FINDING THE LIMIT OF INCOMPLETENESS II

YONG CHENG

Abstract. This work is motivated from finding the limit of the applicability of Gödel’s first incompleteness theorem (G1): can we find a minimal theory in some sense for which G1 holds? The answer of this question depends on our definition of minimality. We first show that the Turing degree structure of r.e. theories for which G1 holds is as complex as the structure of r.e. Turing degrees. Then we examine the interpretation degree structure of r.e. theories weaker than the theory $R$ for which G1 holds, and answer some open questions about this structure in the literature.

1. Preliminaries

Robinson Arithmetic $Q$ and the theory $R$ are both introduced in [15] by Tarski, Mostowski and Robinson as base axiomatic theories for investigating incompleteness and undecidability.

Definition 1.1 (Robinson Arithmetic $Q$). Robinson Arithmetic $Q$ is defined in the language $\{0, S, +, \times\}$ with the following axioms:

- $Q_1$: $\forall x \forall y (Sx = Sy \rightarrow x = y)$;
- $Q_2$: $\forall x (Sx \neq 0)$;
- $Q_3$: $\forall x (x \neq 0 \rightarrow \exists y (x = Sy))$;
- $Q_4$: $\forall x \forall y (x + 0 = x)$;
- $Q_5$: $\forall x \forall y (x + Sy = S(x + y))$;
- $Q_6$: $\forall x (x \times 0 = 0)$;
- $Q_7$: $\forall x \forall y (x \times Sy = x \times y + x)$.

Definition 1.2 (The theory $R$). Let $R$ be the theory consisting of schemes $Ax_1 - Ax_5$ in the language $\{0, S, +, \times, \leq\}$:

- $Ax_1$: $\overline{m + n} = \overline{m} + \overline{n}$;
- $Ax_2$: $\overline{m \times n} = \overline{m} \times \overline{n}$;
- $Ax_3$: $\overline{m} \neq \overline{n}$ if $m \neq n$;
- $Ax_4$: $\forall x (x \leq \overline{n} \rightarrow x = \overline{0} \lor \cdots \lor x = \overline{n})$;
- $Ax_5$: $\forall x (x \leq \overline{m} \lor \overline{n} \leq x)$.
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$^1$For any $n \in \omega$, we define the term $\overline{n}$ as follows: $\overline{0} = 0$, and $\overline{n + 1} = S\overline{n}$.
The theory $R$ contains all key properties of arithmetic for the proof of Gödel’s first incompleteness theorem ($G_1$). Unlike $Q$, the theory $R$ is not finitely axiomatizable.

**Definition 1.3 (Translations and interpretations).**

- Let $T$ be a theory in a language $L(T)$, and $S$ a theory in a language $L(S)$. In its simplest form, a translation $I$ of language $L(T)$ into language $L(S)$ is specified by the following:
  - an $L(S)$-formula $\delta_I(x)$ denoting the domain of $I$;
  - for each relation symbol $R$ of $L(T)$, as well as the equality relation $=$, an $L(S)$-formula $R_I$ of the same arity;
  - for each function symbol $F$ of $L(T)$ of arity $k$, an $L(S)$-formula $F_I$ of arity $k + 1$.
- If $\phi$ is an $L(T)$-formula, its $I$-translation $\phi^I$ is an $L(S)$-formula constructed as follows: we rewrite the formula in an equivalent way so that function symbols only occur in atomic subformulas of the form $F(\bar{x}) = y$, where $x_i, y$ are variables; then we replace each such atomic formula with $F_I(\bar{x}, y)$, we replace each atomic formula of the form $R(\bar{x})$ with $R_I(\bar{x})$, and we restrict all quantifiers and free variables to objects satisfying $\delta_I$. We take care to rename bound variables to avoid variable capture during the process.
- A translation $I$ of $L(T)$ into $L(S)$ is an interpretation of $T$ in $S$ if $S$ proves the following:
  - for each function symbol $F$ of $L(T)$ of arity $k$, the formula expressing that $F_I$ is total on $\delta_I$:
    $$\forall x_0, \cdots \forall x_{k-1} (\delta_I(x_0) \land \cdots \land \delta_I(x_{k-1}) \rightarrow \exists y (\delta_I(y) \land F_I(x_0, \cdots, x_{k-1}, y)))$$
  - the $I$-translations of all axioms of $T$, and axioms of equality.

The simplified picture of translations and interpretations above actually describes only one-dimensional, parameter-free, and one-piece translations. For precise definitions of a multi-dimensional interpretation, an interpretation with parameters, and a piece-wise interpretation, we refer to [19] for more details.

**Definition 1.4 (Interpretations II).**

- A theory $T$ is interpretable in a theory $S$ if there exists an interpretation of $T$ in $S$.
- Given theories $S$ and $T$, let $S \preceq T$ denote that $S$ is interpretable in $T$ (or $T$ interprets $S$); let $S \prec T$ denote that $T$ interprets $S$ but $S$ does not interpret $T$; we say $S$ and $T$ are mutually interpretable, denoted by $S \equiv_I T$, if $S \preceq T$ and $T \preceq S$.
- We say that the theory $S$ is weaker than the theory $T$ w.r.t. interpretation if $S \prec T$.
The notion of interpretation provides us a method to compare different theories in different languages. If $T$ is interpretable in $S$, then all sentences provable (refutable) in $T$ are mapped, by the interpretation function, to sentences provable (refutable) in $S$.

The interpretation relation among first-order theories ($\preceq$) is reflexive and transitive. The equivalence classes of theories, under the equivalence relation $\equiv_I$, are called the interpretation degrees.

In this paper, we work with first-order theories with finite signature, and always assume the arithmetization of the base theory. Under arithmetization, we equate a set of sentences with the set of Gödel’s numbers of sentences in it.

**Definition 1.5.** Let $\sqsubseteq$ be a binary relation on r.e. theories.

1. For r.e. theories $S$ and $T$, define that $S \sqsubseteq T$ iff $S \subseteq T$ and $T \sqsubseteq S$ does not hold.
2. We say $S$ is a minimal theory w.r.t. the relation $\sqsubseteq$ if there is no theory $T$ such that $T \sqsubseteq S$.
3. We say $S$ is a maximal theory w.r.t. the relation $\sqsubseteq$ if there is no theory $T$ such that $S \sqsubseteq T$.

**Definition 1.6 (Folklore).**

1. Given two arithmetic theories $U$ and $V$, $U \leq_T V$ denotes that the theory $U$ is Turing reducible to the theory $V$, and $U <_T V$ denotes that $U \leq_T V$ but $V \not\leq_T U$.
2. We say that the theory $S$ is weaker than the theory $V$ w.r.t. Turing reducibility if $S <_T V$.
3. We say a set $A$ separates $B$ and $C$ if $B \subseteq A$ and $A \cap C = \emptyset$.
4. We say $(S, T)$ is a recursively inseparable pair if $S$ and $T$ are disjoint r.e. subsets of $\omega$, and there is no recursive set $X \subseteq \omega$ such that $X$ separates $S$ and $T$.
5. Let $\langle W_e : e \in \omega \rangle$ be the list of all r.e. sets, and $\langle \varphi_e : e \in \omega \rangle$ be the list of all Turing programs.
6. A theory $T$ is essentially undecidable if any recursively axiomatizable consistent extension of $T$ in the same language is undecidable.
7. A theory $T$ is essentially incomplete if any recursively axiomatizable consistent extension of $T$ in the same language is incomplete.

Note that $x \in W_e$ if and only if for some $y$, the $e$-th Turing program with input $x$ yields an output in less than $y$ steps. We assume that such $y$ is unique if it exists.

---

2 If theories $S$ and $T$ are mutually interpretable, then $T$ and $S$ are equally strong w.r.t. interpretation.

3 In this paper, we only consider countable theories. There are $2^\omega$ countable theories, and $2^\omega$ associated interpretation degrees.

4 The theory of completeness/incompleteness is closely related to the theory of decidability/undecidability (see [15]).
A lattice can be considered as algebraic structures with a signature consisting of two binary operations $\land$ and $\lor$.

**Definition 1.7.** The theory of lattice consists of the following axioms:

**Commutative laws:** $\forall a \forall b (a \lor b = b \lor a); \forall a \forall b (a \land b = b \land a)$.

**Associative laws:** $\forall a \forall b \forall c (a \lor (b \lor c) = (a \lor b) \lor c); \forall a \forall b \forall c (a \land (b \land c) = (a \land b) \land c)$.

**Absorption laws:** $\forall a \forall b (a \lor (a \land b) = a); \forall a \forall b (a \land (a \lor b) = a)$.

**Distributive:** $\forall x \forall y \forall z (x \lor (y \land z) = (x \lor y) \land (x \lor z)); \forall x \forall y \forall z (x \land (y \lor z) = (x \land y) \lor (x \land z))$.

The following theorem provides us with a method for proving the essentially undecidability of a theory via interpretation.

**Theorem 1.8** (Theorem 7, Corollary 2, [15]). Let $T_1$ and $T_2$ be two consistent theories with finite signature such that $T_2$ is interpretable in $T_1$. If $T_2$ is essentially undecidable, then $T_1$ is essentially undecidable.

**Lemma 1.9** (The fixed point lemma, Folklore). Let $T$ be a consistent r.e. extension of $Q$. For any formula $\phi(x)$ with exactly one free variable, there exists a sentence $\theta$ such that $T \vdash \theta \leftrightarrow \phi(\lceil \theta \rceil)$.

## 2. Introduction

Let $T$ be a consistent r.e. theory. To generalize $G_1$ to weaker theories than $PA$ w.r.t. interpretation, we introduce the notion “$G_1$ holds for $T$”.

**Definition 2.1** (Cheng, [1]). We say that $G_1$ holds for a r.e. theory $T$ if any consistent r.e. theory that interprets $T$ is incomplete.

**Proposition 2.2** (Cheng, [1]). $G_1$ holds for $T$ iff $T$ is essentially incomplete iff $T$ is essentially undecidable.

It is well known that $G_1$ holds for Robinson Arithmetic $Q$ and the theory $R$ (see [15]). In fact, $G_1$ holds for many theories weaker than $PA$ w.r.t. interpretation. In summary, we have the following picture:

- $Q \triangleleft I\Sigma_0 + \exp \triangleleft I\Sigma_1 \triangleleft I\Sigma_2 \triangleleft \cdots \triangleleft I\Sigma_n \triangleleft \cdots \triangleleft PA$, and $G_1$ holds for them.
- The theories $Q, I\Sigma_0, I\Sigma_0 + \Omega_1, \cdots, I\Sigma_0 + \Omega_n, \cdots, B\Sigma_1, B\Sigma_1 + \Omega_1, \cdots, B\Sigma_1 + \Omega_n, \cdots$ are all mutually interpretable, and $G_1$ holds for them.
- Theories $PA^-, Q^+, Q^-, TC, AS, S^1_2$ and $Q$ are all mutually interpretable, and $G_1$ holds for them.
- $R \triangleleft Q \triangleleft EA \triangleleft PRA \triangleleft PA$, and $G_1$ holds for them.

---

5For theories with infinite signature, this theorem does not hold.

6For the definition of these weak theories, we refer to [1].
This paper is motivated from finding the limit of the applicability of $G_1$: can we find a minimal theory in some sense for which $G_1$ holds? The answer of this question depends on our definition of minimality.

If we define minimality as having the minimal number of axiom, then any finitely axiomatized essentially undecidable theory (e.g., Robinson Arithmetic $Q$) is a minimal r.e. theory for which $G_1$ holds. For theories which is not finitely axiomatized, if we define minimality as having the minimal number of axiom schemes, then the following theory $VS$ is a minimal r.e. theory for which $G_1$ holds since it has only one axiom scheme and is essentially undecidable. The Vaught set theory $VS$, originally introduced by Vaught [16], is axiomatized by the schema

$$(V_n) \quad \forall x_0, \cdots, \forall x_{n-1} \exists y \forall t (t \in y \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i<n} t = x_i)$$

for all $n \in \omega$, asserting that $\{x_i : i < n\}$ exists.

When we talk about minimality, we should specify the degree structure involved. In [1], we examine the following two degree structures that are respectively induced from Turing reducibility and interpretation: $\langle D, \leq_T \rangle$ and $\langle D, \leq \rangle$.

**Definition 2.3** (Cheng, [1]).

1. Let $D = \{S : S <_T R, \text{ and } G_1 \text{ holds for the r.e. theory } S\}$.
2. Let $D = \{S : S \triangleleft R \text{ and } G_1 \text{ holds for the r.e. theory } S\}$.

In [1], we show that there is no minimal r.e. theory w.r.t. Turing reducibility for which $G_1$ holds, and prove some results about the structure of $\langle D, \leq \rangle$. In this paper, we prove more facts about $\langle D, \leq_T \rangle$, and answer open questions about the structure $\langle D, \leq \rangle$ in [1]. Moreover, we prove in Theorem ?? that the index set of r.e. theories for which $G_1$ holds is $\Pi^0_3$-complete. As a corollary, we show that for some degree structures satisfying the conditions in Theorem ??, there is no minimal r.e. theory for which $G_1$ holds.

3. **The structure $\langle D, \leq_T \rangle$**

In this section, we examine the Turing degree structure of r.e. theories below $R$ for which $G_1$ holds.

Hanf shows that there is a finitely axiomatizable theory in each recursively enumerable tt-degree (see [13]). Feferman shows in [3] that if $A$ is any recursively enumerable set, then there is a recursively axiomatizable theory $T$ having the same Turing degree as $A$. In [14], Shoenfield improves Feferman’s result and shows that if $A$ is not recursive, then there is an essentially undecidable theory with the same Turing degree. To make readers to have a good sense of Shoenfield’s theorem, we give a proof of it which is a reconstruction of Shoenfield’s proof in [14] with more details.
Theorem 3.1 (Shoenfield, [14]). If A is recursively enumerable and not recursive, there is a recursively inseparable pair \(\langle B, C \rangle\) such that A, B and C have the same Turing degree.

Theorem 3.2 (Shoenfield, [14]). Let A be recursively enumerable and not recursive. Then there is a consistent axiomatizable theory T having one non-logical symbol which is essentially undecidable and has the same Turing degree as A.

Proof. Pick a recursively inseparable pair \(\langle B, C \rangle\) as in Theorem 3.1 such that A, B and C have the same Turing degree. The theory T we define has only one non-logical symbol: a binary relation symbol R. Let \(\Phi_n\) be the statement that there is an equivalence class of R consisting of \(n\) elements. The theory T contains the following axioms:

- axioms asserting that R is an equivalence relation;
- \(\Phi_n\) for all \(n \in B\);
- \(\neg \Phi_n\) for all \(n \in C\);
- for each \(n\) we adopt an axiom asserting there is at most one equivalence class of R having \(n\) elements.

Note that T is consistent and axiomatizable. Since \(\Phi_n\) is provable iff \(n \in B\), and \(\neg \Phi_n\) is provable iff \(n \in C\), we have B and C are recursive in T.

Disjunctions of conjunctions whose terms are \(\Phi_n\) or \(\neg \Phi_n\) for some \(n \in \omega\), are called a disjunctive normal form of \(\langle \Phi_n : n \in \omega \rangle\).

Lemma 3.3 (Janiczak, Lemma 2 in [6]). Any sentence \(\phi\) of the theory T is equivalent to a disjunctive normal form of \(\langle \Phi_n : n \in \omega \rangle\), and this disjunctive normal form can be found explicitly once \(\phi\) is explicitly given.

By Lemma 3.3, every sentence \(\phi\) of T is equivalent to a disjunctive normal form of \(\langle \Phi_n : n \in \omega \rangle\), and this disjunctive normal form can be calculated from \(\phi\). It follows that T is recursive in \(\langle B, C \rangle\). Hence, T has the same Turing degree as A. Finally, by a standard argument, we can show that T is essentially undecidable (see [1]).

Corollary 3.4. The structure \(\langle D, \leq_T \rangle\) is as complex as the Turing degree structure of r.e. sets.

However, Shoenfield’s theory T in Theorem 3.2 is not unique as can be seen from the following theorem which improves Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.5. For any non-recursive r.e. set A, there is a countable sequence of r.e. sets \(\langle B_n : n \in \omega \rangle\) such that \(\langle B_n, B_m \rangle\) is a recursively inseparable pair for \(m \neq n\) and each \(B_n\) has same Turing degree as A.

\(^7\)This is a reformulation of Janiczak’s Lemma 2 in [6] in the context of the theory T. Janiczak’s Lemma is proved by means of a method known as the elimination of quantifiers.
Proof. Suppose \( A \) is a non-recursive r.e. set. We construct a sequence of disjoint r.e. sets \( \langle B_n : n \in \omega \rangle \) such that for any \( m \neq n \), \( (B_n, B_m) \) is a recursively inseparable pair and \( B_n \equiv_T B_m \equiv_T A \).

Let \( f \) be the recursive function that enumerates \( A \) without repetitions. Define a partial function \( g \) as follows: \( g(x) = n \) iff \( \exists s \exists t(f(s) = x, t < s) \) and the program \( \varphi_s \) with input \( \langle x, y \rangle \) yields \( n \) as output in \( \leq t \) steps.

By the projection theorem, \( g \) is partial recursive. Let \( B_n = \{ x : g(x) = n \} \). For any \( n \neq m \), we show that \( B_n \) and \( B_m \) have the same Turing degree as \( A \) and \( (B_n, B_m) \) is a recursively inseparable pair. Note that \( B_n \) and \( B_m \) are disjoint r.e. sets.

Claim. \( B_n \leq_T A \).

Proof. We test \( \langle x, y \rangle \in B_n \) as follows. If \( x \notin A \), then \( \langle x, y \rangle \notin B_n \). If \( x \in A \), let \( s = f^{-1}(x) \). We can decide whether the program \( \varphi_y \) with input \( \langle x, y \rangle \) yields \( n \) in \( < s \) steps. If yes, then \( \langle x, y \rangle \in B_n \); if no, then \( \langle x, y \rangle \notin B_n \).

\( \square \)

Claim. \( A \leq_T B_n \).

Proof. We test \( x \in A \) as follows. Suppose the index of the program with constant output value \( n \) is \( e_0 \), i.e. \( \varphi_{e_0}(x) = n \) for any \( x \). If \( \langle x, e_0 \rangle \in B_n \), then \( x \in A \). Suppose \( \langle x, e_0 \rangle \notin B_n \), let \( w \) be the number of computation steps such that \( \varphi_{e_0}(\langle x, e_0 \rangle) = n \). Decide whether \( f(s) = x \) and \( s \leq w \) for some \( s \). If yes, then \( x \in A \); if no, then \( x \notin A \).

Similarly, we can show that \( B_m \leq_T A \) and \( A \leq_T B_m \).

Claim. There is no recursive set \( X \) that separates \( B_n \) and \( B_m \).

Proof. Suppose not. Then \( X \) can find a recursive function \( h \) such that \( \text{ran}(h) = \{ m, n \}, h(B_n) = m \) and \( h(B_m) = n \). Let \( h = \varphi_{e_1} \).

Claim. If \( x \in A \), then the program \( \varphi_{e_1} \) with input \( \langle x, e_1 \rangle \) yields output in at least \( s \) steps where \( s = f^{-1}(x) \).

Proof. Suppose not. Then the program \( \varphi_{e_1} \) with input \( \langle x, e_1 \rangle \) halts in less than \( s = f^{-1}(x) \) steps. Then by definition, we have \( \varphi_{e_1}(\langle x, e_1 \rangle) = n \Leftrightarrow \varphi_{e_1}(\langle x, e_1 \rangle) = m \), which leads to a contradiction. \( \square \)

Let \( l \) be the recursive function such that \( l(x) = \) the number of steps to compute the value of \( \langle x, e_1 \rangle \) in the program \( \varphi_{e_1} \). Then we have:

\[ x \in A \Leftrightarrow \exists s (s \leq l(x) \land f(s) = x). \]

Thus, \( A \) is recursive which leads to a contradiction. \( \square \)

Thus, for any \( n \neq m \), \( (B_n, B_m) \) is a recursively inseparable pair and \( B_n \equiv_T B_m \equiv_T A \). \( \square \)
As a corollary, for any no-recursive r.e. degree \( a \), there are countably many essentially undecidable r.e. theories with the same Turing degree \( a \). Since there are only countably many r.e. theories, this is the best result we can have.

Now, we list some key results about the Turing degree structure of r.e. sets.

**Fact 3.6 (Folklore, many authors).**
- The r.e. degrees are dense: for any r.e. sets \( A <_T B \), there is a r.e. set \( C \) such that \( A <_T C <_T B \).
- No r.e. degree is minimal.
- For any r.e. set \( 0 <_T C <_T 0' \), there exists an r.e. set \( A \) such that \( A \) is incomparable with \( C \) w.r.t. Turing degree. Furthermore, an index for \( A \) can be found uniformly from one for \( C \).
- Given r.e. sets \( A <_T B \), there is an infinite r.e. sequence of r.e. sets \( C_n \) such that \( A <_T C_n <_T B \) and \( C_n \)'s are incomparable w.r.t. Turing degree.
- If \( a \) and \( b \) are r.e. degrees such that \( a < b \), then any countably partially ordered set can be embedded in the r.e. degrees between \( a \) and \( b \).

**Corollary 3.7.**
- \( \langle D, \leq_T \rangle \) is dense: for theories \( A, B \in \overline{D} \) such that \( A <_T B \), there is a theory \( C \in \overline{D} \) such that \( A <_T C <_T B \).
- For any theory \( A \in \overline{D} \), there exists a theory \( B \in \overline{D} \) such that \( B \) is incomparable with \( A \) under \( \leq_T \). As a corollary, for any theory \( A \in \overline{D} \), there exists a theory \( B \in \overline{D} \) such that \( A <_T B \).
- \( \langle D, \leq_T \rangle \) has no minimal element, and has no maximal element.
- Given theories \( A, B \in \overline{D} \) such that \( A <_T B \), there is an infinite r.e. sequence of theories \( C_n \in \overline{D} \) such that \( A <_T C_n <_T B \) and \( C_n \)'s are incomparable w.r.t. Turing degree.
- Given theories \( A, B \in \overline{D} \) such that \( A <_T B \), any countably partially ordered set can be embedded in \( \langle D, \leq_T \rangle \) between \( A \) and \( B \).

Thus, \( \langle D, \leq_T \rangle \) is a dense distributive lattice without endpoints.

**4. Some interpretation degree structures**

In this section, before we examine the structure of \( \langle D, \leq \rangle \), we first review some interpretation degree structures we know in the literature. Let \( \langle D_{PA}, \leq \rangle \) denote the interpretation degree structure of consistent r.e. extensions of \( PA \). For consistent r.e. extensions of \( PA \), we have some equivalent characterizations of the notion of interpretation.

**Fact 4.1 (Folklore, [8]).** Suppose theories \( S, T \) are consistent r.e. extensions of \( PA \). Then the following are equivalent:
(1) $S \preceq T$;
(2) $T \vdash \text{Con}(S \upharpoonright k)$ for any $k \in \omega$;
(3) $(S \upharpoonright k) \preceq T$ for any $k \in \omega$;
(4) For any $\Pi^0_1$ sentence $\phi$, if $S \vdash \phi$, then $T \vdash \phi$.
(5) For every model $M$ of $T$, there is a model $N$ of $S$ such that $M$ is
isomorphic to an initial segment of $N$.

The structure $\langle D_{\text{PA}}, \preceq \rangle$ is well known in the literature. In fact, $\langle D_{\text{PA}}, \preceq, \downarrow, \uparrow \rangle$ is a dense distributive lattice.\footnote{For consistent r.e. extensions $A$ and $B$ of $\text{PA}$, $A \downarrow B = \text{PA} + \{\text{Con}(A \upharpoonright k) \lor \text{Con}(B \upharpoonright k) : k \in \omega\}$ and $A \uparrow B = \text{PA} + \{\text{Con}(A \upharpoonright k) \land \text{Con}(B \upharpoonright k) : k \in \omega\}$.}

For more properties of $\langle D_{\text{PA}}, \preceq \rangle$, we refer to [8].

Now, we examine the interpretation degree structure of general r.e. theories, not restricting to theories interpreting $\text{PA}$.

**Definition 4.2** (Folklore). We introduce two natural operators on r.e. theories.

- The supremum $A \otimes B$ is defined as follows: $A \otimes B$ is a theory in the disjoint sum of the signatures of $A$ and $B$ plus two new predicates $P_0$ and $P_1$. We have axioms that say that $P_0$ and $P_1$ form a partition of the domain and the axioms of $A$ relativized to $P_0$ and the axioms of $B$ relativized to $P_1$.

- The infimum $A \oplus B$ is defined as follows: $A \oplus B$ is a theory in the disjoint sum of the signatures of $A$ and $B$ plus a fresh 0-ary predicate symbol $P$. The theory is axiomatized by all $P \rightarrow \varphi$, where $\varphi$ is an axiom of $A$ plus $\neg P \rightarrow \psi$, where $\psi$ is an axiom of $B$.

Note that the interpretation degree structure of r.e. theories with the operators $\oplus$ and $\otimes$ is a distributive lattice.

The interpretation degree structure of all finitely axiomatized theories, denoted by $\langle D_{\text{finite}}, \preceq \rangle$, is studied by Harvey Friedman in [Fri07]. Note that there are only $\omega$ many interpretation degrees of finitely axiomatized theories. The structure $\langle D_{\text{finite}}, \preceq \rangle$ forms a (reflexive) partial ordering with a minimum element $\top$ and a maximum element $\bot$ where $\top$ is the equivalence class of all sentences with a finite model, and $\bot$ is the equivalence class of all sentences with no models.

**Theorem 4.3** (Harvey Friedman, [4]).

(1) The structure $\langle D_{\text{finite}}, \preceq, \oplus, \otimes, \downarrow, \uparrow, \top \rangle$ forms a distributive lattice.

(2) For any $a \in D_{\text{finite}}$ such that $a \lhd \downarrow$, there exists $b \in D_{\text{finite}}$ such that $a \lhd b \lhd \downarrow$.

(3) The structure $\langle D_{\text{finite}}, \preceq \rangle$ is dense, i.e., $a \lhd b \rightarrow (\exists c)(a \lhd c \lhd b)$.

(4) For any $a, b \in D_{\text{finite}}$, if $a \lhd b$, then there exists an infinite sequence $c_n$ such that $a \lhd c_n \lhd b$ for each $n$ and $c_n$’s are incomparable w.r.t. interpretation.

\textit{Footnotes:}

- \textbf{Footnote 8:} $\text{Con}(S)$ is the canonical arithmetic formula which expresses the consistency of the theory $S$ saying that $0 \neq 0$ is not provable in $S$.
- \textbf{Footnote 9:} For consistent r.e. extensions $A$ and $B$ of $\text{PA}$, $A \downarrow B = \text{PA} + \{\text{Con}(A \upharpoonright k) \lor \text{Con}(B \upharpoonright k) : k \in \omega\}$ and $A \uparrow B = \text{PA} + \{\text{Con}(A \upharpoonright k) \land \text{Con}(B \upharpoonright k) : k \in \omega\}$. 


Thus, \( \langle D_{\text{finite}}, \leq, \oplus, \otimes, \perp, \top \rangle \) is a dense distributive lattice without endpoints. Especially, there is no minimal finitely axiomatized theory w.r.t. interpretation.

The following theorem shows that above any finitely axiomatizable sub-theory of \( \text{PA} \), there are continuum many incomparable sub-theories of \( \text{PA} \) w.r.t. interpretation.

**Theorem 4.4** (Montague, [9]). Let \( T \) be any finitely axiomatizable sub-theory of \( \text{PA} \). Then there is a set \( C \) of cardinality \( 2^\omega \) such that (i) every member of \( C \) is a sub-theory of \( \text{PA} \) and an extension of \( T \), (ii) any two distinct elements of \( C \) are incomparable w.r.t. interpretation.

The structure \( \langle D_{\text{finite}}, \leq \rangle \) bears a rough resemblance to the Turing degree structure of r.e. sets which is very well studied from recursion theory, and is very complicated. It is not fully clear how complicated \( \langle D_{\text{finite}}, \leq \rangle \) is, and how these two structures are related. Moreover, there are many similarities between the structure \( \langle D_{\text{finite}}, \leq \rangle \) and the structure \( \langle \overline{D}, \leq_T \rangle \); an interesting question is: what is the difference between these two structures?

**Definition 4.5** ([17]).

(1) An interpretation is direct when it is un-relativized and identity preserving.

(2) A theory is sequential if it directly interprets the theory Adjunctive Set Theory (\( \text{AS} \)).

(3) We say two sentences have the same derivability degree iff they are provably equivalent over \( \text{EA} \).

Let \( \langle D_{\text{Seq}}, \leq \rangle \) denote the interpretation degree structure of finitely axiomatized sequential theories. The following theorem gives us a nice characterization of the structure \( \langle D_{\text{Seq}}, \leq \rangle \).

**Theorem 4.6** (Visser, [17]). The structure \( \langle D_{\text{Seq}}, \leq \rangle \) is recursively equivalent to the degrees of derivability of \( \Pi^0_1 \)-sentences over \( \text{EA} \).

5. THE STRUCTURE \( \langle D, \leq \rangle \)

In this section, we examine the interpretation degree structure of r.e. theories for which \( G_1 \) holds. The interpretation degree structure of r.e. theories interpreting \( \text{PA} \) is well known. However, the interpretation degree structure of r.e. theories weaker than the theory \( \text{R} \) is much more complex and we know few about it.

Now, we examine the interpretation degree structure of r.e. theories weaker than \( \text{R} \) for which \( G_1 \) holds, and answer open questions about the structure \( \langle D, \leq \rangle \) in \([1]\).

\(^{10}\)The theory \( \text{AS} \) has only one binary relation symbol ‘\( \in \)’, and the following axioms: (1) \( \exists x \forall y (y \notin x) \); (2) \( \forall x \forall y \exists z \forall u (u \in z \leftrightarrow (u = x \lor u = y)) \).
Definition 5.1 ([1]). Let \( \langle A, B \rangle \) be a recursively inseparable pair. Consider the following r.e. theory \( U_{\langle A, B \rangle} \) with the signature \( \{0, S, P\} \) where \( P \) is a unary relation symbol, and \( \bar{\pi} = S^n 0 \) for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \):

1. \( \bar{m} \neq \bar{n} \) if \( m \neq n \);
2. \( P(n) \) if \( n \in A \);
3. \( \neg P(n) \) if \( n \in B \).

Theorem 5.2 (Cheng, [1]). For any recursively inseparable pair \( \langle A, B \rangle \), \( G_1 \) holds for \( U_{\langle A, B \rangle} \) and \( U_{\langle A, B \rangle} \triangleleft R \).

Since there are countably many recursively inseparable pairs, there are countably many elements of \( D \).

Definition 5.3 (Visser). We say a r.e. theory \( U \) is Turing persistent if for any consistent r.e. theory \( V \), if \( U \subseteq V \), then \( U \leq_T V \).

There is no direct relation between the notion of interpretation and the notion of Turing reducibility. Given r.e. theories \( U \) and \( V \), \( U \leq V \) does not imply \( U \leq_T V \), and \( U \leq_T V \) does not imply \( U \leq V \). The notion of “Turing persistent” establishes the relationship between \( U \leq V \) and \( U \leq_T V \). Note that if \( U \) is Turing persistent, then for any r.e. theory \( V \), if \( U \leq V \), then \( U \leq_T V \). Many essentially undecidable theories we know are Turing persistent. A natural question is: can we find an essentially undecidable theory which is not Turing persistent? Now, we give some examples of Turing persistent theories.

Proposition 5.4. For any consistent r.e. theory \( T \), if all recursive functions are representable in \( T \), then \( T \) is Turing persistent.

Proof. This follows from the fact that \( T \) has Turing degree \( 0' \) since any r.e. set is representable in \( T \). \( \square \)

As a corollary, \( R \) is Turing persistent.

Theorem 5.5 (Essentially due to Shoenfield). For any r.e. set \( A \), there are disjoint r.e. sets \( B \) and \( C \) with \( B, C \leq_T A \) such that for any r.e. \( D \) which separates \( B \) and \( C \), we have \( A \leq_T D \).

Proof. Suppose that \( A = W_e \), i.e. \( x \in A \) if and only if for some \( y \), the \( e \)-th Turing program with input \( x \) yields an output in \( <y \) steps.

- Define \( x \in B \) iff for some \( y \), the \( e \)-th Turing program with input \( (x)_0 \) yields an output in \( <y \) steps and for all \( z \leq y \), the \( (x)_1 \)-th Turing program with input \( x \) does not yield an output in \( <z \) steps.

---

\[ \text{\footnotesize 11} \]Our notion of representability is standard. We refer to [10] for definitions.

\[ \text{\footnotesize 12} \]The proof of this theorem is based on Shoenfield’s construction in [14]. Albert Visser also discovered this form in his note on Shoenfield’s theorem.
Define $x \in C$ iff for some $y$, the $e$-th Turing program with input $(x)_0$ yields an output in $< y$ steps and for some $z \leq y$, the $(x)_1$-th Turing program with input $x$ yields an output in $< z$ steps.

Note that $B$ and $C$ are disjoint r.e. sets. If $(x)_0 \not\in A$, then $x \not\in B$ and $x \not\in C$; if $(x)_0 \in A$, then we can decide either $x \in B$ or $x \in C$. Thus, we have $B, C \leq_T A$.

Suppose $D$ is a r.e. set with index $d$, and $B \subseteq D$ and $D \cap C = \emptyset$. We show that $A \leq_T D$.

Claim. $x \in A$ if and only if for some $z$, the $d$-th Turing program with input $\langle x, d \rangle$ yields an output in $< z$ steps and for some $y < z$, the $e$-th Turing program with input $x$ yields an output in $< y$ steps.

Proof. The right-to-left direction is obvious. Suppose $x \in A$. Then either $\langle x, d \rangle \in B$ or $\langle x, d \rangle \in C$. Suppose $\langle x, d \rangle \in C$. Let $y$ be the unique witness such that the $e$-th Turing program with input $x$ yields an output in $< y$ steps. Then there exists $z \leq y$ such that the $d$-th Turing program with input $\langle x, d \rangle$ yields an output in $< z$ steps. Then $\langle x, d \rangle \in D$, which contradicts that $D \cap C = \emptyset$. Thus we have $\langle x, d \rangle \in B$.

Let $y$ be the unique witness such that the $e$-th Turing program with input $x$ yields an output in $< y$ steps. Since $\langle x, d \rangle \in D$, we have for some $z$, the $d$-th Turing program with input $\langle x, d \rangle$ yields an output in $< z$ steps. Since for all $z \leq y$, the $d$-th Turing program with input $\langle x, d \rangle$ does not yield an output in $< z$ steps, we have $z > y$. Thus, the left-to-right direction holds. □

Now we show that $A \leq_T D$. If $\langle x, d \rangle \not\in D$, then $x \not\in A$. If $\langle x, d \rangle \in D$, from the above claim, we can effectively decide whether $x \in A$. □

From Theorem 5.5, we can give a simpler proof of Theorem 3.1.

Proof. Suppose $A$ is a non-recursive r.e. set. Pick the disjoint r.e. sets $\langle B, C \rangle$ as in Theorem 5.5. We show that $\langle B, C \rangle$ is a recursively inseparable pair, and $B$ and $C$ have the same Turing degree as $A$.

Suppose $D$ is a recursive set which separates $B$ and $C$. By Theorem 5.5, $A \leq_T D$ and thus $A$ is recursive which leads to a contradiction.

From Theorem 5.5, we have $B, C \leq_T A$. Since $B$ is a r.e. set which separates $B$ and $C$, by Theorem 5.5, we have $A \leq_T B$. Similarly, we have $A \leq_T C$. Thus, $A, B$ and $C$ have the same Turing degree. □

Theorem 5.6 (Visser, Theorem 6, [18]). For any r.e. theory $T$ with finite signature, $T$ is locally finitely satisfiable iff $T$ is interpretable in $R$.\footnote{\text{In fact, if $T$ is locally finitely satisfiable, then $T$ is interpretable in $R$ via a one-piece one-dimensional parameter-free interpretation.}}
By Theorem 3.2 for any r.e. Turing degree $0 < d < 0'$, there is an essentially undecidable theory with Turing degree $d$. We denote this theory by $T_d$.

**Theorem 5.7.** For any r.e. Turing degree $0 < d < 0'$, the theory $T_d$ is Turing persistent and $T_d \triangleleft R$.

**Proof.** Suppose $A$ is a r.e. set with Turing degree $d$, and $T_d$ is constructed as in Theorem 3.2 via the recursively inseparable pair $\langle B, C \rangle$ constructed as in Theorem 5.5.

Suppose $V$ is a consistent r.e. extension of $T_d$. Define $D = \{ n : V \vdash \Phi_n \}$. Note that $B \subseteq D$ and $D \cap C = \emptyset$. By Theorem 5.5, $A \leq_T D$. Since $T_d$ has the same Turing degree as $A$, we have $T_d \leq_T V$. Thus, $T_d$ is Turing persistent.

Since $T_d$ is locally finitely satisfiable, we have $T_d \triangleleft R$. If $R \triangleleft T_d$, since $R$ is Turing persistent, then $R \leq_T T_d$ which leads to a contradiction. Thus $T_d \triangleleft R$. □

**Theorem 5.8.** For any non-recursive r.e. set $A$, we can uniformly find a recursively inseparable pair $\langle B, C \rangle$ such that:

1. $G1$ holds for $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$;
2. $U_{\langle B, C \rangle} \triangleleft R$;
3. $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$ has the same Turing degree as $A$;
4. $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$ is Turing persistent.

**Proof.** Take the pair of r.e. sets $\langle B, C \rangle$ as in Theorem 5.5 such that $A, B, C$ have the same Turing degree. Since $A$ is not recursive, $\langle B, C \rangle$ is a recursively inseparable pair. From Theorem 5.5, we can uniformly find such a recursively inseparable pair $\langle B, C \rangle$ from a non-recursive r.e. set $A$. By Theorem 3.2, it suffices to prove (3) and (4).

(3): Since $P(\overline{\pi})$ is in $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$ iff $n \in B$, and $\neg P(\overline{\pi})$ is in $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$ iff $n \in C$, we have $B$ and $C$ are recursive in $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$. By essentially the same argument as Theorem 3.2, we can show that $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$ is recursive in $\langle B, C \rangle$. The key point is that the theory $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$ admits the elimination of quantifiers. Thus, any sentence $\theta$ of the theory $T$ is equivalent to a disjunctive normal form of $\{ P(\overline{n}) : n \in \mathbb{N} \}$, and this disjunctive normal form can be found explicitly once $\theta$ is explicitly given.

(4): Suppose $V$ is a consistent r.e. extension of $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$. Define $D = \{ n : V \vdash P(\overline{n}) \}$. Note that $B \subseteq D$ and $D \cap C = \emptyset$. By Theorem 5.5, $A \leq_T D$. Since $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$ has the same Turing degree as $A$, we have $U_{\langle B, C \rangle} \leq_T V$. Thus, $U_{\langle B, C \rangle}$ is Turing persistent. □

It is an open question in [1]: can we show that for any Turing degree $0 < d \leq 0'$, there is a theory $U$ such that $G1$ holds for $U$, $U \triangleleft R$ and $U$ has Turing degree $d$? As a corollary of Theorem 5.8, the following theorem answers this question positively and proves a stronger result.
Theorem 5.9. For any r.e. Turing degree $0 < d \leq 0'$, we can uniformly find a Turing persistent theory $T$ with Turing degree $d$ such that $G1$ holds for $T$ and $T \not< R$.

Since there are only countably many r.e. degrees, we have countably many Turing persistent theories in $\mathcal{D}$.

By default, theories refer to first order theories. Now, we show that Theorem 5.9 also holds for theories in propositional logic. We work in propositional logic with countable many variables $\{p_n : n \in \omega\}$. A theory in propositional logic is just a set of formulas in the language of propositional logic. We could view the language of propositional logic as a special instance of first order language: propositional variables can be viewed as constants in first order language. Thus, our notion of interpretation also applies to theories in propositional logic.

Theorem 5.10 (Jeřábek, Theorem 4.5, [7]).

(1) For $\Sigma^0_2$-axiomatized theory $T$, $T$ is interpretable in some consistent existential theory iff $T$ is weakly interpretable in $\text{EC}_L$ for some language $L$.\footnote{The theory of existentially closed $L$-structures ($\text{EC}_L$) is the model completion of the empty theory in the language $L$ (see [7]).}

(2) The theory $R$ is not weakly interpretable in $\text{EC}_L$ for any language $L$.

By Theorem 5.10, $R$ is not interpretable in any consistent existential theory.

Theorem 5.11. For any r.e. Turing degree $0 < d \leq 0'$, there exists a Turing persistent theory $U_d$ in propositional logic with Turing degree $d$ such that $U_d \not< R$ and $G1$ holds for $U_d$.

Proof. Suppose $A$ is a r.e. set with Turing degree $d$, and $\langle X,Y \rangle$ is the recursively inseparable pair with Turing degree $d$ constructed as in Theorem 5.5. Let $U_d = \{p_n : n \in X\} \cup \{\neg p_n : n \in Y\}$. Note that $U_d$ is consistent.

Claim. $U_d$ is essentially incomplete.

Proof. Let $S$ be a recursively axiomatized consistent extension of $U_d$. Define $B = \{n \in \omega : S \vdash p_n\}$ and $C = \{n \in \omega : S \vdash \neg p_n\}$. Note that $B, C$ are r.e. sets, $X \subseteq B$, and $Y \subseteq C$. Since $\langle X,Y \rangle$ is a recursively inseparable pair, we have $B \cup C \neq \omega$. Thus, there exists $n \in \omega$ such that $S \not\vdash p_n$ and $S \not\vdash \neg p_n$. Hence, $S$ is incomplete. \qed

Now we define a theory $T$ as follows. The language of $T$ consists of the signature of $R$ and an extra unary predicate symbol $P$. The axioms of $T$ consist of axioms of $R$ plus the following axioms: $P(\overline{n})$ if $n \in X$; and $\neg P(\overline{n})$ if $n \in Y$. We can show that $U_d \leq T$ by mapping $p_n$ to $P(\overline{n})$. Since $T$ is locally finitely satisfiable with finite signature,
we have $T \leq R$. Thus, $U_d \leq R$. Since $R$ is not interpretable in any consistent existential theory, we have $U_d \ll R$.

Now we show that $U_d$ has Turing degree $d$. Clearly, $X, Y \leq_T U_d$. By the normal form theorem in propositional logic, any formula in propositional logic is equivalent to a disjunctive normal form. Thus, $U_d \leq_T (X, Y)$. So the theory $U_d$ has Turing degree $d$. □

Note that for Turing persistent theories, if they are comparable w.r.t. interpretation, then they are comparable w.r.t. Turing degree. From Theorem 5.9, given incomparable r.e. sets w.r.t. Turing degree, we can find incomparable r.e. theories in $D$ w.r.t. interpretation. It is an open question in [1]: are elements of $\langle D, \leq \rangle$ comparable? The following theorem answers this question negatively and provides much more information.

**Theorem 5.12.** Given r.e. sets $A <_T B$, there is a sequence of Turing persistent r.e. theories $\langle S_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $S_n \in D$, $A <_T S_n <_T B$ and $S_n$ are incomparable w.r.t. interpretation.

**Proof.** By Fact 3.6, there exists a sequence of r.e. sets $\langle C_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $A <_T C_n <_T B$ and $C_n$ are incomparable w.r.t. Turing degree. By Theorem 5.9, for each $n$, we can find a Turing persistent r.e. theory $S_n \in D$ with the same Turing degree as $C_n$. Thus, $A <_T S_n <_T B$ for each $n$. Since each $S_n$ is Turing persistent, and $C_n$’s are incomparable w.r.t. Turing degree, we have $S_n$’s are incomparable w.r.t. interpretation. □

**Lemma 5.13.** For r.e. theories $A$ and $B$, if $G_1$ holds for both $A$ and $B$, then $G_1$ also holds for $A \oplus B$.

**Proof.** It suffices to show that $A \oplus B$ is essentially undecidable. Suppose $U$ is a consistent decidable extension of $A \oplus B$. Define $X = \{ \langle \phi, \psi \rangle : U \vdash P \rightarrow \phi \text{ or } U \vdash \neg P \rightarrow \psi \}$. Since $U$ is decidable, $X$ is recursive. Note that $A \subseteq (X)_0$ and $B \subseteq (X)_1$. We claim that at least one of $(X)_0$ and $(X)_1$ is consistent. If both $(X)_0$ and $(X)_1$ are inconsistent, then $U \vdash (P \rightarrow \bot)$ and $U \vdash (\neg P \rightarrow \bot)$. Thus, $U \vdash \bot$ which contradicts that $U$ is consistent. WLOG, we assume that $(X)_0$ is consistent. Then $(X)_0$ is a consistent decidable extension of $A$, which contradicts that $A$ is essentially undecidable. □

As a corollary, the interpretation degree structure of r.e. theories for which $G_1$ holds with the operators $\oplus$ and $\otimes$ is also a distributive lattice.

From the email communication, Albert Visser shows that there is a strictly descending chain of essentially undecidable theories w.r.t. interpretation. The following theorem is inspired by Visser’s this result.

**Theorem 5.14.** Given r.e. sets $A <_T B$, there is a sequence of r.e. theories $\langle C_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $C_n \in D$, $A \leq_T C_n \leq_T B$, and
\[ \langle \ldots C_{n+1} \triangleleft C_n \triangleleft \ldots \triangleleft C_0 \rangle \] is a strictly descending chain of elements of \( D \).

Proof. By Theorem 5.12, we can pick a sequence of Turing persistent r.e. theories \( \langle S_n : n \in \omega \rangle \) such that \( S_n \in D, A \triangleleft_T S_n \triangleleft_T B \) and \( S_n \) are incomparable w.r.t. interpretation. Define \( C_n = S_{n+1} \oplus \ldots \oplus S_0 \). By Lemma 5.13, \( C_n \in D \). Note that \( A \triangleleft_T C_n \triangleleft_T B \).

Now we show that \( C_{n+1} \triangleleft C_n \) for any \( n \in \omega \). We prove by induction on \( n \). It is easy to show that \( C_1 \triangleleft C_0 \) since \( S_0 \) and \( S_1 \) are incomparable w.r.t. interpretation. Now, we suppose \( C_{n+1} \triangleleft C_n \) and show that \( C_{n+2} \triangleleft C_{n+1} \). It suffices to show that \( C_{n+1} \not\triangleleft C_{n+2} \). Suppose not, i.e. \( C_{n+1} \triangleleft C_{n+2} \). Then \( C_{n+1} \not\triangleleft S_{n+2} \oplus C_{n+1} \leq S_{n+2} \).

Claim. Suppose \( T \) is a consistent r.e. theory. For any \( n \), if \( C_n \triangleleft T \), then \( S_i \leq_T T \) for some \( 0 \leq i \leq n \).

Proof. We prove by induction on \( n \). If \( n = 0 \), the conclusion holds since \( S_0 \) is Turing persistent. Suppose \( C_{n+1} = S_{n+1} \oplus C_n \geq T, \tau \) is the interpretation of \( C_{n+1} \) in \( T \), and \( \mathbf{P} \) is the new predicate used in \( S_{n+1} \oplus T_n \). If \( T + \mathbf{P}^\tau \) is consistent, then \( S_{n+1} \leq T + \mathbf{P}^\tau \). Since \( S_{n+1} \leq T \), \( S_{n+1} \leq T + \mathbf{P}^\tau \leq T \). Otherwise, \( T + \lnot \mathbf{P}^\tau \) is consistent. Then \( C_n \leq T + \lnot \mathbf{P}^\tau \). By induction, \( S_i \leq_T T + \lnot \mathbf{P}^\tau \leq T \) for some \( 0 \leq i \leq n \). Thus, we have \( S_i \leq_T T \) for some \( 0 \leq i \leq n+1 \).

By the above claim, we have \( S_i \leq_T S_{n+2} \) for some \( 0 \leq i \leq n+1 \), which leads to a contradiction. Thus, \( \langle \ldots C_{n+1} \triangleleft C_n \triangleleft \ldots \triangleleft C_0 \rangle \) is a strictly descending chain of elements of \( D \).

As a corollary of Theorem 5.14, there are many strictly descending chains of elements of \( D \). The following theorem shows that the interpretation degree structure of r.e. theories for which \( G_1 \) holds has no maximal element.

Theorem 5.15. For any r.e. theory \( A \) for which \( G_1 \) holds, we can uniformly find a r.e. theory \( B \) for which \( G_1 \) holds such that \( A \triangleleft B \).

Proof. Let \( A \) be any r.e. theory for which \( G_1 \) holds. By Fact 3.6, we can uniformly find a r.e. theory \( C \) such that \( A \) is incomparable with \( C \) w.r.t. Turing degree. By Theorem 5.9, from \( C \) we can uniformly find a Turing persistent theory \( T \) for which \( G_1 \) holds such that \( T \) has the same Turing degree as \( C \). Let \( B = A \otimes T \). Suppose \( B \leq A \). Since \( T \leq B \leq A \) and \( T \) is Turing comparable with \( A \) which leads to a contradiction. Thus, \( A \triangleleft B \).

Theorem 5.16. If \( \langle D, \triangleleft \rangle \) has a minimal element, then it is also a minimum, and is not Turing persistent.

Proof. Suppose \( A \) is a minimal element of \( \langle D, \triangleleft \rangle \). We show that for any r.e. theory \( B \in D \), we have \( A \triangleleft B \). Since \( A, B \in D \), by Lemma
A ⊕ B ∈ D. Since A is minimal, we have A ⊕ B is mutually interpretable with A. Thus, A ≤ B.

Now we show that A is not Turing persistent. Suppose A is Turing persistent and d₀ is the Turing degree of A. Take a r.e. Turing degree 0 < d₁ < 0’ such that d₀ is incomparable with d₁. By Theorem 5.9, take a Turing persistent theory T ∈ D with the Turing degree d₁. Since A is the minimum element of ⟨D, ⊂⟩, we have A ⊂ T. Since A is Turing persistent, we have A ≤ T, which contradicts the fact that d₀ is incomparable with d₁.

□

By Theorem 5.14, we can effectively find many strictly descending chains of elements of D. But it is unknown that whether for any r.e. theory A for which G₁ holds, we can effectively find a r.e. theory B for which G₁ holds such that B ⊁ A. But for finite axiomatized theories, we can effectively find such a theory B. We first introduce some notions.

Definition 5.17 (The theory TN, [19]). The theory TN consists of the following axioms:

• ∀x(x ≠ 0); ∀x∀y∀z((x < y ∧ y < z) → x < z);
• ∀x∀y∀z(x < y ∨ x = y ∨ y < x);
• ∀x(Sx ≠ x);
• ∀x∀y(x < y → (x < Sx ∧ y ≠ Sx));
• ∀x(x + 0 = x);
• ∀x∀y(x + Sy = S(x + y));
• ∀x(x × 0 = 0);
• ∀x∀y(x × Sy = x × y + x).

Note that a model of TN is a linear ordering that either represents a finite ordinal or starts with a copy of ω.

For Σ₁⁻¹-sentence ψ = ∃xφ(x) where φ is Δ₀⁻₁-sentence, define the finitely axiomatizable theory [ψ] as follows:

[ψ] = TN + ∃x∃y < x φ(y).

Definition 5.18 ([19]). Suppose φ = ∃x A(x) and ψ = ∃x B(x) are two Σ₀⁻¹-sentences. We Define:

1. φ ≤ ψ = ∃x(A(x) ∧ ∀y < x ¬B(y));
2. φ < ψ = ∃x(B(x) ∧ ∀y ≤ x ¬A(y));
3. If θ is φ ≤ ψ, then θ⊥ = ψ < φ;
4. If θ is φ < ψ, then θ⊥ = ψ ≤ φ.

Fact 5.19 (Visser, [19]). Suppose φ, ψ are Σ₀⁻¹-sentences.

• If ψ is false, then [ψ] ⊨ R.
• If ψ is true, then [ψ] ⊨ T.
• If φ ≤ ψ, then [ψ] ⊨ φ.
• Let A = φ ≤ ψ. If φ (or ψ) holds, then either A holds or A⊥ holds.
Theorem 5.20 (Harvey Friedman). For any finitely axiomatized theory $A$, if $\top \prec A$, then there exists a finitely axiomatized theory $B$ such that $\top \prec B \prec A$.

Proof. By the fix point lemma, we can find a sentence $\theta$ such that $\text{PA} \vdash \theta \leftrightarrow (A \sqsubseteq A \oplus [\theta]) \preceq (A \oplus [\theta] \preceq \top)$.

Claim. $A \not\preceq A \oplus [\theta]$.

Proof. Suppose $A \sqsubseteq A \oplus [\theta]$ holds. By Fact 5.19, either $\theta$ holds or $\theta \perp$ holds.

Case one: Suppose $\theta$ holds. By Fact 5.19, $[\theta] \sqsubseteq \top$. Since $A \sqsubseteq A \oplus [\theta]$, we have $A \sqsubseteq \top$, which leads to a contradiction.

Case two: Suppose $\neg \theta$ holds. Then $\theta \perp$ holds. By Fact 5.19, $[\theta] \models \top$ and thus $[\theta] \models \bot$. Since $\neg \theta$ holds, we have $A \oplus [\theta] \sqsubseteq \top$. Thus, $A \sqsubseteq \top$, which leads to a contradiction. \hfill $\Box$

By the similar argument, we can show that $A \oplus [\theta] \not\preceq \top$. Thus, $\top \prec A \oplus [\theta] \prec A$.

Corollary 5.21. If $A$ is a finitely axiomatized theory for which $G_1$ holds and $\top \prec A$, then we can effectively find a finitely axiomatized theory $B$ for which $G_1$ holds such that $\top \prec B \prec A$.

Proof. This follows from Theorem 5.20. Take the finitely axiomatized theory $B = A \oplus [\theta]$ as in Theorem 5.20. Recall that the proof of Theorem 5.20 uses the fixed point lemma, but we can give an effective proof of the fixed point lemma. If $\theta$ is true, then $[\theta] \sqsubseteq \top$ which contradicts that $B \prec A$. Thus, $\theta$ is false. Since $[\theta] \supseteq R$, $G_1$ holds for $[\theta]$. By Lemma 5.13, $G_1$ holds for $B$. \hfill $\Box$

From Corollary 5.21, the interpretation degree structure of finitely axiomatized theories for which $G_1$ holds has no minimal element. The following theorem shows that there is no finitely axiomatized theory interpretable in $R$ for which $G_1$ holds.

Theorem 5.22. If $T \in D$, then $T$ is not finitely axiomatized: i.e., $D_{\text{finite}} \cap D = \emptyset$.

Proof. Suppose $S \in D_{\text{finite}} \cap D$. Since $S \preceq R$, $S$ is locally finitely satisfiable. Since $S$ is finitely axiomatized, then $S$ has a finite model, which contradicts the fact that $S$ is essentially undecidable. \hfill $\Box$

Moreover, for any Turing persistent r.e. theory $A$ for which $G_1$ holds, we can effectively find a weaker r.e. theory $B$ than $A$ w.r.t. interpretation such that $G_1$ holds for $B$.

\footnote{This proof is simple than Friedman’s proof in [4], and the idea of this proof is due to Visser in [19].}
Theorem 5.23. For any Turing persistent r.e. theory $A$ for which $G_1$ holds, we can effectively find a r.e. theory $B$ for which $G_1$ holds such that $B \triangleleft A$.

Proof. Let $A$ be any Turing persistent r.e. theory for which $G_1$ holds. By Fact 3.6, we can effectively find a r.e. set $C$ such that $A$ is incomparable with $C$ w.r.t. Turing degree. By Theorem 5.9, from $C$ we can effectively find a Turing persistent theory $T$ for which $G_1$ holds such that $T$ has the same Turing degree as $C$. Let $B = A \oplus T$. We show that $B \triangleleft A$. Suppose $A \triangleleft B$. Then $A \triangleleft B \triangleleft T$. Since $A$ is Turing persistent, we have $A \leq_T C$ which contradicts the fact that $A$ is Turing incomparable with $C$. Thus, $B \triangleleft A$. □

Recall that we assume by default that the signature of the language is finite. Finally, we show that whether $\langle D, \triangleleft \rangle$ has a minimal element (or $\langle D, \triangleleft \rangle$ is well founded) depends on the signature of the language.

In the following, we assume that the signature of theories is infinite. Now, we show that for any recursively inseparable pair $\langle X, Y \rangle$, there is a minimum theory $T_{\langle X, Y \rangle}$ w.r.t. interpretation for which $G_1$ holds.

Theorem 5.24. For any recursively inseparable pair $\langle X, Y \rangle$, there is a theory $T_{\langle X, Y \rangle}$ with infinite signature such that $G_1$ holds for $T_{\langle X, Y \rangle}$ and $T_{\langle X, Y \rangle}$ is interpretable in any first order theory.

Proof. Let $\langle X, Y \rangle$ be a recursively inseparable pair. Define the theory $T_{\langle X, Y \rangle}$ as follows. The language of $T_{\langle X, Y \rangle}$ consists of a countable list of unary predicate symbols $\langle P_n : n \in \omega \rangle$. The axioms of $T_{\langle X, Y \rangle}$ consist of the following:

1. $\forall x P_n(x)$ if $n \in X$;
2. $\exists x \neg P_n(x)$ if $n \in Y$.

Lemma 5.25. The theory $T_{\langle X, Y \rangle}$ is essentially incomplete.

Proof. Let $S$ be a recursively axiomatized consistent extension of $T_{\langle X, Y \rangle}$. Define $A = \{ n \in \omega : S \vdash \forall x P_n(x) \}$ and $B = \{ n \in \omega : S \vdash \exists x \neg P_n(x) \}$. Note that $A, B$ are r.e. sets, $X \subseteq A$, and $Y \subseteq B$. Since $\langle X, Y \rangle$ is a recursively inseparable pair, we have $A \cup B \neq \omega$. Thus, there exists $n \in \omega$ such that $n \notin A \cup B$. Hence, $S$ is incomplete. □

Lemma 5.26. The theory $T_{\langle X, Y \rangle}$ is interpretable in any first order theory.

Proof. For any $n \in X$, we interpret $P_n(x)$ as $x = x$; and for any $n \in Y$, we interpret $P_n(x)$ as $x \neq x$. □
Theorem 5.24 shows that, interpretation for theories with infinite signature is not a good notion for comparing essentially undecidable theories since an essentially undecidable theory may be interpretable in a decidable theory.

6. Conclusion

Finally, we give some concluding remarks. The existence of non-recursive r.e. set is essential to understand the incompleteness phenomenon. Given any non-recursive r.e. set $A$, we can uniformly construct a r.e. theory for which $G_1$ holds with the same Turing degree as $A$. In [5], Harvey Friedman proves $G_2$ for theories interpreting $I\Sigma_1$ based on the existence of a remarkable set which is equivalent to the existence of non-recursive r.e. set.

We have shown that whether there is a minimal r.e. theory for which $G_1$ holds depends on the definition of minimality. The fact that there is no minimal r.e. theory and no maximal r.e. theory for which $G_1$ holds w.r.t. some degree structures shows that incompleteness is omnipresent and there is no limit of the first incompleteness theorem.

Both [1] and this paper are about the limit of $G_1$. A natural question is: what is the limit of the second incompleteness theorem ($G_2$) if any? Both mathematically and philosophically, $G_2$ is more problematic than $G_1$. In the case of $G_1$, we are mainly interested in the fact that some sentence is independent of the base theory. But in the case of $G_2$, we are also interested in the content of the consistency statement. We can say that $G_1$ is extensional in the sense that we can construct a concrete independent mathematical statement without referring to arithmetization and provability predicate. However, $G_2$ is intensional and “whether the consistency of $T$ is provable in $T$” depends on many factors such as the way of formalization, the base theory we use, the way of coding, the way to express consistency, the provability predicate we use, the way we enumerate axioms of the base theory, etc. For the discussion of the intensionality of $G_2$, we refer to [2].

We assume that $\text{Con}(T)$ is the canonical arithmetic formula expressing the consistency of the base theory $T$ defined as $\neg \text{Pr}_T(0 \neq 0)$ where both the coding and provability predicate it uses are standard. We define that $G_2$ holds for a r.e. theory $T$ if for any r.e. theory $S$ interpreting $T$, we have $S \nvdash \text{Con}(S)$. Pavel Pudlák shows that for any r.e. theory $T$ interpreting $Q$, $T \nvdash \text{Con}(T)$ (see [12]). Thus, $G_2$ holds for $Q$. But from [11], $G_2$ does not hold for $R$ since we can find a theory mutually interpretable with $R$ but it proves its consistency.

The following are two natural questions about the limit of $G_2$ worthy of future examination.

---

16This means that the coding we use is the standard Gödel coding, and the provability predicate we use satisfies the Hilbert-Bernays-Löb derivability conditions.
Question 6.1.

(1) Is there a r.e. theory $T$ such that $\mathsf{G2}$ holds for $T$ and $T$ has Turing degree less than $0'$?

(2) Is there a r.e. theory $T$ such that $\mathsf{G2}$ holds for $T$ and $T \triangleleft \mathsf{Q}$?
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