GONTEMPORARY MATHEMATICS

Volume 65

Logic and Combinatorics

Proceedings of the AMS-IMS-SIAM
Joint Summer Research Conference
held August 4–10, 1985, with
support from the National Science
Foundation

Stephen G. Simpson, Editor

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

Providence · Rhode Island

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	ix
V. M. ABRUSCI Dilators, Generalized Goodstein Sequences, Independence Results: A Survey	1
V. M. ABRUSCI, JY. GIRARD, J. VAN DE WIELE Some Uses of Dilators in Combinatorial Problems, Part I	25
B. ACKMAN, J. OWINGS Cross Products of Souslin Trees	55
V. BERGELSON Ergodic Ramsey Theory	63
A. BLASS Ultrafilters Related to Hindman's Finite Unions Theorem and its Extensions	89
A. R. BLASS, J. L. HIRST, S. G. SIMPSON Logical Analysis of Some Theorems of Combinatorics and Topological Dynamics	125
J. E. BAUMGARTNER, A. HAJNAL A Remark on Partition Relations for Infinite Ordinals, With an Application to Finite Combinatorics	157
S. H. BRACKIN A Summary of "On Ramsey-type Theorems and Their Provability in Weak Formal Systems"	169
W. BUCHHOLZ, S. WAINER Provably Computable Functions and the Fast Growing Hierarchy	179
F. VAN ENGELEN, A. W. MILLER, J. STEEL Rigid Borel Sets and Better Quasiorder Theory	199

P. ERDOS	
Some Problems on Finite and Infinite Graphs	223
H. FRIEDMAN, N. ROBERTSON, P. D. SEYMOUR The Metamathematics of the Graph Minor Theorem	229
N. HINDMAN Summable Ultrafilters and Finite Sums	263
M. LOEBL, J. MATOUSEK On Undecidability of the Weakened Kruskal Theorem	275
J. NESETRIL, R. THOMAS Well Quasi Orderings, Long Games, and a Combinatorial Study of Undecidability	281
M. OKADA, G. TAKEUTI On the Theory of Quasi Ordinal Diagrams	295
P. PUDLAK Improved Bounds to the Length of Proofs of Finitistic Consistency Statements	309
JP. RESSAYRE Non Standard Universes with Strong Embeddings, and Their Finite Approximations	333
S. G. SIMPSON Unprovable Theorems and East-Growing Functions	359

PROVABLY COMPUTABLE FUNCTIONS AND THE FAST GROWING HIERARCHY

Wilfried Buchholz and Stan Wainer (München) (Leeds)

ABSTRACT. Our aim here is to give as direct a proof as seems possible of

- I. The functions provably computable in formal Peano Arithmetic are just those which appear in the Fast Growing Hierarchy below level ε and also to illustrate its use by deducing the following well-known independence result of Kirby-Paris [1982].
- II. The statement "every Goodstein sequence terminates" is true but not provable in Peano Arithmetic.

§0. The history of I goes back to Kreisel [1952] who showed that the functions provably computable in Peano Arithmetic can all be defined by recursions over certain natural well orderings of order-types < $\varepsilon_{\rm O}$. Later, Schwichtenberg [1971] and the second author [1970,72 building on work with Löb] independently generalised earlier hierarchy results of Grzegorczyk [1953, giving the primitive recursive functions below level ω and Robbin [1965, giving the "multiply recursive" functions below level ω^{ω}] to show that Kreisel's "ordinal recursive" functions could be characterised by means of the Fast Growing Hierarchy below $\varepsilon_{\rm O}$, thus completing I. These results have since been reworked and further extended by many others and in various ways, but for reference we mention especially Schwichtenberg [1977] and Rose [1984]. The proof of I set out here is due to the first author and is a simple base-case of his much more general [1984]. His crucial idea is that by careful use of direct ordinal assignments one can avoid completely any mention of "codes" for infinite proof-trees.

© 1987 American Mathematical Society 0271-4132/87 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

An immediate corollary of I is that the fast growing function occuring \underline{at} level ε_0 is not itself provably computable. It is the strong combinatorial connections between this function and the Finite Ramsey Theorem (see Ketonen-Solovay [1981]) and the Goodstein Theorem (see Cichon [1983] and also Abrusci, etal [1984]) which then give direct access to the independence results of Paris-Harrington [1977] and Kirby-Paris [1982]. It must be noted however, that their original proofs were by quite different model-theoretic methods. The proof of II given here is that of Cichon [1983].

§1. THE FAST GROWING HIERARCHY

By "a fast growing" hierarchy we simply mean a transfinitely extended version of the Grzegorczyk hierarchy i.e. a transfinite sequence of number-theoretic functions F_{α} defined recursively by iteration at successor levels and diagonalisation over suitable fixed fundamental sequences at limit levels. The F_{α} 's thus form a backbone which we flesh out by collecting, at each level α , the class $C(F_{\alpha})$ of all functions computable within time or space bounded by some fixed iterate $F_{\alpha}^{k} = F_{\alpha} \circ F_{\alpha} \circ \dots \circ F_{\alpha}$. Of course the hierarchy obtained will depend upon the initial function F_{α} and more importantly, upon the choice of fundamental sequences at limit ordinals. We are concerned

with the ordinals below $\epsilon_0 = \omega^{\omega}$ and for these there is an obvious choice of fundamental sequences. First note that every ordinal $\alpha < \epsilon_0$ can be represented in a unique Cantor normal form

$$\alpha = \omega^{\beta} k + \omega^{\beta} k - 1 + \dots + \omega^{\beta} 1 + \omega^{\beta}$$

where $\alpha > \beta_k \ge \beta_{k-1} \ge \dots \ge \beta_1 \ge \beta_0$.

If β_0 = 0 then α is a successor. Otherwise α is a limit and we can assign to it a fundamental sequence $\alpha_0<\alpha_1<\alpha_2<\dots$ with supremum α as follows

$$\alpha_n = \omega^{\beta_k} + \omega^{\beta_{k-1}} + \dots + \omega^{\beta_1} + \begin{cases} \omega^{\gamma}(n+1) & \text{if } \beta_0 = \gamma + 1 \\ (\beta_0)_{n \text{ if } \beta_0 \text{ is a limit.}} \end{cases}$$

Thus for example, ω is assigned the fundamental sequence $1 < 2 < 3 < \dots$ and ω^{ω} is assigned the fundamental sequence $\omega < \omega^2 < \omega^3 < \dots$ etc.

The version of the Fast Growing Hierarchy we shall choose is the following:

$$\begin{split} &F_{\alpha}(n) &= n+1 \\ &F_{\alpha+1}(n) &= F_{\alpha}^{n+1}(n) \\ &F_{\alpha}(n) &= F_{\alpha}(n) & \text{if } \alpha \text{ is a limit.} \end{split}$$

It is closely related to the so-called Hardy Hierarchy (see Wainer [1972]):

$$H_{\alpha}(n) = n$$
 $H_{\alpha+1}(n) = H_{\alpha}(n+1)$
 $H_{\alpha}(n) = H_{\alpha}(n) \text{ if } \alpha \text{ is a limit}$

for if $\alpha = \omega^{\beta} k + \dots + \omega^{\beta} o$ as above and $\gamma < \omega^{\beta} o$ then

$$H_{\alpha+\gamma} = H_{\alpha} \circ H_{\gamma}$$

and hence for every $\alpha < \epsilon$

$$H_{\alpha} = F_{\alpha}$$
.

Ketonen-Solovay [1981] noted an immediate combinatorial property of the H_{α} 's call an interval $[n,m] = \{n,n+1,\ldots,m-1,m\}$ O-large if it is non-empty, i.e. $n \leq m$; $\alpha + 1$ -large if there are at least two $k \in [n,m]$ such that [k,m] is α -large; and λ -large (where λ is a limit) if [n,m] is λ -large. Then

 $H_{\alpha}(n)$ = least m such that [n,m] is α -large

$$F_{\alpha}(n)$$
 = least m such that [n,m] is ω^{α} -large.

The crucial properties of the H- and F-hierarchies are that each H_{α} (hence each F_{α}) is strictly increasing and majorises every $H_{\beta}(F_{\beta})$ for $\beta < \alpha$. These properties are easily proved using

DEFINITION 1 For each fixed k write $\beta <_{k} \alpha$ if there is a descending sequence of ordinals

$$\alpha = \gamma_0 > \gamma_1 > ... > \gamma_i > \gamma_{i+1} > ... > \gamma_r = \beta$$

where for each i, $\gamma_{i+1} = \gamma_i - 1$ if γ_i is a successor, and

$$\gamma_{i+1} = (\gamma_i)_k$$
 if γ_i is a limit.

(This is just the relation $\alpha \xrightarrow{k} \beta$ of Ketonen-Solovay).

LEMMA 1 For each limit ordinal $\lambda < \epsilon_0$, if m < n then $\lambda_m + 1 < \lambda$. Hence if $\beta < \lambda$ there is a k such that $\beta <_n \lambda$ for all $n \ge k$.

THEOREM 1 For each $\alpha < \epsilon$

- (i) H is strictly increasing,
- (ii) $\underline{\text{if}} \quad \beta <_k \alpha \quad \underline{\text{then}} \quad H_{\beta}(n) < H_{\alpha}(n) \quad \underline{\text{for every}} \quad n > k$,
- (iii) if $\beta < \alpha$ then $H_{\beta}(n) < H_{\alpha}(n)$ for every $n > \underline{\text{some}} + k$,
- (iv) the same properties hold for the F,'s.

PROOF (i) and (ii) are proved simultaneously by a straightforward induction on α , using the first part of Lemma 1. (iii) then follows by the second part of Lemma 1 and (iv) follows from the fact that F_{α} = H_{α} and if $\beta <_k \alpha$, $\omega^{\beta} <_k \omega^{\alpha}$.

DEFINITION 2 The *elementary* functions are those which can be explicitly defined from the zero, successor, subtraction, projection and addition functions using bounded sums and products. If an arbitrary but fixed function f is thrown in as an additional initial function then the resulting class of functions "elementary-in-f" is denoted E(f).

- (i) $C(F_{\alpha}) = E(F_{\alpha})$,
- (ii) $F_{\alpha} \in C(F_{\alpha})$,
- (iii) F_{α} majorises every function in $C(F_{\beta})$.

§2. PEANO ARITHMETIC

We formalise arithmetic in a manner suitable for proof-theoretic analysis. Thus we shall derive finite sets $\Gamma = \{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ of formulas A built up using the logical symbols \land , \lor , \lor , \lor from elementary prime formulas

"f(t₁,...,t_n) = t_{n+1}" or "f(t₁,...,t_n) \neq t_{n+1}" representing the <u>graphs</u> of elementary functions f. The terms t₁ are built up from variables x,y,... and the constant O using only the successor function symbol S, so each term is either SS...Sx or a numeral SS...SO. The negation τ A of a formula A is defined by: τ (f(t₁,...,t_n) = t_{n+1}) is f(t₁,...,t_n) \neq t_{n+1}, τ (f(t₁,...,t_n) \neq t_{n+1}) is f(t₁,...,t_n) = t_{n+1}, τ (AAB) is τ A \vee τ B, τ VxB(x) is \exists x τ B(x) etcetera. Henceforth Γ will denote an arbitrary set $\{A_1,...,A_k\}$. The intended meaning of Γ is the disjunction A_1 \vee ... \vee A_k and we write Γ , A for Γ \cup $\{A\}$ etcetera.

The axioms of Peano Arithmetic (PA) are of three kinds:

- 1) Logical Axioms: [, 7A, A for every formula A.
- 2) <u>Elementary Axioms</u>: all substitution instances of
 - (=) Γ , x = x Γ , $x \neq y$, y = x Γ , $x \neq y$, $y \neq z$, x = z
 - (S) Γ , $Sx \neq 0$ Γ , $Sx \neq Sy$, x = y Γ , $x \neq y$, Sx = Sy
 - (f) Γ , "defining equations for each elementary function f". For example in the case of addition we have axioms
 - (+) Γ , x + 0 = x Γ , x + y \neq z, x + Sy = Sz Γ , x \neq x', y \neq y', z \neq z', x + y \neq z , x' + y' = z' Γ , x + y \neq z, x + y \neq z', z = z'.
- 3) Induction Axioms: Γ , 7A(0), $\exists x(A(x) \land \neg A(Sx))$, $\forall xA(x)$ for every A.

 The logical rules of inference are of five kinds:

$$(A) \quad \frac{\Gamma, A_0, \Gamma, A_1}{\Gamma, (A_0, A_1)} \qquad (V) \quad \frac{\Gamma, A_i}{\Gamma, (A_0, A_1)} \qquad i = 0 \text{ or } 1.$$

$$(\forall) \qquad \frac{\Gamma \ , \ A(x)}{\Gamma \ , \ \forall \ xA(x)} \quad x \quad \text{not free in} \quad \Gamma \ . \qquad (\exists) \qquad \frac{\Gamma \ , \ A(t)}{\Gamma \ , \ \exists \ xA(x)}$$

(Cut)
$$\frac{\Gamma, 7A \quad \Gamma, A}{\Gamma}$$
.

The theorems of PA are those Γ derivable from axioms by the rules. DEFINITION 3 A number-theoretic function Γ is said to be provably comput-

able in PA if there are two elementary functions V and T such that

(i) for all arguments n_1, \ldots, n_k

 $F(n_1, ..., n_k) = V(least m such that <math>T(n_1, ..., n_k, m) = 0)$

(ii) $\forall x_1 \dots \forall x_k \exists y (T(x_1 \dots x_k, y) = 0)$ is a theorem of PA.

REMARK Condition (i) is no real restriction since every computable function can be expressed in this way. However, condition (ii) demands essentially that there is a program for computing F whose "total correctness" can be expressed and verified in PA.

THEOREM 3 Every function appearing in the Fast Growing Hierarchy below level ϵ_{o} is provably computable in PA.

PROOF We argue very informally, merely indicating the points at which the essential principles built into PA are used.

First notice that the elementary axioms serve to prove the totality of all elementary definitions and so if we can prove the totality of F we can also prove the totality of every function elementary in F. It therefore suffices to show that each of the Hardy functions H_{α} ($\alpha < \epsilon_0$) and therefore each F_{α} , is provably computable in PA.

Using say prime factor decomposition, one can code each ordinal $\alpha < \epsilon_{_{\scriptsize{O}}}$ as a number ${}^{r}\alpha^{1}$ so that the decisions whether α is a successor, α is a limit, or $\alpha < \beta$ are all given by elementary functions of the codes for α and β . Furthermore if α is a limit the function ${}^{r}\alpha^{1}$, $n \longmapsto {}^{r}\alpha^{1}_{n}$ becomes elementary. Thus one can express in the language of PA the principle of transfinite induction below a given ordinal $\beta < \epsilon_{_{\scriptsize{O}}}$: TI(β ,A) is just the disjunction of

7 A(O), $7 \bigvee \alpha < \beta(A(\alpha) \rightarrow A(\alpha+1))$, $7 \bigvee \alpha < \beta(\text{Lim}(\alpha) \land \bigvee xA(\alpha) \rightarrow A(\alpha))$, $\bigvee \alpha < \beta A(\alpha)$.

Now $\text{TI}(\omega,A)$ follows immediately from the induction axiom 3) of PA. Suppose we assume $\forall \gamma (\text{TI}(\gamma,A) \rightarrow \text{TI}(\gamma+\omega^{\alpha},A))$ and $\text{TI}(\gamma,A)$. Then again by the induction axiom we get $\forall x \text{TI}(\gamma+\omega^{\alpha}x,A)$. But from this follows $\text{TI}(\gamma+\omega^{\alpha+1},A)$ since $\delta < \gamma + \omega^{\alpha+1} \rightarrow \exists x (\delta < \gamma+\omega^{\alpha}x)$. Thus we have proved

$$\forall_{\gamma}(\text{TI}(\gamma,A) \rightarrow \text{TI}(\gamma+\omega^{\alpha},A)) \rightarrow \forall_{\gamma}(\text{TI}(\gamma,A) \rightarrow \text{TI}(\gamma+\omega^{\alpha+1},A)).$$

We can also prove $\operatorname{Lim}(\alpha) \wedge \bigvee \operatorname{xTI}(\gamma + \omega^{X}, A) \to \operatorname{TI}(\gamma + \omega^{\alpha}, A)$ since $\delta < \gamma + \omega^{\alpha} \wedge \operatorname{Lim}(\alpha) \to \exists \times (\delta < \gamma + \omega^{X})$. Therefore using transfinite induction on $\alpha < \beta$ we can deduce $\bigvee \alpha < \beta \bigvee \gamma (\operatorname{TI}(\gamma, A) \to \operatorname{TI}(\gamma + \omega^{\alpha}, A))$ and hence $\bigvee \gamma (\operatorname{TI}(\gamma, A) \to \operatorname{TI}(\gamma + \omega^{\beta}, A))$. In other words, for a suitable formula B depending on A

$$TI(\beta,B) \rightarrow \forall \gamma (TI(\gamma,A) \rightarrow TI(\gamma+\omega^{\beta},A))$$

is a theorem of PA. By repeated use of this, starting with $TI(\omega,A)$, we see that for every $\alpha < \epsilon_0$ and every formula A, $TI(\alpha,A)$ is a theorem. (This result goes back to Gentzen and was since refined and developed by Schütte, Feferman and others).

$$\begin{split} L(\alpha,n,k,0) &= 1 \\ L(\alpha,n,k,\ell+1) &= 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad n \leq k \leq \ell. \\ &= L(\beta,n+1,k,\ell) \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha = \beta + 1. \\ &= L(\alpha,n,k,\ell) \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha \quad \text{is a limit.} \\ &= 1 \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{split}$$

"L(α ,n,k, ℓ) = O" expresses the fact that it takes ℓ steps to verify that [n,k] is α -large. Now let W,V,U be elementary pairing functions so that $V(W(k,\ell)) = k$ and $U(W(k,\ell)) = \ell$, and define $T(\alpha,n,m) = L(\alpha,n,V(m),U(m))$. Then for each $\alpha < \epsilon$

(i) $H_{\alpha}(n) = V(\text{least m} \text{ such that } T(\alpha,n,m) = 0)$ and (ii) $\forall x \exists y (T(\alpha,x,y) = 0)$ is provable in PA by transfinite induction up to α . Hence Theorem 3.

§3. BOUNDING THE PROVABLY COMPUTABLE FUNCTIONS

In this section we prove the converse of Theorem 3. The strategy is to first embed PA in an infinitary system of arithmetic which replaces the induction axioms and the \forall -rule by the so-called ω -rule:

$$(\omega)$$
 $\Gamma,A(0)$ $\Gamma,A(1)$ $\Gamma,A(2)$... $\Gamma,A(n)$ $\Gamma, \forall x A(x)$

Then by well-known proof-theoretic methods, all but the most trivial applications of the Cut-rule can be eliminated and from the resulting "simplified" proofs we can read off bounds on existential theorems. The cut-elimination method stems from Gentzen, then Schütte, Tait, Takeuti, Feferman, Prawitz and many other since. The proof here is due to Buchholz and is based on the treatment by Tait [1968]. See also Schwichtenberg [1977]. The essential new ingredient is a careful assignment of ordinals which not only measure the "lengths" of ω -proofs but also give direct estimates of number-theoretic bounds for existential theorems.

The basic idea underlying cut-elimination is very simple. Consider an ω -proof of Γ of the following form where the cut-formula A is either $\exists xB(x)$ or $B_0 \lor B_1$, so $\neg A$ is either $\forall x \neg B(x)$ or $\neg A \lor B_0 \lor B_1$.

$$(\omega \text{ or } \wedge) \xrightarrow{\Gamma, \ 7B_{\underline{i}} \text{ all } \underline{i}} \qquad (\exists \text{ or } \vee) \xrightarrow{\Gamma, B_{\underline{n}} \text{ some } \underline{n}}$$

$$(Cut) \xrightarrow{\Gamma, \ 7B_{\underline{i}} \text{ all } \underline{i}} \qquad \Gamma, \ A$$

Then this proof can be replaced by (reduced to)

$$(Cut) / \frac{\Gamma, \neg B_n}{\Gamma, B_n}$$

where the cut-formula B_n is now a "subformula" of the original A. Repetition of this idea should hopefully yield a proof of Γ in which all the cut-formulas are prime! For the technicalities see Lemma 4 below.

Now the language of the infinitary system of arithmetic we are about to define is that of PA but with one new relation " $x \in N$ " added. Its intended meaning is that x is a non-negative integer. However we can now restrict attention to <u>closed</u> formulas only (i.e. ones without any free variables), since the free variable x in the premise of the \forall -rule is now replaced by infinitely many premises Γ , Λ (n), n = 0, 1, 2, ... in the ω -rule.

Thus the only terms are numerals n = SS...SO and the closed elementary prime formulas (cepf) are just atomic relations stating that the value of a given elementary function on given arguments $n_1, ..., n_r$ is - or is not - equal to a given number m. Every cepf is therefore either true or false. DEFINITION 4 The relation $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, meaning Γ is derivable in the infinitary system with ordinal bound $\alpha < \varepsilon_0$, is defined inductively according to the rules:-

(Axioms) $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, A if A is any true cepf or "O ϵ N". $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, n \notin N, n ϵ N n any numeral.

- (N) if $\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \Gamma$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then $\frac{1-\alpha+1}{1-\alpha+1} \Gamma$, $\operatorname{Sn} \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (v) if $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, A_i (i=0 or 1) then $\vdash \alpha+1 \Gamma$, $(A_0 \lor A_1)$.
- (A) if $\frac{\alpha}{\Gamma}$ Γ , A, (i=0 and 1) then $\frac{\alpha+1}{\Gamma}$ Γ , (A Λ A)
- (3) if $\left|\frac{\alpha}{\alpha}\right|$, A(n) (some n) then $\left|\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}\right|$, \exists xA(x).
- (ω) if $\vdash^{\alpha} \Gamma$, A(n) (every n) then $\vdash^{\alpha+1} \Gamma$, $\bigvee xA(x)$.
- (Cut) if $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, \neg A and $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, A then $\vdash \alpha + 1 \Gamma$.

(Accumulation) if $\vdash \alpha = \Gamma$ and if $\alpha <_k \beta$ where $k = \max{\{2\}} \cup \{3n : "n \notin N" \text{ is in } \Gamma\} \text{ then } \vdash \beta = \Gamma.$

Notice that if $\models \alpha \cap \Gamma$ and $\Gamma \subset \Gamma'$ then $\models \alpha \cap \Gamma'$, for if $\alpha <_k \beta$ and $k \le k'$ then $\alpha <_{k'} \beta$ by a straightforward induction on β using Lemma 1. DEFINITION 5 For each formula A of PA let A^N be the result of relativising all quantifiers in A to N, i.e. replace $\exists x(\dots)$ by $\exists x(x \in N \land \dots)$ and replace $\forall x(\dots)$ by $\forall x(x \notin N \lor \dots)$. If $\Gamma = \{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ let $\Gamma^N = \{A_1^N, \dots, A_k^N\}$.

EMBEDDING LEMMA 2 If Γ is a theorem of PA, containing free variables x_1, \dots, x_r then there is an ordinal $\alpha = \omega \ell$ for some integer ℓ , such that for all n_1, \dots, n_r ,

$$\frac{\alpha}{n_1 \in N, \dots, n_r \in N, \Gamma^N(n_1, \dots, n_r)}$$

where $\Gamma^N(n_1, \dots, n_r)$ is the result of substituting n_i at all free occurrences of x_i in Γ^N .

PROOF by induction over the generation of theorems in PA.

- (i) For the logical axioms it will clearly be sufficient to show that for every closed formula A in the language augmented with "N", $\vdash \alpha \uparrow A, A$ for some α . We do this by induction on the "length" of A. If A is a closed elementary prime formula or "n \in N" then $\vdash \alpha \uparrow A, A$ because it's an axiom. Now suppose, for example that B is the formula $\exists xA(x)$ where, for each numeral $n, \vdash \alpha \uparrow A(n), A(n)$. Then by the $\exists -\omega -$ and Accumulation rules we get $\vdash \alpha + 1 \uparrow A(n), \exists x A(x), \vdash \alpha + 2 \bigvee x \uparrow A(x), \exists x A(x)$ and hence $\vdash \alpha \uparrow B, B$. The other forms of B can be treated similarly to obtain $\vdash \alpha \uparrow A, A$ for each closed A where ℓ is its "length".
- (ii) The result follows immediately when Γ is an elementary axiom because, on substitution of numerals for the free variables, we obtain a true cepf.
- (iii) Now consider an induction axiom

$$\Gamma$$
 , $7A(0)$, $\exists x(A(x) \land 7A(Sx))$, $\forall x A(x)$.

Deleting mention of Γ and any variables other than x which may occur free, it is sufficient to show $\vdash \alpha^{+\omega} \uparrow A^N(0)$, $\exists x(x \in N \land A^N(x) \land \neg A^N(Sx))$, $\forall x(x \notin N \lor A^N(x))$, where $\alpha = \omega(\ell+1)$, ℓ again denoting the length of $A^N(x)$. This follows by Accumulation from

$$\vdash \omega \ell + 3n \rightarrow A^{N}(0), \exists x (x \in N \land A^{N}(x) \land \neg A^{N}(Sx)), A^{N}(n)$$

by induction on n (remember that we can always add n \notin N and any other "side" formulas throughout a derivation without increasing the ordinal bound). Now for n = O we have $\frac{\omega^{\ell}}{\sqrt{2}} 7 A^{N}(O)$, $A^{N}(O)$ by part (i) above. Assume $\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}} 7 A^{N}(O)$, C, $A^{N}(O)$, C, $A^{N}(O)$, where C is the formula $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} x(x \in N \land A^{N}(x) \land 7A^{N}(Sx))$ and $\beta = \omega \ell + 3n$. Then $\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}} 7 A^{N}(O)$, C, $A^{N}(n)$, $A^{N}(Sn)$ and by part (i)

- (iv) Now suppose Γ , $\forall xA(x)$ is derived from Γ , A(x) in PA using the \forall -rule. Then again deleting mention of any free variables occurring in Γ , we can assume inductively that there is an ordinal $\alpha = \omega.\ell$ for some ℓ , such that $\models \alpha \ n \notin N$, Γ^N , $A^N(n)$ and hence $\models \alpha+2 \Gamma^N$, $n \notin N \vee A^N(n)$ for every n. Therefore $\models \alpha+\omega \Gamma^N$, $\forall x(x\notin N \vee A^N(x))$ by ω -rule followed by Accumulation, since $\alpha + 3 <_k \alpha + \omega$ if $k \ge 2$.
- (v) Suppose Γ , $\exists xA(x)$ is derived from Γ , A(t) in PA using the \exists - rule, where t is some term. The only possible forms of term t are either a numeral $m = S^{m}O$ or $S^{m}x$ for some variable x, where S^{m} denotes m iterations of the successor symbol. It may be that t is of the form $\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{x}$ and \mathbf{x} also occurs free in $\Gamma.$ In this case (again neglecting any other free variables in Γ , A) we have, by the induction hypothesis, an ordinal $\alpha = \omega.l$ such that for every $n \vdash \alpha n \notin N$, $\Gamma^{N}(n)$, $\Lambda^{N}(S^{m})$. Choosing $\beta = \alpha + \omega.m$ we then have $\beta = \frac{\beta}{n} + \frac{\beta}{N}$, $\Gamma^{N}(n)$, $\Lambda^{N}(n+m)$ and also $\frac{\beta}{n+1}$ n \notin N , Γ^N (n), n + m \in N by alternate applications of the N-rule and Accumulation, starting from $\frac{\alpha}{n}$ n \in N , $\Gamma^{N}(n)$, n \in N. Then by the \wedge -rule, \vdash $\stackrel{\beta+1}{\vdash}$ n \notin N , Γ^{N} (n), n + m \in N \land A $\stackrel{N}{\vdash}$ (n+m) and by the $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}$ - rule, \vdash $\stackrel{\beta+2}{\vdash}$ n \notin N , $\Gamma^{N}(n)$, $\exists x(x \in N \land A^{N}(x))$, so by Accumulation, $\vdash \frac{\beta+\omega}{n} \in N$, $\Gamma^{N}(n)$, $\exists x(x \in N \land A^{N}(x))$ for every n, as required. If t is $S^{m}x$ where x does not occur free in Γ we can safely replace x by O throughout the proof of Γ , A thereby reducing to the case where t is $S^{m}O$. This is then dealt with in a similar way to the above but with n = 0.
- (vi) The remaining cases, corresponding to applications of the \wedge , \vee or Cut-rules, follow immediately from the induction hypothesis, using Accumulation to "match up" the ordinal bounds on premises of \wedge , Cut.

This completes the proof.

REMARK The reason for this somewhat tiresome Embedding of PA into the infinitary system, is that the Cut-rule - which is the only rule whose conclusion fails to determine its premises - cannot be eliminated from PA. It can however be eliminated almost entirely from the infinitary system, as is shown in the following. The point is that from "cut-free" proofs one can read off numerical bounds. The price one pays for cut-elimination is an iterated exponential increase in the length of the proof. Since ε_0 is the first ordinal closed under exponentiation $\alpha \mapsto \omega^{\alpha}$ we therefore catch a glimpse of the significance of ε_0 in proof-theoretic studies of PA.

The remaining results of this section concern the infinitary system of Definition 4 and finally provide the converse to Theorem 3.

INVERSION LEMMA 3

- (i) If $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, $A_0 \wedge A_1$ then $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, A_0 and $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, A_1 .
- (ii) If $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, $\forall xA(x)$ then $\vdash \alpha \Gamma$, A(n) for every n.

REDUCTION LEMMA 4 Suppose $\vdash \alpha \Gamma_0$, 7A with cut-rank $\leq r$ where $\alpha = \omega^{\alpha}k + \ldots + \omega^{\alpha}$ in Cantor normal form and A is of either form $\exists xB(x)$ or $B_0 \lor B_1$ and of length r+1. Then if $\vdash \beta \Gamma$, A with cut-rank $\leq r$, where $\beta < \omega$ we have $\vdash \alpha + \beta \Gamma_0$, Γ with cut-rank $\leq r$.

PROOF by transfinite induction on β .

If Γ , A is an axiom then Γ must be an axiom and hence so is Γ_{\circ} , Γ . If $\models \beta$ Γ , A follows by Accumulation from $\models \delta$ Γ , A where $\delta <_k \beta$ and $k = \max\{2\}$ \cup $\{3n : "n \not \in N" occurs in <math>\Gamma$, A} then by the induction hypothesis, $\models \alpha + \delta$ Γ_{\circ} , Γ with cut-rank \leq r. But $k \leq \max\{2\}$ \cup $\{3n : "n \not \in N" is in <math>\Gamma_{\circ}$, $\Gamma\}$ = k' because A is not of the form $n \not \in N$. Therefore $\delta <_k$, β and $\alpha + \delta <_k$, $\alpha + \beta$ so $\models \alpha + \beta$ Γ_{\circ} , Γ by Accumulation, and still with cut-rank \leq r.

Suppose $\Gamma = \Gamma'$, C where C is some formula other than A and suppose $\beta \Gamma'$, C, A follows from premises $\beta \Gamma'$, C, A by a rule other than Accumulation. Then $\beta = \delta + 1$ and by the induction hypothesis, $\beta \Gamma'$, C, C with cut-rank C Therefore by applying the rule concerned and noting that if it's a cut then the length of each C must be C by assumption - we obtain $\beta \Gamma'$, Γ' ,

Suppose A is of the form $\exists xB(x)$ and $\bigsqcup^{\beta} \Gamma$, A follows from $\bigsqcup^{\delta} \Gamma'$, B(n) by the \exists -rule with $\beta = \delta + 1$ and Γ' , $A = \Gamma$, A. Then $\bigsqcup^{\delta} \Gamma$, A,B(n) and hence $\bigsqcup^{\alpha+\delta} \Gamma_{o}$, Γ ,B(n) by the induction hypothesis, with cut-rank $\leq r$. Since $\bigsqcup^{\alpha} \Gamma_{o}$, 7A and 7A is $\bigvee x 7B(x)$ we have by Inversion $\bigsqcup^{\alpha} \Gamma_{o}$, 7B(n) with cut-rank $\leq r$ and hence $\bigsqcup^{\alpha+\delta} \Gamma_{o}$, Γ , 7B(n) with cut-rank $\leq r$, by Accumulation. Therefore as B(n) has length r we can apply Cut to obtain $\bigsqcup^{\alpha+\beta} \Gamma_{o}$, Γ with cut-rank $\leq r$.

Finally if A is B_O v B₁ and $\vdash \beta$ Γ, A follows from $\vdash \delta$ Γ', B₁ with i = O or 1, $\beta = \delta + 1$ and Γ' , A = Γ, A, then $\vdash \delta$ Γ, A, B₁ and so by the induction hypothesis, $\vdash \alpha + \delta$ Γ_O, Γ, B₁ with cut-rank \leq r. Since $\vdash \alpha$ Γ_O, 7 A and 7 A is 7B_O ^7B₁ we then obtain $\vdash \alpha$ Γ_O, 7B₁ by Inversion and $\vdash \alpha + \delta$ Γ_O, Γ, 7B₁ by Accumulation, both with cut-rank \leq r. So as B₁ has length \leq r we can apply Cut to obtain $\vdash \alpha + \delta + 1$ Γ_O, Γ, i.e. $\vdash \alpha + \beta$ Γ_O, Γ with cut-rank \leq r.

CUT - ELIMINATION THEOREM 4 If $\frac{\alpha}{1} - \frac{\alpha}{1} - \frac{\alpha}{1} + \frac{\alpha$

PROOF We only need prove that if $\begin{subarray}{c} \begin{subarray}{c} \begin{suba$

DEFINITION 6 By a positive $\Sigma_1(N)$ formula is meant any formula built up from elementary prime formulas and " $x \in N$ " using only $^{\wedge}$, $^{\vee}$ and Ξ . Note that " $x \notin N$ " is not allowed. A set $\Gamma = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ of closed positive $\Sigma_1(N)$ formulas is said to be true in k if one of the A_i 's in Γ is true when N is interpreted as the finite set $\{n: 3n < k\}$. Note that if Γ is true in k and k < k' then Γ is also true in k'.

BOUNDING LEMMA 5 If Γ contains only closed positive $\Sigma_1(N)$ formulas and $\lim_{n \to \infty} n_1 \notin N, \dots, n_r \notin N$, Γ with cut-rank O then Γ is true in $F_{\alpha}(k)$ where $k = \max\{2\}$ u $\{3n_1, \dots, 3n_r\}$.

If it's an axiom then $\ \Gamma$ contains either a true cepf or "O \in N" or "n $_i \in$ N" for some i, so Γ is true in $F_{\alpha}(k)$ since $F_{\alpha}(k) > 3n$ for each i.

The ω -rule is not applicable since Γ does not contain \forall and the cases where the \wedge or \vee -rules are applied follow trivially from the

induction hypothesis since $F_{\beta}(k) < F_{\beta+1}(k)$.

For an application of the $\overline{\mathbf{J}}$ -rule suppose Γ contains $\overline{\mathbf{J}} \times \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\overline{\mathbf{J}} \times \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\overline{\mathbf{J}} \times \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x})$ for some numeral \mathbf{M} where $\alpha = \beta + 1$. Then $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M})$ cannot be of the form " $\mathbf{M} \notin \mathbf{N}$ " so by the induction hypothesis Γ , $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M})$ is true in $\mathbf{F}_{\beta}(\mathbf{k})$ and therefore in $\mathbf{F}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{k})$. Hence $\Gamma = \Gamma$, $\overline{\mathbf{J}} \times \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x})$ is true in $\mathbf{F}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{k})$.

For the N-rule suppose Γ contains "Sm \in N" and $\vdash \beta$ $n_1 \notin N, \ldots$..., $n_r \notin N$, Γ , $m \in N$ where $\alpha = \beta + 1$. Then Γ , $m \in N$ is true in $F_{\beta}(k)$ and therefore $\Gamma = \Gamma$, Sm \in N is true in $F_{\alpha}(k)$ as $3m < F_{\beta}(k)$ implies $3m + 3 < F_{\alpha}(k)$.

Now suppose $\longmapsto^{\alpha} n_1 \notin N, \ldots, n_r \in N, \Gamma$ follows from $\biguplus^{\beta} n_1 \notin N, \ldots, n_r \notin N, \Gamma, \tau \text{ A} \text{ and } \biguplus^{\beta} n_1 \notin N, \ldots, n_r \notin N, \Gamma, \Lambda \text{ by Cut}$ where $\beta + 1 = \alpha$. Since the cut has rank 0, A is either a cepf or of the form "m \in N" for some numeral m. By the induction hypothesis, if A is a cepf then both Γ , τ A and Γ , A are true in $\Gamma_{\beta}(k)$ and so Γ is true in $\Gamma_{\beta}(k)$ and hence in $\Gamma_{\alpha}(k)$ because one of τ A or A is false. If A is of the form "m \in N" then Γ must be true in $\Gamma_{\beta}(\max(k,3m))$ and Γ , m \in N is true in $\Gamma_{\beta}(k)$, so either Γ is true in $\Gamma_{\beta}(k)$ - hence also in $\Gamma_{\alpha}(k)$ - or else $3m < \Gamma_{\beta}(k)$ and Γ is true in $\Gamma_{\beta}(\max(k,3m))$ which is $\Gamma_{\beta}(\kappa) = \Gamma_{\beta}(\kappa) = \Gamma_{\beta}$

THEOREM 5 Every function provably computable in PA is elementary in some F_{α} for $\alpha < \epsilon_0$, and is therefore majorised by $F_{\alpha+1}$.

PROOF Suppose f is defined from elementary V and T by

 $f(n_1, ..., n_r) = V(least m such that <math>T(n_1, ..., n_r, m) = 0$

where $\forall x_1 \dots \forall x_r \exists y (T(x_1, \dots, x_r, y) = 0)$ is a theorem of PA - note that $"T(x_1, \dots, x_r, y) = 0"$ is an elementary prime formula. By the Embedding Lemma and the Cut-Elimination Theorem there is an ordinal

$$\alpha = \omega^{\omega}$$
 < ϵ such that

with cut-rank O. By repeated use of the Inversion Lemma together with the simple fact that if $\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}$ Γ , A \vee B then $\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}$ Γ , A \cap B we then obtain for all n_1,\ldots,n_r ,

$$\vdash^{\alpha} n_{1} \notin N, \dots, n_{r} \notin N, \exists y (y \in N \land T(n_{1}, \dots, n_{r}, y) = 0)$$

with cut-rank O and by the Bounding Lemma $\exists y (y \in \mathbb{N} \land T(n_1, \dots, n_r, y) = 0)$ is therefore true in $F_{\alpha}(\max(2,3n_1,\dots,3n_r))$. Thus for every sequence of arguments n_1,\dots,n_r there is an $m < F_{\alpha}(\max(2,3n_1,\dots,3n_r))$ such that $T(n_1,\dots,n_r,m) = 0$. Now it is well-known that the elementary functions are closed under bounded minimisation, so


$$V(least m < b such that T(n_1, ..., n_r, m) = 0)$$

is an elementary function of n_1,\ldots,n_r and b. Therefore substituting $F_{\alpha}(\max(2,3n_1,\ldots,3n_r)) \quad \text{for b we obtain an elementary-in-}F_{\alpha} \quad \text{definition of f.}$ Since $F_{\alpha+1}$ majorises all functions elementary in F_{α} , it majorises f.

Theorems 3 and 5 together give the main result I.

§4. GOODSTEIN SEQUENCES

than (n+1) n+1 into the ordinals less than ϵ_0 and clearly every ordinal less than ϵ_0 is in the range of all but finitely-many g_n 's. Thus the g_n 's give a direct-limit representation of ϵ_0 :



For each n define $g_{n,n+1} = g_{n+1}^{-1} \circ g_n$ so that $g_{n,n+1}(a)$ is the result of replacing (n+1) by (n+2) throughout the complete base n + 1 form of a.

DEFINITION 7 The Goodstein sequence starting with a is the sequence of numbers $\{a_k\}$ defined as follows. Choose the least number n such that

$$a < (n+1) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} (n+1) \\ \end{pmatrix} n + 1$$

$$a < (n+1) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} (n+1) \\ \end{pmatrix} n + 1$$

$$b = a - 1$$

$$a = a - 1$$

$$b = a - 1$$

$$b = a - 1$$

$$c = a - 1$$

$$c$$

NOTE that the statement "every Goodstein sequence terminates" is expressible by a formula

$$\forall x \exists y (T(x,y) = 0)$$

in the language of PA, where T is elementary. For a_k is a computable function of a and k, so there is an elementary function $T'(a,k,\ell)$ such that $T'(a,k,\ell)=0$ if and only if within ℓ steps it is possible to compute $a_0,a_1,\ldots,a_{k-1},a_k$ and check that $a_0\neq 0$, $a_1\neq 0,\ldots,a_{k-1}\neq 0$, $a_k=0$. Now set T(a,y)=T'(a,V(y),U(y)) where U,V are elementary pairing functions.

Then T(a,y) = 0 if and only if V(y) is the least k such that a = 0, and U(y) bounds the number of steps needed to verify this.

Now with each Goodstein sequence $\{a_k\}$ is associated a sequence $\{g_{n+k}(a_k)\}$ of ordinals $<\epsilon$. It is not too difficult to convince oneself that for any

$$a < (n+1)$$
 $n+1$

$$g_n(a - 1) = P_n(g_n(a))$$

where $P_n(0) = 0$, $P_n(\alpha+1) = \alpha$ and $P_n(\alpha) = P_n(\alpha)$ if α is a limit with fundamental sequence $\{\alpha_n\}$. Therefore by induction on k,

$$g_{n+k}(a_k) = P_{n+k}P_{n+k-1} \dots P_{n+1}P_n(g_n(a))$$

and so the statement that "the Goodstein sequence starting with a terminates" is equivalent to

$$\exists m \ge n (P_{m-1}^{P} ... P_{n+1}^{P} p_{n}(g_{n}(a)) = 0).$$

LEMMA 6 For every $\alpha < \epsilon_0$ and all n, if $\alpha \neq 0$ then

$$H_{\alpha}(n) = \underline{least} \quad m \geq n (P_{m m-1} \cdot ... \cdot P_{n+1} P_{n}(\alpha) = 0) + 1.$$

PROOF by straightforward induction over the definition of the Hardy functions H_{α} given in §1.

THEOREM 6 (Kirby-Paris [1982]). The statement

"every Goodstein sequence terminates"

is true but not provable in Peano Arithmetic.

PROOF (Cichon [1983]). Since $P_n(\alpha) < \alpha$ when $\alpha \neq 0$ it follows that the sequence of ordinals

$$g_{n+k}(a_k) = P_{n+k} \dots P_{n+1} P_n(g_n(a))$$

associated with a given Goodstein sequence $\{a_k\}$ is decreasing and therefore $g_{n+k}(a_k)$ - and hence a_k - is eventually 0 (this was Goodstein's result). Suppose, for a contradiction, that the formula $\forall x \exists y (T(x,y) = 0)$ expressing that "every Goodstein sequence terminates" were a theorem of PA. Then the

function

Goodstein (a) =
$$V(\text{least y such that } T(a,y) = 0)$$

= least k such that $a_k = 0$

would be provably computable in PA. But if we define $H_{\epsilon}(n) = H_{\epsilon}(n)$

where $(\epsilon_0)_n = \omega^{\omega} \cdot {}^{\omega}$ then by the above Lemma and the comments preceeding it

Thus if the Goodstein function were provably computable in PA so would be the function H_{ϵ} . This is impossible however, because H_{ϵ} (n) = F_{ϵ} (n) H_{ϵ} (n) majorises all provably computable functions of PA.

NOTES

- (1) Although we have not done so here, the techniques can be refined to produce independence results for various fragments of Peano Arithmetic, obtained by restricting the complexity of the formula A in the Induction Axiom. Parsons was the first to study the relationships between such fragments and his (and others') work in this area is developed further and unified in Sieg [1985].
- (2) An alternative approach to our Bounding Theorem 5, based on Gödel's Dialectica Interpretation of PA and Normalisation of infinitary terms, is set out in Rose [1984]. A streamlined version of this approach is in handwritten notes of Buchholz: "Three contributions to the conference on Recent Advances in Proof Theory", Oxford, April 1980.

References

- [1952] G. Kreisel, On the interpretation of non-finitist proofs II, J. Symb. Logic 17, 43-58.
- [1953] A. Grzegorczyk, <u>Some classes of recursive functions</u>, Rozprawy Matem. IV, Warsaw.
- [1965] J.W. Robbin, Subrecursive hierarchies, Ph.D. Princeton.
- [1968] W.W. Tait, Normal derivability in classical logic, in J. Barwise Ed., Springer Lecture Notes in Math. 72, 204-236.
- [1970] S.S. Wainer, A classification of the ordinal recursive functions, Archiv. f. math. Logik 13, 136-153.
- [1971] H. Schwichtenberg, Eine klassifikation der ε -rekursiven funktionen, Zeit. f. math. Logik 17, 61-74.
- [1972] S.S. Wainer, Ordinal recursion, and a refinement of the extended Grzegorezyk hierarchy, J. Symb. Logic 37, 281-292.
- [1977] H. Schwichtenberg, Proof theory: some applications of cut-elimination in J. Barwise Ed. Handbook of Mathematical Logic (N. Holland, Amsterdam), 867-896.
- [1977] J. Paris and L. Harrington, A mathematical incompleteness in Peano arithmetic, ibid 1133-1142.
- [1981] J. Ketonen and R. Solovay, Rapidly growing Ramsey functions, Annals of Math. 113, 267-314.
- [1982] L. Kirby and J. Paris, Accessible independence results for Peano arithmetic, Bull. London Math. Soc. 14, 285-293.
- [1983] E.A. Cichon, A short proof of two recently discovered independence results using recursion theoretic methods, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 87 (4), 704-706.
- [1984] H.E. Rose, Subrecursion: functions and hierarchies, Oxford Logic Guides 9, Oxford Univ. Press.
- [1984] W. Buchholz, An independence result for $(\Pi_1^1 CA) + BI$, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, to appear.
- [1984] V.M. Abrusci, J.Y. Girard and J. van de Wiele, Some uses of dilators in combinatorial problems I, II, Research reports in Math., University of Siena. To be published.
- [1985] W. Sieg, <u>Fragments of Arithmetic</u>, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 28, 33-71.

W. Buchholz, Mathematisches Institut, Universität München, D-8000 MUNCHEN 2. S.S. Wainer, School of Mathematics, Leeds University, LEEDS LS2 9JT.