\varphi \to \Box\psi}{\varphi \to \Box\forall x\psi}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \forall y\Box\neg Set(y, X) \tag{1}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \Box\neg Set(y, X) \tag{2}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \Box\forall y\neg Set(y, X) \tag{3}$$

Hence the need for free logic.

Inconsistency?

Standard modal model theory validates the rule

$$\frac{\varphi \to \Box\psi}{\varphi \to \Box\forall x\psi}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \forall y\Box\neg Set(y, X) \tag{1}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \Box\neg Set(y, X) \tag{2}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \Box\forall y\neg Set(y, X) \tag{3}$$

Hence the need for free logic.
UI $= \forall x[\forall y \varphi y \to \varphi x]$;

Inconsistency?

Standard modal model theory validates the rule

$$\frac{\varphi \to \Box\psi}{\varphi \to \Box\forall x\psi}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \forall y \Box \neg Set(y, X) \tag{1}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \Box \neg Set(y, X) \tag{2}$$

$$(Xx \leftrightarrow x \notin x) \to \Box \forall y \neg Set(y, X) \tag{3}$$

Hence the need for free logic.
UI $= \forall x[\forall y \varphi y \to \varphi x]$;
Instantiation requires assumption of existence.

Relative Consistency

- In fact ZFC interprets L.

Relative Consistency

- In fact ZFC interprets L.

$t : \mathcal{L}_0 \times V \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T) \mapsto \psi(T)$

Relative Consistency

- In fact ZFC interprets L.

$t : \mathcal{L}_0 \times V \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T) \mapsto \psi(T)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$. (!)

Relative Consistency

- In fact ZFC interprets L.

$t : \mathcal{L}_0 \times V \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T) \mapsto \psi(T)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$. (!)
- membership claims = id, commutes with propositional connectives

Relative Consistency

- In fact ZFC interprets L.

$t : \mathcal{L}_0 \times V \to \mathcal{L}_{\in}, (\varphi, T) \mapsto \psi(T)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$. (!)
- membership claims = id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T) := t(x) \in t(X) \subseteq T$

Relative Consistency

- In fact ZFC interprets L.

$t : \mathcal{L}_0 \times V \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T) \mapsto \psi(T)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$. (!)
- membership claims = id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T) := t(x) \in t(X) \subseteq T$
- $t(\forall x \varphi)(T) := \forall x \in T[t(\varphi)(T)]$

Relative Consistency

- In fact ZFC interprets L.

$t : \mathcal{L}_0 \times V \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T) \mapsto \psi(T)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$. (!)
- membership claims = id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T) := t(x) \in t(X) \subseteq T$
- $t(\forall x \varphi)(T) := \forall x \in T[t(\varphi)(T)]$
- $t(\forall X \varphi)(T) := \forall x \subseteq T[t(\varphi)(T)]$

Relative Consistency

- In fact ZFC interprets L.

$t : \mathcal{L}_0 \times V \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T) \mapsto \psi(T)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$. (!)
- membership claims = id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T) := t(x) \in t(X) \subseteq T$
- $t(\forall x \varphi)(T) := \forall x \in T[t(\varphi)(T)]$
- $t(\forall X \varphi)(T) := \forall x \subseteq T[t(\varphi)(T)]$
- $t(\Box \varphi)(T) := \forall S \supseteq T[t(\varphi)(S)]$

Relative Consistency

- In fact ZFC interprets L.

$t : \mathcal{L}_0 \times V \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T) \mapsto \psi(T)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$. (!)
- membership claims = id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T) := t(x) \in t(X) \subseteq T$
- $t(\forall x \varphi)(T) := \forall x \in T[t(\varphi)(T)]$
- $t(\forall X \varphi)(T) := \forall x \subseteq T[t(\varphi)(T)]$
- $t(\Box \varphi)(T) := \forall S \supseteq T[t(\varphi)(S)]$

Theorem

L $\vdash \varphi$ implies $ZFC \vdash t(\varphi)(T)]$

Relative Consistency

- In fact ZFC interprets L.

$t : \mathcal{L}_0 \times V \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T) \mapsto \psi(T)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$. (!)
- membership claims = id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T) := t(x) \in t(X) \subseteq T$
- $t(\forall x \varphi)(T) := \forall x \in T[t(\varphi)(T)]$
- $t(\forall X \varphi)(T) := \forall x \subseteq T[t(\varphi)(T)]$
- $t(\Box \varphi)(T) := \forall S \supseteq T[t(\varphi)(S)]$

Theorem

L $\vdash \varphi$ implies $ZFC \vdash t(\varphi)(T)]$

Note: convention on variables T, S.

Converse Translation

Converse Translation

Mirroring theorem

Converse Translation

Mirroring theorem

For φ in $\mathcal{L}_\in$, let $\varphi^\Diamond$ be the result of prefixing all atomic formulas and existential quantifiers by $\Diamond$ (and universal quantifiers by $\Box$.) Then we have

Converse Translation

Mirroring theorem

For φ in $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$, let $\varphi^{\Diamond}$ be the result of prefixing all atomic formulas and existential quantifiers by $\Diamond$ (and universal quantifiers by $\Box$.) Then we have

$$\Gamma \vdash_{FOL} \varphi \Leftrightarrow \Gamma^{\Diamond} \vdash_{\mathsf{L}} \varphi^{\Diamond}$$

Converse Translation

Mirroring theorem

For φ in $\mathcal{L}_\in$, let $\varphi^\Diamond$ be the result of prefixing all atomic formulas and existential quantifiers by $\Diamond$ (and universal quantifiers by $\Box$.) Then we have

$$\Gamma \vdash_{FOL} \varphi \Leftrightarrow \Gamma^\Diamond \vdash_{\mathsf{L}} \varphi^\Diamond$$

Note on replacement$^\Diamond$.

Converse Translation

Mirroring theorem

For φ in $\mathcal{L}_\in$, let $\varphi^\Diamond$ be the result of prefixing all atomic formulas and existential quantifiers by $\Diamond$ (and universal quantifiers by $\Box$.) Then we have

$$\Gamma \vdash_{FOL} \varphi \Leftrightarrow \Gamma^\Diamond \vdash_{\mathsf{L}} \varphi^\Diamond$$

Note on replacement$^\Diamond$.

Linnebo Interpretation Theorem

$\mathsf{L} \vdash ZFC^\Diamond$.

Converse Translation

Mirroring theorem

For φ in $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$, let $\varphi^{\Diamond}$ be the result of prefixing all atomic formulas and existential quantifiers by $\Diamond$ (and universal quantifiers by $\Box$.) Then we have

$$\Gamma \vdash_{FOL} \varphi \Leftrightarrow \Gamma^{\Diamond} \vdash_{\mathsf{L}} \varphi^{\Diamond}$$

Note on replacement$^{\Diamond}$.

Linnebo Interpretation Theorem

$\mathsf{L} \vdash ZFC^{\Diamond}$.

Proof: use mirroring.

Axioms for the theory L

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF
3. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \rightarrow X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation
2. $\Box\forall X\Diamond\exists x[Set(x, X)]$
3. $\Diamond\exists X\Box\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}x]$
4. $\Diamond\exists X\Box\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow x \subseteq y]$
5. A modal translation of replacement

Mini-conclusion

Mini-conclusion

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, $\mathsf{L} \equiv ZFC$.

Mini-conclusion

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, L $\equiv$ ZFC.

Bi-interpretation

In fact, ZFC $\vdash t(\phi^{\Diamond})(T) \leftrightarrow \phi$;

Mini-conclusion

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, L $\equiv$ ZFC.

Bi-interpretation

In fact, ZFC $\vdash t(\phi^{\Diamond})(T) \leftrightarrow \phi$; and
L $\vdash Univ(T) \rightarrow (t(\phi)(T)^{\Diamond} \leftrightarrow \phi)$

Mini-conclusion

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, $\mathsf{L} \equiv \mathit{ZFC}$.

Bi-interpretation

In fact, ZFC $\vdash t(\phi^{\Diamond})(T) \leftrightarrow \phi$; and
$\mathsf{L} \vdash \mathit{Univ}(T) \rightarrow (t(\phi)(T)^{\Diamond} \leftrightarrow \phi)$

This is essentially what Button calls 'near-synonymy'.

Table of Contents

Motivation

Motivation

- Imagine one has the ability to take things and make a set containing them.

Motivation

- Imagine one has the ability to take things and make a set containing them.
- Imagine one is also able to take a partial order and add a filter meeting all its (current) dense sets;

Motivation

- Imagine one has the ability to take things and make a set containing them.
- Imagine one is also able to take a partial order and add a filter meeting all its (current) dense sets;
- Or, equivalently, to take some things and add an enumerating function.

Motivation

- Imagine one has the ability to take things and make a set containing them.
- Imagine one is also able to take a partial order and add a filter meeting all its (current) dense sets;
- Or, equivalently, to take some things and add an enumerating function.
- Axiomatize this conception and work out its non-modal counterpart.

Language

The Language $\mathcal{L}_1$

- object variables x, y, z

Language

The Language $\mathcal{L}_1$

- object variables x, y, z
- plural variables X, Y, Z

Language

The Language $\mathcal{L}_1$

- object variables x, y, z
- plural variables X, Y, Z
- $\wedge, \neg, \forall, =$

Language

The Language $\mathcal{L}_1$

- object variables x, y, z
- plural variables X, Y, Z
- $\wedge, \neg, \forall, =$
- $\Box_{\uparrow}$, $\Box_{\leftarrow}$, $\Box$

Language

The Language $\mathcal{L}_1$

- object variables x, y, z
- plural variables X, Y, Z
- $\wedge, \neg, \forall, =$
- $\Box_{\uparrow}$, $\Box_{\leftarrow}$, $\Box$
- $\in$

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF for each modal (or free S5)

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF for each modal (or free S5)
3. $\Box\varphi \to \Box_{\uparrow}\varphi$, same for $\Box_{\leftarrow}$.

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF for each modal (or free S5)
3. $\Box\varphi \to \Box_{\uparrow}\varphi$, same for $\Box_{\leftarrow}$.
4. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \to X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF for each modal (or free S5)
3. $\Box\varphi \to \Box_{\uparrow}\varphi$, same for $\Box_{\leftarrow}$.
4. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \to X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF for each modal (or free S5)
3. $\Box\varphi \to \Box_{\uparrow}\varphi$, same for $\Box_{\leftarrow}$.
4. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \to X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF for each modal (or free S5)
3. $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box_{\uparrow}\varphi$, same for $\Box_{\leftarrow}$.
4. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \rightarrow X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation
2. $\Box\forall X \Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists x[Set(x, X)]$

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF for each modal (or free S5)
3. $\Box\varphi \to \Box_{\uparrow}\varphi$, same for $\Box_{\leftarrow}$.
4. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \to X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation
2. $\Box\forall X\Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists x[Set(x, X)]$
3. $\Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists X\Box\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}x]$

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF for each modal (or free S5)
3. $\Box\varphi \to \Box_{\uparrow}\varphi$, same for $\Box_{\leftarrow}$.
4. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \to X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation
2. $\Box\forall X\Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists x[Set(x, X)]$
3. $\Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists X\Box\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}x]$
4. $\Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists X\Box_{\uparrow}\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow x \subseteq y]$

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF for each modal (or free S5)
3. $\Box\varphi \to \Box_{\uparrow}\varphi$, same for $\Box_{\leftarrow}$.
4. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \to X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation
2. $\Box\forall X\Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists x[Set(x, X)]$
3. $\Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists X\Box\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}x]$
4. $\Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists X\Box_{\uparrow}\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow x \subseteq y]$
5. $\Box\forall X\Diamond_{\leftarrow}\exists f[f : \mathbb{N} \twoheadrightarrow X]$

Axioms for the theory M

Logical Axioms

1. Free FO logic
2. S4.2 modal logic + CBF for each modal (or free S5)
3. $\Box\varphi \to \Box_{\uparrow}\varphi$, same for $\Box_{\leftarrow}$.
4. $\forall z[Xz \leftrightarrow Yz] \to X = Y$, rigidity, Choice, Comp

Set-theoretic axioms

1. Extensionality, $\in$-rigidity, foundation
2. $\Box\forall X \Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists x[Set(x, X)]$
3. $\Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists X\Box\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}x]$
4. $\Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists X\Box_{\uparrow}\forall x[Xx \leftrightarrow x \subseteq y]$
5. $\Box\forall X \Diamond_{\leftarrow}\exists f[f : \mathbb{N} \twoheadrightarrow X]$
6. A modal translation of replacement

Some basic facts

Some basic facts

- M interprets ZFC under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond\uparrow}$.

Some basic facts

- M interprets ZFC under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond\uparrow}$.
- M interprets ZFC$^-$ under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond}$.

Some basic facts

- M interprets ZFC under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond\uparrow}$.
- M interprets ZFC^- under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond}$.
- M proves $\neg Pow^{\Diamond}$.

Some basic facts

- M interprets ZFC under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond\uparrow}$.
- M interprets ZFC$^-$ under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond}$.
- M proves $\neg Pow^{\Diamond}$.
- M proves $V = HC^{\Diamond}$ and hence $SOA^{\Diamond}$.

Some basic facts

- M interprets ZFC under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond\uparrow}$.
- M interprets ZFC^{-} under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond}$.
- M proves $\neg Pow^{\Diamond}$.
- M proves $V = HC^{\Diamond}$ and hence $SOA^{\Diamond}$.
- M proves the universal possibility of forcing.

Some basic facts

- M interprets ZFC under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond\uparrow}$.
- M interprets ZFC$^-$ under the translation $\varphi \mapsto \varphi^{\Diamond}$.
- M proves $\neg Pow^{\Diamond}$.
- M proves $V = HC^{\Diamond}$ and hence $SOA^{\Diamond}$.
- M proves the universal possibility of forcing.
- e.g., it proves it is possible for the continuum to exist and have a cardinality at least as great as any $\aleph$ number whose existence is provable in ZFC.

Inconsistency?

The axioms imply

$$\Diamond\exists x(\Diamond_{\leftarrow}\exists y[y \subseteq x \wedge y = z] \wedge \Box_{\uparrow}\neg\exists y[y = z])$$

Inconsistency?

The axioms imply

$$\Diamond\exists x(\Diamond_{\leftarrow}\exists y[y \subseteq x \wedge y = z] \wedge \Box_{\uparrow}\neg\exists y[y = z])$$

abbreviate the formula in parentheses by $\Psi(x, z)$.

Inconsistency?

The axioms imply

$$\Diamond\exists x(\Diamond_{\leftarrow}\exists y[y \subseteq x \wedge y = z] \wedge \Box_{\uparrow}\neg\exists y[y = z])$$

abbreviate the formula in parentheses by $\Psi(x, z)$.
By comprehension,

$$\Diamond\exists x\Psi(x, z) \wedge \exists X\forall y[Xy \leftrightarrow y \in z]$$

Inconsistency?

The axioms imply

$$\Diamond\exists x(\Diamond_{\leftarrow}\exists y[y \subseteq x \wedge y = z] \wedge \Box_{\uparrow}\neg\exists y[y = z])$$

abbreviate the formula in parentheses by $\Psi(x, z)$.
By comprehension,

$$\Diamond\exists x\Psi(x, z) \wedge \exists X\forall y[Xy \leftrightarrow y \in z]$$

By height potentialism/rigidty,

$$\Diamond\exists x\Psi(x, z) \wedge \Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists w\forall y[y \in w \leftrightarrow y \in z]$$

Inconsistency?

The axioms imply

$$\Diamond\exists x(\Diamond_{\leftarrow}\exists y[y \subseteq x \wedge y = z] \wedge \Box_{\uparrow}\neg\exists y[y = z])$$

abbreviate the formula in parentheses by $\Psi(x, z)$.
By comprehension,

$$\Diamond\exists x\Psi(x, z) \wedge \exists X\forall y[Xy \leftrightarrow y \in z]$$

By height potentialism/rigidty,

$$\Diamond\exists x\Psi(x, z) \wedge \Diamond_{\uparrow}\exists w\forall y[y \in w \leftrightarrow y \in z]$$

But then the rigidity/extensionality imply $w = z$ after all, so we have a contradiction.

Resolution

The argument just sketched uses comprehension with arbitrary parameters:

$$\exists X \forall y [Xy \leftrightarrow y \in z]$$

Resolution

The argument just sketched uses comprehension with arbitrary parameters:

$$\exists X \forall y [Xy \leftrightarrow y \in z]$$

And in the crucial application, it applies when we have no *a priori* guarantee z even exists (indeed this is what we are trying to establish.)

Resolution

The argument just sketched uses comprehension with arbitrary parameters:

$$\exists X \forall y [Xy \leftrightarrow y \in z]$$

And in the crucial application, it applies when we have no *a priori* guarantee z even exists (indeed this is what we are trying to establish.) Natural solution: 'restrict' comp to closed form:

$$\Box \forall z \Box \forall Z \exists X \forall y [Xy \leftrightarrow \varphi(y, z, Z)]$$

Resolution

The argument just sketched uses comprehension with arbitrary parameters:

$$\exists X \forall y [Xy \leftrightarrow y \in z]$$

And in the crucial application, it applies when we have no *a priori* guarantee z even exists (indeed this is what we are trying to establish.) Natural solution: 'restrict' comp to closed form:

$$\Box \forall z \Box \forall Z \exists X \forall y [Xy \leftrightarrow \varphi(y, z, Z)]$$

Amounts to 'restricting' ourselves to parameters that exist at the world of evaluation.

Relative Consistency

Key Point

Relative Consistency

Key Point

It turns out that M exhibits roughly the same relation to second order arithmetic together with the $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ -*Perfect Set Property* as L to ZFC.

Relative Consistency

Key Point

It turns out that M exhibits roughly the same relation to second order arithmetic together with the $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ -*Perfect Set Property* as L to ZFC.

- A set of reals is *perfect* iff it is closed and has no isolated points. There are only $2^{\aleph_0}$ such sets.

Relative Consistency

Key Point

It turns out that M exhibits roughly the same relation to second order arithmetic together with the $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ -*Perfect Set Property* as L to ZFC.

- A set of reals is *perfect* iff it is closed and has no isolated points. There are only $2^{\aleph_0}$ such sets.
- A set of reals is said to *have the perfect set property* iff it is countable, or has a perfect subset.

Relative Consistency

Key Point

It turns out that M exhibits roughly the same relation to second order arithmetic together with the $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ -*Perfect Set Property* as L to ZFC.

- A set of reals is *perfect* iff it is closed and has no isolated points. There are only $2^{\aleph_0}$ such sets.
- A set of reals is said to *have the perfect set property* iff it is countable, or has a perfect subset.
- E.g. every closed set has the PSP.

Relative Consistency

Key Point

It turns out that M exhibits roughly the same relation to second order arithmetic together with the $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ -*Perfect Set Property* as L to ZFC.

- A set of reals is *perfect* iff it is closed and has no isolated points. There are only $2^{\aleph_0}$ such sets.
- A set of reals is said to *have the perfect set property* iff it is countable, or has a perfect subset.
- E.g. every closed set has the PSP.
- If the reals can be well-ordered (AC), not all sets have the PSP.

Relative Consistency

Key Point

It turns out that M exhibits roughly the same relation to second order arithmetic together with the $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ -*Perfect Set Property* as L to ZFC.

- A set of reals is *perfect* iff it is closed and has no isolated points. There are only $2^{\aleph_0}$ such sets.
- A set of reals is said to *have the perfect set property* iff it is countable, or has a perfect subset.
- E.g. every closed set has the PSP.
- If the reals can be well-ordered (AC), not all sets have the PSP.
- The Γ-PSP is the assertion that every set of reals defined by a formula of type Γ has the PSP.

Relative Consistency

Key Point

It turns out that M exhibits roughly the same relation to second order arithmetic together with the $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ -*Perfect Set Property* as L to ZFC.

- A set of reals is *perfect* iff it is closed and has no isolated points. There are only $2^{\aleph_0}$ such sets.
- A set of reals is said to *have the perfect set property* iff it is countable, or has a perfect subset.
- E.g. every closed set has the PSP.
- If the reals can be well-ordered (AC), not all sets have the PSP.
- The Γ-PSP is the assertion that every set of reals defined by a formula of type Γ has the PSP.
- The Γ-PSP implies no formula in Γ defines a well-order of the reals.

Relative Consistency

Key Point

It turns out that M exhibits roughly the same relation to second order arithmetic together with the $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ -*Perfect Set Property* as L to ZFC.

- A set of reals is *perfect* iff it is closed and has no isolated points. There are only $2^{\aleph_0}$ such sets.
- A set of reals is said to *have the perfect set property* iff it is countable, or has a perfect subset.
- E.g. every closed set has the PSP.
- If the reals can be well-ordered (AC), not all sets have the PSP.
- The Γ-PSP is the assertion that every set of reals defined by a formula of type Γ has the PSP.
- The Γ-PSP implies no formula in Γ defines a well-order of the reals.
- Γ-definable sets are thus 'regular' or 'well behaved'.

Relative Consistency

Intuitive idea

Relative Consistency

Intuitive idea

(From now on, I will ignore the difference between SOA and $\mathrm{ZFC}^{-} + \mathrm{V} = \mathrm{HC}$. Replacement is formulated as collection.)

Relative Consistency

Intuitive idea

(From now on, I will ignore the difference between SOA and $\mathsf{ZFC}^- + \mathsf{V} = \mathsf{HC}$. Replacement is formulated as collection.)

- We will use the fact that $\mathsf{T} = \mathsf{SOA} + \Pi^1_1\text{-}\mathsf{PSP} \equiv \mathsf{ZFC}$, and in fact T proves that $L[r]$ is a model of ZFC for every real r.

Relative Consistency

Intuitive idea

(From now on, I will ignore the difference between SOA and $\mathrm{ZFC}^- + \mathrm{V} = \mathrm{HC}$. Replacement is formulated as collection.)

- We will use the fact that $\mathrm{T} = \mathrm{SOA} + \Pi^1_1\text{-PSP} \equiv \mathrm{ZFC}$, and in fact T proves that $L[r]$ is a model of ZFC for every real r.
- Our translation will be doubly parameterized, once by a real and once by a transitive set.

Relative Consistency

Intuitive idea

(From now on, I will ignore the difference between SOA and $\mathsf{ZFC}^- + \mathsf{V} = \mathsf{HC}$. Replacement is formulated as collection.)

- We will use the fact that $\mathsf{T} = \mathsf{SOA} + \Pi^1_1\text{-}\mathsf{PSP} \equiv \mathsf{ZFC}$, and in fact T proves that $L[r]$ is a model of ZFC for every real r.
- Our translation will be doubly parameterized, once by a real and once by a transitive set.
- Our interpretation for $\Diamond_\uparrow$ will involve holding r fixed and climbing transitive sets in $L[r]$;

Relative Consistency

Intuitive idea

(From now on, I will ignore the difference between SOA and $\mathsf{ZFC}^- + \mathsf{V} = \mathsf{HC}$. Replacement is formulated as collection.)

- We will use the fact that $\mathsf{T} = \mathsf{SOA} + \Pi^1_1\text{-}\mathsf{PSP} \equiv \mathsf{ZFC}$, and in fact T proves that $L[r]$ is a model of ZFC for every real r.
- Our translation will be doubly parameterized, once by a real and once by a transitive set.
- Our interpretation for $\Diamond_\uparrow$ will involve holding r fixed and climbing transitive sets in $L[r]$;
- while our interpretation for $\Diamond_\leftarrow$ will involve allowing new reals to be added but not extending the height of the transitive set parameter.

Relative consistency

Relative consistency

Let $M \models SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

Relative consistency

Let $M \vDash SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

$t : \mathcal{L}_1 \times M \times \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T, r) \mapsto \psi(T, r)$

Relative consistency

Let $M \vDash SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

$t : \mathcal{L}_1 \times M \times \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T, r) \mapsto \psi(T, r)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$.

Relative consistency

Let $M \vDash SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

$t : \mathcal{L}_1 \times M \times \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T, r) \mapsto \psi(T, r)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$.
- Membership $=$ id, commutes with propositional connectives

Relative consistency

Let $M \vDash SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

$t : \mathcal{L}_1 \times M \times \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T, r) \mapsto \psi(T, r)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$.
- Membership $=$ id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T, r) := t(x) \in t(X)$

Relative consistency

Let $M \vDash SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

$t : \mathcal{L}_1 \times M \times \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T, r) \mapsto \psi(T, r)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$.
- Membership $=$ id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T, r) := t(x) \in t(X)$
- $t(\forall x \varphi)(T, r) := \forall x \in T[t(\varphi)(T, r)]$

Relative consistency

Let $M \vDash SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

$t : \mathcal{L}_1 \times M \times \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T, r) \mapsto \psi(T, r)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$.
- Membership = id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T, r) := t(x) \in t(X)$
- $t(\forall x \varphi)(T, r) := \forall x \in T[t(\varphi)(T, r)]$
- $t(\forall X \varphi)(T, r) := \forall x \subseteq T[x \in L[r] \to t(\varphi)(T, r)]$

Relative consistency

Let $M \vDash SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

$t : \mathcal{L}_1 \times M \times \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T, r) \mapsto \psi(T, r)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$.
- Membership = id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T, r) := t(x) \in t(X)$
- $t(\forall x \varphi)(T, r) := \forall x \in T[t(\varphi)(T, r)]$
- $t(\forall X \varphi)(T, r) := \forall x \subseteq T[x \in L[r] \to t(\varphi)(T, r)]$
- $t(\Box_\uparrow \varphi)(T, r) := \forall S \supseteq T[S \in L[r] \to t(\varphi)(S, r)]$

Relative consistency

Let $M \vDash SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

$t : \mathcal{L}_1 \times M \times \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T, r) \mapsto \psi(T, r)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$.
- Membership $=$ id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T, r) := t(x) \in t(X)$
- $t(\forall x \varphi)(T, r) := \forall x \in T[t(\varphi)(T, r)]$
- $t(\forall X \varphi)(T, r) := \forall x \subseteq T[x \in L[r] \to t(\varphi)(T, r)]$
- $t(\Box_\uparrow \varphi)(T, r) := \forall S \supseteq T[S \in L[r] \to t(\varphi)(S, r)]$
- $t(\Box_\leftarrow \varphi)(T, r) := \forall s[r \in L[s] \to \forall S \in L[s][T \subseteq S \wedge rank(S) = rank(T) \to t(\varphi)(S, s)]]$

Relative consistency

Let $M \vDash SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

$t : \mathcal{L}_1 \times M \times \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathcal{L}_\in, (\varphi, T, r) \mapsto \psi(T, r)$

- assign singular/plural variables even/odd numbered variables $t(x), t(X)$.
- Membership = id, commutes with propositional connectives
- $t(Xx)(T, r) := t(x) \in t(X)$
- $t(\forall x \varphi)(T, r) := \forall x \in T[t(\varphi)(T, r)]$
- $t(\forall X \varphi)(T, r) := \forall x \subseteq T[x \in L[r] \to t(\varphi)(T, r)]$
- $t(\Box_\uparrow \varphi)(T, r) := \forall S \supseteq T[S \in L[r] \to t(\varphi)(S, r)]$
- $t(\Box_\leftarrow \varphi)(T, r) := \forall s[r \in L[s] \to \forall S \in L[s][T \subseteq S \wedge rank(S) = rank(T) \to t(\varphi)(S, s)]]$

Theorem

M $\vdash \varphi$ implies T $\vdash \forall r, T \in L[r][t(\varphi)(X, r)]$

Converse Translation

Converse Translation

Theorem

$\mathsf{M} \vdash \Pi^1_1 PSP^\Diamond$

Converse Translation

Theorem

$\mathsf{M} \vdash \Pi^1_1 PSP^\Diamond$

Proof (sketch)

Converse Translation

Theorem

$\mathsf{M} \vdash \Pi^1_1 PSP^\Diamond$

Proof (sketch)

Given any possible real r, one can show $\Diamond\exists x[x = \mathbb{R}^{L[r]}]$ using the $\Diamond_\uparrow$ translation of ZFC and some absoluteness lemmas.

Converse Translation

Theorem

$\mathsf{M} \vdash \Pi^1_1 PSP^{\Diamond}$

Proof (sketch)

Given any possible real r, one can show $\Diamond \exists x[x = \mathbb{R}^{L[r]}]$ using the $\Diamond_{\uparrow}$ translation of ZFC and some absoluteness lemmas. One can also show by forcing that "$\Diamond \mathbb{R}^{L[r]}$ is countable."

Converse Translation

Theorem

$M \vdash \Pi^1_1 PSP^{\Diamond}$

Proof (sketch)

Given any possible real r, one can show $\Diamond\exists x[x = \mathbb{R}^{L[r]}]$ using the $\Diamond_{\uparrow}$ translation of ZFC and some absoluteness lemmas. One can also show by forcing that "$\Diamond\mathbb{R}^{L[r]}$ is countable." This yields the $\Diamond$-translation of "$\mathbb{R}^{L[r]}$ exists for every r, and is coutnable."

Converse Translation

Theorem

$\mathsf{M} \vdash \Pi^1_1 PSP^\Diamond$

Proof (sketch)

Given any possible real r, one can show $\Diamond\exists x[x = \mathbb{R}^{L[r]}]$ using the $\Diamond_\uparrow$ translation of ZFC and some absoluteness lemmas. One can also show by forcing that "$\Diamond\mathbb{R}^{L[r]}$ is countable." This yields the $\Diamond$-translation of "$\mathbb{R}^{L[r]}$ exists for every r, and is coutnable." By a result of Solovay, if only countably many reals are constructible from r, then the $\Pi^1_1[r]$ PSP holds.

Converse Translation

Theorem

$\mathsf{M} \vdash \Pi^1_1 PSP^\lozenge$

Proof (sketch)

Given any possible real r, one can show $\lozenge \exists x[x = \mathbb{R}^{L[r]}]$ using the $\lozenge_\uparrow$ translation of ZFC and some absoluteness lemmas. One can also show by forcing that "$\lozenge \mathbb{R}^{L[r]}$ is countable." This yields the $\lozenge$-translation of "$\mathbb{R}^{L[r]}$ exists for every r, and is coutnable." By a result of Solovay, if only countably many reals are constructible from r, then the $\Pi^1_1[r]$ PSP holds. Hence by mirroring $\Pi^1_1[r] PSP^\lozenge$.

Converse Translation

Theorem

$\mathsf{M} \vdash \Pi^1_1 PSP^\Diamond$

Proof (sketch)

Given any possible real r, one can show $\Diamond\exists x[x = \mathbb{R}^{L[r]}]$ using the $\Diamond_\uparrow$ translation of ZFC and some absoluteness lemmas. One can also show by forcing that "$\Diamond\mathbb{R}^{L[r]}$ is countable." This yields the $\Diamond$-translation of "$\mathbb{R}^{L[r]}$ exists for every r, and is coutnable." By a result of Solovay, if only countably many reals are constructible from r, then the $\Pi^1_1[r]$ PSP holds. Hence by mirroring $\Pi^1_1[r]PSP^\Diamond$. But r is arbitrary.

Table of Contents

Conclusions

Conclusions

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, $\mathsf{M} \equiv SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.

Conclusions

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, $\mathsf{M} \equiv SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$. The latter is in fact equiconsistent with ZFC. $\mathsf{M} \equiv \mathsf{L} \equiv ZFC$.

Conclusions

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, M $\equiv SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.
The latter is in fact equiconsistent with ZFC. M $\equiv$ L $\equiv ZFC$.

Bi-interpretation

As before, SOA $+ \Pi^1_1 PSP \vdash t(\phi^\Diamond)(X, r) \leftrightarrow \phi$;

Conclusions

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, $\mathsf{M} \equiv SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$. The latter is in fact equiconsistent with ZFC. $\mathsf{M} \equiv \mathsf{L} \equiv ZFC$.

Bi-interpretation

As before, $\mathsf{SOA} + \Pi^1_1 PSP \vdash t(\phi^\Diamond)(X, r) \leftrightarrow \phi$; but, whether the converse holds is rather doubtful. (Related to 'inconsistency'.)

Philosophical Interest?

The 'first order picture' corresponding to the height + width potentialist view seems to be second order arithmetic + topological regularity.

Conclusions

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, $\mathsf{M} \equiv SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$. The latter is in fact equiconsistent with ZFC. $\mathsf{M} \equiv \mathsf{L} \equiv ZFC$.

Bi-interpretation

As before, SOA $+ \; \Pi^1_1 PSP \vdash t(\phi^\Diamond)(X, r) \leftrightarrow \phi$; but, whether the converse holds is rather doubtful. (Related to 'inconsistency'.)

Philosophical Interest?

The 'first order picture' corresponding to the height + width potentialist view seems to be second order arithmetic + topological regularity.

Conclusions

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, $\mathsf{M} \equiv SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$. The latter is in fact equiconsistent with ZFC. $\mathsf{M} \equiv \mathsf{L} \equiv ZFC$.

Bi-interpretation

As before, SOA $+ \Pi^1_1 PSP \vdash t(\phi^{\Diamond})(X, r) \leftrightarrow \phi$; but, whether the converse holds is rather doubtful. (Related to 'inconsistency'.)

Philosophical Interest?

The 'first order picture' corresponding to the height + width potentialist view seems to be second order arithmetic + topological regularity. The theory is up to interpreting ZFC in fairly natural 'inner models'

Conclusions

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, $\mathsf{M} \equiv SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$. The latter is in fact equiconsistent with ZFC. $\mathsf{M} \equiv \mathsf{L} \equiv ZFC$.

Bi-interpretation

As before, SOA $+ \Pi^1_1 PSP \vdash t(\phi^\Diamond)(X, r) \leftrightarrow \phi$; but, whether the converse holds is rather doubtful. (Related to 'inconsistency'.)

Philosophical Interest?

The 'first order picture' corresponding to the height + width potentialist view seems to be second order arithmetic + topological regularity.
The theory is up to interpreting ZFC in fairly natural 'inner models'
Conventionally, it is the regularity properties that are taken to hold in 'inner models'

Conclusions

Equivalence

We have an exact proof-theoretic equivalence, $\mathsf{M} \equiv SOA + \Pi^1_1 PSP$.
The latter is in fact equiconsistent with ZFC. $\mathsf{M} \equiv \mathsf{L} \equiv ZFC$.

Bi-interpretation

As before, SOA $+ \Pi^1_1 PSP \vdash t(\phi^\Diamond)(X, r) \leftrightarrow \phi$; but, whether the converse holds is rather doubtful. (Related to 'inconsistency'.)

Philosophical Interest?

The 'first order picture' corresponding to the height + width potentialist view seems to be second order arithmetic + topological regularity.
The theory is up to interpreting ZFC in fairly natural 'inner models'
Conventionally, it is the regularity properties that are taken to hold in 'inner models'
A peculiar sort of necker cube effect. Of philosophical interest?

Thanks!