

Iterated self-applicable truth

GEL & MR

27th March 2024

Contents

1	Overview	1
2	A theory	1
3	From the thesis: Theories with multiple self-applicable truth predicates	2
3.1	Consistency	7
3.2	An ordinal notation system for impredicative theories	11
3.3	Lower bounds on the proof-theoretic ordinal	17
3.4	Upper bounds on the proof-theoretic ordinal	24
4	Conclusion	31

1 Overview

Should *is true* be *is justifiable* or *verifiable*?

2 A theory

Language \mathcal{L}_Ω : extend language of PRA by binary predicate T . Assuming an ordinal notation system of a sufficiently large ordinal κ , and $\eta < \kappa$, $T_\eta s$ means $T(\ulcorner \eta \urcorner, s)$.

For $\beta < \kappa$, define a theory T_β extending HA by axioms, for each $\eta \leq \kappa$:

$$\forall \ulcorner A \urcorner \ulcorner B \urcorner (T_\eta \ulcorner A \urcorner \rightarrow B \urcorner \rightarrow (T_\eta \ulcorner A \urcorner \rightarrow T_\eta \ulcorner B \urcorner)) \quad (\text{I})$$

$$\forall \ulcorner A(x) \urcorner (\forall n T_\eta \ulcorner A(\dot{n}) \urcorner \rightarrow T_\eta \ulcorner \forall x A(x) \urcorner) \quad (\text{U})$$

$$\forall \xi \leq \beta (T_\eta \ulcorner T_\xi \dot{x} \urcorner \rightarrow T_\eta x) \quad (\text{D})$$

$$\forall \xi < \eta (T_\eta x \rightarrow T_\eta \ulcorner T_\xi \dot{x} \urcorner) \quad (\text{R})$$

and rules of inference

$$A \vdash T_\beta \ulcorner A \urcorner \quad (\text{Nec})$$

$$T_\beta \ulcorner A \urcorner \vdash A \quad (\text{Conec})$$

What gives the strength is that (D) ‘collapses’ all internal truth predicates to the current level (η). In contrast, (R) only permits ‘expanding’ the internal level by lower level predicates.

We argue that

Theorem 1. For every $p < \omega$,

$$\|\mathsf{T}_p\| = \vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot \omega).$$

Theorem 2. For $\omega \leq \beta < \vartheta\Omega^\Omega$,

$$\vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot \omega) \leq \|\mathsf{T}_\beta\| \leq \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega).$$

Theorem 3. The limit of the autonomous progression of $\{\mathsf{T}_\beta : \beta < \Omega\}$ is the large Veblen ordinal, $\vartheta\Omega^\Omega$.

It seems likely that the same claims hold for (intuitionistic) T_β .

The ordinal analysis of T_β theories is derived from the analysis of a classical extension of the theories in the first author's PhD thesis [?]. Some arguments require changing to accommodate the intuitionistic base (T-elimination), and some have been streamlined (?).

3 From the thesis: Theories with multiple self-applicable truth predicates

chap:ext

Truth is often used as a means of reflection; a tool by which one may obtain principles, schemata etc. that were implicit, but not necessary explicit, in the acceptance of some axiomatic system. Feferman, for example, views the theory of truth Ref (see ??) as an operation which, when applied to a theory S , answers the question “which statements in the base language ... ought to be accepted if one has accepted the basic axioms and rules of $[S]$?” [?, p. 2]. The Friedman-Sheard theories A to I can also be viewed as operations which have been applied to PRA: one adds to PRA a (new) predicate T , formalising the acceptance of PRA; on top of this one adds some subset of the Optional Axioms, for example adding \forall -Inf formalises the acceptance of ω -logic, while the axiom T-Del formalises closure under the rule T-Elim.

Viewing theories of truth as operations provides a natural way to describe the general processes behind their construction and allows one to possibly iterate the operation. In this section we will look at this specifically from the perspective of the Friedman-Sheard theory F .

One way of arguing for the naturalness of S_3 is to view it as formalising the acceptance of S_2 . Within S_3 one has T-Rep and T-Del, formalising the rules of inference T-Intro and T-Elim of S_2 , and thus

$$S_3 \vdash \forall x (\text{Bew}_{S_2}(x) \wedge \text{Sent}_{\mathcal{L}_T}(x) \rightarrow T(x)).$$

However, S_2 contains the rule T-Intro, so it seems reasonable that the theory attempting to formalise its acceptance should also be closed under T-Intro. But the presence of T-Rep, T-Del and T-Elim in S_3 means this is not possible, so perhaps S_3 is not such a natural theory after all.

Since closure of F under \neg T-Elim is vacuous, F and S_2 are identical as theories. Therefore, S_3 can be seen as formalising the acceptance of F , although one might expect in this case, to also add

$$T(\ulcorner \neg T(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T(\neg x)$$

as an axiom.¹ Still, the resulting theory cannot be closed under T-Intro, as one would like.

If one were to stratify the language, in much the same way as one would to form a Tarskian hierarchy of truth predicates, the problem can be circumvented. Recall $F = \text{Base}_T + \text{T-Intro} + \text{T-Elim} +$

¹As the \mathcal{L}_T -structure \mathfrak{M} used in ?? also satisfies the axiom $T(\ulcorner \neg T(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T(\neg x)$, the extension of S_3 obtained by adding this axiom is also consistent.

\neg T-Elim + T-Del + \forall -Inf. Let HST_0 denote F formulated with the predicate T_0 in place of T , and suppose T_1 is a (new) unary predicate symbol. The theory formalising acceptance of HST_0 , which we shall denote by HST_1 , would then contain the following axioms

$$\text{val}(x) \wedge \text{Sent}_{\mathcal{L}_{T_0}}(x) \rightarrow T_1(x), \quad (1) \quad \{\text{eqn:FFax0}\}$$

$$\text{Ax}_{HST_0}(x) \wedge \text{Sent}_{\mathcal{L}_{T_0}}(x) \rightarrow T_1(x), \quad (2) \quad \{\text{eqn:FFax1}\}$$

$$T_1(x) \wedge T_1(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow T_1(y), \quad (3) \quad \{\text{eqn:FFax2}\}$$

$$(\forall x T_1(\ulcorner A(\dot{x}) \urcorner)) \rightarrow T_1(\ulcorner \forall x A(x) \urcorner), \quad (4) \quad \{\text{eqn:FFaxw}\}$$

$$T_1(x) \rightarrow T_1(\ulcorner T_0(\dot{x}) \urcorner), \quad (5) \quad \{\text{eqn:FFax3}\}$$

$$T_1(\ulcorner T_0(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_1(x), \quad (6) \quad \{\text{eqn:FFax4}\}$$

$$T_1(\ulcorner \neg T_0(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_1(\ulcorner \neg x \urcorner). \quad (7) \quad \{\text{eqn:FFax5}\}$$

Equations (1) and (2) state the acceptance of all axioms of HST_0 (logical and non-logical), whereas eq. (3) formalises *modus ponens* in HST_0 . These three also combine to imply the axioms of Base_{T_1} . Equations (5) to (7) express the acceptance of the rules Nec_0 , Conec_0 and $\neg\text{Conec}_0$, respectively, in HST_0 , while eq. (4) closes the predicate under ω -logic.

The predicate T_1 is viewed as an extension of the predicate T_0 and as such we would expect it to satisfy the relevant axioms of F , that is, we also have

$$T_1(\ulcorner T_1(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_1(x),$$

and closure under Conec_1 , Nec_1 and $\neg\text{Conec}_1$. Combining also the axioms of HST_0 it is then easy to deduce

$$\forall x (\text{Bew}_{HST_0}(x) \wedge \text{Sent}_{\mathcal{L}_{T_0}}(x) \rightarrow T_1(x)). \quad (8) \quad \{\text{eqn:F1reflect}\}$$

We are happy with the thought of T_0 being a self-applicable truth predicate, and so far there is nothing to stop T_1 also being self-applicable. Moreover, T_0 may meaningfully occur in the scope of the predicate T_1 . Thus we have described the first step in a hierarchy of self-applicable truth predicates. But, should the predicate T_1 be allowed to occur in the scope of T_0 ? After all, the motivation behind working with theories that contain their own truth predicate is in their ability to reason about themselves. Since Nec_1 may apply to arbitrary sentences in \mathcal{L}_{T_0, T_1} , the question of whether or not T_0 can meaningfully apply to sentences containing T_1 is essentially decided by how we restrict the quantifiers in eqs. (3) to (7) (in particular eq. (5) pertaining to Nec_0) for inclusion in HST_1 : if we restrict them to range over only codes of \mathcal{L}_{T_0} -sentences we will have no non-trivial occurrences of this inter-applicability.

As is consistent with our earlier chapters, we view our theories as being presented in a Hilbert style deduction system, with certain axioms and rules of inference which are treated in their broadest sense. Namely, we consider a rule of inference of a theory S to be applicable to any extension of the language, logic or axioms of S . Thus, if one imagines the theory HST_0 being first formulated in the language $\mathcal{L} \cup \{T_0, T_1\}$, and only then completing the reflection step to HST_1 by adding the axioms and rules pertaining to T_1 , it seems natural to suppose the predicates T_0 and T_1 are inter-applicable. Since Nec_0 was applicable in HST_0 to formulae containing the predicate T_1 , so should T_0 in HST_1 . Thus, we expect HST_1 to have the axiom T_0 -Imp,

$$\forall x \forall y [T_0(x) \wedge T_0(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow T_0(y)],$$

as opposed to its relativised form

$$\forall x \forall y [\text{Sent}_{\mathcal{L}_{T_0}}(x) \wedge \text{Sent}_{\mathcal{L}_{T_0}}(y) \rightarrow (T_0(x) \wedge T_0(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow T_0(y))]; \quad (9) \quad \{\text{eqn:T0relative}\}$$

and, more importantly, that HST_1 contains the unrelativised axioms

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x [T_1(x) \rightarrow T_1(\ulcorner T_0(\dot{x}) \urcorner)], \\ \forall x [T_1(\ulcorner T_0(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_1(x)], \\ \forall x [T_1(\ulcorner \neg T_0(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_1(\neg x)]. \end{aligned} \quad (10) \quad \{\text{eqn:F1ax1}\}$$

This provides, for example,

$$\forall x [T_1(\ulcorner T_1(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \leftrightarrow T_1(\ulcorner T_0(\ulcorner T_1(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \urcorner)],$$

which, by Nec_1 and eq. (8), yields $T_0(\ulcorner T_1(\ulcorner A \urcorner) \urcorner)$ for every theorem A of HST_0 . Thus our informal interpretation leads us to the curious situation where we have two self-applicable predicates T_0, T_1 which may also be applied to each other.

If, on the other hand, we had considered relativising the quantifiers as in eq. (9), T_1 may apply to the language \mathcal{L}_{T_0, T_1} whereas T_0 may only meaningfully apply to \mathcal{L}_{T_0} and one would obtain the base of a strict hierarchy of self-applicable truth predicates. In this case we can no longer argue that T_0 represents a truth predicate for the whole language but only of the sub-language \mathcal{L}_{T_0} . The reason for choosing a self-applicable notion of truth in the first place was that it may be treated as a truth predicate for the entire language, including any subsequent extension. Thus, T_0 *should* be applicable to sentences involving the predicate T_1 and we find ourselves returning to the world of two inter-applicable truth predicates.

So far we have argued that in HST_1 the interpretation of T_0 should be closed under Conec_0 and $\neg\text{Conec}_0$ while the interpretation of T_1 should be closed under Nec_0 , Conec_0 , $\neg\text{Conec}_0$, Conec_1 and $\neg\text{Conec}_1$. However, we desire T_1 to be viewed as an extension of T_0 so as to allow for closure of HST_1 under a form of *truth introduction* and this fact should be recognised by the theory. That is, from the point of view of the theory HST_1 , there should be no essential difference between the predicates T_0 and T_1 . Thus we propose to also include the principle

$$T_0(\ulcorner T_1(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_0(x) \quad (11) \quad \{\text{eqn:T1Del}\}$$

as an axiom of HST_1 (in fact as an axiom of HST_0). Equation (11) expresses that the interpretation of T_0 is closed under the rule Conec_1 . This is vacuously valid in the theory HST_0 . It also serves to confirm the inter-applicability of the two predicates by allowing meaningful inferences regarding T_1 under a T_0 predicate. If we accept eq. (11) we should also accept $T_0(\ulcorner \neg T_1(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_0(\neg x)$, but as we shall see, this axiom will be trivially satisfied by our model.

We have only described the step HST_0 to HST_1 , but one can imagine repeating this, first adding an additional truth predicate T_2 to HST_1 and then reflecting upon it to form the theory HST_2 .² This process may be continued into the transfinite to form a hierarchy of theories, supporting a hierarchy of inter-applicable truth predicates.³

²A more precise way to describe the construction of HST_2 may be given as follows: first imagine formulating HST_0 with three predicates, T_0, T_1 , and T_2 . One then formulates HST_1 in this language by reflecting upon HST_0 , and only then is HST_2 formulated by reflecting upon HST_1 . In this sense we view HST_0 as not being formulated in a fixed language, but rather in a language that may be expanded as and when we see fit.

³The inter-applicability of the predicates calls into question whether what we obtain is truly a “hierarchy of truth predicates” as we describe. Our model construction, in the next section, will show that one can view the truth predicates as based on a hierarchy, although not, perhaps, in a manner one might first imagine.

The description of HST_1 and HST_2 presented above is purely motivational and requires making explicit, which the next definition achieves. As we pass beyond finite iterations and consider the construction of theories HST_ω , $\text{HST}_{\varepsilon_0}$, *etc.*, one requires the ability to internally quantify over the indices of truth predicates in the language. We therefore need to fix some computable ordinal κ from the outset and only consider iterating the construction up to ordinals $\alpha < \kappa$. In fact to maintain as much similarity with our previous work as possible (for example to ensure a primitive recursive Gödel numbering) we will insist κ is primitive recursively definable. One could consider taking $\kappa = \Gamma_0$ and utilising the encoding chosen in ??, but as we shall see $\|F_1\| \geq \Gamma_0$ (see theorem 6 below) and so we will require the construction of a larger class of ordinals to perform a sufficient proof-theoretic analysis. Suitable choices for κ will ultimately depend on our analysis and have no substantial role in defining the theories. Since the precise definition of κ is not essential for the definition, we shall assume for the time being that κ represents some fixed primitive recursive ordinal.

Definition 1. For $\beta < \kappa$, let \mathcal{L}_β denote the language of PRA augmented by predicates T_ξ for each $\xi \leq \beta$. Let HST_β be the theory formulated in the language \mathcal{L}_β , extending PA with the schema of induction for \mathcal{L}_β , and for each $\eta \leq \beta$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x (T_\eta(x_1) \wedge T_\eta(x_1 \rightarrow x_2) \rightarrow T_\eta(x_2)), & \quad (\text{Imp}_\eta) \quad \{\text{ax:imp}\} \\ \forall^\top A(x)^\top [(\forall n T_\eta(\ulcorner A(\dot{n}) \urcorner)) \rightarrow T_\eta(\ulcorner \forall x A(x) \urcorner)], & \quad (\text{uni}_\eta) \quad \{\text{ax:uni}\} \\ \forall \xi \leq \bar{\beta} \forall x (T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_\eta(x)), & \quad (\text{Del}_\eta) \quad \{\text{ax:del}\} \\ \forall \xi < \bar{\eta} \forall x (T_\eta(x) \rightarrow T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi(\dot{x}) \urcorner)), & \quad (\text{Rep}_\eta) \quad \{\text{ax:rep}\} \end{aligned}$$

as well as the rules of inference

$$\begin{aligned} \text{from } A \text{ infer } T_\beta(\ulcorner A \urcorner), & \quad (\text{nec}_\beta) \quad \{\text{ax:nec}\} \\ \text{from } T_\beta(\ulcorner A \urcorner) \text{ infer } A. & \quad (\text{conec}_\beta) \quad \{\text{ax:conec}\} \end{aligned}$$

Define $\text{HST}_{<\beta} = \bigcup_{\eta < \beta} \text{HST}_\eta$. Let us denote by HST_β^n the collection of theorems of HST_β provable with at most n (serial) applications of (nec_β) and no restriction on the number of applications of (conec_β) . Thus HST_β^0 denotes the theory HST_β without (nec_β) , and HST_β^n is a sub-theory of HST_β^{n+1} for every n .

The theory HST_0 is identical to F and the definition of HST_β fits the informal description we gave of ‘F viewed as an operation applied to $\text{HST}_{<\beta}$ ’. Also, HST_β^0 is a conservative extension of HA as, with no applications of (nec_β) , all predicates T_η in HST_β^0 may be interpreted trivially to show neither $\text{HST}_\beta^0 \vdash T_\beta s$ nor $\text{HST}_\beta^0 \vdash \neg T_\beta s$ may hold.

Although HST_1 may be borne from a notion of truth and acceptance, it is by no means necessarily consistent. Indeed, with its multiple truth predicates and inter-applicability, the reader would be duly justified to view this construction with some scepticism. The process of reflection that led us to HST_1 , however, is almost identical to that which describes the theory S_3 . As a result it may not be surprising to know that HST_1 is consistent and in fact HST_1^1 proves the same arithmetical statements as the theory S_3 . Unfortunately we do not at this time have the suitable machinery to prove their equivalence (this will have to wait until section 4), but the following remark should motivate the connection.

Remark 1. It is natural to first consider embedding HST_1^1 into S_3 . As the predicate T_1 can be interpreted vacuously in HST_1^0 (as can T_0), one may expect the interpretation given by

$$T_1(s)^* = T_0(s)^* = T(g(s))$$

extrem:S3

to suffice, where g is a primitive recursive function chosen, by the primitive recursion theorem, such that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= x, \text{ if } x \text{ is the code of an arithmetical literal,} \\ g(\ulcorner T_1(s) \urcorner) &= \ulcorner s \neq s \urcorner, \\ g(\ulcorner T_0(s) \urcorner) &= \ulcorner T(g(s)) \urcorner, \\ g(\ulcorner A \circ B \urcorner) &= g(\ulcorner A \urcorner) \circ g(\ulcorner B \urcorner), \text{ for } \circ \in \{\wedge, \vee\} \\ g(\ulcorner QxA(x) \urcorner) &= \forall x g(\ulcorner A(x) \urcorner). \end{aligned}$$

This interpretation will translate the axioms Del_1 , Uni_1 and Rep_1 of HST_1 to the axioms T-Del , $\forall\text{-Inf}$ and T-Rep respectively of S_3 . Since S_3 does not have the axiom $\neg\text{T-Del}$ (nor can we expect to derive it in S_3) one cannot derive the translation of $\neg\text{Del}_1$ from HST_1^1 . Fortunately, the model construction of ?? can easily incorporate the additional axiom $\neg\text{T-Del}$ and rule $\neg\text{T-Elim}$ with minimal adjustments: one may consistently add the rule pertaining to $\neg\text{T-Del}$ to each of the theories \mathcal{F}_α and expand ?? to also prove $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \vdash \neg T(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ implies $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \vdash \neg A$, thus showing $S_3 + \neg\text{T-Del} + \neg\text{T-Elim}$ is a consistent theory.

The problem with this interpretation manifests when dealing with applications of Conec_1 in HST_1^1 . Suppose $\text{HST}_1^1 \vdash T_1(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$. If A does not contain the predicate T_1 , $\ulcorner A^* \urcorner = g(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ and an application of T-Elim in S_3 suffices. If, however, A contains T_1 , the interpretation of $T_1(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ and A under $*$ are very different; indeed, there will be sentences B for which $S_3 \vdash T(g(\ulcorner B \urcorner))$ but $S_3 \not\vdash B^*$ (for example, take B to be $\neg T_1(\ulcorner C \urcorner)$ where C is any statement provable in S_3 . Then $S_3 \vdash B^*$ implies $S_3 + \neg\text{T-Elim} \vdash \neg C$, which contradicts the consistency of $S_3 + \neg\text{T-Elim}$. On the other hand, $g(\ulcorner B \urcorner) = \ulcorner \neg(s \neq s) \urcorner$ for some s , so $S_3 \vdash T(g(\ulcorner B \urcorner))$ holds). If A were an axiom of HST_1^0 though, $S_3 \vdash A^*$; moreover, if one views $\text{T}_1\text{-Imp}$, Del_1 and $\text{T}_1\text{-Rep}$ as a rule of inference, as in \mathcal{F} , one could deduce closure under Conec_1 by induction on the height of a derivation. Viewing the axioms of HST_1^1 in this manner is reminiscent of the use of the infinitary system \mathcal{F}_∞ in the analysis of F ; thus it seems natural to delay a further investigation of this connection until we have first analysed HST_1 in detail.

Although the addition of full Nec_1 to HST_1^1 (forming HST_1) creates a theory markedly stronger than S_3 , it is not straightforward to embed S_3 into HST_1 . Such an embedding would require stratifying \mathcal{L}_T to involve the two predicates T_0 and T_1 of \mathcal{L}_1 . The most obvious way to proceed would appear to involve replacing the outermost predicate by T_1 and all others by T_0 , thus mapping the axioms $T(\ulcorner \text{T-Imp} \urcorner)$, $T(\ulcorner \forall\text{-Inf} \urcorner)$ and $T(\ulcorner \text{T-Del} \urcorner)$ of S_3 to theorems of HST_1^1 . This could be achieved by picking a primitive recursive function f which recursively substitutes $T_0(f(s))$ for $T(s)$, and considering the interpretation $*$ of \mathcal{L}_T into \mathcal{L}_1 given by

$$(T(s))^* = T_1(f(s)).$$

This interpretation maps the axioms $\forall\text{-Inf}$, T-Imp , T-Del and T-Rep by instances of axioms Uni_1 , $\text{T}_1\text{-Imp}$, Del_1 and Rep_1 respectively, but since $f(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ need not equal $\ulcorner A^* \urcorner$, applications of T-Elim in S_3 do not translate into inferences we can readily recognise as holding in HST_1 .

We now move to the task of proving the consistency of HST_β for arbitrary β . This will be obtained by generalising the consistency argument for S_3 to theories with multiple predicates and is presented in section 3.1 below. Following this we will perform a detailed ordinal analysis of these theories, first determining lower bounds on their proof-theoretic strength, and second upper bounds. Lower bounds on the strength of the theories HST_β will be obtained in section 3.3 by extending the well-ordering results previously established for S_2 and S_3 . Upper bounds are determined in section 3.4 where we attempt to directly formalise the model constructions of section 3.1 in a manner similar to our analysis

of F . However, much care will be required when dealing with a hierarchy of truth predicates and the transfinite iterations of T -Intro caused by the interaction between axioms Uni_η and Rep_η .

The axiom Del_η implies the interpretation of the predicate T_η is closed under T_ξ -Elim for every $\xi \leq \eta$. Likewise Rep_η implies T_η is closed under T_ξ -Intro for each $\xi < \eta$. From this observation we may deduce the following proposition, in which Bew_η abbreviates the formalised provability predicate for HST_η .

Proposition 2. *For every $\eta < \beta$, HST_β is closed under Nec_η and $Conec_\eta$. Moreover,*

$$HST_\beta^1 \vdash \forall x (Bew_\eta(x) \wedge Sent_{\mathcal{L}_\eta}(x) \rightarrow T_\beta(x)).$$

Proof. All axioms of HST_η are axioms of HST_β^0 , and by Nec_β we have

$$HST_\beta^1 \vdash \forall x (Ax_\eta(x) \wedge Sent_{\mathcal{L}_\eta}(x) \rightarrow T_\beta(x)),$$

where $Ax_\eta(x)$ expresses that x is a sentential axiom of HST_η . To complete the proof, we observe that HST_β^1 has the axioms Imp_β , Del_β , T_β^- -Rep and $\neg Del_\beta$ formalising applications of *modus ponens*, $Conec_\eta$, Nec_η and $\neg Conec_\eta$ respectively in HST_η . \square

3.1 Consistency

At first glance the theory HST_β could easily look suspect, after all it contains Del_η , $Conec_\eta$, Nec_η and an axiom that appears extremely close to T_η -Rep, for each $\eta \leq \beta$. As the motivation behind the theories HST_β comes from abstracting the transition from PA to F one might expect that if HST_β is consistent, models of HST_β may be constructed by extending models of F . This is indeed the case; moreover, the extension we defined for establishing the consistency of S_3 makes a suitable base from which to start the construction. We will only sketch the consistency argument as it will be subsumed by our work in section 3.4 where we determine an upper bound on the proof-theoretic strength of HST_β .

Let Ω denote the first uncountable ordinal. For the remainder of this section Greek letters, ρ, σ, τ will be used to range over elements of \mathbb{O} , the class of all ordinals; letters α, β , etc., will range over countable ordinals; we reserve the letters η, ξ for indices of the truth predicates and so represent ordinals below κ . Suppose

$$\rho = \Omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot \beta_0 + \dots + \Omega^{\alpha_n} \cdot \beta_n,$$

with $\alpha_0 > \dots > \alpha_n$ and $\beta_i < \Omega$ for each $i \leq n$. We denote by $\rho|_\gamma$ the ordinal $\Omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot \beta_0 + \dots + \Omega^{\alpha_k} \cdot \beta_k$ where $k < n$ is the least such that $\alpha_k > \gamma \geq \alpha_{k+1}$, or $k = n$ if $\alpha_n > \gamma$. An ordinal ρ is called an Ω -limit if $\rho = \rho_0 + \Omega^\eta \cdot \alpha$ and either α or η is a limit ordinal.

Define a system \mathcal{F}_ρ^* for $\rho \in \mathbb{O}$, formulated in a Tait-style sequent calculus in the language \mathcal{L}_κ . The system has three axioms.

- Ax.1. $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow A$ whenever A is a true atomic literal,
- Ax.2 $_\eta$. $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash T_\eta s, \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta s$ for every closed term s and $\eta < \kappa$,
- Ax.3 $_\eta$. $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash T_\eta s, \Gamma \Rightarrow A$ if $s^\mathbb{N}$ is not the code of an \mathcal{L}_κ -sentence.

The rules of this system are the usual arithmetical rules (\wedge) , (\vee_0) , (\vee_1) and (\exists) , plus the following six rules for every $\eta < \kappa$.

- $\frac{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta s \quad \mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(s \rightarrow t)}{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta t} \text{Imp}_\eta$
- $\frac{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi s \urcorner) \quad \xi < \beta}{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta s} \text{Del}_\eta$
- $\frac{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta s \quad \xi < \eta}{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi s \urcorner)} \text{Rep}_\eta$
- $\frac{\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow A \quad \sigma < \rho|_\eta}{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Delta, T_\eta \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner \Rightarrow T_\eta \ulcorner A \urcorner} \text{Nec}_\eta$
- $\frac{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta \ulcorner A(n) \urcorner \text{ for all } n \quad \rho|_\eta \text{ not an } \Omega\text{-limit}}{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta \ulcorner \forall x A(x) \urcorner} \text{Uni}_\eta$
- $\frac{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow A(n) \quad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}}{\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow \forall x A(x)} \omega$

Moreover, for each ρ define the set of (codes of) \mathcal{L}_κ -sentences

$$\mathcal{F}_{<\rho}^* = \{ \ulcorner A \urcorner : \mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash \Rightarrow A \text{ for some } \sigma < \rho \}.$$

Before we proceed with analysing the role of the truth predicates in \mathcal{F}_ρ^* , it is important to note that a rule of *modus ponens*, or cut is lacking from our definition. However, it is not hard to show the cut rule is, in fact, admissible in \mathcal{F}_ρ^* : a derivation of the form $\Gamma, \neg T_\eta(s)$ with $\neg T_\eta(s)$ active *must* be an instance of an axiom, hence if one has derivations of $\Gamma, \neg T_\eta(s)$ and $\Gamma, T_\eta(s)$ one can easily obtain instead a derivation of Γ . This argument is essentially identical to that employed in the Cut-Elimination theorem for \mathcal{F}_∞ , ??.

Lemma 3 (Admissibility of cut). *Suppose $\eta < \kappa$, $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta s$, and $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Delta, T_\eta s \Rightarrow A$ for some ordinal ρ . Then $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \Rightarrow A$.*

If $\alpha < \Omega$, $\alpha|_0 = 0$ and so no applications the rule Nec_η is not available in \mathcal{F}_α^* for any η . Thus, $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega}^*$ is trivially closed under Conec_η for every η . Moreover, for every $\alpha < \Omega$, only applications of Nec_0 have been permitted in $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega \cdot \alpha}^*$. Thus, we can establish by induction on $n < \omega$ that the predicate T_0 in $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega \cdot n}^*$ may be interpreted as the theory $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega \cdot n}^*$ and that $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega \cdot n}^*$ is closed under Conec_0 (this is identical to the argument showing $\mathcal{F}_\infty \upharpoonright_{n+1}^\alpha \vdash \ulcorner A \urcorner$ for some α implies $\mathcal{F}_\infty \upharpoonright_n^\beta \vdash A$ for some β). Since all other truth predicates in $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega \cdot n}^*$ may be interpreted vacuously, we conclude $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega \cdot n}^*$ is closed under Conec_η for every $\eta < \kappa$. Hence HST_0^n may be interpreted in $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega \cdot n}^*$.

This suggests that for $n < \omega$, $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega \cdot n}^*$, like \mathcal{F}_n , reconstructs the theories Th_n used by Friedman and Sheard to prove the consistency of F. At the first limit ordinal, we obtain $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega \cdot \omega}^*$, a set of \mathcal{L}_κ -sentences closed under Nec_0 and Conec_0 , and containing Del_0 , Rep_0 (which holds vacuously) and all other axioms of HST_0 .

To proceed with the analysis of HST_1 , we first consider HST_1^0 which, without the rule Nec_1 , is vacuously closed under Conec_1 and $\neg \text{Conec}_1$. In HST_1^1 , the situation differs from previous case; we need to interpret the predicate T_1 as a theory closed under ω -logic (due to Uni_1), Nec_0 (due to Rep_1), Conec_0 and Conec_1 (due to Del_1). Moreover, we need to find an interpretation of T_0 closed under ω -logic, Conec_0 , and now also Conec_1 (as implied by the axiom Del_0). The properties we established for the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega}$ in ?? motivate us to consider $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2}^*$, a set closed under Nec_0 , Conec_0 and, by a similar argument as

before, ω -logic (cf. the proof of ??). For every $\alpha < \Omega$, the predicate T_1 may be interpreted vacuously in $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega \cdot \alpha}^*$, so $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2}^*$ is also closed under Conec_1 . Thus $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2}^*$ provides a consistent interpretation of both predicates T_0 and T_1 in HST_1^1 .

The next step is to consider T_1 in HST_1^2 . Two applications of Nec_1 are permitted and one can derive sentences of the form $T_1(\ulcorner T_1(\ulcorner A \urcorner) \urcorner)$ whenever $\text{HST}_1^0 \vdash A$, suggesting a shift to $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2}^*$, where one can derive $T_1(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ whenever $A \in \mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2}^*$, might yield a suitable interpretation for T_1 . However, $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2}^*$ is not closed under Nec_0 (only the systems $\mathcal{F}_{<\rho+\Omega \cdot \sigma}^*$ for limit ordinals σ are), leading us instead to consider $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2+\Omega \cdot \omega}^*$ which is closed under Nec_0 , but not ω -logic; there will be sentences $A \in \mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2}^*$ for which $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2+\Omega \cdot n}^* \vdash T_0(f(n, \ulcorner A \urcorner))$ for each $n < \omega$, where $f(0, n) = \ulcorner \bar{n} \urcorner$ and $f(m+1, n) = \ulcorner T_0(f(m, n)) \urcorner$, but the sentence $\forall x T_0(f(x, \ulcorner A \urcorner))$ is not contained in $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2+\Omega \cdot \omega}^*$. Indeed to obtain both closure under ω -logic and Nec_0 we must move to the theory $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2 \cdot 2}^*$. We also require the interpretation to be closed under Conec_0 . To manage this we repeat the same argument as before, but starting from $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2}^*$ in place of \mathcal{F}_{Ω}^* . We know $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2}^*$ is closed under Conec_0 since the predicate T_0 can be consistently interpreted as the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2}^*$. This leads us to successively deduce the theories $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2+\Omega \cdot n}^*$ are closed under Conec_0 for each $n < \omega$. Note, we can still interpret T_1 in $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2+\Omega \cdot n}^*$ by the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2}^*$ as there has been no further applications of Nec_1 . In $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2+\Omega \cdot \omega}^*$ we aim to interpret T_0 by $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2+\Omega \cdot \omega}^*$, which unlike $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2+\Omega \cdot n}^*$ is not closed under ω -logic; however, $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2+\Omega \cdot \omega}^*$ is not closed under (Uni_1) so this does not pose a problem. Thus we may continue through the construction of $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2 \cdot 2}^*$ determining each theory $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2+\Omega \cdot \alpha}^*$ for $\alpha < \Omega$ is closed under Conec_0 .

The argument above highlights that the predicates T_1 and T_0 in HST_1^n may be interpreted as the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2 \cdot n}^*$, and hence HST_1 naturally embeds into $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2 \cdot \omega}^*$. If we wanted to proceed beyond this and construct models for HST_2 , we could imagine constructing a sequence of systems

$$\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2 \cdot \omega}^*, \mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2 \cdot \omega + \Omega}^*, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2 \cdot \omega + \Omega \cdot \alpha}^*, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2 \cdot (\omega+1)}^*, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2 \cdot \alpha}^*, \dots$$

to obtain $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^3}^*$, an interpretation of the predicate T_2 in HST_2^1 . The ability to recognise each theory $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2 \cdot \alpha + \Omega \cdot \gamma}^*$ as closed under Conec_1 and Conec_0 , however, is essential for the interpretation of T_2 -Del in HST_2^1 . As already argued, the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2 \cdot \alpha + \Omega \cdot \gamma}^*$ provides an interpretation of T_0 in $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2 \cdot \alpha + \Omega \cdot \gamma}^*$; but unless γ is a limit ordinal, this need not be closed under Nec_0 , so cannot interpret the predicate T_1 . The answer is to interpret T_1 in $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2 \cdot \alpha + \Omega \cdot \gamma}^*$ as the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2 \cdot \alpha}^*$ for every $\gamma < \Omega$. Only when we pass to $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^2 \cdot (\alpha+1)}^*$ do we alter the interpretation of T_1 (in this case it is changed to the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2 \cdot (\alpha+1)}^*$). It is for exactly this reason that the rule Uni_η was restricted so as to apply to \mathcal{F}_ρ^* only if $\rho|_\eta$ is not an Ω -limit; the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^2 \cdot \alpha}^*$ will not be closed under ω -logic if α is a limit ordinal.

Once one has constructed $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^3}^*$ and verified that it is closed under T_n -Elim for $n = 0, 1, 2$, one would then embark on the construction of a further sequence of systems

$$\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^3}^*, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{\Omega^3 + \Omega \cdot \alpha}^*, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{\Omega^3 + \Omega^2}^*, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{\Omega^3 + \Omega^2 \cdot 2}^*, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{\Omega^3 + \Omega^2 \cdot \alpha}^*, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{\Omega^3 \cdot 2}^*, \dots$$

and subsequently $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^3 \cdot \omega}^*$, a theory into which HST_2 embeds. In general, we expect HST_β to embed into $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega}^*$ for each β .

The next lemma deals with the task of determining the theory \mathcal{F}_ρ^* is closed under Conec_η for every $\eta < \kappa$. Before that, however, we require the following result regarding the behaviour of Ω -limits.

Proposition 4. *If ρ is not an Ω -limit and $\sigma_n < \rho$ for every $n < \omega$,*

$$\sup_{n < \omega} \sigma_n < \rho.$$

Proof. Suppose ρ is not an Ω -limit and $\sigma_n < \rho$ for every $n < \omega$. Then $\rho > 0$ and there are ordinals ρ_0, α_0 such that $\rho = \rho_0 + \Omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot \Omega$. This means we can associate an ordinal $\delta_n < \Omega$ to each $n < \omega$ so

that $\sigma_n < \rho_0 + \Omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot \delta_n$. The set $\{\delta_n : n < \omega\}$ is a countable set of countable ordinals, and hence is bounded in Ω , whence

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_n \sigma_n &\leq \sup_n \{\rho_0 + \Omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot \delta_n\} \\ &\leq \rho_0 + \Omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot (\sup_n \delta_n) \\ &< \rho_0 + \Omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot \Omega \\ &= \rho. \end{aligned}$$

□

A sequent Γ is called *T-positive* if all occurrences of a predicate T_η in Γ for any $\eta < \kappa$ are positive. Define, for each ordinal ρ , an \mathcal{L}_κ -structure \mathfrak{M}_ρ according to the following criterion.

$$\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(s) \text{ iff } s^{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{F}_{<\rho|\eta}^*.$$

Theorem 4 (T-Elimination theorem). *Suppose $\rho \in \mathbb{O}$.*

1. *For every T-positive sequent Γ , $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma$ implies $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \bigvee \Gamma$;*
2. *For any $\eta < \kappa$, $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash T_\eta(s)$ implies there is a sentence A with $s^{\mathbb{N}} = \ulcorner A \urcorner$ and $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash A$;*

Proof. We proceed by transfinite induction on ρ . For (i), one has a *subsidiary* induction on the height of the derivation. The base case is easy to deal with. For the induction step we argue according to the last rule applied in the derivation $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \Gamma$. Whichever rule was applied, the sequent(s) in the premise must also be T-positive and we may apply the subsidiary induction hypothesis to them.

If the last rule was one of the arithmetical rules, that is, (\vee_i) , (\wedge) , (ω) or (\exists) , $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \bigvee \Gamma$ is an immediate consequence of the subsidiary induction hypothesis, and in the case of the weakening rule, $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \bigvee \Gamma$ follows from the fact that Γ is T-positive. If the last applied rule was Nec_η , $T_\eta(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ is contained in Γ and $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash A$ for some $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$, so $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$. For the remaining rules, the subsidiary induction hypothesis implies $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \bigvee \Gamma \vee (A_0 \wedge A_1)$ for some suitable choice of A_0, A_1 . Of course, if $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \bigvee \Gamma$ we are done, so we may assume $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models A_0 \wedge A_1$.

Imp $_\eta$. If the last rule applied was Imp_η , we may assume A_0 is $T_\eta(s_0)$ and A_1 is $T_\eta(s_0 \rightarrow s_1)$, while Γ contains $T_\eta(s_1)$. By the above, we may assume $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(s_0) \wedge T_\eta(s_0 \rightarrow s_1)$. Thus, $s_0^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $s_1^{\mathbb{N}}$ are Gödel numbers of \mathcal{L}_κ -sentences, say B_0 and B_1 respectively, and there is some $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$ so that $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash B_0$ and $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash \neg B_0, B_1$. Admissibility of the cut rule (lemma 3) yields $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash B_1$, and hence $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(s_1)$.

Del $_\eta$. In the case the last applied rule is Del_η , we may identify A_0 as $T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi(s) \urcorner)$ for some $\xi < \kappa$ and term s ; moreover, $T_\eta(s)$ is contained in Γ . $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi(s) \urcorner)$ implies $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash T_\xi(s)$ for some $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$. Since $\sigma < \rho$, the *main* induction hypothesis may be applied, whence $s^{\mathbb{N}} = \ulcorner A \urcorner$ for some A and $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash A$. Thus $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(s)$ and $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \bigvee \Gamma$.

Rep $_\eta$. Here we have $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(s)$ and $T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi(s) \urcorner)$ is in Γ for some $\xi < \eta$. By definition this implies $s^{\mathbb{N}} = \ulcorner A \urcorner$ for some sentence A and $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash A$ for some $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$, whence $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma+\Omega^{\xi+1}}^* \vdash T_\xi(s)$ is derivable. But since $\xi < \eta$ and $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$, we have $\sigma + \Omega^{\xi+1} < \rho|_\eta$, and so $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \bigvee \Gamma$.

Uni_η . The assumption is that $\mathbb{M}_\rho \models \forall x T_\eta(\ulcorner A(x) \urcorner)$. This entails the existence of, for every $n < \omega$, an ordinal $\sigma_n < \rho|_\eta$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma_n}^* \vdash A(\bar{n})$. Weakening and the ω -rule yields $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash \forall x A(x)$, where $\sigma = \sup_n \sigma_n$, but one need not in general have $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$.⁴ Due to the restriction on applications of Uni_η , however, $\rho|_\eta$ is not an Ω -limit, thus by proposition 4, $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$ and so $\mathbb{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(\ulcorner \forall x A(x) \urcorner)$, whence $\mathbb{M}_\rho \models \bigvee \Gamma$.

This completes the proof of (i).

(ii) is now a consequence of (i). If $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash T_\eta(s)$, (i) implies $\mathbb{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(s)$, whence $s^\mathbb{N} = \ulcorner A \urcorner$ for some \mathcal{L}_κ -sentence A and $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash A$ for some $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$. By weakening, $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash A$, as desired.

Observe that in the case of every rule of inference in the system \mathcal{F}_ρ^* , T-positive premises yield T-positive consequents. Therefore $\mathcal{F}_\eta^* \vdash \Gamma$ implies $\bigvee \Gamma$ is satisfied in the *everything is true* \mathcal{L}_κ structure, so $\mathcal{F}_\rho^* \vdash \neg T_\eta(s)$ is impossible and (iii) holds vacuously. \square

Proposition 5. *Let A be any axiom of HST_β . Then $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^{\beta+1}}^* \vdash A$.*

Proof. One can derive each of the axioms via the corresponding rule and Ax.2 $_\eta$, as in ???. In the case of Uni_η note $\Omega^{\beta+1}|_\eta$ is not an Ω -limit for any $\eta \leq \beta$. \square

Theorem 5. *The theory HST_β is consistent for every $\beta < \kappa$.*

Proof. Lemma 3, theorem 4 and the previous proposition provide the means to deduce, by induction on n , that HST_β^n embeds into $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega^{\beta+1}.n}^*$. Thus every sentential theorem of HST_β is contained in $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^{\beta+1}.n}^*$. However, clearly the empty sequent is not derivable in \mathcal{F}_ρ^* for any ρ , so HST_β must be consistent. \square

3.2 An ordinal notation system for impredicative theories

To carry out an ordinal analysis of HST_β we require the current set of ordinal terms, OT, to be extended to cover a larger segment of the ordinals. We will make use of an ordinal notation system for the Bachmann-Howard ordinal introduced by Rathjen and Weiermann [?]. This ordinal has proved significant in the analysis of certain impredicative systems such as the theory of inductive definitions, ID_1 [?]. It will turn out that the theories HST_β are substantially weaker than ID_1 , but this notation system is still a natural one to consider. The key to generating notations for characteristic ordinals beyond Γ_0 is the use of constructions referencing certain ‘external points’. In our case the ‘external point’ will be Ω , the first uncountable ordinal.

In order to generate unique representations for ordinals we will introduce a normal form for non- ε -ordinals, based on the Cantor normal form. We write $\alpha =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$ if $\alpha = \omega^\gamma + \delta$ and either $\delta = 0$ and $\gamma < \alpha$, or $\delta = \omega^{\delta_1} + \dots + \omega^{\delta_k}$, $\gamma \geq \delta_1 \geq \dots \geq \delta_k$ and $k \geq 1$. Let $\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ be the first ε -ordinal larger than Ω . For each $\alpha < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ we denote by α^* the largest ε -ordinal below Ω used in the normal form presentation for α ; that is,

1. $0^* = \Omega^* = 0$,
2. $\alpha^* = \alpha$, if $\alpha < \Omega$ is an ε -ordinal,
3. $\alpha^* = \max\{\gamma^*, \delta^*\}$, if $\alpha =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$.

⁴For example, suppose $\rho|_\eta = \rho_0 + \Omega^\xi$ and ξ is a limit ordinal. If $\sigma_n = \rho_0 + \Omega^{\xi_n}$, where $\xi = \sup_n \xi_n$ and $\xi_n < \xi$ for every $n < \omega$, one has $\sigma_n < \rho|_\eta$, but $\sup_n \sigma_n = \rho|_\eta$.

[Elaborate that the following is constructive.]

Define sets of ordinals $C_k(\alpha, \beta)$, and a function $\vartheta: \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \Omega$ by transfinite recursion on $\alpha \in \mathbb{O}$ as follows.

- (C1) $\{0, \Omega\} \cup \beta \subseteq C_k(\alpha, \beta)$,
- (C2) $\gamma, \delta \in C_k(\alpha, \beta)$ and $\xi =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$ implies $\xi \in C_{k+1}(\alpha, \beta)$,
- (C3) $\xi \in C_k(\alpha, \beta)$ and $\xi < \alpha$ implies $\vartheta\xi \in C_{k+1}(\alpha, \beta)$,
- (C4) $C(\alpha, \beta) = \bigcup_{k < \omega} C_k(\alpha, \beta)$,
- (ϑ_1) $\vartheta\alpha = \min\{\xi < \Omega : C(\alpha, \xi) \cap \Omega \subseteq \xi \wedge \alpha \in C(\alpha, \xi)\}$.

The next two propositions shed some light on the role the function ϑ plays in generating initial segments of \mathbb{O} .

Proposition 6. $\vartheta\alpha$ is defined for every $\alpha < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$.

Proof. Let $\gamma_0 = \alpha^* + 1$. By rules (C1) and (C2) we may deduce $\alpha \in C(\alpha, \gamma_0)$. Suppose $\gamma_k < \Omega$ has been defined. As $C(\alpha, \gamma_k)$ has a countable definition, it contains only countably many elements; thus $C(\alpha, \gamma_k) \cap \Omega$ is bounded in Ω . Let $\gamma_{k+1} < \Omega$ be such that $C(\alpha, \gamma_0) \cap \Omega \subseteq \gamma_{k+1}$ and define $\gamma = \sup_{k < \omega} \gamma_k$. Since $\{\gamma_k : k < \omega\}$ is a countable set of countable ordinals, it too must be bounded in Ω , so $\gamma < \Omega$. Since $\alpha < \gamma_0 \leq \gamma$, also $\alpha^* \in C(\alpha, \gamma)$. Finally,

$$C(\alpha, \gamma) \subseteq \bigcup_{n < \omega} C(\alpha, \gamma_n),$$

so $C(\alpha, \gamma) \cap \Omega \subseteq \gamma$ and $\vartheta\alpha \leq \gamma$ by (ϑ_1). □

The argument in the proof above provides a means to approximate the ordinal $\vartheta\alpha$ from below. Define $\gamma_0 = \alpha^* + 1$ and $\gamma_{m+1} = \min\{\xi < \Omega : C(\alpha, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega \subseteq \xi\}$; then $\vartheta\alpha \leq \sup_m \gamma_m$. By (C2) it is clear that each γ_m is a limit ordinal, whence we may deduce

$$[(\forall \delta \in C(\alpha, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega) \forall \xi < \delta F(\xi)] \rightarrow \forall \delta < \gamma_{m+1} F(\delta)$$

for every formula F .

The function ϑ works by “collapsing” ordinals below $\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ into countable ordinals, thus allowing one to represent ordinals beyond Γ_0 . Moreover, the condition “ $\alpha \in C(\alpha, \xi)$ ” in (ϑ_1) ensures the function $\alpha \mapsto \vartheta\alpha$ is strictly increasing on Ω . Thus, unlike the Veblen functions φ_α , one never has $\vartheta\beta = \vartheta\vartheta\beta$. In the following proposition we show ϑ is in fact injective on $\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ and show that relation ‘ $\alpha < \beta$ ’ may be decided purely on the normal form presentation for α and β .

Proposition 7. For all ordinals α, β and γ the following holds.

1. $\alpha \in C(\alpha, \vartheta\alpha)$,
2. $\vartheta\alpha = C(\alpha, \vartheta\alpha) \cap \Omega$ and $\vartheta\alpha \notin C(\alpha, \vartheta\alpha)$,
3. $\vartheta\alpha$ is an ε -ordinal,
4. $\gamma \in C(\alpha, \beta)$ if and only if $\gamma^* \in C(\alpha, \beta)$,

5. $\beta < \vartheta\alpha$ if and only if $\beta < \Omega$ and $\beta^* < \vartheta\alpha$,
6. $\alpha^* < \vartheta\alpha$,
7. $\vartheta\alpha = \vartheta\beta$ if and only if $\alpha = \beta$,
8. $\vartheta\alpha < \vartheta\beta$ if and only if $(\alpha < \beta \wedge \alpha^* < \vartheta\beta) \vee (\beta < \alpha \wedge \vartheta\alpha \leq \beta^*)$.

Proof. Proposition 6 ensures $\vartheta\alpha$ is defined for every $\alpha < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, so (i) is a direct consequence of (ϑ_1) . By (C_1) , $\vartheta\alpha \subseteq C(\alpha, \vartheta\alpha)$ whence (ii) also follows from (ϑ_1) . (ii) then implies (iii) since, as a result of (C_2) , $\gamma < \vartheta\alpha$ only if $\omega^\gamma < \vartheta\alpha$.

(iv). Suppose $\gamma \in C_k(\alpha, \beta)$. If $k = 0$, $\gamma^* \in C(\alpha, \beta)$ is immediate by (C_1) , so suppose $k > 0$. We show $\gamma^* \in C(\alpha, \beta)$ by examining the normal form of γ . If γ is either 0 or Ω , $\gamma^* = 0 \in C(\alpha, \beta)$ by (C_1) , and if γ is an ε -ordinal, $\gamma^* = \gamma$ and we are done. Otherwise $\gamma =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\xi + \delta$ and $\delta, \xi \in C_{k-1}(\alpha, \beta)$. The induction hypothesis implies $\delta^*, \xi^* \in C(\alpha, \beta)$, whence $\gamma^* \in C(\alpha, \beta)$. The converse direction holds by a similar argument.

(v) is an immediate consequence of (iv) and (ii); (vi) holds on account of (i), (ii) and (iv). To show (vii) suppose $\vartheta\alpha = \vartheta\beta$ but $\alpha < \beta$. Then $C(\alpha, \vartheta\alpha) \subseteq C(\beta, \vartheta\beta)$, so $\alpha \in C(\beta, \vartheta\beta)$ by (i), whence $\vartheta\alpha \in C(\beta, \vartheta\beta) \cap \Omega$ by (C_3) . Thus $\vartheta\beta \in C(\beta, \vartheta\beta) \cap \Omega$ contradicting (ii).

(viii). Assume $\alpha < \beta$. By (vi), $\vartheta\alpha < \vartheta\beta$ implies $\alpha^* < \vartheta\beta$. Also $\alpha^* < \vartheta\beta$ implies $\alpha^* \in C(\beta, \vartheta\beta)$, whence $\vartheta\alpha \in C(\beta, \vartheta\beta) \cap \Omega$ and so $\vartheta\alpha < \vartheta\beta$ by (ii). Thus

$$\alpha < \beta \rightarrow (\vartheta\alpha < \vartheta\beta \leftrightarrow \alpha^* < \vartheta\beta). \quad (12) \quad \{\text{eqn:theta1.1}\}$$

Now suppose $\beta < \alpha$. By the same argument we obtain

$$\beta < \alpha \rightarrow (\vartheta\beta < \vartheta\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta^* < \vartheta\alpha),$$

and so, by (vii),

$$\beta < \alpha \rightarrow (\vartheta\alpha < \vartheta\beta \leftrightarrow \vartheta\alpha \leq \beta^*). \quad (13) \quad \{\text{eqn:theta1.2}\}$$

Combining eqs. (12) and (13) gives (viii). \square

We can now proceed with defining a primitive recursive set of ordinal terms for use in the later analysis of HST_β .

Definition 8. Define a subset $\text{OT}_\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, an encoding τ of ordinals into OT_Ω and a rank function $|\cdot|$ on ordinals by recursion according to the following rules.

1. $\tau(0) = 0 \in \text{OT}_\Omega$, $\tau(\Omega) = \langle 0, 1 \rangle \in \text{OT}_\Omega$, and $|0| = |\Omega| = 0$,
2. If $\alpha = \vartheta\alpha_0$ and $\tau(\alpha_0) \in \text{OT}_\Omega$, $\tau(\alpha) = \langle 1, \tau(\alpha_0) \rangle \in \text{OT}_\Omega$ and $|\alpha| = |\alpha_0| + 1$,
3. If $\alpha =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$ and $\tau(\gamma), \tau(\delta) \in \text{OT}_\Omega$, $\tau(\alpha) = \langle 2, \tau(\gamma), \tau(\delta) \rangle \in \text{OT}_\Omega$ and $|\alpha| = \max\{|\gamma|, |\delta|\} + 1$.

It should be noted that the definition of $x \in \text{OT}_\Omega$ and $|\alpha|$ are primitive recursive.

We now want to define an ordering $<_\vartheta$ on OT_Ω such that $\tau(\alpha) <_\vartheta \tau(\beta)$ if and only if $\alpha < \beta$. Conditions (iii) and (vii) of proposition 7 ensures every ordinal built up from the constants 0, Ω and functions $\alpha, \beta \mapsto \omega^\alpha + \beta$ and $\alpha \mapsto \vartheta\alpha$ has a unique representation. We may therefore dispense with the function τ and identify members of OT_Ω with the ordinals they represent, as was the case with OT .

Define the relation $\alpha <_\vartheta \beta$ on OT_Ω by recursion on the value of $|\alpha| + |\beta|$. The conditions involved in comparing two ordinals $\vartheta\xi_0$ and $\vartheta\xi_1$ will be taken from (viii) of proposition 7. Let $\alpha <_\vartheta \beta$ if and only if one of the following conditions hold.

1. $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$;
 2. $\alpha =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$ and either:
 - a) $\beta = \Omega$ and $\gamma <_\vartheta \beta$,
 - b) $\beta =_{\text{NF}} \omega^{\gamma_0} + \delta_0$ and $\gamma <_\vartheta \gamma_0$, or $\gamma = \gamma_0 \wedge \delta <_\vartheta \delta_0$, or
 - c) $\beta = \vartheta \xi$ and $\gamma <_\vartheta \beta$;
 3. $\alpha = \vartheta \xi$ and either:
 - a) $\beta = \Omega$,
 - b) $\beta =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$ and $\alpha \leq_\vartheta \gamma$,⁵ or
 - c) $\beta = \vartheta \eta$ and either, $\xi <_\vartheta \eta \wedge \xi^* <_\vartheta \beta$, or $\eta <_\vartheta \xi \wedge \alpha \leq_\vartheta \eta^*$.
- ($\gamma \leq_\vartheta \delta$ abbreviates $\gamma <_\vartheta \delta$ or $\gamma = \delta$.)

Since the function $\alpha \mapsto \alpha^*$ is primitive recursive, the relation $<_\vartheta$ is also primitive recursive.

Before we proceed with the analysis of HST_β , we will show how the ordinals $\alpha \geq \Omega$ in OT_Ω enable the generation of the φ_α functions for $\alpha < \Gamma_0$ and that OT_Ω properly extends OT .

Let $\Omega \cdot 0 = 0$ and if $\alpha = \omega^{\alpha_0} + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_n}$ and $\alpha_0 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n$, define

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega \cdot \alpha &= \omega^{\Omega+\alpha_0} + \dots + \omega^{\Omega+\alpha_n}, \\ \Omega^\beta \cdot \alpha &= \omega^{\Omega \cdot \beta + \alpha_0} + \dots + \omega^{\Omega \cdot \beta + \alpha_n}.\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 9. $\text{OT}_\Omega \cap \Omega$ forms an initial segment of the ordinals.

Proof. Suppose $\delta \in \text{OT}_\Omega \cap \Omega$. We prove $\alpha \in \text{OT}_\Omega$ for every $\alpha < \delta$ by transfinite induction on α . Suppose

$$\forall \xi < \alpha (\xi \in \text{OT}_\Omega). \quad (14) \quad \{\text{eqn:ordOT1}\}$$

If $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$, eq. (14), (C1) and (C2) imply $\alpha \in \text{OT}_\Omega$, so assume α is an ε -ordinal. In search of a contradiction, assume further that $\alpha \notin \text{OT}_\Omega$. We prove $\alpha = \vartheta \xi$ for some $\xi \in \text{OT}_\Omega$. Pick β to be the least ordinal in $\{\gamma \leq \delta : \gamma \in \text{OT}_\Omega \wedge \alpha < \gamma\}$. Then β must be an ε -ordinal as otherwise $\beta = \omega^{\gamma_0} + \gamma_1$ for some $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 < \beta$, whence $\alpha \leq \max\{\gamma, \delta\} \in \text{OT}_\Omega \cap \Omega$. Since $\beta \in \text{OT}_\Omega$, $\beta = \vartheta \xi$ for some $\xi \in \text{OT}_\Omega$. Now, as $\xi^* < \vartheta \xi$ we have $\xi^* < \alpha$. Thus $\xi \in C(\xi, \alpha)$.

Moreover, we claim $C(\xi, \alpha) \cap \Omega \subseteq \alpha$. The argument proceeds by induction on the definition of $\eta \in C(\xi, \alpha) \cap \Omega$. In case $\eta = 0$ or $\eta =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$, it is immediate that $\eta < \alpha$, so suppose $\eta = \vartheta \zeta$. Then $\zeta < \xi$ and, since

$$\eta \in C(\xi, \alpha) \cap \Omega \subseteq C(\xi, \vartheta \xi) \cap \Omega = \vartheta \xi,$$

$\eta < \beta$. By eq. (14) and the fact $\xi \in \text{OT}_\Omega$, we obtain $C(\xi, \alpha) \subseteq \text{OT}_\Omega$, so $\eta = \vartheta \zeta \in \text{OT}_\Omega$, whence $\eta < \alpha$ by the choice of β .

Thus we have shown $\xi \in C(\xi, \alpha)$ and $C(\xi, \alpha) \cap \Omega \subseteq \alpha$, whence $\vartheta \xi \leq \alpha$ by ($\vartheta 1$), and $\alpha = \beta \in \text{OT}_\Omega$. \square

⁵Recall that if γ is an ε -ordinal, $\beta =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$ only if $\delta > 0$, whence $\vartheta \xi <_\vartheta \beta$ if $\vartheta \xi = \gamma$.

Proposition 10.

1. $\vartheta\Omega$ is the least ordinal closed under the function $\gamma \mapsto \vartheta\gamma$.
2. $\vartheta\Omega^2$ is the least ordinal closed under the function $\gamma \mapsto \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \gamma)$.
3. $\vartheta\Omega^3$ is the least ordinal closed under the function $\gamma \mapsto \vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot \gamma)$.

Proof. (i). Let $\gamma_0 = 0$ and $\gamma_{m+1} = \vartheta\gamma_m$; we claim

$$\sup_{n < \omega} \gamma_n = \vartheta\Omega,$$

whence it is clear (i) holds. $\gamma_0 < \vartheta\Omega$ holds trivially and, if $\gamma_m < \vartheta\Omega$, we have $(\gamma_m)^* < \vartheta\Omega$ and so $\gamma_{m+1} = \vartheta\gamma_m < \vartheta\Omega$ by (viii) of proposition 7; thus $\sup_n \gamma_n \leq \vartheta\Omega$.

To show $\vartheta\Omega \leq \sup_n \gamma_n$ we prove $\beta < \vartheta\Omega$ implies $\beta < \gamma_m$ for some m by induction on the rank of β . Suppose $\beta < \vartheta\Omega$. Both $\vartheta\Omega$ and $\sup_n \gamma_n$ are ε -ordinals, so the case $\beta =_{\text{NF}} \omega^{\beta_0} + \beta_1$, holds by the induction hypothesis. If $\beta = \vartheta\xi$ we deduce $\xi < \Omega$ and $\xi^* < \vartheta\Omega$, since $\beta < \vartheta\Omega$ and $\Omega^* = 0$. ξ^* has rank strictly less than β , so the induction hypothesis yields an $m < \omega$ such that $\xi^* < \gamma_m$. Proposition 7 (v) then entails $\xi < \gamma_m$. Moreover, since $\gamma_m = (\gamma_m)^* < \vartheta\gamma_m$, by proposition 7 (vi), $\gamma_m < \gamma_{m+1}$, so $\xi^* < \vartheta\gamma_m$. Therefore $\beta = \vartheta\xi < \vartheta\gamma_m = \gamma_{m+1}$.

(ii). Let $\gamma_0 = 0$ and $\gamma_{m+1} = \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \gamma_m)$; we claim

$$\sup_{n < \omega} \gamma_n = \vartheta\Omega^2,$$

whence (ii) holds. Let $\alpha = \sup_n \gamma_n$. Naturally, $\gamma_0 < \vartheta\Omega^2$, and if $\gamma_m < \vartheta\Omega^2$,

$$(\Omega \cdot \gamma_m)^* = \gamma_m^* < \vartheta\Omega^2,$$

so $\gamma_{m+1} < \vartheta\Omega^2$ by proposition 7 (viii). Thus $\alpha \leq \vartheta\Omega^2$.

To show the converse, we prove $\beta < \vartheta\Omega^2$ implies $\beta < \alpha$ by induction on the rank of β . Suppose $\beta < \vartheta\Omega^2$ and $\beta = \vartheta\xi$ for some ξ . As $(\Omega^2)^* = 0$ and $\beta < \vartheta\Omega^2$, proposition 7 (viii) implies $\xi < \Omega^2$ and $\xi^* < \vartheta\Omega^2$, whence the induction hypothesis implies $\xi^* < \gamma_m$ for some m . Since $\xi < \Omega^2$, there are $\delta_0, \delta_1 < \Omega$ such that $\xi = \Omega \cdot \delta_0 + \delta_1$, whence $\delta_0^* \leq \xi^* < \gamma_m$. So $\xi < \Omega \cdot \gamma_m$ and $\beta < \gamma_{m+1}$ by proposition 7 (viii).

(iii) involves a near identical argument as (ii). Pick $\gamma_0 = 0$ and $\gamma_{m+1} = \vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot \gamma_m)$. That $\sup_n \gamma_n \leq \vartheta\Omega^3$ is easily established using proposition 7. For the converse direction, $\vartheta\Omega^3 \leq \sup_n \gamma_n$, we suppose $\beta < \vartheta\Omega^3$ and seek to determine $\beta < \gamma_m$ for some m . If $\beta = \vartheta\xi < \vartheta\Omega^3$, we may assume $\xi^* < \gamma_m$ for some m , whence $\xi < \Omega^2 \cdot \gamma_m$, and so $\beta < \gamma_{m+1}$. \square

Proposition 10 allows us to identify some characteristic ordinals in terms of both the Veblen and ϑ functions.

Corollary 11.

1. $\alpha < \varphi_{20}$ implies $\varepsilon_\alpha = \vartheta\alpha$.
2. $\vartheta\Omega = \varphi_{20}$.
3. $\vartheta\Omega^2 = \Gamma_0$.
4. $\vartheta(\Omega^2 + \Omega)$ is the least fixed point of the function $\xi \mapsto \Gamma_\xi$, which enumerates the class $\{\xi : \xi = \varphi\xi 0\}$.

Proof. (i) is argued by transfinite induction on $\alpha < \varphi 20$. Suppose $\vartheta\beta = \varepsilon_\beta$ for every $\beta < \alpha$. We will begin by showing a) $C(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha) \cap \Omega \subseteq \varepsilon_\alpha$, and b) $\alpha \in C(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha)$, allowing us to deduce $\vartheta\alpha \leq \varepsilon_\alpha$ by ($\vartheta 1$).

a) is shown by a further induction on the construction of $C(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha)$. It is trivial that $\beta \in C_0(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha) \cap \Omega$ entails $\beta < \varepsilon_\alpha$, and that ε_α is closed under applications of rule (C2). Moreover, the induction hypothesis implies that for $\beta < \alpha$, $\vartheta\beta < \varepsilon_\alpha$, thus (C3) is also dealt with, and $C(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha) \cap \Omega \subseteq \varepsilon_\alpha$.

b) uses the fact $\alpha < \varphi 20$, whence $\alpha < \varepsilon_\alpha$ and $\alpha \in C(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha)$ by (C1).

To see $\varepsilon_\alpha \leq \vartheta\alpha$, assume otherwise. Then $\vartheta\alpha = \varepsilon_\beta$ for some $\beta < \alpha$ by proposition 7 (iii). The induction hypothesis yields $\vartheta\alpha = \vartheta\beta$, contradicting $\beta < \alpha$.

(ii) is an immediate consequence of (i) and proposition 10.

(iii). The proof for (i) above can be extended to $\alpha > \varphi 20$, but then one can at best show $\varepsilon_\alpha \leq \vartheta\alpha \leq \varepsilon_{\alpha+1}$ for $\alpha < \Omega$.⁶ One can then prove

$$\varphi 2\alpha \leq \vartheta(\Omega + \alpha) \leq \varphi 2(\alpha + 1)$$

for $\alpha < \Omega$ by transfinite induction on α , using the definition of ϑ . This can easily be extended to deduce, in general,

$$\varphi\alpha\beta \leq \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \alpha + \beta) \leq \varphi(\alpha + 1)(\beta + 1)$$

for $\alpha, \beta < \Gamma_0$, from which proposition 10 (ii) implies $\vartheta\Omega^2 = \Gamma_0$.

(iv). Let Δ_0 denote the least fixed point of the function $\xi \mapsto \Gamma_\xi$. Following from (iii) above, $\vartheta(\Omega^2 + \alpha) = \Gamma_\alpha$ for $\alpha < \Delta_0$. Since $\vartheta(\Omega^2 + \Omega)$ is the least ordinal closed under the function $\alpha \mapsto \vartheta(\Omega^2 + \alpha)$, we deduce $\vartheta(\Omega^2 + \Omega) = \Delta_0$. \square

In this notation system, $\vartheta\Omega^3$ represents the *Ackermann ordinal*, $\vartheta\Omega^\Omega$ denotes the *Veblen ordinal* and $\vartheta\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ is the *Bachmann-Howard ordinal* where

$$\vartheta\varepsilon_{\Omega+1} = \sup\{\vartheta\Omega, \vartheta\Omega^\Omega, \vartheta\Omega^{\Omega^\Omega}, \dots\} = \sup_{\alpha \in \text{OT}_\Omega} \vartheta\alpha.$$

Having established an ordinal notation system suitable for the analysis of the theories HST_β , we may now fix the language of HST_β . Since the proof-theoretic strength of each theory HST_β with $\beta < \vartheta\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ will not exceed $\vartheta\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, we may pick $\kappa = \vartheta\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ and suppose the theories HST_β are formulated in the language \mathcal{L}_κ .

We require a few further technical results about ordinals before we can proceed with the analysis. Suppose $\beta = \Omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot \beta_0 + \dots + \Omega^{\alpha_n} \cdot \beta_n$ such that $\alpha_0 > \dots > \alpha_n$ and $\beta_i < \Omega$ for each $i \leq n$. Recall from the previous section that $\beta|_\gamma$ denotes the ordinal $\Omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot \beta_0 + \dots + \Omega^{\alpha_k} \cdot \beta_k$ where $k < n$ is the least such that $\alpha_k > \gamma \geq \alpha_{k+1}$, or $k = n$ if $\alpha_n > \gamma$.

The following observations are immediate consequences of the definition.

Proposition 12. For all ordinals $\alpha, \beta < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ and $\gamma, \delta < \Omega$,

1. $\gamma < \delta$ implies $\alpha|_\gamma \leq \alpha|_\delta$,
2. $\alpha < \beta$ implies $\alpha|_\gamma \leq \beta|_\gamma$.
3. $\delta \leq \gamma$ implies $(\alpha|_\gamma)|_\delta = \alpha|_\gamma$,
4. $\beta < \alpha|_\gamma$ if and only if $\beta + \Omega^{\gamma+1} \leq \alpha$,
5. $\beta < \alpha|_\gamma$ and $\delta \leq \gamma$ implies $\beta + \Omega^\delta < \alpha|_\gamma$.

⁶ $\vartheta\alpha = \varepsilon_{\alpha+1}$ for $\alpha = \varphi 20$ for example.

3.3 Lower bounds on the proof-theoretic ordinal

We will now establish lower bounds for the theories HST_β . This will be achieved by extending the well-ordering proofs used in our analysis of F (??) and S_3 (??). Recall $\kappa = \vartheta_{\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}}$.

[Remark that case distinctions below are all decidable]

HST_0 is identical to F , for which an optimal lower bound was established in ?? . However, because of the change in ordinal notation system and the reflective nature of the theories HST_β it will be useful to provide a new proof of the result. For each $\xi < \kappa$ let $\text{wo}_\xi(x)$ denote the formula

$$\forall^\top A(x)^\top \forall y < x \text{ T}_\xi(\top \text{TI}(\dot{y}, A)^\top).$$

Let $F_0(\rho)$ denote the formula $\text{wo}_0(\rho^*) \wedge \forall \sigma < \rho [\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)]$ and $F_0^\rho(\alpha)$ denote $\alpha < \Omega \rightarrow F_0(\rho + \alpha)$. We begin with a technical lemma.

Lemma 13. $\text{HST}_0^1 \vdash \forall \rho [\text{T}_0(\top F_0(\dot{\rho})^\top) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \rho)]$.

Proof. Argue within HST_0^1 , and assume

$$\text{T}_0(\top F_0(\dot{\rho})^\top). \quad (15) \quad \{\text{eqn:F0tech1}\}$$

Let $\gamma_0 = \rho^* + 1$ and $\gamma_{m+1} = C(\rho, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega$. Moreover, let $\text{wo}_0^1(x)$ denote $\text{T}_0(\top \text{wo}_0(\dot{x})^\top)$. Equation (15) implies $\text{wo}_0^1(\gamma_0)$ and $\forall \sigma < \rho [\text{wo}_0^1(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0^1(\vartheta \sigma)]$, whence it is easy to deduce $\forall m [\text{wo}_0^1(\gamma_m) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0^1(\gamma_{m+1})]$ and thus $\text{wo}_0^1(\vartheta \rho)$. By Del_0 , $\text{wo}_0(\vartheta \rho)$ holds. \square

Lemma 14. For every $m < \omega$, $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash F_0(\Omega \cdot \bar{m})$.

Proof. $\text{HST}_0^0 \vdash F_0(\bar{0})$ holds vacuously, so suppose $m = n + 1 > 0$ and

$$\text{HST}_0^n \vdash F_0(\Omega \cdot \bar{n}). \quad (16) \quad \{\text{eqn:4.1}\}$$

The first step is to establish $\text{HST}_0^n \vdash \text{Prog}_{F_0^{\Omega \cdot \bar{n}}}$. Argue informally within HST_0^n , assuming $\forall v < \mu F_0^{\Omega \cdot \bar{n}}(v)$ for some μ , that is,

$$\forall v < \mu (\text{wo}_0(v^*) \wedge \forall \sigma < \Omega \cdot \bar{n} + v [\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)]). \quad (17) \quad \{\text{eqn:4.3}\}$$

We want to show $\text{wo}_0(\mu^*)$ and $\forall \sigma < \Omega \cdot \bar{n} + \mu [\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)]$. The former is obvious since the fact $\text{wo}_0(\varepsilon_\alpha)$ is progressive in α is provable in HST_0^1 (cf. ??). To prove the latter, assume $\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*)$ for some $\sigma < \Omega \cdot \bar{n} + \mu$. If $\mu = 0$ or is a limit ordinal, $\text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)$ is immediate given eq. (17). Otherwise $\mu = v + 1$ for some v , whence we may assume $\sigma = \Omega \cdot \bar{n} + v$. Let $\gamma_0 = \sigma^* + 1$ and $\gamma_{m+1} = C(\sigma, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega$. Then $\gamma_m < \Omega$ for each m and

$$\vartheta \sigma \leq \sup_m \gamma_m$$

by proposition 6. $\text{wo}_0(\gamma_0)$ is a consequence of $\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*)$, so suppose

$$\text{wo}_0(\gamma_m) \quad (18) \quad \{\text{eqn:4.4}\}$$

with the aim of showing $\text{wo}_0(\gamma_{m+1})$ by induction on the recursive definition of $C(\sigma, \gamma_m)$. Assume $\text{wo}_0(\alpha)$ holds for every $\alpha \in C_k(\sigma, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega$ and suppose $\beta \in C_{k+1}(\sigma, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega$.

(C1). $\beta \leq \gamma_m$, so $\text{wo}_0(\beta)$ is a result of eq. (18).

(C2). $\beta =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\delta + \eta$, and $\delta, \eta \in C_k(\sigma, \gamma_m)$. Since also $\delta, \eta < \Omega$ the induction hypothesis yields $\text{wo}_0(\delta) \wedge \text{wo}_0(\eta)$ and so $\text{wo}_0(\beta)$.

(C3). $\beta =_{\text{NF}} \vartheta \xi$ and $\xi \in C_k(\sigma, \gamma_m) \cap \sigma$. Thus, $\xi^* \in C_k(\sigma, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega$ and therefore $\text{wo}_0(\xi^*)$ by the induction hypothesis. If $\xi < \Omega \cdot n$, $\text{wo}_0(\vartheta \xi)$ is a consequence of eq. (16), otherwise $\Omega \cdot n \leq \xi < \sigma$ and $\text{wo}_0(\vartheta \xi)$ is implied by eq. (17).

Thus we may deduce $\forall \alpha < \gamma_{m+1} \text{wo}_0(\alpha)$, hence $\text{wo}_0(\gamma_{m+1})$, and so $\text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)$, concluding the proof of

$$\text{HST}_0^n \vdash \text{Prog} F_0^{\Omega \cdot \bar{n}}. \quad (19) \quad \{\text{eqn:4.2}\}$$

An application of Nec_0 entails $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \text{T}_0(\ulcorner \text{Prog} F_0^{\Omega \cdot \bar{n}} \urcorner)$, so

$$\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \forall \alpha [\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{T}_0(\ulcorner F_0(\Omega \cdot \bar{n} + \alpha) \urcorner)],$$

and hence, by lemma 13,

$$\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \forall \alpha (\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta(\Omega \cdot \bar{n} + \alpha))). \quad (20) \quad \{\text{eqn:4.6}\}$$

To obtain $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash F_0(\Omega \cdot \bar{m})$ and complete the proof we argue within HST_0^m . Firstly, $\text{wo}_0((\Omega \cdot \bar{m})^*)$ holds trivially as $(\Omega \cdot \bar{m})^* = 0$. Secondly, if $\sigma < \Omega \cdot \bar{m}$, we have either $\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)$ by eq. (16), or $\sigma = \Omega \cdot \bar{n} + \zeta$ for some $\zeta < \Omega$, whence $\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\zeta)$ and $\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)$ results from eq. (20). \square

Corollary 15. $\|\text{HST}_0^m\| \geq \vartheta(\Omega \cdot m)$ and $\|\text{HST}_0\| \geq \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \omega)$.

Proof. Let $\gamma_0 = 1$ and $\gamma_{k+1} = C(\Omega \cdot m, \gamma_k) \cap \Omega$. Then $\vartheta(\Omega \cdot m) \leq \sup_{k < \omega} \gamma_k$ and $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\gamma_0)$ holds. Moreover, if $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\bar{\alpha})$ for every $\alpha < \gamma_k$ we may deduce $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\bar{\alpha})$ for every $\alpha < \gamma_{k+1}$ by induction on the definition of γ_{k+1} thus: suppose $\beta \in C_{k+1}(\Omega \cdot m, \gamma_k) \cap \Omega$ and $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\bar{\alpha})$ for every $\alpha \in C_k(\Omega \cdot m, \gamma_k) \cap \Omega$. If β was enumerated into $C_{k+1}(\Omega \cdot m, \gamma_k)$ by either (C1) or (C2), $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\bar{\beta})$ is easily obtained from the induction hypothesis. If, however, $\beta = \vartheta \xi$ for some $\xi \in C_k(\Omega \cdot m, \gamma_k) \cap \Omega \cdot m$, $\xi = \Omega \cdot n + \alpha$ for some $n < m$, $\alpha \in C_k(\Omega \cdot m, \gamma_k) \cap \Omega$ and $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\bar{\xi}^*)$ by the induction hypothesis, whence lemma 14 implies $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\bar{\beta})$.

Since $\vartheta(\Omega \cdot m) \leq \sup_{k < \omega} \gamma_k$, we obtain $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\bar{\alpha})$ for every $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot m)$ and so $\text{HST}_0^m \vdash \text{TI}(<\vartheta(\Omega \cdot m))$ by an application of Conec_0 . \square

We will now extend the well-ordering proof above to determine lower bounds on the strength of each theory HST_β . This will be done in stages, first for $\beta = 1$, then for arbitrary $\beta < \omega$ and finally for transfinite levels of the hierarchy. In doing so we will find ourselves migrating from the function $\alpha \mapsto \vartheta \alpha$ to the function $\alpha \mapsto \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \alpha)$, and eventually to functions $\alpha \mapsto \vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot \alpha)$.

Before proceeding directly with HST_1 we require a slightly more general form of lemma 14. As its proof makes no explicit use of the fact m is finite, nor any application of Nec_0 in showing $\text{Prog} F_0^{\Omega \cdot \bar{m}}$ given $F_0(\Omega \cdot \bar{m})$, we may readily deduce the following generalisation.

Proposition 16. $\text{HST}_0^1 \vdash \forall \rho [F_0(\rho) \rightarrow \text{Prog} F_0^\rho]$.

Proof. Argue inside HST_0^1 and assume $F_0(\rho)$ and $\forall v < \mu F_0^\rho(v)$, that is,

$$\text{wo}_0(\rho^*), \quad (21) \quad \{\text{eqn:F03.1}\}$$

$$\forall \sigma < \rho [\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)], \quad (22) \quad \{\text{eqn:F03.2}\}$$

$$\forall v < \mu(\text{wo}_0(v^*) \wedge \forall \sigma < \rho + v [\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)]), \quad (23) \quad \{\text{eqn:F03.3}\}$$

for some $\mu < \Omega$; we want to prove $\text{wo}_0(\mu^*)$ and $\forall \tau < \rho + \mu[\text{wo}_0(\tau^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta\tau)]$. The former holds immediately given eq. (23) so assume

$$\text{wo}_0(\tau^*), \quad (24) \quad \{\text{eqn:F03.4}\}$$

for some $\tau < \rho + \mu$. We will prove $\text{wo}_0(\vartheta\tau)$.

Let $\gamma_0 = \tau^* + 1$ and $\gamma_{m+1} = C(\tau, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega$. That $\text{wo}_0(\gamma_m)$ holds for each m will be established by induction on m . From eq. (24) one has $\text{wo}_0(\gamma_0)$. Assume $\text{wo}_0(\gamma_m)$. In order to show $\text{wo}_0(\gamma_{m+1})$, assume $\text{wo}_0(\alpha)$ for every $\alpha \in C_k(\tau, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega$. Pick an arbitrary $\alpha_0 \in C_{k+1}(\tau, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega$. If α_0 was enumerated into the set by either (C1) or (C2), $\text{wo}_0(\alpha_0)$ is immediate. Otherwise $\alpha_0 = \vartheta\xi$ for some $\xi \in C_k(\tau, \gamma_m) \cap \tau$ and, since $\xi^* \in C_k(\tau, \gamma_m) \cap \Omega$, we have $\text{wo}_0(\xi^*)$. If $\xi < \rho$, eq. (22) provides $\text{wo}_0(\vartheta\xi)$. Otherwise $\tau = \rho + \nu$ for some $\nu < \mu$ and $\text{wo}_0(\vartheta\xi)$ holds due to eq. (23). Either way $\text{wo}_0(\alpha_0)$, and so $\text{wo}_0(\alpha)$ for every $\alpha < \gamma_{m+1}$, whence $\text{wo}_0(\gamma_{m+1})$.

Since $\vartheta\tau \geq \sup_m \gamma_m$ we obtain $\text{wo}_0(\vartheta\tau)$. \square

Proposition 16 plays a key role in the analysis of HST_0^m and also HST_1^1 . Lemma 13 entails

$$\begin{aligned} \text{HST}_0^1 \vdash T_0(\ulcorner \text{Prog} F_0^{\dot{\rho}} \urcorner) &\rightarrow \forall \alpha[\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow T_0(\ulcorner F_0^{\dot{\rho}}(\dot{\alpha}) \urcorner)] \\ &\rightarrow \forall \alpha[\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0\vartheta(\rho + \alpha)], \end{aligned}$$

so $\text{HST}_1^1 \vdash \forall \rho[T_1(\ulcorner F_0(\dot{\rho}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_1(\ulcorner F_0(\dot{\rho} + \Omega) \urcorner)]$. This amounts to proving

$$\text{HST}_1^1 \vdash \forall \rho[F_1(\rho) \rightarrow \text{Prog} F_1^{\rho}] \quad (25) \quad \{\text{eqn:F11.1}\}$$

where $F_1(\rho)$ is the formula $T_1(\ulcorner F_0(\rho) \urcorner)$ and $F_1^{\rho}(\alpha)$ denotes $\alpha < \Omega \rightarrow F_1(\rho + \Omega \cdot \alpha)$. Equation (25) is sufficient to deduce a lower bound on the strength of the theory HST_1^1 .

Corollary 17. $\|\text{HST}_1^1\| \geq \vartheta\Omega^2$.

Proof. Since $\text{HST}_0 \vdash F_0(\bar{0})$, eq. (25) implies

$$\text{HST}_1^1 \vdash \text{Prog} F_1^{\bar{0}}. \quad (26) \quad \{\text{eqn:F11lower1}\}$$

Let $\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\sigma_{m+1} = \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \sigma_m)$. By proposition 10 (ii), $\vartheta\Omega^2 = \sup_m \sigma_m$, so it suffices to show $\text{HST}_1^1 \vdash \text{wo}_1(\bar{\sigma}_m)$ for each m . This is trivial for $m = 0$; for $m = n + 1$ argue within HST_1^1 assuming $\text{wo}_1(\bar{\sigma}_n)$. Then $\text{wo}_1(\bar{\sigma}_n + 1)$ and so $T_1(\ulcorner F_0(\Omega \cdot \bar{\sigma}_n) \urcorner)$ by an application of Conec_1 and eq. (26). Lemma 13 yields $T_1(\ulcorner \text{wo}_0\vartheta(\Omega \cdot \bar{\sigma}_n) \urcorner)$ and so $\text{wo}_1(\bar{\sigma}_m)$ holds. \square

Within HST_1^2 , the above proof may be replicated under a T_1 predicate, allowing one to reach ordinals beyond $\vartheta\Omega^2$, as the next proposition demonstrates.

Lemma 18. For each m , $\text{HST}_1^{m+1} \vdash F_1(\Omega^2 \cdot \bar{m})$ and $\text{HST}_1^{m+1} \vdash \text{Prog} F_1^{\Omega^2 \cdot \bar{m}}$.

Proof. $\text{HST}_1^1 \vdash F_1(\bar{0})$ holds trivially, so suppose $m = n + 1$ and $\text{HST}_1^m \vdash F_1(\Omega^2 \cdot \bar{n})$. Equation (25) yields $\text{HST}_1^m \vdash \text{Prog} F_1^{\Omega^2 \cdot \bar{n}}$, whence an application of Nec_1 and T_1^- -Rep implies

$$\text{HST}_1^{m+1} \vdash T_1(\ulcorner \forall \alpha[\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow T_0(\ulcorner F_1(\Omega^2 \cdot \bar{n} + \Omega \cdot \dot{\alpha}) \urcorner)] \urcorner). \quad (27) \quad \{\text{eqn:F1well.1}\}$$

However, arguing within HST_0 , from $F_0(\rho)$ one obtains $\text{wo}_0(\vartheta\rho)$, so eq. (27) entails

$$\text{HST}_1^{m+1} \vdash T_1(\ulcorner \forall \alpha[\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0\vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot \bar{n} + \Omega \cdot \dot{\alpha})] \urcorner),$$

and thus $\text{HST}_1^{m+1} \vdash F_1(\Omega^2 \cdot \bar{m})$ as required. \square

Theorem 6. Suppose $m < \omega$. Then every theorem of $\text{PA} + \text{TI}(<\vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot m))$ is derivable in HST_1^m . Moreover, every theorem of $\text{PA} + \text{TI}(<\vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot \omega))$ is derivable in HST_1 .

Proof. Since $\vartheta 0 = \varepsilon_0$ and HST_1^0 extends PA, the case $m = 0$ holds, so suppose $m = n + 1 > 0$. If $\text{HST}_1^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\bar{\alpha})$, lemma 18 implies

$$\text{HST}_1^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot \bar{n} + \Omega \cdot \bar{\alpha})),$$

whereby if $\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\sigma_{k+1} = \vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot n + \Omega \cdot \sigma_k)$, $\text{HST}_1^m \vdash \text{wo}_0(\bar{\sigma}_k)$ for every k .

Thus we require to show $\vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot m) \leq \sup_k \sigma_k$. This is proved by induction on the rank of $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot m)$. If $\alpha =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta < \vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot m)$, the induction hypothesis immediately implies $\alpha < \sigma_k$ for some k . Otherwise

$$\alpha = \vartheta \xi < \vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot m)$$

and there are two cases to consider:

1. $\xi < \Omega^2 \cdot m$ and $\xi^* < \vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot m)$; or
2. $\xi > \Omega^2 \cdot m$ but $\vartheta \xi \leq (\Omega^2 \cdot m)^*$.

b) cannot hold since $(\Omega^2 \cdot m)^* = 0$, so $\xi^* < \vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot m)$. As ξ^* has rank strictly smaller than α the induction hypothesis implies $\xi^* < \sigma_k$ for some k . But then $\xi < \Omega^2 \cdot n + \Omega \cdot \sigma_k$ and $\alpha < \sigma_{k+1}$.

The second part of the theorem is easily established using the fact $\vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot \omega) = \sup_k \vartheta(\Omega^2 \cdot k)$. \square

We can now turn our attention to the theories HST_p for $p < \omega$. Lemma 18 essentially shows $\text{HST}_1 \vdash F_1(\Omega^2 \cdot \bar{\alpha})$ implies $\text{HST}_1 \vdash F_1(\Omega^2 \cdot (\bar{\alpha} + 1))$. This can be extended to show $\text{HST}_1 \vdash \forall v < \bar{\mu} F_1(\Omega^2 \cdot v)$ implies $\text{HST}_1 \vdash F_1(\Omega^2 \cdot \bar{\mu})$, whence

$$\text{HST}_2^1 \vdash \text{Prog} F_2^{\bar{0}} \tag{28} \quad \{\text{eqn:Fbwell11}\}$$

where $F_2^{\bar{0}}(\alpha)$ is the formula $\alpha < \Omega \wedge T_2(\ulcorner F_0(\rho + \Omega^2 \cdot \alpha) \urcorner)$.

Equation (28) suffices to deduce a lower bound for HST_2^1 and acts as the base step in the analysis of HST_2 and ultimately HST_p , which follows a generalised form of the procedure used in lemma 18.

Let $F_p(\rho)$, for $0 < p < \omega$, be the formula $T_p(\ulcorner F_0(\rho) \urcorner)$, that is

$$T_p(\ulcorner \text{wo}_0(\rho^*) \wedge \forall \sigma < \rho [\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)] \urcorner),$$

and denote by $F_p^{\bar{\rho}}(\alpha)$ the formula $\alpha < \Omega \wedge F_p(\rho + \Omega^{\bar{\rho}} \cdot \alpha)$.

Lemma 19. For each $p < \omega$, $\text{HST}_p^1 \vdash \forall \rho [F_p(\rho) \rightarrow \text{Prog} F_p^{\bar{\rho}}]$ and, for $m < \omega$, $\text{HST}_p^{m+1} \vdash F_p(\Omega^{\bar{p}+1} \cdot \bar{m})$.

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction on $p < \omega$. The case of $p = 0$ has already been shown in proposition 16 so suppose $p = q + 1 > 0$. Argue informally within HST_p^1 . Assume

$$F_p(\rho), \tag{29} \quad \{\text{eqn:Fpwell11}\}$$

$$\forall v < \mu F_p^{\bar{\rho}}(v) \tag{30} \quad \{\text{eqn:Fpwell12}\}$$

for some $\mu < \Omega$. If $\mu = 0$, of course $F_p^\rho(\mu)$ holds by eq. (29), and if μ is a limit ordinal, eq. (30) implies $T_p(\ulcorner \forall v < \dot{\mu} F_0(\rho + \Omega^{\bar{p}} \cdot \mu) \urcorner)$, whence $F_p^\rho(\mu)$ is immediate. This leaves only the case in which μ is a successor ordinal. But for every ordinal τ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_p(\tau) &\rightarrow T_p(\ulcorner F_q(\dot{\tau}) \urcorner), \\
&\rightarrow T_p(\ulcorner \text{Prog} F_q^{\dot{\tau}} \urcorner), \\
&\rightarrow T_p(\ulcorner T_0(\ulcorner \text{Prog} F_q^{\dot{\tau}} \urcorner) \urcorner), \\
&\rightarrow T_p(\ulcorner \forall \alpha [\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow T_0(\ulcorner F_q^{\dot{\tau}}(\dot{\alpha}) \urcorner)] \urcorner), \\
&\rightarrow T_p(\ulcorner \forall \alpha [\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow T_0(\ulcorner F_0(\dot{\tau} + \Omega^{\bar{q}} \cdot \dot{\alpha}) \urcorner)] \urcorner), \\
&\rightarrow T_p(\ulcorner \forall \alpha [\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta(\dot{\tau} + \Omega^{\bar{q}} \cdot \dot{\alpha})) \urcorner] \urcorner).
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

The second implication holds on account of the induction hypothesis, while the final holds due to Del_0 and lemma 13. Given that if $\tau \leq \sigma < \tau + \Omega^p$ there exists some $\zeta < \Omega$ such that $\sigma < \tau + \Omega^q \cdot \zeta$ and $\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\zeta)$ (pick $\zeta = (\sigma^*)^{\varepsilon+}$), eq. (31) entails $F_p(\tau) \rightarrow T_p(\ulcorner F_0(\dot{\tau} + \Omega^{\bar{p}}) \urcorner)$, that is $\forall \tau [F_p^\tau(\alpha) \rightarrow F_p^\tau(\alpha + 1)]$.

For the second part, the case $m = 0$ is immediate, so suppose $m = n + 1$ and $\text{HST}_p^m \vdash F_p(\Omega^{\bar{p}+1} \cdot \bar{n})$. Then $\text{HST}_p^{m+1} \vdash T_p(\ulcorner \text{Prog} F_p^{\Omega^{\bar{p}+1} \cdot \bar{n}} \urcorner)$, from which we deduce

$$\text{HST}_p^{m+1} \vdash T_p(\ulcorner \forall \alpha [\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow T_0(\ulcorner F_p(\Omega^{\bar{p}+1} \cdot \bar{n} + \Omega^{\bar{p}} \cdot \dot{\alpha}) \urcorner)] \urcorner)$$

and hence obtain $\text{HST}_p^{m+1} \vdash F_p(\Omega^{\bar{p}+1} \cdot \bar{m})$. \square

Theorem 7. For every $m < \omega$ and $p < \omega$, $\text{HST}_p^m \vdash \text{TI}(<\vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot m))$ and $\text{HST}_p \vdash \text{TI}(<\vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot \omega))$.

Proof. For every p , the base case, $m = 0$, is immediate since HST_p^0 extends PA formulated in the language \mathcal{L}_p . Otherwise $m = n + 1 > 0$ and the previous lemma shows $\text{HST}_p^m \vdash \text{Prog} F_p^{\Omega^{\bar{p}+1} \cdot \bar{n}}$. Given $\text{HST}_p^m \vdash \text{wo}_p(\bar{\alpha})$, one obtains $\text{HST}_p^m \vdash F_p(\Omega^{\bar{p}+1} \cdot \bar{n} + \Omega^{\bar{p}} \cdot \bar{\alpha})$, and so

$$\text{HST}_p^m \vdash \text{wo}_p(\vartheta(\Omega^{\bar{p}+1} \cdot \bar{n} + \Omega^{\bar{p}} \cdot \bar{\alpha})),$$

by unravelling the definition of F_p and lemma 13.

Let $\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\sigma_{k+1} = \vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot n + \Omega^p \cdot \sigma_k)$. The previous paragraph establishes $\text{HST}_p^m \vdash \text{TI}(<\sigma_k)$ for every k , so all that remains is to show $\vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot m) \leq \sup_k \sigma_k$, which proceeds by induction on the rank of $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot m)$. If $\alpha = 0$ we are done, and if $\alpha =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$, the induction hypothesis implies $\alpha < \sigma_k$ for some k . Thus, suppose

$$\alpha = \vartheta \xi < \vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot m)$$

for which there are two cases to consider.

1. $\xi < \Omega^{p+1} \cdot m$ and $\xi^* < \vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot m)$; or
2. $\xi > \Omega^{p+1} \cdot m$ but $\vartheta \xi \leq (\Omega^{p+1} \cdot m)^*$.

Since $(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot m)^* = 0$, b) is impossible, and so $\xi^* < \sigma_k$ for some k by the induction hypothesis. Then $\xi < \Omega^{p+1} \cdot n + \Omega^p \cdot \sigma_k$, whence $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot n + \Omega^p \cdot \sigma_k) = \sigma_{k+1}$.

The second part of the theorem is an immediate consequence of the fact

$$\vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot \omega) = \sup_{k < \omega} \vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot k).$$

\square

Finally, we extend the well-ordering proofs to theories HST_β for $\beta \geq \omega$. For $\beta = \omega$ this involves generalising the above proof so that one may derive

$$\text{HST}_\omega \vdash \forall p < \omega \, \text{T}_\omega(\ulcorner \text{Prog} F_p^{\bar{0}} \urcorner), \quad (32) \quad \{\text{eqn:Fbetawell1}\}$$

whence $\text{HST}_\omega \vdash \forall p < \omega \, \text{T}_\omega(\ulcorner \forall \alpha [\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta(\Omega^p \cdot \alpha))] \urcorner)$ and also

$$\text{HST}_\omega \vdash \forall \sigma < \Omega^\omega [\text{wo}_\omega(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_\omega(\vartheta \sigma)].$$

Equation (32) is not difficult to establish as the proof of lemma 19 is clearly uniform in $p < \omega$ and thus can be repeated under a T_ω predicate in HST_ω . But in order to lift the construction to arbitrary $\beta \in \text{OT}_\Omega \cap \Omega$ we require a more general argument.

For each $\beta \in \text{OT}_\Omega$ let $G_\beta(\rho)$ denote the formula

$$\text{T}_\beta(\ulcorner F_0(\dot{\rho}) \urcorner),$$

and let $G_\beta^\rho(\alpha)$ abbreviate $\alpha < \Omega \wedge \forall \eta < \bar{\beta} \, G_\beta(\rho + \Omega^\eta \cdot \alpha)$.

Proposition 20. *For each $\beta \in \text{OT}_\Omega \cap \Omega$, $\text{HST}_\beta^1 \vdash \forall \rho [G_\beta(\rho) \rightarrow \text{Prog} G_\beta^\rho]$ and for every $m < \omega$, $\text{HST}_\beta^{m+1} \vdash G_\beta(\Omega^{\bar{\beta}} \cdot \bar{m})$.*

The proof of proposition 20 is by transfinite induction on β and requires, for a given β , the following technical lemmata.

Lemma 21. $\text{HST}_\beta^1 \vdash \forall \rho [G_\beta(\rho) \rightarrow \forall \eta < \bar{\beta} \, \text{T}_\beta(\ulcorner \text{Prog} G_\eta^\rho \urcorner)]$.

Lemma 22. $\text{HST}_\beta^1 \vdash \text{T}_\beta(\ulcorner \forall \tau \forall \eta < \bar{\beta} [F_0(\tau) \wedge \text{T}_0(\ulcorner \text{Prog} G_\eta^\tau \urcorner) \rightarrow F_0(\tau + \Omega^\eta)] \urcorner)$.

Proof. The two lemmata hold vacuously when $\beta = 0$. For $\beta > 0$

$$\text{HST}_\beta^1 \vdash G_\beta(\rho) \leftrightarrow \forall \eta < \bar{\beta} \, \text{T}_\beta(\ulcorner G_\eta(\dot{\rho}) \urcorner),$$

so the first lemma would result from replicating the proof of (the transfinite induction hypothesis of) proposition 20 under a T_β predicate. This is possible as the proof of the proposition, which is presented below, is uniform in $\eta < \bar{\beta}$.

In order to establish lemma 22, argue within HST_β^1 under the scope of a T_β predicate. Fix $\eta < \bar{\beta}$, some arbitrary τ and assume

$$\text{T}_0(\ulcorner \text{Prog} G_\eta^\tau \urcorner), \quad (33) \quad \{\text{eqn:Fbetatech2}\}$$

$$F_0(\tau). \quad (34) \quad \{\text{eqn:Fbetatech3}\}$$

Equation (33) entails

$$\forall \alpha [\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow \forall \xi < \eta \, \text{T}_0(\ulcorner G_\eta(\dot{\tau} + \Omega^\xi \cdot \dot{\alpha}) \urcorner)],$$

so $\forall \alpha [\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow \forall \xi < \eta \, \text{T}_0(\ulcorner F_0(\dot{\tau} + \Omega^\xi \cdot \dot{\alpha}) \urcorner)]$ by Del_0 and

$$\forall \xi < \eta \forall \alpha [\text{wo}_0(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta(\tau + \Omega^\xi \cdot \alpha))] \quad (35) \quad \{\text{eqn:Fbetatech4}\}$$

by lemma 13. If $\tau \leq \sigma < \tau + \Omega^\eta$, there exists some $\zeta < \Omega$ and $\xi < \eta$ such that $\sigma < \tau + \Omega^\xi \cdot \zeta$ and $\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\zeta)$ (pick $\zeta = (\sigma^*)^{\varepsilon^+}$), whence $\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)$ results from eq. (35) as $\vartheta \sigma < \vartheta(\tau + \Omega^\xi \cdot \zeta)$. If, however, $\sigma < \tau$, eq. (34) implies $\text{wo}_0(\sigma^*) \rightarrow \text{wo}_0(\vartheta \sigma)$. Thus, $F_0(\tau + \Omega^\eta)$ holds. \square

of proposition 20. Argue informally within HST_β^1 . Fix some arbitrary ρ and assume $G_\beta(\rho)$. Lemma 21 yields $\forall \eta < \bar{\beta} \text{ T}_\beta(\ulcorner \text{Prog} G_\eta^\rho \urcorner)$ from which, using T_β^- -Rep and lemma 22, one obtains $\forall \eta < \bar{\beta} \text{ T}_\beta(\ulcorner F_0(\rho + \Omega^\eta) \urcorner)$, that is, $\forall \eta < \bar{\beta} G_\beta(\rho + \Omega^\eta)$. Therefore

$$\text{HST}_\beta^1 \vdash \forall \rho [G_\beta^\rho(\alpha) \rightarrow G_\beta^\rho(\alpha + 1)]. \quad (36) \quad \{\text{eqn:FbetaWell}\}$$

If μ is a limit ordinal, $\forall v < \mu G_\beta^\rho(v)$ and Uni_β implies

$$\forall \eta < \bar{\beta} \text{ T}_\beta(\ulcorner \forall v < \dot{\mu} F_0(\dot{\rho} + \Omega^\eta \cdot v) \urcorner),$$

from which $\text{T}_\beta(\ulcorner F_0(\dot{\rho} + \Omega^\eta \cdot \dot{\mu}) \urcorner)$ is easily deduced. Thus eq. (36) entails

$$\text{HST}_\beta^1 \vdash \forall \rho [G_\beta(\rho) \rightarrow \text{Prog} G_\beta^\rho].$$

The second half of proposition 20 is proved by induction on $m < \omega$. The case $m = 0$ holds since $F_0(\bar{0})$ is vacuously true. If $m = n + 1$ and $\text{HST}_\beta^m \vdash G_\beta(\Omega^{\bar{\beta}} \cdot \bar{n})$,

$$\text{HST}_\beta^{m+1} \vdash \text{T}_\beta(\ulcorner \text{Prog} G_\beta^{\Omega^{\bar{\beta}} \cdot \bar{n}} \urcorner),$$

so $\text{HST}_\beta^{m+1} \vdash G_\beta(\Omega^{\bar{\beta}} \cdot \bar{m})$ by an argument similar to lemma 22. \square

Much as in the finite case, proposition 20 suffices to obtain lower bounds on the theories HST_β^m . In theorem 8 below we prove $\|\text{HST}_\beta\| \geq \vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot \omega)$. This is achieved by showing the proof-theoretic ordinal of HST_β^m is closed under the operations $\alpha \mapsto \vartheta(\Omega^\eta \cdot \alpha)$ for every $\eta < \beta$ and extends the strength of HST_β^n for $n < m$. The method will only work if β is not “too large”, that is $\vartheta \Omega^\beta$ is indeed the *least* ordinal closed under the above operations. By taking β to be no larger than the Veblen ordinal $\vartheta \Omega^\Omega$, we can ensure that this is the case.

Theorem 8. *For every $\beta < \vartheta \Omega^\Omega$ and every $m < \omega$, $\text{HST}_\beta^m \vdash \text{TI}(< \vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot m))$ and $\text{HST}_\beta \vdash \text{TI}(< \vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot \omega))$.*

Proof. For every $\beta < \vartheta \Omega^\Omega$, the base case, $m = 0$, is immediate since HST_β^0 extends PA formulated in the language \mathcal{L}_κ . Otherwise $m = n + 1 > 0$ and proposition 20 implies $\text{HST}_\beta^m \vdash \text{Prog} G_\beta^{\Omega^{\bar{\beta}} \cdot \bar{n}}$. Then, given $\text{HST}_\beta^m \vdash \text{wo}_\beta(\bar{\alpha})$, we obtain $\text{HST}_\beta^m \vdash \forall \eta < \bar{\beta} G_\beta(\Omega^{\bar{\beta}} \cdot \bar{n} + \Omega^\eta \cdot \bar{\alpha})$, and so

$$\text{HST}_\beta^m \vdash \forall \eta < \bar{\beta} \text{wo}_\beta(\vartheta(\Omega^{\bar{\beta}} \cdot \bar{n} + \Omega^\eta \cdot \bar{\alpha})),$$

by unravelling the definition of G_β .

Let $\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\sigma_{k+1} = \sup_{\eta < \beta} \vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot n + \Omega^\eta \cdot \sigma_k)$. The previous paragraph establishes $\text{HST}_\beta^m \vdash \text{TI}(< \sigma_k)$ for every k . Therefore, all that remains is to show $\vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot m) \leq \sup_k \sigma_k$, which proceeds by induction on the rank of $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot m)$. If $\alpha = 0$ we are done, and if $\alpha =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$, the induction hypothesis implies $\alpha < \sigma_k$ for some k . Thus, suppose

$$\alpha = \vartheta \xi < \vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot m).$$

There are two cases to consider.

1. $\xi < \Omega^\beta \cdot m$ and $\xi^* < \vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot m)$; or

2. $\xi > \Omega^\beta \cdot m$ but $\vartheta\xi \leq (\Omega^\beta \cdot m)^*$.

a) entails $\xi^* < \sigma_k$ for some k by the induction hypothesis (since ξ^* has rank strictly smaller than α). Then $\xi < \Omega^\beta \cdot m + \Omega^\eta \cdot \sigma_k$ for some $\eta < \beta$, whence $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot n + \Omega^\eta \cdot \sigma_k) \leq \sigma_{k+1}$.

To manage b) one utilises $\beta < \vartheta(\Omega^\Omega)$. Since $\vartheta\xi \leq \beta^*$ and $(\Omega^\Omega)^* = 0$, we have

$$\vartheta\xi < \vartheta(\Omega^\Omega)$$

and $\xi < \Omega^\Omega$. But then $\beta \leq \xi^* < \Omega$ contradicting $\vartheta\xi \leq \beta^*$.

The lower bound on HST_β is an immediate consequence of the fact

$$\vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot \omega) = \sup_{k < \omega} \vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot k).$$

□

3.4 Upper bounds on the proof-theoretic ordinal

[Keep this about the classical theory.]

We now move to the task of determining an upper bound on the strength of the theory HST_β . The ultimate aim is to demonstrate that any arithmetical theorem of HST_β is derivable in the theory $\text{PA} + \text{TI}(<\delta)$ for a suitable ordinal δ . To achieve this it is natural to attempt to formalise the consistency proof provided in section 3.1. For it to be successful, however, we must show that the arguments involved can be carried out within the confines of $\text{PA} + \text{TI}(<\delta)$. The main difficulty is with formalising the T-Elimination theorem, theorem 4, since:

- The proof makes free use of transfinite induction beyond the first uncountable ordinal.
- Moreover, each subsidiary induction appears to also require transfinite induction beyond δ (albeit this time bounded in Ω) in order to support later steps in the main induction.
- In particular, the case in which the last rule employed was Uni_η makes use of non-finitistic properties of Ω ; namely proposition 4.

By introducing bounds on the height of the derivations in \mathcal{F}_ρ^* (for a fixed ordinal $\rho \in \text{OT}_\Omega$), we observe that δ can be chosen so as to bound all uses of the subsidiary transfinite induction hypothesis described in the second point. Moreover, δ can be chosen in such a way that all references to the main induction hypothesis in theorem 4 are for ordinals of the form $\Omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot \beta_0 + \Omega^{\alpha_1} \cdot \beta_1 + \dots + \Omega^{\alpha_n} \cdot \beta_n$ where $\alpha_i, \beta_i < \delta$ for every $i \leq n$; the upshot being that a formalised version of theorem 4 needs only countable induction on some suitable (lexicographical-style) ordering.

The third point, however, has no immediate alternative; we need the regularity of Ω to ensure the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\rho}^*$ is closed under the ω -rule if ρ is not an Ω -limit, a property required to establish that \mathcal{F}_ρ^* is closed under Conec_η . Suppose $\rho = \rho' + \Omega^{\xi+1}$ is not an Ω -limit. If $A(x)$ is a formula of \mathcal{L}_κ and $\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}^* \vdash A(\bar{n})$ with $\rho_n < \rho$ for every n , we want to obtain an ordinal $\sigma < \rho$ such that $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash \forall x A(x)$. As each application of Nec_η must increase the height of a derivation, introducing bounds on the height of a derivation indirectly yields bounds on its T-rank. That is, if $\mathcal{F}_\tau^* \vdash B$ with height α , one can prove the existence of a ordinal $\tau_0 \leq \tau$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_0}^* \vdash B$ and τ_0 is no larger than the maximum of α and all η such that Nec_η was utilised in the derivation $\mathcal{F}_\tau^* \vdash B$. Thus, if α is an ordinal bounding the height of the derivation $\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}^* \vdash A(\bar{n})$ for every n , we may observe the ordinal ρ_n is “bounded” by α for every

n , and so effectively find an ordinal $\gamma < \Omega$ depending on α and ρ , so that if $\sigma = \rho' + \Omega^\xi \cdot \gamma$, $\rho_n < \sigma$ for every n and, hence, $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^* \vdash \forall x A(x)$.

Although at present these arguments are somewhat vague, they should explain the motivation behind a number of the technical results to follow. In particular, the remarks we made in relation to the third point are made explicit in the Condensation lemma (lemma 25).

It will be important to compare ordinals greater than Ω by their construction as well as their size. Therefore, we introduce a new ordering $<^*$, defined on OT_Ω by

$$\rho <^* \sigma \leftrightarrow (\rho < \sigma \wedge \rho^* \leq \sigma^*).$$

$\rho \leq^* \sigma$ abbreviates $\rho <^* \sigma \vee \rho = \sigma$.

Definition 23. Fix $\kappa = \partial_{\mathcal{E}_{\Omega+1}}$. Define $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow A$ for $\alpha, \rho \in \text{OT}_\Omega$ with $\alpha < \Omega$ and $\Gamma \Rightarrow A$ an \mathcal{L}_κ -sequent, according to the following rules: (Ax.1), (\wedge), (\vee), (ω) and (\exists) as in ??, along with the following for each $\eta < \kappa$ and each $\beta, \gamma < \alpha \in \text{OT}_\Omega \cap \Omega$.

$$(\text{Ax.2}_\eta) \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma, T_\eta(s_0) \Rightarrow T_\eta(s_1) \text{ if } s_0^\mathbb{N} = s_1^\mathbb{N}.$$

$$(\text{Ax.3}_\eta) \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma, T_\eta s \Rightarrow A \text{ if } s^\mathbb{N} \text{ is not the Gödel number of an } \mathcal{L}_\kappa\text{-sentence.}$$

$$(\text{Imp}_\eta) \frac{\beta}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(s_0), \frac{\gamma}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(s_1) \text{ and } s_0^\mathbb{N} = (s_1 \rightarrow s_2)^\mathbb{N} \text{ implies } \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(s_2).$$

$$(\text{Nec}_\eta) \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(s) \text{ whenever } \frac{\beta}{\sigma} \Gamma \Rightarrow A, \text{ with } \sigma \# \Omega^{\eta+1} \leq^* \rho \text{ and } s^\mathbb{N} = \ulcorner A \urcorner.$$

$$(\text{Del}_\eta) \frac{\beta}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(s), s^\mathbb{N} = \ulcorner T_\xi(s_0) \urcorner \text{ and } \xi < \kappa \text{ implies } \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(s_0).$$

$$(\text{Rep}_\eta) \frac{\beta}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(s), \xi < \eta \text{ implies } \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(s_0) \text{ if } s^\mathbb{N} = \ulcorner T_\xi(s_0) \urcorner \text{ and } s_0^\mathbb{N} \text{ is the Gödel number of an } \mathcal{L}_\kappa\text{-sentence.}$$

$$(\text{T}_\eta\text{-}\omega) \frac{\beta}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(\ulcorner A(\bar{n}) \urcorner) \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ where } A(x) \text{ is a formula of } \mathcal{L}_\kappa \text{ with at most } x \text{ free, implies } \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma \Rightarrow T_\eta(s) \text{ whenever } s^\mathbb{N} = \ulcorner \forall x A(x) \urcorner \text{ and } \rho|_\eta \text{ is not an } \Omega\text{-limit.}$$

$$(\text{Weakening}) \frac{\beta}{\sigma} \Gamma \Rightarrow A \text{ implies } \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma, \Delta \Rightarrow A \text{ whenever } \sigma \leq^* \rho \text{ and } \Delta \text{ is an } \mathcal{L}_\top\text{-sequent.}$$

We refer to ρ as the *T-rank* and α as the *height* of the derivation $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma$. For a fixed η , the rules (Imp_η) to ($\text{T}_\eta\text{-}\omega$), are collectively referred to as *T $_\eta$ -rules*. The collection as a whole (for any η) is referred to as the *T-rules*. In each application of a rule or axiom above we specify the *active*, *minor* and *side* formulae as usual.

Often when working with hierarchical systems one needs an extended notion of the rank of a formula. In this case, however, the basic definition of rank suffices and as such our work in \mathcal{T}_∞ is greatly simplified. Define the *rank* of an \mathcal{L}_κ -sentence A , denoted $|A|$, as in ?? with the addition that $|T_\eta(s)| = |\neg T_\eta(s)| = 0$ for every $\eta < \kappa$.

We observe the following straightforward results for \mathcal{T}_∞ and, henceforth make free use of them without mention.

Proposition 24.

1. $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma, A \text{ implies } \mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma \text{ if } A \text{ is a false arithmetical literal.}$

2. $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma, T_\eta(s)$ implies $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma$ if $s^\mathbb{N}$ is not the code of an \mathcal{L}_κ -sentence.
3. $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma, T_\eta(s), T_\eta(t)$ and $s^\mathbb{N} = t^\mathbb{N}$ implies $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma, T_\eta(s)$.
4. $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma, \neg T_\eta(s), \neg T_\eta(t)$ and $s^\mathbb{N} = t^\mathbb{N}$ implies $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma, \neg T_\eta(s)$.
5. $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma, A(t)$ and $s^\mathbb{N} = t^\mathbb{N}$ implies $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma, A(s)$.

Proof. The proof is essentially identical to the proof of ??, and hence omitted. \square

Although we did not formulate \mathcal{T}_∞ with a cut rule, it is easy to see that such a rule is admissible. The proof proceeds in the same manner as the cut elimination theorems of ?? (cf. ??????).

Theorem 9 (Admissibility of cut). *For every $\alpha, \beta < \Omega$ and every $\sigma \in \text{OT}_\Omega$, $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma, A$ and $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Delta, \neg A$ imply $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\beta}{\sigma} \Gamma, \Delta$ for some $\beta < \alpha^+$.⁷*

Proof. By the definition of \mathcal{T}_∞ , $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Delta, \neg T_\eta(s)$ holds with $\neg T_\eta(s)$ active only if $\Delta, \neg T_\eta(s)$ is an instance of either (Ax.2 $_\eta$) or (Ax.3 $_\eta$). If further, $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\beta}{\sigma} \Gamma, T_\eta(s)$ holds, it is easy to deduce in fact $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha \# \beta}{\sigma} \Gamma, \Delta$. Thus the claim holds when A is either $T_\eta(s)$ or $\neg T_\eta(s)$ for some $\eta < \kappa$ and term s .

The other cases are proved by induction $|A|$ and their arguments are identical to those used in the Reduction Lemma for \mathcal{F}_∞ , ??.

The remainder of this section is concerned with proving the equivalent form of the T-Elimination theorem for \mathcal{F}_ρ^* , theorem 4, and showing the argument can be formalised within the theory $\text{PA} + \text{TI}(<\delta)$ for some suitable δ . We begin with the Condensation lemma, replacing the use of proposition 4.

Lemma 25 (Condensation lemma). *Let $\Theta^*(\sigma)$ denote the least ordinal η^* such that $\Omega^{\eta+1} > \sigma$. If $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma$ holds for some α, σ and Γ , there is a $\rho \leq \sigma$ with $\rho^* \leq \max\{\alpha^*, \Theta^*(\sigma)\}$ such that $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma$.*

Proof. We proceed by transfinite induction on the height of the derivation $\frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \Gamma$. In the case of axioms one may always take $\rho = 0$ and for any rule other than (T $_\eta$ - ω) or (Nec $_\eta$) one may apply the induction hypothesis and leave ρ unchanged. In the case (Nec $_\eta$) was the last rule applied one obtains a formula $T_\eta(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ in Γ and a derivation $\frac{\alpha_0}{\tau} A$ for some $\alpha_0 < \alpha$ with $\tau \# \Omega^{\eta+1} \leq^* \sigma$. The induction hypothesis yields an ordinal $\tau_0 \leq \tau$ fulfilling $\tau_0^* \leq \max\{\alpha_0^*, \Theta^*(\tau)\}$ such that $\frac{\alpha_0}{\tau_0} A$, whence we observe taking $\rho = \tau_0 \# \Omega^{\eta+1}$ suffices, since

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^* &\leq \max\{\tau_0^*, \eta^*\} \\ &\leq \max\{\alpha_0^*, \Theta^*(\tau), \eta^*\} \\ &\leq \max\{\alpha^*, \Theta^*(\sigma)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case of (T $_\eta$ - ω) suppose $\sigma|_\eta$ is not an Ω -limit, Γ contains the sentence $T_\eta(\ulcorner \forall x A(x) \urcorner)$ and there exists $\alpha_0 < \alpha$ such that $\frac{\alpha_0}{\sigma} \Gamma, T_\eta(\ulcorner A(\bar{n}) \urcorner)$ for every n . The induction hypothesis yields a $\tau_0 \leq \sigma$ such that $\frac{\alpha_0}{\tau_0} \Gamma, T_\eta(\ulcorner A(\bar{n}) \urcorner)$ with $\tau_0^* \leq \max\{\alpha_0^*, \Theta^*(\sigma)\}$. If τ_0 is not an Ω -limit take $\rho = \tau_0$, otherwise pick $\rho = \tau_0 + \Omega^\xi$, where ξ is such that $\sigma|_\eta = \sigma_0 + \Omega^\xi$ for some $\sigma_0 < \sigma$. In either case $\rho \leq \sigma$ and

$$\rho^* = \max\{\tau_0^*, \xi^*\} \leq \max\{\alpha^*, \Theta^*(\sigma)\}.$$

\square

⁷Recall $\alpha^{\varepsilon+}$ is the least ε -ordinal greater than α .

We will now define a collection of standard \mathcal{L}_κ -structures \mathfrak{M}_ρ indexed by ordinals $\alpha < \Omega$ and $\rho < \Omega^\kappa$. These play the role of the structures \mathfrak{M}_ρ used in theorem 4. Set

$$\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(s) \text{ iff there is an } \mathcal{L}_\kappa\text{-sentence } A \text{ with } s^\mathbb{N} = \ulcorner A \urcorner \text{ and ordinals } \beta, \sigma \text{ such that } \sigma^*, \beta < \vartheta\rho, \sigma < \rho|_\eta \text{ and } \mathcal{T}_\infty \upharpoonright_\sigma^\beta A.$$

Proposition 26. *If Γ is a T -positive sequent and $\rho \leq^* \sigma$, $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \bigvee \Gamma$ implies $\mathfrak{M}_\sigma \models \bigvee \Gamma$.*

Proof. Suppose $\rho \leq^* \sigma$. Since $\rho^* < \vartheta\sigma$, we have $\vartheta\rho \leq \vartheta\sigma$ by proposition 7 (viii), which coupled with the fact $\rho|_\eta \leq \sigma|_\eta$ entails $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(s)$ implies $\mathfrak{M}_\sigma \models T_\eta(s)$ for every $\eta < \kappa$. The remaining cases are now easily verified. \square

The next proposition will enable us to pass from derivations in \mathcal{T}_∞ to satisfaction in the structures \mathfrak{M}_ρ for T -positive sequents.

Lemma 27. *The following hold for every $\alpha < \Omega$, $\eta < \kappa$ and $\rho < \Omega^\kappa$.*

1. $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \forall x \forall y (T_\eta(x) \wedge T_\eta(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow T_\eta(y))$.
2. $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \forall \xi < \bar{\eta} \forall x (T_\eta(x) \rightarrow T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi(\dot{x}) \urcorner))$.
3. $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \forall \xi < \bar{\kappa} \forall x (T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_\eta(x))$ if, for every $\sigma < \rho$ and β such that $\sigma^*, \beta < \vartheta\rho$, $\mathcal{T}_\infty \upharpoonright_\sigma^\beta \Gamma$ implies $\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma+\beta} \models \bigvee \Gamma$.
4. $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \forall \xi < \bar{\kappa} \forall \ulcorner A \urcorner (T_\eta(\ulcorner \neg T_\xi(\ulcorner A \urcorner) \urcorner) \rightarrow T_\eta(\ulcorner \neg A \urcorner))$.
5. If $\rho|_\eta$ is not an Ω -limit, $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \forall x T_\eta(\ulcorner A(\dot{x}) \urcorner)$ and $\rho <^* \rho'$, $\mathfrak{M}_{\rho'} \models T_\eta(\ulcorner \forall x A(x) \urcorner)$.

Proof. 1. We observe that if $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(\ulcorner A \urcorner) \wedge T_\eta(\ulcorner A \rightarrow B \urcorner)$, there is an $\alpha < \vartheta\rho$ and $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$ such that

$$\upharpoonright_\sigma^\alpha A \text{ and } \upharpoonright_\sigma^\alpha \neg A, B$$

holds and $\sigma^* < \vartheta\rho$. Admissibility of the cut rule, theorem 9, yields $\upharpoonright_\sigma^\gamma B$ for some $\gamma < \alpha^{\varepsilon+}$. But $\rho > \Omega$, so $\gamma < \vartheta\alpha < \vartheta\rho$ and hence $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(\ulcorner B \urcorner)$ by definition.

2. Fix some $\eta < \kappa$. Note $(\rho|_\eta)^* < \vartheta\rho$ for every η , since $\rho^* < \vartheta\rho$. Also $\rho < \Omega^\kappa$, so $\eta^* \leq (\rho|_\eta)^*$. If $\rho|_\eta = 0$, 2 holds vacuously. Otherwise, suppose $\mathcal{T}_\infty \upharpoonright_\sigma^\beta A$ for some \mathcal{L}_κ -sentence A , some β and $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$ such that $\beta, \sigma^* < \vartheta\rho$. Then $\sigma \# \Omega^{\xi+1} < \rho|_\eta$ for every $\xi < \eta$, and $(\sigma \# \Omega^{\xi+1})^* \leq \max\{\sigma^*, \eta^*\} < \vartheta\rho$. So $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \forall \xi < \bar{\eta} T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi(\ulcorner A \urcorner) \urcorner)$ as required.

3. Suppose $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(\ulcorner T_\xi(s) \urcorner)$ and $\xi < \kappa$; we want to show $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(s)$. By definition there are ordinals α and $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$ such that $\sigma^*, \alpha < \vartheta\rho$ and

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \upharpoonright_\sigma^\alpha T_\xi(s).$$

The additional assumption yields $\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma+\alpha} \models T_\xi(s)$, whence $s^\mathbb{N} = \ulcorner A \urcorner$ for some A and there is a β and $\tau < \sigma|_\xi$ such that $\tau^*, \beta < \vartheta(\sigma + \alpha)$ and

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \upharpoonright_\tau^\beta A.$$

Since $\sigma^*, \alpha < \vartheta\rho$ and $\sigma + \alpha < \rho$,

$$\vartheta(\sigma + \alpha) < \vartheta\rho,$$

and thus $\tau^*, \beta < \vartheta\rho$. Moreover, $\tau < \rho|_\eta$ so $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models T_\eta(s)$ follows by definition.

4 holds vacuously as $\mathcal{T}_\infty|_\sigma^\beta \neg T_\xi(s)$ cannot hold for any β, σ and term s .

5. Suppose $\mathfrak{M}_\rho \models \forall x T_\eta(\ulcorner A(x) \urcorner)$, $\rho < \rho'$ and $\rho|_\eta$ is not an Ω -limit. By definition, $\rho|_\eta > 0$ and one obtains ordinals α_n and τ_n for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n &< \rho|_\eta, \\ \alpha_n, \tau_n^* &< \vartheta\rho, \\ \mathcal{T}_\infty|_{\tau_n}^{\alpha_n} A(\bar{n}). \end{aligned}$$

Our aim is to find ordinals σ, γ such that

$$\sigma < \rho'|_\eta, \tag{37} \quad \{\text{eqn:T8Mprop4}\}$$

$$\gamma, \sigma^* < \vartheta\rho', \tag{38} \quad \{\text{eqn:T8Mprop5}\}$$

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty|_\sigma^{\gamma+1} \forall x A(x). \tag{39} \quad \{\text{eqn:T8Mprop6}\}$$

As $\rho|_\eta$ is not an Ω -limit there exists $\xi, \rho_0 < \rho$ such that $\rho|_\eta = \rho_0 + \Omega^{\xi+1}$. Moreover, the Condensation lemma 25 provides ordinals $\sigma_n \leq \tau_n$ such that

$$\sigma_n^* \leq \max\{\alpha_n^*, \Theta^*(\tau_n)\}, \tag{40} \quad \{\text{eqn:T8Mprop3}\}$$

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty|_{\sigma_n}^{\alpha_n} A(\bar{n}), \tag{41} \quad \{\text{eqn:T8Mprop2}\}$$

where $\Theta^*(\tau_n)$ is defined as in the statement of lemma 25. Let $\gamma = \vartheta\rho$ and $\sigma = \rho_0 + \Omega^\xi \cdot \vartheta\rho$. Then eq. (37) clearly holds; moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^* &\leq \max\{\rho_0^*, \xi^*, \vartheta\rho\}, \\ &= \vartheta\rho, \end{aligned} \tag{42} \quad \{\text{eqn:T8Mprop7}\}$$

so $\sigma^* = \vartheta\rho < \vartheta\rho'$. Therefore eq. (38) also holds.

To establish eq. (39) and complete the proof, we will show $\sigma_n \leq^* \sigma$ and apply (Weakening) to eq. (41). Fix an arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By eq. (40),

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_n^* &\leq \max\{\alpha_n^*, \Theta^*(\tau_n)\}, \\ &\leq \max\{\alpha_n^*, \tau_n^*\}, \\ &< \vartheta\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\sigma_n < \sigma$ because either $\sigma_n < \rho_0 < \sigma$ or there is some $\gamma_0 < \Omega$ such that

$$\rho_0 + \Omega^\xi \cdot \gamma_0 \leq \sigma_n < \rho_0 + \Omega^\xi \cdot (\gamma_0 + 1),$$

whence $\gamma_0^* \leq \sigma_n^* < \vartheta\rho$, so $\gamma_0 < \vartheta\rho$ and $\sigma_n < \sigma$. Hence $\mathfrak{M}_{\rho'} \models T_\eta(\ulcorner \forall x A(x) \urcorner)$ as desired. \square

Theorem 10 (T-Elimination theorem). *For every $\rho \in \text{OT}_\Omega$ and $\alpha \in \text{OT}_\Omega \cap \Omega$,*

1. $\mathcal{T}_\infty|_\rho^\alpha \Gamma$ implies $\mathfrak{M}_{\rho+\alpha} \models \bigvee \Gamma$ if Γ is a T -positive sequent;

2. $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \vdash T_\eta(s)$ implies there is an \mathcal{L}_\top -sentence A with $s^\mathbb{N} = \ulcorner A \urcorner$ such that $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\beta}{\sigma} \vdash A$ for some $\beta, \sigma < \rho|_\eta$ with $\sigma^*, \beta < \vartheta(\rho + \alpha)$;
3. $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \vdash \neg T_\eta(s)$ implies there is an \mathcal{L}_\top -sentence A with $s^\mathbb{N} = \ulcorner A \urcorner$ such that $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \vdash \neg A$.

Proof. By main transfinite induction on ρ with a subsidiary transfinite induction on α . We begin with (i).

First observe that since \mathfrak{M}_ρ is standard all arithmetical rules and axioms are dealt with easily. Proposition 26 deals with (Weakening). Moreover, no instances of (Ax.2 $_\eta$) and (Ax.3 $_\eta$) are T-positive, so Γ is not an instance of these axioms. Thus we need only consider the T-rules. Suppose $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \vdash \Gamma$ is derived via a T_η -rule. If the last rule applied was (Nec $_\eta$), there is an \mathcal{L}_κ -sentence A and term s with $s^\mathbb{N} = \ulcorner A \urcorner$ so that $T_\eta(s)$ is in Γ , and $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\beta}{\sigma} \vdash A$ holds for some $\beta < \alpha$ and σ such that $\sigma \# \Omega^{\eta+1} \leq^* \rho$. But then $\sigma < \rho|_\eta$ and $\beta, \sigma^* < \vartheta\rho$, so $\mathfrak{M}_{\rho+\alpha} \models \bigvee \Gamma$.

For the remaining rules, lemma 27 entails $\mathfrak{M}_{\rho+\alpha} \models \bigvee \Gamma$ is a consequence of the subsidiary induction hypothesis and, in the case of (Del $_\eta$), the main induction hypothesis.

(ii) follows directly as a result of (i) and the definition of $\mathfrak{M}_{\rho+\alpha}$.

It is easy to check that $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \vdash \neg T_\eta(s)$ can only hold if $s^\mathbb{N}$ is not the code of some \mathcal{L}_κ -sentence, whence (iii) holds vacuously. \square

Having established that \mathcal{T}_∞ is also closed under Conec $_\eta$ for every $\eta < \kappa$ we can proceed with embedding each HST_η into \mathcal{T}_∞ . This is the focus of the following proposition and theorem.

Proposition 28. For each axiom A of HST_β , $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot n} \vdash A$, for some $\alpha < \varepsilon_0$ and every $n < \omega$.

Lemma 29 (Embedding lemma for \mathcal{T}_∞). Fix some $\beta < \vartheta\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ and suppose $\text{HST}_\beta \vdash A$ with A a sentence of \mathcal{L}_β . Then there are ordinals α and ρ such that $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \vdash A$, $\rho < \Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega$, $\alpha, \rho^* < \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega)$ and $\rho = \rho|_0$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on the length of the derivation $\text{HST}_\beta \vdash A$.

Case I. $\beta = 0$. This essentially follows from the embedding of \mathbf{F} in \mathcal{T}_∞ , ??, since $\vartheta(\Omega \cdot \omega) = \varphi\omega 0$. Proposition 28 deals with the axioms of HST_0 . According to the induction hypothesis, an application of *modus ponens* in HST_0 means one has

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha_0}{\Omega \cdot m_0} \vdash B, \quad \mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha_1}{\Omega \cdot m_1} \vdash \neg B, A$$

for some sentence B , ordinals $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot (m+1))$, and $m_0, m_1 < \omega$. Weakening implies

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\gamma}{\Omega \cdot m} \vdash B, \quad \mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\gamma}{\Omega \cdot m} \vdash \neg B, A$$

where $\gamma = \max\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1\}$ and $m = \max\{m_0, m_1\}$, whence $\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\Omega \cdot m} \vdash A$ holds for some $\alpha < \gamma^{\varepsilon^+}$. Since $\gamma < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \omega) < \Omega$, $\vartheta\gamma < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \omega)$ and so $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \omega)$ whence we are done.

An application of Nec $_0$ in HST_0 corresponds to an application of the rule (Nec $_0$) in \mathcal{T}_∞ . It is an immediate consequence of the induction hypothesis that in this case the desired bounds are maintained.

This leaves only applications of Conec $_0$ and \neg Conec $_0$ in HST_0 to consider, for which we employ theorem 10. \neg Conec $_0$ is immediate, so suppose $\text{HST}_0 \vdash T_0(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ for some \mathcal{L}_κ -sentence A . The induction hypothesis implies

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \frac{\alpha}{\Omega \cdot m} \vdash T_0(\ulcorner A \urcorner) \tag{43}$$

for some $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \omega)$ and $m < \omega$. By theorem 10 one obtains some $\gamma < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot m + \alpha)$ and $n < m$ such that

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \Big|_{\Omega \cdot n}^\gamma A$$

holds. But $\Omega \cdot m + \alpha < \Omega \cdot \omega$ and $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \omega)$, so $\gamma < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \omega)$.

Case II. $\beta > 0$. Proposition 28 deals with the axioms of HST_β . According to the induction hypothesis, an application of *modus ponens* in HST_β means one has

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \Big|_\sigma^{\alpha_0} B, \quad \mathcal{T}_\infty \Big|_\tau^{\alpha_1} \neg B, A$$

for some sentence B , ordinals $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 < \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega)$, and $\sigma, \tau < \Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega$ such that $\sigma^*, \tau^* < \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega)$, $\sigma|_0 = \sigma$ and $\tau|_0 = \tau$. Applying (Weakening) yields

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \Big|_\rho^\alpha B, \quad \mathcal{T}_\infty \Big|_\rho^\alpha \neg B, A$$

where $\rho = \sigma \# \tau$ and $\alpha = \max\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1\}$, whence one obtains $\mathcal{T}_\infty \Big|_\rho^\gamma A$ for some $\gamma < \alpha^{\varepsilon+}$. We take $\rho = \sigma \# \tau$ in place of $\rho = \max\{\sigma, \tau\}$ to ensure $\sigma, \tau \leq^* \rho$ as is required for (Weakening). Since $\rho < \Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega$ and $\rho^* = \max\{\sigma^*, \tau^*\}$, we have $\rho^*, \gamma < \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega)$.

If an application of Nec_β was utilised in HST_β , A is $\text{T}_\beta(\ulcorner B \urcorner)$ for some sentence B and the induction hypothesis yields

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \Big|_\rho^\alpha B$$

for some $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega)$ and $\rho < \Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega$. An application of the rule (Nec_β) in \mathcal{T}_∞ yields

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \Big|_{\rho \# \Omega^{\beta+1}}^{\alpha+1} \text{T}_\beta(\ulcorner B \urcorner).$$

$\rho \# \Omega^{\beta+1} < \Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega$ if and only if $\rho < \Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega$, and

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho \# \Omega^{\beta+1})^* &= \max\{\rho^*, \beta^*\} \\ &\leq \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega), \end{aligned}$$

so the desired bounds are maintained.

This leaves only applications of Conec_β and $\neg\text{Conec}_\beta$ in HST_β to consider, for which we employ theorem 10. The case of $\neg\text{Conec}_\beta$ is immediate given the induction hypothesis, so suppose $\text{HST}_\beta \vdash \text{T}_\beta(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ for some \mathcal{L}_κ -sentence A . The induction hypothesis entails

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \Big|_\rho^\alpha \text{T}_\beta(\ulcorner A \urcorner) \tag{44}$$

for some $\rho < \Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega$ and $\alpha, \rho^* < \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega)$. By theorem 10 (ii) one obtains some γ and σ such that $\sigma^*, \gamma < \vartheta(\rho + \alpha)$, $\sigma < \rho|_\beta$ and

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \Big|_\sigma^\gamma A$$

holds. $\sigma < \Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega$ and, since $\rho^*, \alpha < \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega)$, one has $\vartheta(\rho + \alpha) < \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega)$, whence $\gamma, \sigma^* < \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega)$. \square

Lemma 29 allows us to easily determine an upper bound on the strength of the theories HST_β . By making use of the remarks at the beginning of this section, we see that the next theorem is provable with an almost identical argument to ??.

Theorem 11. *Every arithmetical theorem of HST_β , for $\beta < \vartheta_{\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}}$, is derivable in $\text{PA} + \text{TI}(< \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega))$.*

4 Conclusion

By combining the work of sections 3.3 and 3.4 we may determine the strength of the theory HST_β for every $\beta < \vartheta\Omega^\Omega$.

Theorem 12. *For every $p < \omega$*

$$\|\text{HST}_p\| = \vartheta(\Omega^{p+1} \cdot \omega).$$

Theorem 13. *For every $\beta \geq \omega$ with $\beta < \vartheta\Omega^\Omega$,*

$$\vartheta(\Omega^\beta \cdot \omega) \leq \|\text{HST}_\beta\| \leq \vartheta(\Omega^{\beta+1} \cdot \omega).$$

Proof. Theorem 11 provides the upper bounds for the two theorems. The lower bound for theorem 12 results from theorem 7, whereas the lower bound of theorem 13 is a consequence of theorem 8 \square

When presented with some hierarchy of theories $\{\mathsf{T}_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{O}\}$ it is natural to ask the limit of the corresponding autonomous progression, that is, the least ordinal not in the set X_T generated by the operation $\|\mathsf{T}_0\| \subseteq X_\mathsf{T}$ and $\alpha \in X_\mathsf{T}$ implies $\|\mathsf{T}_\alpha\| \subseteq X_\mathsf{T}$. Autonomous progressions of ramified theories such as RA_α are well-studied, as are those obtained by iterating reflection principles. In the case $\mathsf{T}_\alpha = \text{HST}_\alpha$ this is not difficult to determine given theorem 13.

Theorem 14. *The limit of the autonomous progression defined from $\{\text{HST}_\beta : \beta < \Omega\}$ is the large Veblen ordinal, $\vartheta\Omega^\Omega$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma_0 = 0$ and $\sigma_{m+1} = \vartheta(\Omega^{\sigma_m})$. Theorem 8 implies $\|\text{HST}_{\sigma_m}^1\| \geq \sigma_{m+1}$, while theorem 13 entails $\|\text{HST}_{\sigma_m}\| < \sigma_{m+2}$, so $X_\mathsf{F} = \sup_m \sigma_m$. It remains to show

$$\vartheta(\Omega^\Omega) = \sup_{m < \omega} \sigma_m.$$

Since $\sigma_m < \Omega$ for every m , we have $\Omega^{\sigma_m} < \Omega^\Omega$. So $\sigma_m < \vartheta(\Omega^\Omega)$ implies $\sigma_{m+1} < \vartheta(\Omega^\Omega)$. Thus $\vartheta(\Omega^\Omega) \geq \sup_m \sigma_m$ is established by induction on m .

For the converse direction we prove $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega^\Omega)$ implies $\alpha < \sigma_m$ for some m by induction on the rank of α . If $\alpha =_{\text{NF}} \omega^\gamma + \delta$ for some γ, δ , one easily obtains $\alpha < \sigma_m$ by the induction hypothesis, so suppose

$$\alpha = \vartheta\xi < \vartheta(\Omega^\Omega),$$

for which there are two cases to consider:

1. $\xi < \Omega^\Omega$ and $\xi^* < \vartheta(\Omega^\Omega)$; or
2. $\xi > \Omega^\Omega$ but $\vartheta\xi \leq (\Omega^\Omega)^*$.

Since $(\Omega^\Omega)^* = 0$, the latter is impossible. From the former, however, one obtains $\alpha < \vartheta(\Omega^\Omega)$ via the induction hypothesis. \square

Our motivation for defining the theory HST_β as we did stemmed from the idea of formalising the acceptance of F . The theory S_3 with just one truth predicate appears to almost achieve this, but the general inability to close S_3 under the rule T-Intro means the truth predicate no longer satisfies the same principles as it did in F . This lead us to consider stratifying the language, viewing the original predicate of F , now T_0 , as the base level and gradually extending the language by including predicates T_1, T_2 , etc. in such a way that each predicate T_η in the language locally satisfies the same axioms and rules as T_0 .

The analysis of the theories HST_β reveals that stratification of the language did not lead us as far from the world of a single self-applicable truth predicate as might have first appeared. Indeed, theorems 4 and 5 show the truth predicates of HST_β^1 may be treated as identical; they can all be interpreted as the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^{\beta+1}}^*$. Within HST_β^2 they may all be interpreted as the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^{\beta+1,2}}^*$ and, in general, all truth predicates in HST_β can be interpreted as the set $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^{\beta+2}}^*$ (one cannot simply use $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^{\beta+1},\omega}^*$ for the interpretation of T_β in HST_β as the set is not closed under the ω -rule, whereas $\mathcal{F}_{<\Omega^{\beta+2}}^*$ is, as well being closed under $\text{Conec}_\eta, \text{Nec}_\eta$ for every $\eta \leq \beta$.) The upshot is that we may view each predicate T_η as “extending” the base predicate T_0 as well as T_ξ for $\xi < \eta$. It would be interesting to determine whether the theory HST_β can be rewritten in some natural type-free form.

The model constructions employed in the previous section for the analysis of HST_1 allow us to obtain an upper bound for the theory S_3 introduced in ?? . Essentially, we stratify the language \mathcal{L}_T as described in remark 1, interpreting the outermost truth predicate by T_1 and all others by T_0 , but by first embedding S_3 in an infinitary theory formulated without T-Elim, we avoid the problems relating to Conec_0 and Conec_1 .

Theorem 15. S_3 proves the same arithmetical statements as HST_1^1 and hence has proof-theoretic ordinal Γ_0 .

Proof. We define an infinitary proof system \mathcal{S}_∞ based on \mathcal{T}_∞ into which we may embed S_3 . Let $*$ be the interpretation of \mathcal{L}_0 into \mathcal{L}_T that recursively interprets the predicate T_0 as T and otherwise commutes with all connectives and quantifiers. Define $\mathcal{S}_\infty \vdash^\alpha \Gamma$ according to the rules (Ax.1), (Ax.2), (Ax.3), (\wedge) , (\vee_i) , (ω) , (\exists) , (T-Imp), (T-Del), (T-Rep), (T- ω), and the following additional rule

$$(\text{Ax.4})^{\mathcal{F}} \quad \mathcal{T}_\infty \vdash_{\Omega, \gamma}^\beta A \quad \text{for some } \gamma, \beta < \Omega \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathcal{S}_\infty \vdash^\alpha \Gamma, T(\ulcorner A^* \urcorner) \quad \text{for any } \alpha > \max\{\beta, \gamma\}.$$

The Condensation lemma entails, for $\gamma < \Omega$, that

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty \vdash_{\Omega, \gamma}^\alpha \Gamma \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathcal{S}_\infty \vdash^\alpha \Gamma^*. \quad (45) \quad \{\text{eqn:S81}\}$$

Define a sequence of \mathcal{L}_T -structures

$$\mathfrak{M}_\alpha = \langle \mathbb{N}, \{\ulcorner A^* \urcorner : \mathcal{T}_\infty \vdash_{\Omega, \gamma}^\beta A \text{ for some } \gamma < \alpha \text{ and } \beta < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \alpha)\} \rangle.$$

We claim

$$\mathcal{S}_\infty \vdash^\alpha \Gamma \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathfrak{M}_\alpha \models \bigvee \Gamma \quad (46) \quad \{\text{eqn:S82}\}$$

whenever Γ is T-positive. The proof proceeds by transfinite induction on α . If Γ is an instance of $(\text{Ax.4})^{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathfrak{M}_\alpha \models \bigvee \Gamma$ holds by definition, while if Γ is derived through an application of (T-Rep), it follows from the induction hypothesis and closure of \mathcal{T}_∞ under (Nec_0) . If the last applied rule is (T- ω), $\mathfrak{M}_\alpha \models \bigvee \Gamma$ holds by an application of (ω) in \mathcal{T}_∞ and the fact $\vartheta(\Omega \cdot \alpha)$ is increasing in α . Furthermore,

by the definition of the function ϑ , we have $\vartheta(\Omega \cdot \delta + \beta) < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \alpha)$ whenever $\delta < \alpha$ and $\beta < \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \alpha)$; thus theorem 10 implies

$$\mathfrak{M}_\alpha \models \forall \ulcorner A \urcorner (T(\ulcorner T(\ulcorner A \urcorner \urcorner) \urcorner) \rightarrow T(\ulcorner A \urcorner)),$$

and we may deduce $\mathfrak{M}_\alpha \models \bigvee \Gamma$ from the induction hypothesis if the last rule applied was (T-Del).

Equation (46) can now be utilised along with eq. (45) to conclude

$$\mathcal{S}_\infty \models^\alpha T(\ulcorner A \urcorner) \text{ implies } \mathcal{S}_\infty \models^{\vartheta(\Omega \cdot \alpha)} A.$$

Since $\vartheta\Omega^2$ is the least ordinal closed under the function $\alpha \mapsto \vartheta(\Omega \cdot \alpha)$ (see proposition 10) we may deduce $S_3 \vdash A$ implies $\mathcal{S}_\infty \models^\alpha A$ for some $\alpha < \vartheta\Omega^2$ for any sentence A , whence $\|S_3\| \leq \vartheta\Omega^2$. Finally, note $\vartheta\Omega^2 = \Gamma_0$ by corollary 11. \square

On a final note, one may reasonably consider applying this idea to the other Friedman-Sheard theories (or indeed to other theories of self-referential truth). The theory E is ω -inconsistent (*cf.* ??), so a definition of E_1 cannot consistently contain the axiom Uni_1 . Thus, since the predicate T_1 could not adhere to the rules governing T_0 , this process could not be applied to E . Iterating the operation pertaining to I , however, does lead to a hierarchy of consistent theories. I does not contain the rule T-Intro, so one would not naturally include the principle

$$T_1(x) \rightarrow T_1(\ulcorner T_0(\dot{x}) \urcorner)$$

as an axiom of I_β . Without such an axiom, though, there would be no dependency between the two predicates: any occurrence of T_0 under T_1 may be treated vacuous, as can any occurrence of T_1 under T_0 . In an attempt to resolve the matter one could add to I_1 the axiom $T_1(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ whenever A is an axiom of I_0 (I formulated with the predicate T_0). This would appear a natural choice as it agrees with the construction of HST_1 . It would be interesting to ascertain the strength of the resulting iteration and compare it to our results regarding HST_β .