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Abstract
We investigate sentences which are simultaneously partially conservative over several theories. We generalize Bennet’s results on this topic to the case of more than two theories. Moreover, for any theories \(T\) and \(U\), we give a new sufficient condition for the existence of \(\Sigma_n\) sentences which are \(\Pi_n\)-conservative over \(T\) but not provable in \(U\).

1 Introduction

Let \(T\) be a recursively enumerable (r.e.) consistent extension of Peano Arithmetic \(\text{PA}\). Let \(\Gamma\) denote either \(\Sigma_n\) or \(\Pi_n\) for some \(n \geq 1\). Also \(\text{Th}(T)\) denotes the set of all sentences provable in \(T\) and \(\text{Th}_\Gamma(T)\) denotes the set of all \(\Gamma\) sentences provable in \(T\). We say a sentence \(\varphi\) is \(\Gamma\)-conservative over \(T\) if for any \(\Gamma\) sentence \(\psi\), \(T \vdash \psi\) whenever \(T + \varphi \vdash \psi\). Define \(\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T)\) to be the set of all \(\Gamma\) sentences which are \(\Gamma\)-conservative over \(T\) where \(\Sigma^d_n = \Pi_n\) and \(\Pi^d_n = \Sigma_n\). Guaspari \([2]\) proved that \(\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(T)\) is non-empty, that is, there exist \(\Gamma^d\) sentences which are \(\Gamma\)-conservative over \(T\) and unprovable in \(T\). Also, Guaspari asked the following question (in p. 62).

If \(\{T_i\}_{i \in \omega}\) is an r.e. sequence of r.e. theories, is there a \(\Gamma\) sentence which is independent and \(\Gamma^d\)-conservative over each \(T_i\)? The question is open even for sequence of length 2.

Guaspari actually proved that for any theory \(T\), there are \(\Gamma^d\) sentences which are \(T\)-unprovable and simultaneously \(\Gamma\)-conservative over all subtheories of \(T\). Thus for subtheories of \(T\), Guaspari’s question has an affirmative answer.

On the other hand, Misercroque \([6]\) proved that Guaspari’s problem does not hold in general. That is, Misercroque found an infinite r.e. sequence \(\{T_i\}_{i \in \omega}\) of theories such that there is no \(\Gamma^d\) sentence which is simultaneously unprovable and \(\Gamma\)-conservative over \(T_i\) for all \(i \in \omega\). This is a counterexample of Guaspari’s problem in the case of infinite r.e. sequences of theories.

Bennet \([1]\) investigated Guaspari’s problem for two theories. Bennet firstly proved that the statement “\(\bigcap_{i \leq 1} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset\)” saying that “there exists a \(\Gamma^d\) sentence which is simultaneously unprovable and \(\Gamma\)-conservative over \(T_0\) and \(T_1\)” is equivalent to “\(\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_0) \setminus \text{Th}(T_1) \neq \emptyset\) and \(\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_1) \setminus \text{Th}(T_0) \neq \emptyset\)”
∅". Thus the investigation of Guaspari’s problem for two theories is reduced to that of the condition “Cons(Γ, T) \ Th(U) ≠ ∅". Then, Bennet proved that the condition “Th_{T_n}(T) ⊈ Th(U) or Th_{T}(T) + U is consistent" is sufficient for Cons(Γ, T) \ Th(U) ≠ ∅. Furthermore, he proved that in the case of Γ = Σ_n, “Th_{T_0}(T) ⊈ Th(U) or Th_{Σ_n}(T) + U is consistent" is actually equivalent to Cons(Σ_n, T) \ Th(U) ≠ ∅.

We can easily find theories T_0 and T_1 not satisfying the condition “Th_{Π_n}(T_0) ⊈ Th(T_1) or Th_{Σ_n}(T_0) + T_1 is consistent”. Then we obtain \bigcap_{i=1}^n \{(Cons(Γ, T_i) \ Th(T_i)) \neq ∅. This is a counterexample of Guaspari’s problem for two theories in the case of Γ = Σ_n. Whereas, in the case of Γ = Π_n, Bennet proved that a similar equivalence as in the case of Γ = Σ_n does not hold. Also, Guaspari’s problem for two theories in the case of Γ = Π_n has not been settled yet.

In Section 2 we introduce some notation and facts. In Section 3, we survey on already known results concerning Guaspari’s problem. In Section 4, we generalize Bennet’s results explained above to the case of theories more than two. Among other things, we prove that for any r.e. sequence \{T_i\}_{i \in ω} of theories, if there exists an r.e. set X of natural numbers such that \bigcap_{i \in X} Th_{T_i}(T_i) \notin Th(\bigcup_{i \in X} Th_{T_i}(T_i) + U), then ((\bigcap_{i \in ω} Cons(Γ, T_i)) \ Th(U)) is non-empty. Moreover, we prove that the converse implication also holds for finite sequences of theories in the case of Γ = Σ_n. We also give some counterexamples of several implications. In Section 5, we investigate Σ_n sentences which are simultaneously Π_n-conservative over two theories. Then we give a new sufficient condition for Cons(Π_n, T) \ Th(U) ≠ ∅.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we consider only theories which are r.e. consistent extensions of Peano Arithmetic PA, hence we call such a theory simply a theory. A sequence \{T_i\}_{i \in ω} of theories is r.e. if the set \{(i, φ) : φ \in T_i\} is r.e. Let \overline{n} denote the numeral for a natural number n. We fix a natural Gödel numbering, and for any formula φ, let \overline{Γφ^n} denote the numeral for the Gödel number of φ.

The classes Σ_n and Π_n of formulas are defined as usual. Throughout this paper, Γ denotes either Σ_n or Π_n for some n ≥ 1. Let Σ^d_n = Π_n and Π^d_n = Σ_n.

For each theory T, we can naturally construct a formula \Prf_T(x, y) whose meaning is “y is the Gödel number of a T-proof of a formula with the Gödel number x”. The Σ_1 formula \Prf_T(x) := ∃y \Prf_T(x, y) is a standard provability predicate of T.

Let \Gamma(x) be a \Delta_1 formula saying that “x is the Gödel number of a Γ formula” and let Truer_T(x) be a Γ formula saying that “x is the Gödel number of a true Γ sentence” (see Hájek and Pudlák [3]). Then define [Γ]_T(x, y) to be the Γ formula

\forall u ≤ y \forall v ≤ y(\Gamma(u) ∧ \Prf_T(x → u, v) → Truer_T(u)),

where x → y is a term such that for any formulas φ and ψ, PA ⊢ Γφ → Γψ → Γφ → Γψ. Then, the following fact holds.
Fact 2.1 (cf. Lindström [5]).

1. $\text{PA} \vdash \forall x \forall y \forall z (([\Gamma] T(x, y) \land z \leq y) \rightarrow [\Gamma] T(x, z))$.

2. For all sentences $\varphi$ and natural numbers $m$, $T + \varphi \vdash [\Gamma] T([\varphi^\Gamma], \overline{m})$.

3. For all sentences $\varphi$ and $\psi$, if $\psi$ is $\Gamma$ and $T + \varphi \vdash \psi$, then there is a natural number $q$ such that $\text{PA} + \neg \psi \vdash \neg [\Gamma] T([\varphi^\Gamma], \overline{q})$.

We use the following fact many times.

Fact 2.2 (cf. Lindström [5]). For any formulas $\alpha(x)$ and $\beta(y)$, let $\sigma :\equiv \exists x (\alpha(x) \land \forall y \leq x \neg \beta(y))$ and $\sigma^*:\equiv \exists y (\beta(y) \land \forall x < y \neg \alpha(x))$. Then

1. $\text{PA} \vdash \neg \sigma \lor \neg \sigma^*$.

2. $\text{PA} \vdash (\exists x \alpha(x) \lor \exists y \beta(y)) \rightarrow (\sigma \lor \sigma^*)$.

At last, we define the following sets.

Definition 2.3. Let $T$ be a theory and $M$ be a model.

- $\omega$ is the set of all natural numbers.
- For any $k \in \omega$, $I_k := \{0, \ldots, k\}$.
- $\text{Th}(T) := \{\varphi : T \vdash \varphi \land \text{\varphi is a sentence}\}$.
- $\text{Th}_{\Gamma}(T) := \{\varphi \in \Gamma : T \vdash \varphi \land \text{\varphi is a sentence}\}$.
- $\text{Th}_{\Gamma}(M) := \{\varphi \in \Gamma : M \models \varphi \land \text{\varphi is a sentence}\}$.

3 Background

The notion of partially conservative sentences has been appeared in the context of the incompleteness theorems. For example, Kreisel [4] showed that the negation of the consistency statement of $T$ is $\Pi_1$-conservative over $T$, that is, for any $\Pi_1$ sentence $\pi$, $T \vdash \pi$ whenever $T + \neg \text{Con}_T \vdash \pi$. This is an extension of Gödel’s second incompleteness theorem. For another example, Smoryński [9] proved that $T$ is $\Sigma_1$-sound if and only if every $T$-undecidable $\Pi_1$ sentence is $\Sigma_1$-conservative over $T$. Also, Smoryński proved that $T$ is $\Sigma_1$-sound if and only if $\text{Con}_T$ is $\Sigma_1$-conservative over $T$.

Guaspari investigated the general concept of $\Gamma$-conservativity in [2].

Definition 3.1. Let $T$ be any theory.

- A sentence $\varphi$ is said to be $\Gamma$-conservative over $T$ if for all $\Gamma$ sentences $\psi$, if $T + \varphi \vdash \psi$, then $T \vdash \psi$.
- Let $\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T) := \{\varphi \in \Gamma^d : \varphi$ is $\Gamma$-conservative over $T\}$. 


Every $T$-provable $\Gamma^d$ sentence $\varphi$ is trivially contained in $\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T)$. Also, Guaspari proved that every theory has non-trivially $\Gamma$-conservative $\Gamma^d$ sentences, that is,

**Fact 3.2** (Guaspari [2]). *For any theory $T$, $\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(T) \neq \emptyset$.***

If $T \vdash \neg \varphi$, then $T + \varphi$ is inconsistent, and hence $\varphi$ is not $\Gamma$-conservative over $T$ because $T$ is consistent. This shows that if $\varphi \in \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(T)$, then $\varphi$ is undecidable in $T$. Therefore Fact 3.2 can be thought as an extension of Gödel-Rosser’s first incompleteness theorem. Moreover, the following strengthening of Fact 3.2 is proved by Solovay.

**Fact 3.3** (Solovay (cf. Guaspari [2])). *Let $T$ be any theory. There is a $\Gamma^d$ sentence $\varphi$ such that $\varphi \in \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(T)$ and $\neg \varphi \in \text{Cons}(\Gamma^d, T) \setminus \text{Th}(T)$.***

Mostowski proved the following generalization of Gödel-Rosser’s first incompleteness theorem.

**Fact 3.4** (Mostowski [7]). *Let $\{T_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ be an r.e. sequence of theories. Then there is a $\Pi_1$ sentence $\varphi$ such that $\varphi, \neg \varphi \notin \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \text{Th}(T_i)$.***

Then it is natural to expect the existence of a sentence which is simultaneously $\Gamma$-conservative over several theories. Actually, Guaspari proposed the following problem.

**Problem 3.5** (Guaspari [2]). *For any r.e. sequence $\{T_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ of theories, does $\bigcap_{i \in \omega} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset$ hold?***

Also, Guaspari wrote that this problem is open even for sequences of length two. In the remaining of this subsection, we survey on already known results concerning Guaspari’s problem. Guaspari actually proved a stronger result than Fact 3.2 that there exists a $\Gamma^d$ sentence which is simultaneously $\Gamma$-conservative over all subtheories of $T$. These sentences are called hereditarily $\Gamma$-conservative.

**Definition 3.6.** *Let $T$ be any theory.

- A sentence $\varphi$ is said to be hereditarily $\Gamma$-conservative over $T$ if for all theories $S$ such that $T \vdash S \vdash \text{PA}$, $\varphi \in \text{Cons}(\Gamma, S)$.

- Let $\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T) := \{\varphi \in \Gamma^d : \varphi$ is hereditarily $\Gamma$-conservative over $T\}$.***

**Fact 3.7** (Guaspari [2]). *For any theory $T$, $\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(T) \neq \emptyset$.***

Following Guaspari’s study, Misercque and Bennet also investigated Guaspari’s Problem 3.5. Misercque proved that Guaspari’s problem does not generally hold.

**Fact 3.8** (Misercque [3]). *There is an r.e. sequence $\{T_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ of theories such that for all $\Gamma$, $\bigcap_{i \in \omega} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) = \emptyset$.***
Since Misercque’s sequence of theories is not finite, it is not a counterexample of Guaspari’s problem in the case of finite sequences of theories. Bennet analyzed the existence of $\Gamma^d$ sentences which are simultaneously $\Gamma$-conservative over two theories. He showed that Guaspari’s problem for two theories can be reduced to more easily studied problem.

**Fact 3.9** (Bennet [1]). For any theories $T_0$ and $T_1$, the following are equivalent:

1. $\bigcap_{i \leq 1} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset$.
2. $\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_0) \setminus \text{Th}(T_1) \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_1) \setminus \text{Th}(T_0) \neq \emptyset$.

Therefore, the investigation of Guaspari’s problem for two theories is equivalent to that of the condition “$\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$”. For the condition “$\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$”, Bennet gave the following sufficient condition concerning theories $T$ and $U$.

**Fact 3.10** (Bennet [1]). Let $T$ and $U$ be any theories. Suppose either $\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(U)$ or $\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T) + U$ is consistent. Then $\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$.

In particular, in the case of $\Gamma = \Sigma_n$, this sufficient condition is also necessary for $\text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$.

**Fact 3.11** (Bennet [1]). For any theories $T$ and $U$, the following are equivalent:

1. $\text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$.
2. $\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(U)$ or $\text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T) + U$ is inconsistent.

Let $\phi$ be a sentence such that $\phi \in \text{Cons}(\Pi_n, PA) \setminus \text{Th}(PA)$ (See Fact 3.2). Let $T_0 := PA + \phi$ and $T_1 := PA + \neg \phi$. Then, it is easy to see $\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T_0) \subseteq \text{Th}(T_1)$ and $\text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T_0) + T_1$ is inconsistent. Hence, $\text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, T_0) \setminus \text{Th}(T_1) = \emptyset$ by Fact 3.11. Therefore, by Fact 3.9, $\bigcap_{i \leq 1} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) = \emptyset$. That is, this is a counterexample of Guaspari’s problem for two theories in the case of $\Gamma = \Sigma_n$ (see also Lindström [5] Exercise 5.9.(a)).

For two theories, remaining Guaspari’s problem is the case of $\Gamma = \Pi_n$ and this has not been settled yet. Thus Bennet proposed the following problem.

**Problem 3.12** (Bennet [1]). Are there theories $T$ and $U$ such that $\text{Cons}(\Pi_n, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) = \emptyset$?

Bennet proved that the condition “$\text{Cons}(\Pi_n, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$” cannot be characterized like Fact 3.11.

**Fact 3.13** (Bennet [1]). There are $T$ and $U$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\text{Cons}(\Pi_n, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$.
2. $\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T) \subseteq \text{Th}(U)$.
3. $\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T) + U$ is inconsistent.
Bennet also investigated Guaspari’s problem with respect to hereditarily \( \Gamma \)-conservative sentences. He proved the following equivalence concerning the statement \( \bigcap_{i \leq 1} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \), which corresponds to Fact 3.9.

**Fact 3.14** (Bennet [1]). For any theories \( T_0 \) and \( T_1 \), the following are equivalent:

1. \( \bigcap_{i \leq 1} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).
2. \( \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_0) \setminus \text{Th}(T_1) \neq \emptyset \) and \( \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_1) \setminus \text{Th}(T_0) \neq \emptyset \).

Bennet characterized the condition “\( \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset \)” by using Misercque’s method used in his proof of Fact 3.8.

**Fact 3.15** (Bennet [1]). For any theories \( T \) and \( U \), the following are equivalent:

1. \( \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset \).
2. \( \text{Th}_\Gamma(T) + U \) is consistent.

As a corollary to Facts 3.14 and 3.15, we have:

**Corollary 3.16** (Bennet [1]). For any theories \( T_0 \) and \( T_1 \), the following are equivalent:

1. \( \bigcap_{i \leq 1} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).
2. \( \text{Th}_\Gamma(T_0) + T_1 \) and \( \text{Th}_\Gamma(T_1) + T_0 \) are consistent.

# 4 Generalizations of Bennet’s results

In this section, we generalize Bennet’s results introduced in the last section. This section consists of three subsections. In Subsection 4.1, we investigate hereditarily \( \Gamma \)-conservative sentences. Then, we generalize Facts 3.14 and 3.15 to the case of theories more than two. In Subsection 4.2, we generalize Facts 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11. At last, in Subsection 4.3, we give some counterexamples of several implications.

## 4.1 Hereditarily \( \Gamma \)-conservative sentences

In this subsection, we generalize Facts 3.14 and 3.15. First, we generalize Fact 3.14 to the case of finite sequences of theories.

**Theorem 4.1.** For any \( k \geq 1 \) and theories \( T_0, \ldots, T_k \), the following are equivalent:

1. \( \bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).
2. For all \( i \leq k \), \( \bigcap_{j \neq i} (\bigcap_{j \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_j) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).
Proof. 1 $\Rightarrow$ 2: This is trivial.

2 $\Rightarrow$ 1: Suppose for all $i \leq k$, \( \left( \bigcap_{j \neq i} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_j) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i) \neq \emptyset \).

Case 1: $\Gamma = \Sigma_n$. For each $i \leq k$, let $\varphi_i \in \left( \bigcap_{j \neq i} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_j) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)$ and let $\theta_i$ be a $\Pi_n$ sentence satisfying the following equivalence:

\[
\text{PA} \vdash \theta_i \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{j \neq i, j \leq k} \varphi_j \land \forall y \left( [\Sigma_n]_{T_i}(\gamma \vartheta_i \gamma, y) \rightarrow \neg \text{Prf}_{T_i}(\gamma \bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \gamma, y) \right).
\]

We prove $\bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \in \bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{HCons}(\Sigma_n, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i))$.

First, we prove $T_i \nvdash \bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j$ for all $i \leq k$. Assume there is an $i \leq k$ such that $T_i \vdash \bigvee_{j \neq i} \theta_j$, then there is a $p \in \omega$ such that $\text{PA} \vdash \text{Prf}_{T_i}(\gamma \bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \gamma, p)$. Also, by Fact 2.1(iii), $T_i + \vartheta_i \vdash [\Sigma_n]_{T_i}(\gamma \vartheta_i \gamma, \sigma)$. Then, $T_i + \vartheta_i \vdash \exists y([\Sigma_n]_{T_i}(\gamma \vartheta_i \gamma, y) \land \text{Prf}_{T_i}(\gamma \bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \gamma, y))$. Hence, by the choice of $\theta_i$, $T_i + \vartheta_i \vdash \neg \theta_i$. That is, $T_i \vdash \neg \theta_i$.

By our assumption, $T_i \vdash \bigvee_{j \neq i} \theta_j$. For any $j \leq k$ with $j \neq i$, $\text{PA} \vdash \theta_j \rightarrow \varphi_i$ by the choice of $\theta_j$. Therefore, $T_i \vdash \bigvee_{j \neq i} \theta_j \rightarrow \varphi_i$, and hence $T_i \vdash \varphi_i$. This is a contradiction.

Next, we prove $\bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \in \text{HCons}(\Sigma_n, T_i)$ for all $i \leq k$. Let $S$ be a theory and $\sigma$ be a $\Sigma_n$ sentence such that $T_i \vdash S \vdash \text{PA}$ and $S + \bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \vdash \sigma$. Then $S + \theta_i \vdash \sigma$. In particular, $T_i + \theta_i \vdash \sigma$. Therefore, by Fact 2.1(iii), there is a $q \in \omega$ such that $\text{PA} \vdash \neg [\Sigma_n]_{T_i}(\gamma \vartheta_i \gamma, \sigma)$ and by Fact 2.1(i), $\text{PA} \vdash \neg \exists y([\Sigma_n]_{T_i}(\gamma \vartheta_i \gamma, y) \land \text{Prf}_{T_i}(\gamma \bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \gamma, y))$. Hence $\text{PA} \vdash \neg \exists y([\Sigma_n]_{T_i}(\gamma \vartheta_i \gamma, y) \rightarrow \neg \text{Prf}_{T_i}(\gamma \bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \gamma, y))$. Therefore, $\text{PA} \vdash \neg \exists y([\Sigma_n]_{T_i}(\gamma \vartheta_i \gamma, y) \rightarrow \neg \text{Prf}_{T_i}(\gamma \bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \gamma, y))$. Therefore, $\text{PA} \vdash \neg \exists y([\Sigma_n]_{T_i}(\gamma \vartheta_i \gamma, y) \rightarrow \neg \text{Prf}_{T_i}(\gamma \bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \gamma, y))$. Therefore, $\text{PA} \vdash \neg \sigma + \bigwedge_{j \neq i} \varphi_j \neq \sigma$, because $S + \theta_i \vdash \sigma$. Hence $S + \bigwedge_{j \neq i} \varphi_j \vdash \sigma$. Let $i_0 \leq k$ such that $i_0 \neq i$. Then, $S + \varphi_{i_0} \vdash \neg \bigwedge_{j \neq i_0} \varphi_j \neq \sigma$. Since $\varphi_{i_0} \in \text{HCons}(\Sigma_n, T_i)$ and $\neg \bigwedge_{j \neq i_0} \varphi_j \neq \sigma$ is a $\Sigma_n$ sentence, $S + \neg \bigwedge_{j \neq i_0} \varphi_j \neq \sigma$. That is, $S + \bigwedge_{j \neq i_0} \varphi_j \vdash \sigma$. By repeating this argument, we obtain $S \vdash \sigma$.

Case 2: $\Gamma = \Pi_n$. For each $i \leq k$, let $\varphi_i \in \left( \bigcap_{j \neq i} \text{HCons}(\Pi_n, T_j) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)$ and let $\theta_i$ be a $\Sigma_n$ sentence satisfying the following equivalence:

\[
\text{PA} \vdash \theta_i \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{j \neq i, j \leq k} \varphi_j \land \exists y \left( \neg [\Pi_n]_{T_i}(\gamma \vartheta_i \gamma, y) \land \forall z \leq y \neg \text{Prf}_{T_i}(\gamma \bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \gamma, z) \right).
\]

By the almost same argument as in Case 1, we conclude $\bigvee_{j \leq k} \theta_j \in \bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{HCons}(\Pi_n, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i))$.

Secondly, we generalize Fact 3.15 to the case of r.e. sequences of theories by using Fact 3.15 itself.
Theorem 4.2. For any r.e. sequence \( \{T_i\}_{i \in \omega} \) of theories and for any theory \( T \), the following are equivalent:

1. \( (\bigcap_{i \in \omega} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset \).
2. For all \( k \in \omega \), \( (\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset \).
3. \( \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \text{Th}_i(T_i) + U \) is consistent.

Proof. 1 \( \Rightarrow 2 \): This is trivial.

2 \( \Rightarrow 3 \): Suppose \( \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \text{Th}_i(T_i) + U \) is inconsistent. Then there is a \( k \in \omega \) such that \( \bigcup_{i \leq k} \text{Th}_i(T_i) + U \) is inconsistent. Thus, there are \( \Gamma \) sentences \( \varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_k \) such that \( T_i \vdash \varphi_i \) for each \( i \leq k \) and \( U \vdash \bigvee_{i \leq k} \neg \varphi_i \). Let \( \{\psi_j\}_{j \in \omega} \) be an enumeration of all \( \Gamma \) sentences and let \( T^j_i := \text{PA} + \varphi_i \lor \neg \psi_j \) for each \( i \leq k \) and \( j \in \omega \). By the choice of \( \varphi_i \), \( T_i \vdash T^j_i \vdash \text{PA} \) for each \( i \leq k \) and \( j \in \omega \). We fix any \( j \in \omega \). To prove either \( \psi_j \notin \bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \) or \( U \vdash \psi_j \), we distinguish the following two cases.

- **Case 1:** There is an \( i \leq k \) such that \( T^j_i \not\vdash \varphi_i \). Then \( \psi_j \notin \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T^j_i) \) because \( T^j_i + \psi_j \vdash \varphi_i \). In particular, \( \psi_j \notin \bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \).

- **Case 2:** For all \( i \leq k \), \( T^j_i \vdash \varphi_i \). Then, for all \( i \leq k \), \( \text{PA} + \neg \psi_j \vdash \varphi_i \). Hence, \( \text{PA} + \neg \psi_j \vdash \bigwedge_{i \leq k} \varphi_i \). That is, \( \text{PA} \vdash \bigvee_{i \leq k} \neg \varphi_i \vdash \neg \psi_j \). Since \( U \vdash \bigvee_{i \leq k} \neg \varphi_i \), \( U \vdash \psi_j \).

Therefore, for any \( j \in \omega \), \( \psi_j \notin \bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \) or \( U \vdash \psi_j \). That is, \( (\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) = \emptyset \).

3 \( \Rightarrow 1 \): Suppose \( \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \text{Th}_i(T_i) + U \) is consistent. Let \( T^+ := \text{PA} + \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \text{Th}_i(T_i) \). Then \( T^+ \) is a consistent r.e. extension of \( \text{PA} \). Since \( T^+ + U \vdash \text{Th}_i(T^+) + U \), \( \text{Th}_i(T^+) + U \) is also consistent. Therefore, there is a \( \psi \in \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \) for any \( i \in \omega \). For each \( i \in \omega \), let \( S_i \) be a theory and \( \varphi \) be a \( \Gamma \) sentence such that \( T_i \vdash S_i \vdash \text{PA} \) and \( S_i + \psi \vdash \varphi \). Then \( \psi \rightarrow \varphi \) is a \( \Gamma \) sentence provable in \( S_i \). Therefore, \( \text{PA} + \text{Th}_i(S_i) + \psi \vdash \varphi \). Since \( T^+ \vdash \text{PA} + \text{Th}_i(T_i) \vdash \text{PA} + \text{Th}_i(S_i) \vdash \text{PA} \), \( \text{PA} + \text{Th}_i(S_i) \vdash \psi \) by the hereditarily \( \Gamma \)-conservativity of \( \psi \). That is, \( S_i \vdash \varphi \). \( \square \)

**Remark 4.3.** Theorem 4.2 includes the case of finite sequences of theories. Let \( T_0, \ldots, T_k \) and \( U \) be a finite sequence of theories. Let \( T^*_i := T_k \) for all \( s \geq k + 1 \). Then \( \{T_i\}_{i \in \omega} \) is an r.e. sequence of theories and then the equivalence of the following conditions 1 and 2 easily follows from Theorem 4.2.

1. \( (\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset \).
2. \( \bigcup_{i \leq k} \text{Th}_i(T_i) + U \) is consistent.

This remark can be applied to other results in our paper.
Theorem 4.1 is about only finite sequences of theories. From Theorem 4.1, the investigation of the condition \( \bigcap_{i \leq k+1} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \) is reduced to that of the condition \( (\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset \). We do not know whether this reduction can be applied to r.e. sequences of theories or not. Hence, we propose the following problem.

**Problem 4.4.** For any r.e. sequence \( \{T_i\}_{i \in \omega} \) of theories, are the following conditions equivalent?

1. \( \bigcap_{i \in \omega} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).
2. For all \( i \in \omega \), \( \bigcap_{j \not= i} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_j) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).

Of course, the implication 1 \( \Rightarrow \) 2 in this problem is obvious. The condition 2 in Problem 4.4 is characterized as follows.

**Corollary 4.5.** For any r.e. sequence \( \{T_i\}_{i \in \omega} \) of theories, the following are equivalent:

1. For all \( i \in \omega \), \( \bigcap_{j \not= i} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_j) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).
2. For all \( k \in \omega \), \( \bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).
3. For all \( i \in \omega \), \( \bigcup_{j \not= i} \text{Th}(T_j) + T_i \) are consistent.

**Proof.**

1 \( \Rightarrow \) 2: Let \( k \in \omega \). Then for any \( i \leq k \), \( \bigcap_{j \not= i} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_j) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \). Therefore, \( \bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \) by Theorem 4.1.

2 \( \Rightarrow \) 3: Let \( i \in \omega \) and \( k \geq i \). Then \( \bigcap_{j \not= i} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_j) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \) by Theorem 4.1. Hence, \( \bigcup_{j \not= i} \text{Th}(T_j) + T_i \) is consistent by Theorem 4.2. Since \( k \geq i \) is arbitrary, \( \bigcup_{j \not= i} \text{Th}(T_j) + T_i \) is consistent.

3 \( \Rightarrow \) 1: By Theorem 4.2.

### 4.2 Γ-conservative sentences

In this subsection, we generalize Facts 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11. First, we generalize Fact 3.9. Since the proof is almost same as in our proof of Theorem 4.1, we omit it.

**Theorem 4.6.** For any \( k \geq 1 \), the following are equivalent:

1. \( \bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).
2. For all \( i \leq k \), \( \bigcap_{j \not= i} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_j) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).
As in the case of hereditarily $\Gamma$-conservative sentences, we do not know whether we can extend Theorem 4.6 to the case of infinite sequences of theories or not. We consider the following three conditions:

(a) $\bigcap_{i \in \omega} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset$.

(b) For all $i \in \omega$, $(\bigcap_{j \neq i} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_j)) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i) \neq \emptyset$.

(c) For all $k \in \omega$, $\bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset$.

**Problem 4.7.** Does the condition (b) imply the condition (a)?

As a corollary to Theorem 4.6, we obtain the following implications.

**Corollary 4.8.** For any r.e. sequence $\{T_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ of theories, (a) implies (b), and (b) implies (c).

**Proof.** (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): This is trivial.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c): Suppose for all $i \in \omega$, $(\bigcap_{j \neq i} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_j)) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i) \neq \emptyset$.

For $k = 0$, $\bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset$ by Fact 3.10.

For $k \geq 1$, $\bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \leq k$. Therefore, $\bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset$ by Theorem 4.6.

In subsection 4.3, we will prove in Theorem 4.19 that the implication (c) $\Rightarrow$ (b) does not hold in general. Remark that for hereditarily $\Gamma$-conservative sentences, the corresponding implication of (c) $\Rightarrow$ (b) was already proved in Corollary 4.5.

Secondly, we generalize Fact 3.10. In the case of two theories, Fact 3.10 gives two sufficient conditions “$\text{Th}(\omega)(T) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(U)$” and “$\text{Th}(T) + U$ is consistent” for $\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$. These two conditions are simply generalized to the case of r.e. sequences of theories as the conditions “$\bigcap_{i \in \omega} \text{Th}(\omega)(T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(U)$” and “$\bigcup_{i \in \omega} \text{Th}(T_i) + U$ is consistent”, respectively. Actually, we can show that each of these generalized conditions implies $(\bigcap_{i \in \omega} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, we found the following new condition which is also sufficient for $(\bigcap_{i \in \omega} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$:

**C1:** There is an r.e. set $X \subseteq \omega$ such that

$$\bigcap_{i \in X} \text{Th}(\omega)(T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}(T_i) + U).$$

Here, $\bigcap_{i \in X} \text{Th}(\omega)(T_i)$ denotes the set of all sentences. Hence, the consistency of $\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}(T_i) + U$ implies C1 because $\omega$ is r.e. Also, $\bigcap_{i \in \omega} \text{Th}(\omega)(T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(U)$ implies C1 because $\emptyset$ is r.e. Therefore, the following theorem is indeed a generalization of Fact 3.10.

**Theorem 4.9.** Let $\{T_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ be any r.e. sequence of theories. If the condition **C1** holds for $\{T_i\}_{i \in \omega}$, then $(\bigcap_{i \in \omega} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$.


Corollary 4.11. Let \( \Gamma \)-conservativity of \( \psi \) 

\[
\neg k \supseteq \text{Proposition 4.10. Let } \Gamma \text{ be a theory.}
\]

\[
\text{Proof. Suppose } \varphi \in \bigcap_{i \in \omega \setminus X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^d}(T_i) \text{ and } \bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^d}(T_i) + U \not\models \varphi. \text{ Let } X' := \{ i \in \omega : T_i \not\models \varphi \}. \text{ Then } X' \text{ is a } \Pi_1 \text{ set because } \{ T_i \}_{i \in \omega} \text{ is an r.e. sequence. Obviously } \varphi \in \bigcap_{i \in \omega \setminus X'} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^d}(T_i). \text{ If } i \notin X, \text{ then } T_i \models \varphi, \text{ and hence } i \notin X'. \text{ This means } X' \subseteq X, \text{ and thus } \bigcup_{i \in X'} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^d}(T_i) + U \text{ is a subtheory of } \bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^d}(T_i) + U. \text{ Therefore } \bigcup_{i \in X'} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^d}(T_i) + U \not\models \varphi. \text{ We conclude } \bigcap_{i \in \omega \setminus X'} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^d}(T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^d}(T_i) + U). \]

Related to this matter, we have the following corollary. Recall that for each \( k \in \omega, I_k = \{ 0, \ldots, k \}. \)

Corollary 4.11. Let \( \{ T_i \}_{i \in \omega} \text{ be an r.e. sequence of theories and } U \text{ be a theory. If there exists a set } X \subseteq \omega \text{ such that } \bigcap_{i \in \omega \setminus X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^d}(T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^d}(T_i) + U), \text{ then for all } k \in \omega, (\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset. \)
Proof. Suppose that $\bigcap_{i \in \omega \setminus X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^\omega}(T_i) \subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}(T_i) + U)$ for some $X \subseteq \omega$. We fix a $k \in \omega$ and let $X' := X \cap I_k$. Then $\bigcap_{i \in I_k \setminus X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^\omega}(T_i) \subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}(T_i) + U)$. Therefore, $\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$ by Theorem 4.9.

At last, we generalize Fact 3.11 to the case of finite sequences of theories.

**Theorem 4.12.** Let $k \in \omega$ and let $T_0, \ldots, T_k$ and $U$ be theories. Then the following are equivalent:

1. $\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$.

2. There is an $X \subseteq I_k$ such that $\bigcap_{i \in I_k \setminus X} \text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T_i) \subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T_i) + U)$.

**Proof.** 2 $\Rightarrow$ 1: Since every finite set is r.e., this follows from Theorem 4.9.

1 $\Rightarrow$ 2: Suppose $\bigcap_{i \in I_k \setminus X} \text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T_i) \subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T_i) + U)$ for all $X \subseteq I_k$. Let $\psi \in \bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, T_i)$ and let $\beta(x)$ be a $\Pi_{n-1}$ formula such that $\neg \psi$ is equivalent to $\exists x \beta(x)$. It is sufficient to show $U \not\vdash \psi$. For this, we show the following two claims.

**Claim 1.** Let $m \leq k$. For all $t \leq m$ and all distinct natural numbers $i_0, \ldots, i_t$ in $I_k$, there exist $\Sigma_n$ sentences $\varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_t)}$ satisfying the following conditions:

(i) For any $t \leq m$ and any distinct natural numbers $i_0, \ldots, i_t$ in $I_k$, $T_{i_t} \vdash \varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_t)}$.

(ii) For any $t \leq m$ and any distinct natural numbers $i_0, \ldots, i_{t-1}$ in $I_k$, let $\{j_0, \ldots, j_{k-t}\} := I_k \setminus \{i_0, \ldots, i_{t-1}\}$. Then, $U \vdash \bigwedge_{u \leq t} \neg \theta_{(i_0, \ldots, i_u)}(\varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_{t-1}, j_u)}) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{u < t} \neg \theta_{(i_0, \ldots, i_u)}(\varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_{t-1}, j_u)})$.

Where, for each $u \leq m$ and distinct natural numbers $i_0, \ldots, i_u$ in $I_k$,

- $\alpha_{(i_0, \ldots, i_u)}(x)$ is a $\Pi_{n-1}$ formula such that $\varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_u)} \equiv \exists x \varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_u)}(x)$.
- $\theta_{(i_0, \ldots, i_u)} := \exists x (\alpha_{(i_0, \ldots, i_u)}(x) \land \forall y \leq x \neg \beta(x))$.
- $\theta_{(i_0, \ldots, i_u)}^* := \exists y (\beta(y) \land \forall x < y \neg \alpha_{(i_0, \ldots, i_u)}(x))$.

**Proof.** By induction on $m$.

For $m = 0$. By our supposition with $X = I_k$, we obtain $\bigcap_{i \in I_k} \text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T_i) \subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in I_k} \text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T_i) + U)$. That is, $\bigcup_{i \in I_k} \text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T_i) + U$ is inconsistent. Hence, there are $\Sigma_n$ sentences $\varphi_{(0)}, \ldots, \varphi_{(k)}$ such that $T_j \vdash \varphi_{(j)}$ for any $j \in I_k = \{j_0, \ldots, j_k\}$ and $U \vdash \neg \bigwedge_{s < k} \varphi_{j_s}$. Then (i) holds. Since $U \vdash \bigwedge_{s < k} \varphi_{j_s} \rightarrow \bot$, (ii) also holds.

Assume that the claim holds for $m$. For any $t \leq m$ and any distinct natural numbers $i_0, \ldots, i_t$ in $I_k$, we take $\Sigma_n$ sentences $\varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_t)}$ satisfying two conditions stated in the claim for $m$. Let $i_0, \ldots, i_m$ be any distinct natural numbers in $I_k$. For any $t \leq m$, we show that $T_{i_t} \vdash \neg \theta^*_{(i_0, \ldots, i_t)}$ whenever $T_{i_t} \vdash \varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_t)}$. Assume $T_{i_t} \vdash \varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_t)}$. Then $T_{i_t} + \psi \vdash \theta_{(i_0, \ldots, i_t)}$ by the choice of $\theta_{(i_0, \ldots, i_t)}$. Since $\theta_{(i_0, \ldots, i_t)}$
is a $\Sigma_n$ sentence and $\psi \in \text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, T_{i_0})$, we obtain $T_{i_0} \vdash \theta_{(i_0, \ldots, i_1)}$. Therefore, by Fact 2.2 (i), $T_{i_1} \vdash -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_1)$. Thus, $T_{i_1} \vdash -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_1)$ for any $t \leq m$ by induction hypothesis with (i). Thus $T_i \vdash \bigvee_{t \leq m} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_t)$ for any $s \leq m$.

Let $\{i_0, \ldots, i_{k-1}\} := I_k \setminus \{i_0, \ldots, i_m\}$. Again by our supposition with $X = \{i_0, \ldots, i_{k-1}\}$, we obtain $\bigcap_{s \leq m} \text{Th}_{T_i}(T_i) \subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{s \leq k-1} \text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T_{j_s}) + U)$. Hence, $\bigcup_{s \leq k-1} \text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T_{j_s}) + U \vdash \bigvee_{t \leq m} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_t)$. That is, for each $s \leq k - m - 1$, there is a $\Sigma_n$ sentence $\varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-s}, j_s)}$ such that $T_{j_s} \vdash \varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-s}, j_s)}$ and $U \vdash \bigwedge_{0 \leq s \leq k-m} \varphi(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-s}, j_s) \rightarrow \bigvee_{t \leq m} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_t)$. This shows (i) and (ii) for $m + 1$.

Next, we prove the following claim.

**Claim 2.** Let $m \leq k$ and $i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m}$ be any distinct natural numbers in $I_k$. Then,

$$U + \neg \psi \vdash \bigvee_{t \leq k-m} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_t).$$

**Proof.** We prove the claim by induction on $m$.

Assume $m = 0$. For any $t \leq k$, $T_{i_0} \vdash \varphi^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_t)$ by Claim 1.(i). Therefore, by the same argument as in proof of Claim 1, we obtain $T_{i_0} \vdash -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_t)$. Then $T_{i_0} \vdash \bigvee_{t \leq k} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_t)$ for any $i \in I_k$. By our supposition with $X = \emptyset$, we obtain $\bigcap_{i \in I_k} \text{Th}_{T_{i_0}}(T_{i_0}) \subseteq \text{Th}(U)$. Then, $U \vdash \bigvee_{t \leq k} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_t)$. In particular, $U + \neg \psi \vdash \bigvee_{t \leq k} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_t)$.

Assume the claim holds for $m$. Let $\{i_0, \ldots, i_{m}\} = I_k \setminus \{i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m}\}$. By induction hypothesis, for each $s \leq m$, $U + \neg \psi \vdash \bigvee_{t \leq k-m-1} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m-1}; j_s)$. Since $\text{PA} + \neg \psi \vdash \theta_{(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m-1}; j_s)} \lor \theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m-1}; j_s)$ and $\text{PA} \vdash \theta_{(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m-1}; j_s)} \rightarrow \varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m-1}; j_s)}$ for each $s \leq m$, $U + \neg \psi \vdash \bigvee_{t \leq k-m-1} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m}, j_s)$. Also, $U \vdash \bigwedge_{s \leq m} \varphi_{(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m}, j_s)} \rightarrow \bigvee_{t \leq k-m-1} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m})$ by Claim 1.(ii). Therefore, $U + \neg \psi \vdash \bigvee_{t \leq k-m-1} -\theta^*_T(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-m})$.

For any $i \leq k$, $U + \neg \psi \vdash -\theta^*_T(i)$ by Claim 2 with $m = k$. Since $\text{PA} + \neg \psi \vdash \theta_{(i)} \lor \theta^*_T(i)$ and $\text{PA} \vdash \theta_{(i)} \rightarrow \varphi_{(i)}$, $U + \neg \psi \vdash \varphi_{(i)}$. Hence, $U + \neg \psi \vdash \bigwedge_{1 \leq k} \varphi_{(i)}$. By Claim 1.(ii), $U + \neg \psi \vdash \bot$. That is, $U \vdash \psi$.

We close this subsection with a open problem concerning implications between conditions concerning infinite r.e. sequences of theories. We have dealt with the following four conditions:

(I) There exists an r.e. set $X \subseteq \omega$ such that $\bigcap_{i \in \omega \setminus X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^*}(T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^*}(T_i)) + U$.

(II) There exists a set $X \subseteq \omega$ such that $\bigcap_{i \in \omega \setminus X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^*}(T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}_{\Gamma^*}(T_i)) + U$.

(III) $\bigcap_{i \in \omega} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \not= \emptyset$.
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(IV) For all $k \in \omega$, $(\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$.

Then, for any r.e. sequence $\{T_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ of theories, we have the following implications:

$$
\begin{align*}
(I) & \Rightarrow (II) \quad \text{(I)} \Rightarrow (III) \quad \text{Theorem 4.9} \\
(II) & \Rightarrow (IV) \quad (II) \Rightarrow (IV) \text{ is Corollary 4.11} \\
(III) & \Rightarrow (IV) \quad (III) \Rightarrow (IV) \text{ is Corollary 4.11}
\end{align*}
$$

In Subsection 4.3, we will prove that both of the implications $(II) \Rightarrow (I)$, and $(IV) \Rightarrow (III)$ do not hold (Corollaries 4.20 and 4.24). Remark that for hereditarily $\Gamma$-conservative sentences, the corresponding implication of $(IV) \Rightarrow (III)$ was already proved in Theorem 4.9. For $\Gamma = \Pi_n$, Fact 3.12 gives a counterexample of the implication $(III) \Rightarrow (II)$. Therefore, for $\Gamma = \Pi_n$, both of the implications $(III) \Rightarrow (I)$, and $(IV) \Rightarrow (II)$ also do not hold. We do not know whether the other implications hold or not.

**Problem 4.13.** Does the implication $(II) \Rightarrow (III)$ hold? Also, for $\Gamma = \Sigma_n$, does each of the implications $(III) \Rightarrow (I)$, $(III) \Rightarrow (II)$ and $(IV) \Rightarrow (II)$ hold?

Notice that the implication $(II) \Rightarrow (III)$ is a strengthening of Theorem 4.9 and Corollary 4.11. For $\Gamma = \Sigma_n$, the implications $(III) \Rightarrow (I)$ and $(III) \Rightarrow (II)$ are generalizations of Theorem 4.12 to the case of infinite r.e. sequences of theories.

### 4.3 Counterexamples

In this section, we give counterexamples of several implications.

As we have already mentioned, we proved in Theorem 4.11 that the investigation of the condition “$\bigcap_{i \leq k+1} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset$” is reduced to that of the condition “$(\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$”. Then we may expect that it can be reduced to that of some simple conditions such as “$\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U)$”. However this is not the case.

**Theorem 4.14.** For any $k \geq 1$, there are theories $T_0, \ldots, T_{k+1}$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\bigcap_{i \leq k+1} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) = \emptyset$.

2. For all distinct $i_0, i_1 \leq k + 1$, $(\bigcap_{j \neq i_0, i_1} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_j)) \setminus \text{Th}(T_{i_1}) \neq \emptyset$.

**Proof.** It suffices to find theories $T_0, \ldots, T_{k+1}$ satisfying the following two conditions:

(i) $\bigcup_{i \leq k} \text{Th}_F(T_i) + T_{k+1}$ is inconsistent.
This is because (i) implies that $\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_{k+1}) = \emptyset$ by Theorem 4.2. Therefore, $\bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) = \emptyset$ by Theorem 4.1. Moreover, (ii) implies that for all distinct $i_0, i_1 \leq k+1$, $\bigcup_{j \neq i_0, i_1} \text{Th}(T_j) + T_{k+1}$ is consistent. Therefore, for all distinct $i_0, i_1 \leq k+1$, $\left( \bigcap_{j \neq i_0, i_1} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_j) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i) \neq \emptyset$ by Theorem 4.2.

Let $\xi(x)$ be a $\Gamma$ formula such that for any infinite binary sequence $\{i_j\}_{j \in \omega}$, $\text{PA} + \{\xi(j)^i : j \in \omega\}$ is consistent. Let $T_{k+1} := \text{PA} = \bigcup_{i \leq k} \neg \xi(i)$ and for each $i \leq k$, let $T_i := \text{PA} + \xi(i)$. Then $\bigcup_{i \leq k} \text{Th}(T_i) + T_{k+1}$ is obviously inconsistent. Moreover, for $i \leq k$, $\bigcup_{j \neq i} T_j$ is deductively equivalent to $\text{PA} + \bigwedge_{j \neq i} \xi(j) + \neg \xi(i)$. Hence, $\bigcup_{j \neq i} T_j$ is consistent by the choice of $\xi(x)$. For $i = k+1$, $\bigcup_{j \neq i} T_j$ is deductively equivalent to $\text{PA} + \bigwedge_{j \neq k+1} \xi(j)$. Hence, $\bigcup_{j \neq k+1} T_j$ is also consistent by the choice of $\xi(x)$. Therefore, for any $i \leq k+1$, $\bigcup_{j \neq k+1} T_j$ is consistent. $\square$

Moreover, from the proof of Theorem 4.14 we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.15.** For any $k \geq 1$, there are theories $T_0, \ldots, T_k$ and $T_{k+1}$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\left( \bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_i) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_{k+1}) = \emptyset$.

2. For all $i \leq k$, $\left( \bigcap_{j \neq i} \text{HCons}(\Gamma, T_j) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_{k+1}) \neq \emptyset$.

For $\Gamma$-conservative sentences, we can prove a similar result to Theorem 4.14 only for $k = 1$ and $\Gamma = \Sigma_n$.

**Theorem 4.16.** There are theories $T_0, T_1$ and $T_2$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\bigcap_{i \leq 2} (\text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) = \emptyset$.

2. For any distinct $i, j \leq 2$, $\text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, T_j) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i) \neq \emptyset$.

**Proof.** First we prove that it is sufficient to show that there are theories $T_0, T_1$ and $T_2$ satisfying the following three conditions:

(i) $\bigcap_{i \leq 1} \text{Th}(T_i) \subseteq \text{Th}(T_2)$.

(ii) For any $i \leq 1$, $\text{Th}(\Sigma_n, T_i) + T_2$ is inconsistent.

(iii) For any distinct $i, j \leq 2$, $\text{Th}(\Sigma_n, T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(T_j)$. 
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Therefore, such that

\[ S_{\text{minimality of conditions:}} \]

Corollary 4.17. There are theories \( T_0, T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) such that

\[ \Pi \vdash \neg \psi \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi \vdash \theta \cdot \Psi \]

Also, by the proof of Theorem 4.16, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 4.17. There are theories \( T_0, T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) satisfying the following conditions:
1. \((\bigcap_{i \leq 1} \text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(T_2) = \emptyset\).

2. For all \(i \leq 1\), \(\text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, T_j) \setminus \text{Th}(T_2) \neq \emptyset\).

We reconsider the following conditions introduced in Subsection 4.2.

(a) \(\bigcap_{i \in \omega} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset\).

(b) For all \(i \in \omega\), \(\bigcap_{j \neq i} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_j)) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i) \neq \emptyset\).

(c) For all \(k \in \omega\), \(\bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset\).

Here we prove that the implication (c) \(\Rightarrow\) (b) does not hold. To prove this, we prepare the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.18.** Let \(T\) be any theory which is not \(\Sigma_1\)-sound. Then there exists a \(\Gamma\) sentence \(\psi\) satisfying the following conditions:

1. \(\psi\) is not provably equivalent to any \(\Gamma\) sentence in \(T\).

2. \(\psi\) is not \(\Gamma\)-conservative over \(T\).

*Proof.* Let \(\theta\) be a \(\Pi_1\) Rosser sentence of \(T\). Then \(T \not\vdash \theta\) and \(T \not\vdash \neg \theta\).

For \(\Gamma = \Sigma_n\), let \(\xi :\equiv \neg \theta\). Then \(\xi\) is not \(\Pi_1\)-conservative over \(T\) (See Lindström [5] Exercise 5.1).

For \(\Gamma = \Pi_n\), let \(\xi :\equiv \theta\). Since \(T\) is not \(\Sigma_1\)-sound, \(\xi\) is not \(\Sigma_1\)-conservative over \(T\) (See Lindström [5] Exercise 5.2.(b)).

Let \(\gamma\) be a \(\Gamma\) sentence which is not provably equivalent to any \(\Gamma\) sentence in \(T + \xi\) (See Lindström [5] Corollary 2.6). Then \(\psi :\equiv \xi \land \gamma\) is a \(\Gamma\) sentence satisfying the required conditions. \(\square\)

**Theorem 4.19.** There exists an r.e. sequence \(\{T_i\}_{i \in \omega}\) of theories satisfying the following two conditions:

1. For all \(k \in \omega\), \(\bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset\).

2. \(\left(\bigcap_{i \neq 0} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i)\right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_0) = \emptyset\).

*Proof.* Let \(T\) be a theory which is not \(\Sigma_1\)-sound. Let \(\{\varphi_i\}_{i \geq 1}\) be any effective sequence of all \(\Gamma\) sentences with \(T \vdash \varphi_1\). By Lemma 4.18, there exists a \(\Gamma\) sentence \(\psi\) such that \(\psi\) is not \(T\)-provably equivalent to any \(\Gamma\) sentence and \(\psi\) is not \(\Gamma\)-conservative over \(T\). Then there exists a \(\Gamma\) sentence \(\xi\) such that \(T + \psi \vdash \xi\) and \(T \not\vdash \xi\). Also \(T \not\vdash \psi\) and \(T \not\vdash \neg \psi\) because \(\psi\) is \(T\)-equivalent to neither \(0 = 0\) nor \(0 \neq 0\).

Let \(D_k := \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}\). First, we recursively define an increasing sequence \(\{X_k\}_{k \geq 1}\) of finite sets of natural numbers satisfying the following three conditions for any \(k \geq 1\):

1. \(X_k \subseteq D_k\).
2. \( T \not\vdash \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \).

3. \( T \vdash \bigvee_{j \in D_k \setminus X_k} \neg \varphi_j \rightarrow \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \).

For \( k = 1 \), let \( X_1 = \emptyset \). Then \( \bigvee_{j \in X_1} \varphi_j \equiv \bot \). Since \( T \not\vdash \xi \), we have \( T \not\vdash \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_1} \varphi_j \). Since \( T \vdash \varphi_1 \), we also have \( T \vdash \bigvee_{j \in D_1 \setminus X_1} \neg \varphi_j \rightarrow \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_1} \varphi_j \).

Suppose \( X_k \) is already defined. We distinguish the following two cases.

- Case 1: \( T \vdash \varphi_{k+1} \lor \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \). In this case, let \( X_{k+1} = X_k \). Since \( T \not\vdash \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \), we obtain \( T \not\vdash \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_{k+1}} \varphi_j \).

From Clause 3 for \( X_k \), \( T \vdash \bigvee_{j \in D_k \setminus X_k} \neg \varphi_j \rightarrow \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \). In this case, \( T \vdash \neg \varphi_{k+1} \rightarrow \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \). Since \( j \in D_{k+1} \setminus X_{k+1} \) if and only if \( j \in D_k \setminus X_k \) and \( j = k + 1 \), we obtain \( T \vdash \bigvee_{j \in D_{k+1} \setminus X_{k+1}} \neg \varphi_j \rightarrow \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \).

Therefore, \( T \vdash \bigvee_{j \in D_{k+1} \setminus X_{k+1}} \neg \varphi_j \rightarrow \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_{k+1}} \varphi_j \).

- Case 2: \( T \not\vdash \varphi_{k+1} \lor \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \). In this case, let \( X_{k+1} = X_k \cup \{ k + 1 \} \). Then \( T \not\vdash \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_{k+1}} \varphi_j \).

From Clause 3 for \( X_k \), \( T \vdash \bigvee_{j \in D_k \setminus X_k} \neg \varphi_j \rightarrow \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \). Since \( D_{k+1} \setminus X_{k+1} = D_k \setminus X_k \), we obtain \( T \vdash \bigvee_{j \in D_{k+1} \setminus X_{k+1}} \neg \varphi_j \rightarrow \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_{k+1}} \varphi_j \).

The definition is completed. Let \( T_0 := T + \neg \psi \) and for \( i \geq 1 \), \( T_i := T + \neg \varphi_i \lor \psi \). Since \( T \not\vdash \psi \) and \( T \not\vdash \neg \psi \), these theories are consistent.

We prove that the sequence \( \{ T_i \}_{i \in \omega} \) of theories satisfies two conditions stated in the theorem.

1. Fix any \( k \). We prove that for any \( i \leq k \), \( \left( \bigcap_{j \neq i} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_j) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i) \neq \emptyset \).

   For \( i = 0 \), let \( \theta_k \) be the \( \Gamma^d \) sentence \( \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \). Then we have \( T \vdash \bigvee_{j \in D_k \setminus X_k} \neg \varphi_j \rightarrow \theta_k \). Since \( T + \psi \vdash \xi \), we obtain \( T + \psi \vdash \theta_k \). Therefore \( T_j \vdash \theta_k \) for all \( j \in D_k \setminus X_k \). This means \( \theta_k \in \bigcap_{j \in D_k \setminus X_k} \text{Th}^d(T_j) \).

   Suppose \( \bigcup_{j \in X_k} \text{Th}^d(T_j) + T_0 \vdash \theta_k \). That is,

\[
T + \bigwedge_{j \in X_k} (\neg \varphi_j \lor \psi) + \neg \psi \vdash \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j.
\]

Then

\[
T + \bigwedge_{j \in X_k} \neg \varphi_j + \neg \psi + \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j.
\]

Since \( T + \neg \bigwedge_{j \in X_k} \neg \varphi_j \vdash \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \) and \( T + \psi \vdash \xi \), we obtain \( T \vdash \xi \lor \bigvee_{j \in X_k} \varphi_j \).

This is a contradiction. Therefore \( \theta_k \notin \text{Th}(\bigcup_{j \in X_k} \text{Th}^d(T_j) + T_0) \).

Thus \( \theta_k \) witnesses the non-inclusion \( \bigcap_{j \in D_k \setminus X_k} \text{Th}^d(T_j) \nsubseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{j \in X_k} \text{Th}^d(T_j) + T_0) \). By Theorem 4.9, we conclude

\[
\left( \bigcap_{\substack{j \neq 0 \\ j \leq k}} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_j) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_0) \neq \emptyset.
\]

(1)
For \( i \neq 0 \), suppose that the theory \( \bigcup_{j \neq i} \text{Th}_T(T_j) + T_i \) is inconsistent. Then \( \text{Th}_T(T_0) + \bigcup_{j \neq 0} T_j \) is inconsistent. Notice that for each \( j \geq 1 \), the theory \( T_j = T + \neg \varphi_j \lor \psi \) is a subtheory of \( T + \psi \). Hence \( T + \text{Th}_T(T + \neg \psi) + \psi \) is inconsistent. Then there exists a \( \Gamma \) sentence \( \gamma \) such that \( T + \neg \psi \vdash \gamma \) and \( T + \gamma + \psi \) is inconsistent. Then we obtain \( T \vdash \psi \iff \neg \gamma \). This is a contradiction because \( \neg \gamma \) is a \( \Gamma^d \) sentence. Therefore \( \bigcup_{j \neq i} \text{Th}_T(T_j) + T_i \) is consistent. We obtain \( \left( \bigcap_{j \neq i} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_j) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i) \neq \emptyset \) by Theorem 4.9. By combining this with [1], we conclude

\[
\text{for any } i \leq k, \quad \left( \bigcap_{j \neq i, j \leq k} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_j) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i) \neq \emptyset.
\]

By Theorem 4.6, this is equivalent to \( \bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).

2. It suffices to prove that for any \( i \geq 1 \), either \( \varphi_i \notin \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \) or \( T_0 \vdash \varphi_i \).

It is easy to show \( T_i + \varphi_i \vdash \psi \). If \( T_i \nvdash \psi \), then \( \varphi_i \notin \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \) because \( \psi \) is a \( \Gamma \) sentence. If \( T_i \vdash \psi \), then \( T + \neg \varphi_i \lor \psi \vdash \psi \). Thus \( T \vdash \neg \varphi_i \rightarrow \psi \). Hence \( T_0 \vdash \varphi_i \).

Since \( \bigcap_{i \in \omega} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \) obviously implies \( \left( \bigcap_{i \neq 0} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \right) \setminus \text{Th}(T_0) \neq \emptyset \), we obtain the following corollary by Theorem 4.19. This is a counterexample of the implication \((c) \Rightarrow (a)\).

**Corollary 4.20.** There exists an r.e. sequence \( \{T_i\}_{i \in \omega} \) of theories satisfying the following two conditions:

1. For all \( k \in \omega \), \( \bigcap_{i \leq k} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) \neq \emptyset \).
2. \( \bigcap_{i \in \omega} (\text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i) \setminus \text{Th}(T_i)) = \emptyset \).

We also reconsider the following conditions introduced in Subsection 4.2.

(I) There exists an r.e. set \( X \subseteq \omega \) such that \( \bigcap_{i \in \omega \setminus X} \text{Th}_T(T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}_T(T_i) + U) \).

(II) There exists a set \( X \subseteq \omega \) such that \( \bigcap_{i \in \omega \setminus X} \text{Th}_T(T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in X} \text{Th}_T(T_i) + U) \).

(III) \( (\bigcap_{i \in \omega} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset \).

(IV) For all \( k \in \omega \), \( (\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset \).

We obtain a counterexample of the implication \((IV) \Rightarrow (III)\) from the proof of Theorem 4.19.
Corollary 4.21. There exist an r.e. sequence \( \{ T_i \}_{i \in \omega} \) of theories and a theory \( U \) satisfying the following two conditions:

1. For all \( k \in \omega \), \( (\bigcap_{i \neq 0} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(T_0) \neq \emptyset \).

2. \( (\bigcap_{i \in \omega} \text{Cons}(\Gamma, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(T_0) = \emptyset \).

For our construction of a counterexample of the implication (II) \( \Rightarrow \) (I), we use the following fact.

Fact 4.22 (Guaspari [2]). For any r.e. set \( X \subseteq \omega \), there exists a \( \Gamma \) formula \( \delta(x) \) satisfying the following conditions for any \( i \in \omega \):

1. If \( i \in X \), then \( T \vdash \delta(i) \).

2. If \( i \notin X \), then \( \neg \delta(i) \) is \( \Gamma \)-conservative over \( T \).

Theorem 4.23. For any \( \Pi_1 \) set \( X \subseteq \omega \), there exist an r.e. sequence \( \{ T_i \}_{i \in \omega} \) of theories and a theory \( U \) such that for any \( Y \subseteq \omega \), \( \bigcap_{i \in \omega \setminus Y} \text{Th}(T_i) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(\bigcup_{i \in Y} \text{Th}(T_i) + U) \) if and only if \( Y = X \).

Proof. Let \( X \) be any \( \Pi_1 \) set. Let \( T \) be some theory which is not \( \Sigma_1 \)-sound. By Lemma 1.18 there exist a \( \Gamma \) sentence \( \psi \) and a \( \Gamma_d \) sentence \( \xi \) such that \( T \nvdash \psi \), \( T \nvdash \neg \psi \), \( T + \psi \vdash \xi \) and \( T \nvdash \xi \). Since \( \omega \setminus X \) is an r.e. set, by Fact 4.22 there exists a \( \Gamma_d \) formula \( \delta(x) \) satisfying the following conditions for any \( i \in \omega \):

1. If \( i \notin X \), then \( T + \neg \psi \vdash \delta(i) \).

2. If \( i \in X \), then \( \neg \delta(i) \) is \( \Gamma_d \)-conservative over \( T + \neg \psi \).

Let \( T_i := T + \neg \delta(i) \lor \psi \) for \( i \in \omega \) and \( U := T + \neg \psi \).

Claim 1. The sequence \( \{ T_i \}_{i \in \omega} \) of theories satisfies the following conditions for any \( i \in \omega \):

(i) If \( i \notin X \), then \( T_i \) is deductively equivalent to \( T + \psi \).

(ii) If \( i \in X \), then \( \text{Th}(T_i) \subseteq \text{Th}(T) \).

Proof. (i). Suppose \( i \notin X \). Then \( T + \neg \psi \vdash \delta(i) \). Thus \( T \vdash (\neg \delta(i) \lor \psi) \leftrightarrow \psi \). This means \( T_i = T + \neg \delta(i) \lor \psi \) is deductively equivalent to \( T + \psi \).

(ii). Suppose \( i \in X \). Then \( \neg \delta(i) \) is \( \Gamma_d \)-conservative over \( T + \neg \psi \). For any \( \Gamma_d \) sentence \( \varphi \), suppose \( T_i \vdash \varphi \). Then \( T + \neg \delta(i) \lor \psi \vdash \varphi \), and hence \( T + \neg \delta(i) \lor \psi \vdash \varphi \) and \( T + \psi \vdash \varphi \). We have \( T + \neg \psi + \neg \delta(i) \lor \varphi \). By the \( \Gamma_d \)-conservativity of \( \neg \delta(i) \lor \varphi \), \( T + \neg \psi \vdash \varphi \). Hence \( T \vdash \varphi \).
We conclude Corollary 4.24. Since 
\[ T \] satisfies the following two conditions:

\[ U \]

Proof. Let \( X \) be any set such that \( \forall \in X \), then \( T \vdash \xi \). Then \( \xi \in \bigcap_{\in \omega \setminus X} T_{\Gamma^{\omega}}(T_i) \).

Suppose, towards a contradiction, that the theory \( \bigcup_{\in X} T_i(T_i) + U \) proves \( \xi \). Then there are \( i_0, \ldots, i_{k-1} \in X \) such that \( T + \wedge_{l<k}(\neg \delta(i_l) \lor \psi) + \neg \psi \vdash \xi \). Thus \( T + \wedge_{l<k}(\neg \delta(i_l)) + \neg \psi \vdash \xi \). This is equivalent to \( T + \neg \psi + \bigvee_{0<l<k} \delta(i_l) \lor \xi \). Since \( \neg \delta(i_0) \) is \( \Gamma^d \)-conservative over \( \Gamma + \neg \psi \) and \( \bigvee_{0<l<k} \delta(i_l) \lor \xi \) is a \( \Gamma^d \) sentence, \( T + \wedge_{0<l<k} \neg \delta(i_l) + \neg \psi \vdash \xi \). By repeating this argument, we obtain \( T + \neg \psi \vdash \xi \).

Next, we prove that if \( Y \neq X \), then \( \bigcap_{\in Y \setminus X} T_i(T_i) \subseteq \bigcap_{\in X \setminus Y} T_i(T_i) + U \). Let \( Y \subseteq \omega \) such that \( Y \neq X \). We distinguish the following two cases.

- Case 1: \( Y \not\subseteq X \). Let \( j \in Y \) and \( j \not\in X \). Then by Claim 1.(i), \( T_j \) is deductively equivalent to \( T + \psi \). Thus \( \psi \in T_i(T_j) \). Since \( U = T + \neg \psi \), \( \bigcup_{\in Y} T_i(T_i) + U \) is inconsistent. Therefore the inclusion \( \bigcap_{\in Y \setminus X} T_i(T_i) \subseteq \bigcap_{\in X \setminus Y} T_i(T_i) + U \) trivially holds.

- Case 2: \( X \not\subseteq Y \). Let \( j \in X \) and \( j \not\in Y \). Let \( \varphi \) be any \( \Gamma^d \) sentence with \( \varphi \in \bigcap_{\in Y \setminus X} T_i(T_i) \). Then \( T_j \vdash \varphi \). By Claim 1.(ii), \( T_{\Gamma^{\omega}}(T_i) \subseteq \bigcap_{\in Y \setminus X} T_i(T_i) + U \). Since \( U \) is an extension of \( T \), \( T_{\Gamma^{\omega}}(T_i) \) also proves \( \varphi \). This shows \( \bigcap_{\in Y \setminus X} T_i(T_i) \subseteq \bigcap_{\in X \setminus Y} T_i(T_i) + U \).

Therefore, \( \{ T_i \}_{i \in \omega} \) and \( U \) satisfy the required conditions.

By Theorem 4.23, we obtain a counterexample of the implication (II) \( \Rightarrow \) (I).

Corollary 4.24. There exist an r.e. sequence \( \{ T_i \}_{i \in \omega} \) of theories and a theory \( U \) satisfying the following two conditions:

1. There exists a set \( X \subseteq \omega \) such that \( \bigcap_{\in \omega \setminus X} T_{\Gamma^{\omega}}(T_i) \not\subseteq \bigcap_{\in X} T_i(T_i) + U \).

2. There is no r.e. set \( X \subseteq \omega \) such that \( \bigcap_{\in \omega \setminus X} T_i(T_i) \not\subseteq \bigcap_{\in X} T_i(T_i) + U \).

Proof. Let \( X \subseteq \omega \) be a \( \Pi_1 \) set which is not r.e. Let \( \{ T_i \}_{i \in \omega} \) be an r.e. sequence of theories as in Theorem 4.23 for this \( X \). Then, \( \bigcap_{\in \omega \setminus X} T_{\Gamma^{\omega}}(T_i) \not\subseteq \bigcap_{\in X} T_i(T_i) + U \). Furthermore, for any r.e. set \( Y \), \( \bigcap_{\in Y \setminus X} T_{\Gamma^{\omega}}(T_i) \subseteq \bigcap_{\in X \setminus Y} T_i(T_i) + U \) because \( Y \neq X \).

5 \( \Pi_n \)-conservative sentences for two theories

Let \( T_0 := PA + Con_{PA} \) and \( T_1 := PA + \neg Con_{PA} \), where \( Con_{PA} := \neg Pr_{PA}(\forall 0 = 1) \) is the consistency statement of \( PA \). Then it is easy to see that \( Th_{\Sigma_1}(T_0) \subseteq \bigcap_{\in \omega \setminus X} T_{\Gamma^{\omega}}(T_i) \not\subseteq \bigcap_{\in X} T_i(T_i) + U \).
Th(T₁) and Th_{Π₁}(T₀) + T₁ is inconsistent. Thus Bennet’s Theorem [3,10] cannot determine whether Cons(Π₁, T₀) \ Th(T₁) \neq ∅ or not. In this section, we give a new condition which is sufficient to show Cons(Π₀, T) \ Th(U) \neq ∅. Then as a corollary to our result, we obtain Cons(Π₁, T₀) \ Th(T₁) \neq ∅.

We prepare some definitions.

**Definition 5.1.** Let T and U be any theories. A formula P(x) is said to be a Γ semi-provability predicate of U in T if P(x) is a Γ formula and for any sentence ϕ, if U ⊬ ϕ, then T ⊨ P(⌜⌜ϕ⌝⌝).

**Definition 5.2.** For any theory T and any formula P(x), let Rfnₚ(Γ) := {P(⌜⌜ϕ⌝⌝) → ϕ : ϕ is a Γ sentence}. This set is called the Γ reflection principle of P.

We found the following new condition which is sufficient for Cons(Π₀, T) \ Th(U) \neq ∅:

**C2 :** There is a Σₙ semi-provability predicate P(x) of U in T such that T ⊨ Rfnₚ(Πₙ).

First, we prove that the condition C₂ is actually sufficient for Cons(Π₀, T) \ Th(U) \neq ∅.

**Theorem 5.3.** If theories T and U satisfy the condition C₂, then Cons(Π₀, T) \ Th(U) \neq ∅.

**Proof.** Let P(x) be a Σₙ semi-provability predicate of U in T such that T ⊨ Rfnₚ(Πₙ). Let σ ∈ Cons(Π₀, T) \ Th(T). Since T \vdash σ, there is a model M of T such that M \models σ. Also let U₊ := U + Th_{Σₙ}(M). We show U₊ is consistent. Suppose U₊ is inconsistent. Then, there is a Σₙ sentence ψ such that U ⊬ ¬ψ and M \models ψ. Then T ⊨ P(⌜⌜¬ψ⌝⌝). Since ¬ψ is a Πₙ sentence, T ⊨ P(⌜⌜¬ψ⌝⌝) → ¬ψ by T ⊨ Rfnₚ(Πₙ). Therefore T ⊨ ¬ψ. Since M is a model of T, ¬ψ is true in M, a contradiction.

We may assume that σ \equiv ∃xδ(x) and P(x) \equiv ∃yPrf(x, y) for some Πₙ \minus 1 formulas δ(x) and Prf(x, y). Let ϕ be a Σₙ sentence satisfying

\[ PA \vdash \varphi \iff \exists x(δ(x) \land \forall y x \leq y \Prf(⌜⌜¬\varphi^*⌝⌝, y)), \]

where \( \varphi^* \equiv \exists y(\Prf(⌜⌜¬\varphi^*⌝⌝, y) \land \forall x < y \varphi(x)) \). We prove that ϕ \in Cons(Π₀, T) \ Th(U).

First, we prove U \not\vdash ϕ. If U \vdash ϕ, then U \vdash ¬ϕ* by Fact [2.2(i)]. Therefore T ⊨ P(⌜⌜¬ϕ^*⌝⌝) and M ⊨ P(⌜⌜¬ϕ^*⌝⌝). In particular, there is a p \in M such that M \models Prf(⌜⌜¬ϕ^*⌝⌝, p). Furthermore, since M \models ∀x δ(x), M \models ∀x < p δ(x). Hence ϕ* is in Th_{Σₙ}(M). Therefore U₊ \vdash ϕ*, this contradicts the consistency of U₊.

Next, we prove ϕ \in Cons(Π₀, T). By the choice of ϕ, PA \vdash σ \land P(⌜⌜¬ϕ^*⌝⌝) \rightarrow ϕ. Since ¬ϕ* is a Πₙ sentence, T \vdash P(⌜⌜¬ϕ^*⌝⌝) \rightarrow ¬ϕ*. Therefore T \vdash σ \land ¬ϕ^* \rightarrow ϕ \land ¬ϕ^*, and by Fact [2.2(i)], T \vdash σ \land ϕ^* \rightarrow ⊥. Then T \vdash σ \rightarrow ¬ϕ^*. Also by Fact [2.2(ii)], T \vdash σ \rightarrow (ϕ \lor ϕ^*). Hence T \vdash σ \rightarrow ϕ. Then, since σ \in Cons(Π₀, T), we obtain ϕ \in Cons(Π₀, T).
Notice that our $\Sigma_1$ provability predicate $Pr_U(x)$ of $U$ is also a $\Sigma_1$ semi-provability predicate of $U$ in $T$. Since the consistency statement $Con_U$ of $U$ is equivalent to $Rfn_{Pr_U}(I_1)$ (cf. Smoryński [8]), we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.4.** Let $T$ and $U$ be any theory. If $T \vdash Con_U$, then $Cons(I_1, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$.

For example, since $PA + Con_{PA} \vdash Con_{PA} + \neg Con_{PA}$, we obtain $Cons(I_1, PA + \neg Con_{PA}) \setminus \text{Th}(PA + \neg Con_{PA}) \neq \emptyset$ from this corollary.

Next, we prove that the condition $C2$ is actually a new sufficient condition to show $Cons(I_n, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$. That is, we prove that $C2$ does not imply any of “$\text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(U)$” or “$\text{Th}_{I_n}(T) + U$ is consistent”. To prove this, we prepare the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.5.** For any theories $T$ and $U$, there is a $\Sigma_n$ semi-provability predicate $P(x)$ of $U$ in $T$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. For all sentences $\varphi$ such that $U \not\vdash \varphi$, $\text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T + \neg P(\varphi^n)) \subseteq \text{Th}(T)$.
2. If $\text{Th}_{I_n}(U) \subseteq \text{Th}(T)$, then $\text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T + Rfn_{P}(I_n)) \subseteq \text{Th}(T)$.

**Proof.** Let $P(x)$ be a $\Sigma_n$ formula satisfying the following equivalence:

$$PA \vdash \forall x (P(x) \leftrightarrow \exists y (Prf_U(x, y) \land [\Sigma_n]T(\neg P(\hat{x})^n, y))),$$

where $\bar{n} P(\hat{x})^n$ is a term corresponding to a primitive recursive function calculating the Gödel number of $\neg P(m)$ from $m \in \omega$.

First, we prove $P(x)$ is a semi-provability predicate of $U$ in $T$. Let $\varphi$ be any sentence with $U \not\vdash \varphi$. Then there is a $p \in \omega$ such that $T \vdash Prf_U(\varphi^n, p)$. Also, $T + \neg P(\varphi^n) \vdash [\Sigma_n]T(\neg P(\varphi^n)^n, \bar{p})$ by Fact 2.1. Therefore, $T + \neg P(\varphi^n) \vdash P(\varphi^n)$ by the above equivalence. We conclude $T \vdash P(\varphi^n)$.

We prove that $P(x)$ satisfies two conditions stated in the lemma.

1. Let $\varphi$ be any sentence such that $U \not\vdash \varphi$ and let $\sigma$ be any $\Sigma_n$ sentence satisfying $T + \neg P(\varphi^n) \vdash \sigma$. Since $\sigma$ is a $\Sigma_n$ sentence, there is a $q \in \omega$ such that $T + \neg \sigma \vdash \forall y \geq q [\Sigma_n]T(\neg P(\varphi^n)^n, y)$ by Fact 2.1. Also, since $U \not\vdash \varphi$, $T \vdash \forall y < q \neg Prf_U(\varphi^n, y)$. Hence, $T + \neg \sigma \vdash \neg P(\varphi^n)$ by the choice of $P(x)$. That is, $T + P(\varphi^n) \vdash \sigma$. Therefore, $T \vdash \sigma$.

2. Assume $\text{Th}_{I_n}(U) \subseteq \text{Th}(T)$. Let $\sigma$ be a $\Sigma_n$ sentence such that $T + Rfn_{P}(I_n) \vdash \sigma$. Then there are $\Pi_n$ sentences $\pi_0, \ldots, \pi_{k-1}$ such that $T \vdash \bigwedge_{i \leq k} (P(\pi_i^n) \rightarrow \pi_i) \rightarrow \sigma$. If $T \not\vdash \pi_i$, then $T \vdash P(\pi_i^n) \rightarrow \pi_i$. Hence, for such $\pi_i$, we can remove $P(\pi_i^n) \rightarrow \pi_i$ from the conjunction. Therefore we may assume that $T \not\vdash \pi_i$ for all $i \leq k$. Then $U \not\vdash \pi_i$ for all $i \leq k$ because $\text{Th}_{I_n}(U) \subseteq \text{Th}(T)$. Also, since $T \vdash \neg P(\pi_i^n) \rightarrow (P(\pi_i^n) \rightarrow \pi_i)$, we obtain $T \vdash \bigwedge_{i \leq k} \neg P(\pi_i^n) \rightarrow \sigma$. Then, $T + \neg P(\pi_0^n) \vdash \bigwedge_{0 \leq i < k} \neg P(\pi_i^n) \rightarrow \sigma$. Since $\bigwedge_{0 \leq i < k} \neg P(\pi_i^n) \rightarrow \sigma$ is a $\Sigma_n$ sentence and $U \not\vdash \pi_0$, we obtain $T \vdash \bigwedge_{0 \leq i < k} \neg P(\pi_i^n) \rightarrow \sigma$ by the first condition. By repeating this argument, we conclude $T \vdash \sigma$.

Then, we prove that our sufficient condition $C2$ is actually a new one.
Theorem 5.6. There are consistent theories $T$ and $U$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T) \subseteq \text{Th}(U)$.

2. $\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T) + U$ is inconsistent.

3. There is a $\Sigma_n$ semi-provability predicate $P(x)$ of $U$ in $T$ such that $T \vdash \text{Rfn}_P(\Pi_n)$.

Proof. By Fact 3.3, there is a $\Sigma_n$ sentence $\varphi$ such that $\varphi \in \text{Cons}(\Pi_n, \text{PA})$, $\neg \varphi \in \text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, \text{PA})$ and $\varphi, \neg \varphi \notin \text{Th}(\text{PA})$. Let $T^- := \text{PA} + \neg \varphi$ and $U := \text{PA} + \varphi$. Obviously, $T^-$ and $U$ are consistent and $\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(U) \subseteq \text{Th}(\text{PA}) \subseteq \text{Th}(T^-)$ by the choice of $\varphi$. Also, there is a $\Sigma_n$ semi-provability predicate $P(x)$ of $U$ in $T^-$ satisfying two conditions of Lemma 5.5. Let $T := T^- + \text{Rfn}_P(\Pi_n)$. If $T$ is inconsistent, then $\text{PA} + \text{Rfn}_P(\Pi_n) \vdash \varphi$. In particular, $T^- + \text{Rfn}_P(\Pi_n) \vdash \varphi$. Because $\varphi$ is a $\Sigma_n$ sentence and $\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(U) \subseteq \text{Th}(T^-)$, $T^- \vdash \varphi$ by Lemma 5.5.2. This contradicts the consistency of $T^-$. Therefore, $T$ is consistent.

We prove that $T$ and $U$ satisfy three conditions stated in the theorem.

The conditions 2 and 3 are immediate from the definitions of $T$ and $U$.

We show 1. For any $\Sigma_n$ sentences $\sigma$ such that $T \vdash \sigma$, $T^- \vdash \sigma$ by Lemma 5.5.2. Since $\neg \varphi \in \text{Cons}(\Sigma_n, \text{PA})$, we obtain $\text{PA} \vdash \sigma$. Therefore $U \vdash \sigma$. □

At last, we prove that our condition C2 together with Bennet’s conditions “$\text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T) \not\subseteq \text{Th}(U)$” or “$\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T) + U$ is consistent” is not necessary for $\text{Cons}(\Pi_n, T) \setminus \text{Th}(T) \neq \emptyset$. This is a strengthenig of Fact 3.13.

Theorem 5.7. There are theories $T$ and $U$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\text{Cons}(\Pi_n, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U) \neq \emptyset$.

2. $\text{Th}_{\Sigma_n}(T) \subseteq \text{Th}(U)$.

3. $\text{Th}_{\Pi_n}(T) + U$ is inconsistent.

4. $T \not\vdash \text{Rfn}_P(\Pi_n)$ for all $\Sigma_n$ semi-provability predicates $P(x)$ of $U$ in $T$.

Proof. By Theorems 5.3 and 5.6, there are theories $T$ and $U^-$ satisfying 1, 2 and 3, but do not satisfy 4. Let $U := U^- + \neg \varphi$ where $\varphi \in \text{Cons}(\Pi_n, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U^-)$. Since $U^- \not\vdash \varphi$, $U$ is consistent. We prove that $T$ and $U$ satisfy four conditions in the theorem.

The conditions 2 and 3 are immediate from the choice of $T$ and the definition of $U$. Since $U$ is consistent, $U \not\vdash \varphi$. Therefore, $\varphi \in \text{Cons}(\Pi_n, T) \setminus \text{Th}(U)$. This shows 1.

At last, we show 4. Suppose that there is a $\Sigma_n$ semi-provability predicate $P$ of $U$ in $T$ such that $T \vdash \text{Rfn}_P(\Pi_n)$. Then $T \vdash P(\neg \varphi)$ because $\neg \varphi$ is a $\Pi_n$ sentence. Since $U \vdash \neg \varphi$, $T \vdash P(\neg \varphi)$. Hence $T \vdash \neg \varphi$. Then, $T \vdash \bot$ because $\varphi \in \text{Cons}(\Pi_n, T)$. This is a contradiction. □

We close this paper with the following problem which is related to Bennet’s Problem 3.12.
Problem 5.8. Are there a natural number $k \in \omega$ and theories $T_0, \ldots, T_k$ and $U$ such that $(\bigcap_{i \leq k} \text{Cons}(\Pi_n, T_i)) \setminus \text{Th}(U) = \emptyset$?
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