

Kreisel–Lévy-type theorems for Kripke–Platek and other set theories

Shuangshuang Shu, Michael Rathjen

Abstract

We prove that, over Kripke–Platek set theory with infinity (KP), transfinite induction along the ordinal $\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ is equivalent to the schema asserting the soundness of KP, where Ω denotes the supremum of all ordinals in the universe; this is analogous to the result that, over Peano arithmetic (PA), transfinite induction along ε_0 is equivalent to the schema asserting the soundness of PA. In the proof we need to code infinitary proofs within KP, and it is done by using partial recursive set functions. This result can be generalised to $\text{KP} + \Gamma\text{-separation} + \Gamma\text{-collection}$ where Γ is any given syntactic complexity, but not to ZF.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminary definitions	3
3	Provable well-orderings in KP	5
4	The infinitary proof system	7
5	Partial recursive set functions	10
6	Expressibility of the infinitary derivations	13
7	Formalisation of cut elimination in $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$	17
8	Embedding KP into $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$	21
	References	27

Department of Pure Mathematics, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom
 mmssh@leeds.ac.uk, m.rathjen@leeds.ac.uk

1 Introduction

In 1968, [KL68] showed that over Peano arithmetic (PA), the axiom schema which asserts the soundness of PA is equivalent to the schema of transfinite induction along ε_0 , the first ordinal α that satisfies $\alpha = \omega^\alpha$: let

$$\text{RFN}(\text{PA}) = \{\forall x(\text{Prov}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner \phi(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow \phi(x)) \mid \phi \text{ a formula in PA}\}$$

be the soundness principle of PA^1 , where $\text{Prov}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner \phi(\dot{x}) \urcorner)$ means $\phi(x)$ is PA-provable²; and let

$$\varepsilon_0 = \sup_n \omega_n \quad \text{where } \omega_0 = \omega, \omega_{n+1} = \omega^{\omega_n};$$

the transfinite induction schema along an ordinal α is

$$\text{TI}(\alpha) = \{\forall \beta((\forall \gamma < \beta)\phi(\gamma) \rightarrow \phi(\beta)) \rightarrow (\forall \beta < \alpha)\phi(\beta) \mid \phi \text{ a formula in PA}\};$$

then the theorem mentioned above reads as

$$\text{RFN}(\text{PA}) \equiv \text{TI}(\varepsilon_0) \quad \text{over PA,}$$

i.e., $\text{PA} + \text{RFN}(\text{PA})$ proves $\text{TI}(\varepsilon_0)$ and vice versa. The direction $\text{PA} + \text{RFN}(\text{PA}) \vdash \text{TI}(\varepsilon_0)$ is essentially from Gentzen's proof that PA proves $\text{TI}(\alpha)$ for every $\alpha < \varepsilon_0$, and [KL68] used another device to prove the other direction; in [Sch77], the direction $\text{PA} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_0) \vdash \text{RFN}(\text{PA})$ is proved by transfinite induction along infinitary proof trees as which all PA-proofs can be interpreted with lengths $< \varepsilon_0$.

This paper aims to prove a very similar result in Kripke–Platek set theory (KP^3). KP is a sub-theory of ZF consisting of the following axioms:

1. Extensionality. $\forall x(x \in a \leftrightarrow x \in b) \rightarrow a = b$.
2. Set induction. $\forall x((\forall y \in x)G(y) \rightarrow G(x)) \rightarrow \forall x G(x)$, for all formulas G .
3. Pair. $\exists x(x = \{a, b\})$.
4. Union. $\exists x(x = \bigcup a)$.
5. Infinity. $\exists x(x \neq \emptyset \wedge (\forall y \in x)(\exists z \in x)(y \in z))$.
6. Δ_0 -separation. $\exists x \forall u(u \in x \leftrightarrow (u \in a \wedge F(u)))$, for all Δ_0 -formulas F .
7. Δ_0 -collection. $(\forall x \in a) \exists y G(x, y) \rightarrow \exists z (\forall x \in a) (\exists y \in z) G(x, y)$, for all Δ_0 -formulas G .

In proof theory, KP is rather similar to PA. For example, it is a well-known result in [Par70] that the primitive-recursive functions on natural numbers are exactly the class of the provably total functions of PA with induction restricted to Σ_1 -formulas. In set theory we may define primitive-recursive functions on sets as well, and by [Rat92] Theorem 1.2, a set function F is primitive-recursive iff it is provably total in KP with (set) induction restricted to Σ_1 -formulas. But more importantly for

¹“RFN” represents “reflection” which is the name of the schema used in [KL68]; in set theory, the same phrase can mean something else, so we avoid using this term

²we assume a standard coding $\ulcorner \cdot \urcorner$ for formulas; $\ulcorner \phi(\dot{x}) \urcorner$ is a primitive-recursive function which on input m outputs $\ulcorner \phi(S^m(0)) \urcorner$ where S is the symbol for successor

³contrary to convention, we will use KP to denote Kripke–Platek set theory with infinity

us, there is a way to transform KP-proofs into infinitary proof trees for which the cuts can at least be partially eliminated. Thus, if we let Ω denote the supremum of all ordinals in the universe of KP, and propose that

$$\text{RFN}(\text{KP}) \equiv \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}) \quad \text{over KP}$$

where $\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ denotes the $(\Omega + 1)$ -th ordinal α that satisfies $\alpha = \omega^\alpha$, then it is possible to follow the method mentioned in [Sch77] to prove our proposition; the equivalence stated above is what we are trying to prove in this paper.

In Section 2 we lay out some preliminary definitions. The direction $\text{KP} + \text{RFN}(\text{KP}) \vdash \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$ will be quickly dealt with in 3, and all the rest 4–8 are dedicated to proving the converse $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}) \vdash \text{RFN}(\text{KP})$. The length of the latter is partly due to the lengthiness of cut elimination theorem and embedding theorem themselves, but also due to a subtlety in expressing the infinitary proofs within KP, and the need of using partial recursive set functions for which the recursion theorem applies.

2 Preliminary definitions

In this paper, our theory T is always assumed to be sufficiently strong, say, it contains primitive-recursive arithmetic.

Definition 2.1. Let T be a theory. The **soundness principle** of T , $\text{RFN}(T)$, is the schema

$$\text{RFN}(T) = \{\forall x(\text{Prov}_T(\ulcorner \phi(\dot{x}) \urcorner) \rightarrow \phi(x)) \mid \phi \text{ a formula in } T\}$$

where $\text{Prov}_T(\ulcorner \phi(\dot{x}) \urcorner)$ means that $\phi(x)$ is T -provable.

Definition 2.2. If our background theory is a set theory in which ω is definable, **primitive-recursive set functions**⁴ are the class of functions built up from the initial functions

- $P_{n,i}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i, 1 \leq i \leq n,$
- $Z(y) = 0,$
- $M(x, y) = x \cup \{y\},$
- $C(x, y, u, v) = x$ if $u \in v, y$ otherwise,
- $\text{Inf}(x) = \omega$

by

- *substitution*: $F(\vec{x}) = K(G_1(\vec{x}), \dots, G_k(\vec{x})),$ and
- *primitive recursion*: $F(z, \vec{x}) = H(\bigcup\{F(u, \vec{x}) \mid u \in z\}, z, \vec{x}).$

Some of the most important examples of primitive-recursive set functions are the characteristic functions of Δ -predicates in KP, and ordinal operations such as addition, multiplication and exponentiation. See [Rat92] 2.2 for details.

⁴the initial function $x \mapsto \omega$ is dispensable in a more general setting

Definition 2.3. Let T be a theory. An **ordinal representation system** $\langle R, \leq \rangle$ in T is a unary relation R and a preorder \leq primitive-recursively coded in T ; members of R are strings of symbols to be interpreted as ordinals and \leq orders the ordinals; the system also comes with basic ordinal operations: addition, multiplication, exponentiation $\alpha \mapsto \omega^\alpha$, all primitive-recursively coded in T .

The strings of symbols in R may be mapped non-injectively into the ordinals and so \leq could be not antisymmetric. For example, ω and ω^1 have the same value, $\omega \leq \omega^1$ and $\omega^1 \leq \omega$, but their notations are different: $\omega \neq \omega^1$.

Definition 2.4. Let T be a theory and let $\langle R, \leq \rangle$ be an ordinal representation system in T ; let U be a predicate. The **progressiveness of $<$ for U** , $\text{Prog}_<(U)$, is the formula

$$\text{Prog}_<(U) \equiv \forall x((\forall y < x)y \in U \rightarrow x \in U).$$

If $a \in R$, the **transfinite induction along a for U** , $\text{TI}_<(a, U)$, is the formula

$$\text{TI}_<(a, U) \equiv \text{Prog}_<(U) \rightarrow (\forall x < a)x \in U.$$

If F is a formula, then by $x \in F$ we mean $F(x)$; so, e.g. $\text{Prog}_<(F)$ is the formula $\forall x((\forall y < x)F(y) \rightarrow F(x))$. The **transfinite induction schema along a** , $\text{TI}_<(a)$, is the schema

$$\text{TI}_<(a) = \{\text{TI}_<(a, F) \mid F \text{ a formula in } T\}.$$

If it is clear which ordinal representation system we are using, we often drop the $<$ symbol.

The ordinal representation system in KP we are going to use is rather canonical. In arithmetic, apparently the numbers we have access to are the natural numbers, but by Cantor normal form, every non-zero ordinal α can be written in the form

$$\alpha = \omega^{\alpha_1} + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_n}$$

for some $n \in \omega$ and ordinals $\alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n$; if $\alpha < \varepsilon_0$ then $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ must be smaller than α , and we can write $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ in Cantor normal forms again, representing them by smaller ordinals. The descending sequences of ordinals must end in finitely many steps, therefore we may represent every ordinal $\alpha < \varepsilon_0$ by just natural numbers. The idea for representing $\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ in KP is exactly the same; we will only sketch the definition.

Definition 2.5. Within KP we define an ordinal representation system $\langle R, \leq \rangle$ as follows. Let ON denote the class of ordinal numbers. If a, b are members of R , we use $a \equiv b$ to denote that a, b are exactly the same string of symbols, whereas $a = b$ means the weaker condition $a \leq b$ and $b \leq a$.

- The symbols are $\{\alpha \mid \alpha \in \text{ON}\}$, Ω , $+$, ω , ε .
- The members a of the class R are in the following forms.
 - $a \equiv \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \text{ON}$.
 - $a \equiv \Omega$.
 - $a \equiv \omega^{a_0}$ where $a_0 \in R$.

- $a \equiv a_1 + a_2$ where a_1, a_2 are of the form $\omega^{b_1} + \dots + \omega^{b_n}$ (not necessarily in Cantor normal form) where $b_1, \dots, b_n \in R$.
- $a \equiv \varepsilon_{a_0}$ where $a_0 \in R$.
- The ordering $<$ is defined as follows. Let $a, b \in R$.
 - $a, b \in \text{ON}$. Then $a < b$ iff $a < b$ as ordinals.
 - $a \in \text{ON}$, $b \equiv \Omega$. Then $a < b$.
 - $a \in \text{ON}$, $b \equiv b_1 + b_2$ or $b \equiv \omega^{b_0}$ or $b \equiv \varepsilon_{b_0}$.
If b contains any Ω symbol, then $a < b$.
If b does not contain any Ω symbol, then b can be evaluated in ON primitive-recursively, and $a < b$ iff $a < b$ in the evaluation.
 - $a \equiv \Omega$, $b \equiv b_1 + b_2$.
If $b_1 < \Omega$, then $b \diamond \Omega$ iff $b_2 \diamond \Omega$, where \diamond is any of $<, =, >$.
If $b_1 = \Omega$, then $b > \Omega$ (since $b_2 > 0$ always in our convention for $+$).
If $b_1 > \Omega$, then $b > \Omega$.
 - $a \equiv \Omega$, $b \equiv \omega^{b_0}$ or ε_{b_0} . Then $b \diamond \Omega$ iff $b_0 \diamond \Omega$ for $\diamond \in \{<, =, >\}$.
 - $a \equiv a_1 + a_2$, $b \equiv b_1 + b_2$ or $b \equiv \omega^{b_0}$. We may primitive-recursively sort a and b into their Cantor normal form and then compare them in the usual way.
 - $a \equiv a_1 + a_2$, $b \equiv \varepsilon_{b_0}$. Let ω^{a_0} be the first term of the Cantor normal form of a .
If $a_0 < b$, then $a < b$.
If $a_0 \geq b$, then $a > b$.
 - $a \equiv \omega^{a_0}$, $b \equiv \omega^{b_0}$. Then $a \diamond b$ iff $a_0 \diamond b_0$ for $\diamond \in \{<, =, >\}$.
 - $a \equiv \omega^{a_0}$, $b \equiv \varepsilon_{b_0}$. Then $a \diamond b$ iff $a_0 \diamond b$ for $\diamond \in \{<, =, >\}$.

The predicates R and $<$ are therefore Δ in KP and are primitive-recursive.

We will be using an auxiliary sum operation for ordinals.

Definition 2.6. Define an operation $\#$ as follows: $\alpha \# 0 = 0 \# \alpha = \alpha$. For α with Cantor normal form $\omega^{\alpha_1} + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_m}$ and β with Cantor normal form $\omega^{\beta_1} + \dots + \omega^{\beta_n}$ define

$$\alpha \# \beta := \omega^{\alpha_{\pi(1)}} + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_{\pi(n)}}$$

where π is a permutation of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\alpha_{\pi(i)} \geq \alpha_{\pi(i+1)}$ for all $1 \leq i < n$. $\alpha \# \beta$ is called the **natural sum** or **Hessenberg sum** of α and β .

3 Provable well-orderings in KP

In this section we prove the direction $\text{KP} + \text{RFN}(\text{KP}) \vdash \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$; the proof follows almost directly from modification of Gentzen's proof that PA proves $\text{TI}(\alpha)$ for every $\alpha < \varepsilon_0$.

Recall that R denotes the symbol class for our ordinal representation system and $<$ is our ordering on R .

Definition 3.1. For a predicate U , let

$$U^J = \{b \in R \mid (\forall a \in R)(R \cap a \subset U \rightarrow R \cap a + \omega^b \subset U)\},$$

denote the **jump** of U , where $R \cap x$ means $\{b \in R \mid b < x\}$.

Lemma 3.2. $\text{KP} \vdash \text{Prog}_<(U) \rightarrow \text{Prog}_<(U^J)$.

Proof. Assume (1) $\text{Prog}_<(U)$ and (2) $(\forall x < b)x \in U^J$, we want to show that $b \in U^J$, i.e.,

$$(\forall a \in R)(R \cap a \subset U \rightarrow R \cap a + \omega^b \subset U).$$

Assume that (3) $R \cap a \subset U$. Let $d \in R \cap a + \omega^b$; we need to show that $d \in U$ under the assumptions (1)–(3).

If $d < a$, then $d \in U$ by (3).

If $d = a$ then using (1) and (3) we have $d \in U$.

If $d > a$, then since $d < a + \omega^b$, we may primitive-recursively find d_1, \dots, d_k such that

$$d = a + \omega^{d_1} + \dots + \omega^{d_k}, \quad d_k \leq \dots \leq d_1 < b.$$

Since $R \cap a \subset U$, we get $R \cap a + \omega^{d_1} \subset U$ by (2). Using (2) a further $k - 1$ times we obtain

$$R \cap a + \omega^{d_1} + \dots + \omega^{d_k} \subset U.$$

Finally, using one application of (1) we have $d \in U$. □

Notation. Let $e_0 \equiv \Omega + 1$, $e_{n+1} \equiv \omega^{e_n}$.

The following lemma shows that $\text{KP} \vdash \text{TI}_<(e_n, U)$ for all $n \in \omega$.

Lemma 3.3. For any $n < \omega$ and any definable class U ,

$$\text{KP} \vdash \text{Prog}_<(U) \rightarrow R \cap e_n \subset U \wedge e_n \in U.$$

Proof. By induction on n (outside of KP).

For $n = 0$ we need to show that $\forall x((\forall y < x)y \in U \rightarrow x \in U) \rightarrow \Omega + 1 \subset U \wedge \Omega + 1 \in U$. Suppose $\text{Prog}_<(U)$ holds but there is some $a < \Omega$ such that $a \notin U$. Then by ϵ -induction of KP, there is a least ordinal α such that there exists some $b \in R$ with value α and $b \notin U$. But this implies $(\forall y < b)y \in U$, and therefore $b \in U$ by $\text{Prog}_<(U)$. Thus, assuming $\text{Prog}_<(U)$, we must have $\Omega \subset U$. Then by applying $\text{Prog}_<(U)$ twice we have $\Omega, \Omega + 1 \in U$.

Now suppose the result holds for n . Since the induction hypothesis (i.h.) holds for all definable classes, we have that

$$\text{KP} \vdash \text{Prog}_<(U^J) \rightarrow R \cap e_n \subset U^J \wedge e_n \in U^J.$$

Since $\text{KP} \vdash \text{Prog}_<(U) \rightarrow \text{Prog}_<(U^J)$, we have

$$(*) \quad \text{KP} \vdash \text{Prog}_<(U) \rightarrow R \cap e_n \subset U^J \wedge e_n \in U^J.$$

Now we argue in KP. Assume $\text{Prog}_<(U)$, then from (*), we obtain

$$R \cap e_n \subset U^J \wedge e_n \in U^J.$$

By the definition of U^J , $e_n \in U^J$ implies that $R \cap 0 \subset U \rightarrow R \cap 0 + \omega^{e_n} \subset U$. Thus $R \cap \omega^{e_n} \subset U$, and an application of $\text{Prog}_<(U)$ yields $\omega^{e_n} \in U$ as required. □

Lemma 3.4. $\text{KP} \vdash \forall n(\text{Prov}_{\text{KP}}(\ulcorner \text{TI}_{<}(e_n, F) \urcorner))$ for any formula F .

Proof. Let F be given; we describe the procedure of writing the proof for $\text{TI}_{<}(e_n, F)$. For any definable class U , let U^{J^n} denote $U^{J \dots J}$ with J applied n times. To find the proof for $\text{TI}_{<}(e_n, F)$, we start with the proof of $\text{Prog}_{<}(F^{J^n}) \rightarrow R \cap e_0 \subset F^{J^n} \wedge e_0 \in F^{J^n}$. Applying the argument of the previous lemma 3.3, we obtain a proof of $\text{Prog}_{<}(F^{J^{n-1}}) \rightarrow R \cap e_1 \subset F^{J^{n-1}} \wedge e_1 \in F^{J^{n-1}}$. Then the argument can be applied again to obtain a proof of $\text{Prog}_{<}(F^{J^{n-2}}) \rightarrow R \cap e_2 \subset F^{J^{n-2}} \wedge e_2 \in F^{J^{n-2}}$, and so on. Eventually, we arrive at $\text{Prog}_{<}(F) \rightarrow R \cap e_n \subset F \wedge e_n \in F$, implying $\text{TI}_{<}(e_n, F)$. This proof-writing function with argument in n is primitive-recursive, hence provably total in KP, which implies that $\text{KP} \vdash \forall n(\text{Prov}_{\text{KP}}(\ulcorner \text{TI}_{<}(e_n, F) \urcorner))$. \square

Corollary 3.5. $\text{KP} + \text{RFN}(\text{KP}) \vdash \forall n \text{TI}_{<}(e_n, F)$. \square

Lemma 3.6. $\text{KP} \vdash \forall x(x < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1} \leftrightarrow (\exists n \in \omega)x < e_n)$.

Proof. Clearly $\text{KP} \vdash \forall x((\exists n \in \omega)x < e_n \rightarrow x < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$. The other direction is immediate for the cases $a \in \text{ON}$, $a \equiv \Omega$, or $a \equiv \varepsilon_{a_0}$. The cases $a \equiv a_1 + a_2$ or $a \equiv \omega^{a_0}$ are done by induction on the lengths of expressions in R . Let ω^{a_0} be the first term of the Cantor normal form of a . If $a < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, we must have $a_0 < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$. Then by the i.h., $a_0 < e_n$ for some n and hence $\omega^{a_0} < e_{n+1}$, so $a < e_{n+1}$. \square

From this lemma we obtain

Corollary 3.7. $\text{KP} + \text{RFN}(\text{KP}) \vdash \text{TI}_{<}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}, F)$ for any formula F . \square

4 The infinitary proof system

The rest of the paper is dedicated to prove

$$\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}) \vdash \text{RFN}(\text{KP}).$$

This will be done by considering KP-proofs as infinitary proofs with lengths $< \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ and with cut complexity at most Π_1/Σ_1 ; an induction along such proof trees will show that the proofs have true conclusions, thus fulfilling $\text{RFN}(\text{KP})$.

We first introduce our infinitary proof system $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$, which is a Tait-style sequent calculus.

Definitions of $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -terms and -formulas 4.1.

- For every set a , the constant c_a is an $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -term.
- If s, t are $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -terms, so are $\{s, t\}$ and $\cup s$.
- If s, t_1, \dots, t_n are $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -terms and $A(a, b_1, \dots, b_n)$ is a Δ_0 -formula of KP with all free variables displayed, then $\{x \in s \mid A(x, t_1, \dots, t_n)\}$ is an $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -term.
- If t_1, \dots, t_n are $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -terms and $A(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is a formula of KP with all free variables displayed, then $A(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is an $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -formula.

$\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -terms are purely symbolic, but we can still evaluate them as sets. Let Comp be a primitive-recursive set function that does the following: for all sets s, t_1, \dots, t_n , Δ_0 -formula $A(a, b_1, \dots, b_n)$ with all free variables indicated,

$$\text{Comp}(s, \vec{t}, \ulcorner A \urcorner) = \{x \in s \mid A(x, \vec{t})\};$$

a primitive-recursive computation of such a function follows from, e.g., the proof of [Bar75] I.5.2 (v). Then we can define a primitive-recursive set function Ev which evaluate $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -terms in the set universe:

- $\text{Ev}(u) = a$ if $u \equiv c_a$ is a constant for the set a ;
- if $u \equiv \cup s$, then $\text{Ev}(u) = \cup \text{Ev}(s)$;
- if $u \equiv \{s, t\}$, then $\text{Ev}(u) = \{\text{Ev}(s), \text{Ev}(t)\}$;
- if $u \equiv \{x \in s \mid A(x, t_1, \dots, t_n)\}$, then $\text{Ev}(u) = \text{Comp}(s, \vec{t}, \ulcorner A \urcorner)$.

Notation.

- If u is an $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -term, $|u|$ denotes the set-theoretic rank of $\text{Ev}(u)$.
- The formula $s = t$ is a shorthand for $(\forall x \in s)x \in t \wedge (\forall x \in t)x \in s$.
- If A is a formula, $\pm A$ denotes formulas both A and $\neg A$.
- If A is a formula, and z is a variable not appearing in A , then A^z denotes A relativised to z : A^z is the result of replacing every unbounded quantifiers $\exists x$ by $(\exists x \in z)$ and $\forall x$ by $(\forall x \in z)$ in A .

Definition of derivability in $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ 4.2. We give an inductive definition of the relation $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V}) \vdash^\alpha \Gamma$ by recursion on α ; this definition is yet outside of KP. The symbol Γ stands for an arbitrary finite set of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -formulas, and if A is a formula, Γ, A means $\Gamma \cup \{A\}$. $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V}) \vdash^\alpha \Gamma$ is meant to express that the system $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ proves the disjunction $\bigvee \Gamma$ with a proof of length $\leq \alpha$.

The axioms of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ are of the form $\vdash^\alpha \Gamma, A$ where A is a Δ_0 -formula true in KP (i.e. provable in KP). More precisely, if $A \equiv A(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is Δ_0 , t_1, \dots, t_n are all the $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -terms appearing in the formula, and $A(\text{Ev}(t_1), \dots, \text{Ev}(t_n))$ is true in KP, then Γ, A is an axiom of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$.

The following are the inference rules of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$.

$$\begin{array}{l}
(\wedge) \quad \frac{\frac{\vdash^{\alpha_0} \Gamma, A \quad \vdash^{\alpha_1} \Gamma, B}{\vdash^\alpha \Gamma, A \wedge B}}{\alpha_0, \alpha_1 < \alpha} \\
(\vee) \quad \frac{\frac{\vdash^{\alpha_0} \Gamma, C \quad \text{for some } C \in \{A, B\}}{\vdash^\alpha \Gamma, A \vee B}}{\alpha_0 < \alpha} \\
(b\forall) \quad \frac{\frac{\vdash^{\alpha_s} \Gamma, s \in t \rightarrow A(s) \quad \text{for all terms } s}{\vdash^\alpha \Gamma, (\forall x \in t)A(x)}}{\alpha_s < \alpha} \\
(b\exists) \quad \frac{\frac{\vdash^{\alpha_0} \Gamma, s \in t \wedge A(s)}{\vdash^\alpha \Gamma, (\exists x \in t)A(x)}}{\alpha_0 < \alpha}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\frac{\vdash^{\alpha_s} \Gamma, A(s) \quad \text{for all terms } s}{\vdash^{\alpha} \Gamma, \forall x A(x)} \quad \alpha_s < \alpha}{\vdash^{\alpha} \Gamma, \exists x A(x)} \quad \alpha_0 < \alpha \\
(\exists) \\
\frac{\frac{\vdash^{\alpha_0} \Gamma, A \quad \vdash^{\alpha_0} \Gamma, \neg A}{\vdash^{\alpha} \Gamma} \quad \alpha_0 < \alpha}{\vdash^{\alpha} \Gamma, \exists z A^z} \quad \alpha_0, \Omega < \alpha, A \text{ is a } \Sigma\text{-formula} \\
(\Sigma\text{-Ref})
\end{array}$$

Proof trees that follow the rules of $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ are called $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -**proofs** or $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -**derivations**. The **end sequent** of a $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation is the lowest sequent (i.e. conclusion) of that derivation. The **direct subderivation(s)** of a derivation are the derivation(s) from which the end sequent is inferred, if they exist. The **side formula(s)** of an inference are the formula(s) that are irrelevant to that inference. The **minor formula** of an inference is the formula to which the inference rule is applied, and the **principal formula** of that inference is the formula formed by that inference.

For example, in the inference

$$\frac{\Gamma, \phi \quad \Gamma, \psi}{\Gamma, \phi \wedge \psi} (\wedge)$$

the side formulas are Γ , the minor formulas are ϕ, ψ and the principal formula is $\phi \wedge \psi$. If a derivation D ends with this inference, then the end sequent of D is $\Gamma, \phi \wedge \psi$, and the direct subderivations of D are the derivations which derived Γ, ϕ and Γ, ψ respectively.

The **rank** of a term or formula is defined as follows.

- $\text{rank}(u) = \omega \cdot |u|$.
- $\text{rank}(\pm u \in v) = \max(\text{rank}(u), \text{rank}(v)) + 1$.
- $\text{rank}(A \wedge B) = \text{rank}(A \vee B) = \max(\text{rank}(A), \text{rank}(B)) + 1$.
- $\text{rank}((\exists x \in u)F(x)) = \text{rank}((\forall x \in u)F(x)) = \max(\text{rank}(u) + 3, \text{rank}(F(c_{\emptyset})) + 2)$.
- $\text{rank}(\exists x F(x)) = \text{rank}(\forall x F(x)) = \max(\Omega, \text{rank}(F(c_{\emptyset})) + 1)$.

$\frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma$ will be used to denote that $\frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma$ and all cut formulas appearing in the derivation have rank $< \rho$.

Observation 4.2.1. For each formula A , define

$$k(A) = \{|t| \mid t \text{ occurs in } A\} \cup \{\Omega \mid \text{if } A \text{ contains an unbounded quantifier}\}.$$

- (i) For each formula A , $\text{rank}(A) = \omega \cdot \max(k(A)) + n$ for some $n < \omega$.
- (ii) $\text{rank}(A) < \Omega$ iff A is Δ_0 ; thus A has rank Ω iff A is $\exists x F(x)$ or $\forall x F(x)$ where $F \in \Delta_0$.

Lemma 4.3. For each formula $A(s)$, if $|s| < \max(k(A(s)))$, then $\text{rank}(A(s)) = \text{rank}(A(c_{\emptyset}))$.

Proof. By induction on complexity of A . □

Some formulas can be regarded as generalisations of disjunctions or conjunctions:

- $A_0 \wedge A_1 \simeq \bigwedge_{i \in \{0,1\}} A_i$.
- $A_0 \vee A_1 \simeq \bigvee_{i \in \{0,1\}} A_i$.
- $(\forall x \in t)A(x) \simeq \bigwedge_s (s \in t \rightarrow A(s))$.
- $(\exists x \in t)A(x) \simeq \bigvee_s (s \in t \wedge A(s))$.
- $\forall x A(x) \simeq \bigwedge_s A(s)$.
- $\exists x A(x) \simeq \bigvee_s A(s)$.

Lemma 4.4. If A contains an unbounded quantifier and $A \simeq \bigvee_{i \in y} A_i$ or $A \simeq \bigwedge_{i \in y} A_i$ then

$$(\forall i \in y) \text{rank}(A_i) < \text{rank}(A).$$

Proof. Straightforward by using the previous lemma. □

The following lemmas will be formalised in Section 7; their proofs outside KP can be carried out similarly to the standard ones (e.g. as in [Sch77]). The parts that need consideration are how to code the infinitary proofs in KP and how to express and prove these lemmas in KP.

Weakening 4.5. If $\alpha \leq \alpha'$, $\rho \leq \rho'$, Γ and Γ' are finite sets of formulas, and $\frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma$, then $\frac{\alpha'}{\rho'} \Gamma, \Gamma'$.

Inversion 4.6. If A is not Δ_0 , $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_i)_{i \in y}$ and $\frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma, A$ then for all $i \in y$, $\frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma, A_i$.

Reduction 4.7. Suppose $\text{rank}(C) = \rho > \Omega$. If $\frac{\alpha}{\rho} \Gamma, \neg C$ and $\frac{\beta}{\rho} \Gamma, C$, then $\frac{\alpha+\beta}{\rho} \Gamma$.

Cut elimination 4.8. If $\frac{\beta}{\rho+1} \Gamma$ and $\rho > \Omega$, then $\frac{\omega\beta}{\rho} \Gamma$.

5 Partial recursive set functions

Most naively (and so not quite possibly), one might attempt to define the $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation in such a way: if for all terms s , $D_s \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation with end sequent $\Gamma, F(s)$, then $\langle \ulcorner \forall^1, \{D_s \mid s \text{ a term}\} \rangle$ is an $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation with end sequent $\Gamma, \forall x F(x)$. At least two problems are evident here: (1) $\{D_s \mid s \text{ a term}\}$ is a proper class, so we need to enclose this class-many information into a set function expressed as an index; (2) this recursive definition involves an unbounded universal quantifier, which is not allowed in KP in general.

To fix these problems altogether, we use partial recursive set functions, for which the recursion theorem applies. Here we cite [Rat12] Section 2.2 to define partial E -recursive functions; more on partial E -recursive functions can be found in [Nor78] and [Sac17] Chapter X.

Definition 5.1. Let $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{s}_N, \mathbf{p}_N, \mathbf{d}_N, \bar{\mathbf{0}}, \bar{\omega}, \gamma, \rho, \nu, \pi, \mathbf{i}_1, \mathbf{i}_2, \mathbf{i}_3$ be distinct natural numbers; they will be indices for initial partial E -recursive functions.

We define a class \mathbb{E} of triples $\langle e, x, y \rangle$ by induction. Instead of $\langle e, x, y \rangle \in \mathbb{E}$ we will write $[e](x) \simeq y$; if $n > 1$, we use $[e](x_1, \dots, x_n) \simeq y$ to convey that

$$[e](x_1) \simeq \langle e, x_1 \rangle \wedge [\langle e, x_1 \rangle](x_2) \simeq \langle e, x_1, x_2 \rangle \wedge \dots \wedge [\langle e, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} \rangle](x_n) \simeq y.$$

We say that $[e](x)$ is defined, written $[e](x) \downarrow$, if $[e](x) \simeq y$ for some y . Let \mathbb{N} denote ω ; \mathbb{E} is defined by the following clauses:

- $[\mathbf{k}](x, y) \simeq x$.
- $[\mathbf{s}](x, y, z) \simeq [[x](z)]([y](z))$.
 $[\mathbf{s}](x, y, z)$ is not defined unless $[x](z)$, $[y](z)$ and $[[x](z)]([y](z))$ are already defined; the clause for \mathbf{s} should be read as a conjunction of the following clauses: $[\mathbf{s}](x) \simeq \langle \mathbf{s}, x \rangle$, $[\langle \mathbf{s}, x \rangle](y) \simeq \langle \mathbf{s}, x, y \rangle$, and, if there exist a, b, c such that $[x](z) \simeq a$, $[y](z) \simeq b$, $[a](b) \simeq c$, then $[\langle \mathbf{s}, x, y \rangle](z) \simeq c$.
- $[\mathbf{p}](x, y) \simeq \langle x, y \rangle$.
- $[\mathbf{p}_0](x) \simeq (x)_0$.
- $[\mathbf{p}_1](x) \simeq (x)_1$.
- $[\mathbf{s}_\mathbb{N}](n) \simeq n + 1$ if $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- $[\mathbf{p}_\mathbb{N}](0) \simeq 0$.
- $[\mathbf{p}_\mathbb{N}](n + 1) \simeq n$ if $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- $[\mathbf{d}_\mathbb{N}](n, m, x, y) \simeq x$ if $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n = m$.
- $[\mathbf{d}_\mathbb{N}](n, m, x, y) \simeq y$ if $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \neq m$.
- $[\bar{\mathbf{0}}](x) \simeq 0$.
- $[\bar{\omega}](x) \simeq \omega$.
- $[\boldsymbol{\pi}](x, y) \simeq \{x, y\}$.
- $[\boldsymbol{\nu}](x) \simeq \cup x$.
- $[\boldsymbol{\gamma}](x, y) \simeq x \cap (\cap y)$.
- $[\boldsymbol{\rho}](x, y) \simeq \{[x](u) \mid u \in y\}$ if $[x](u)$ is defined for all $u \in y$.
Similarly to the clause for \mathbf{s} , this means that $[\boldsymbol{\rho}](x) \simeq \langle \boldsymbol{\rho}, x \rangle$, and if there is a function f with domain y such that $[x](u) \simeq f(u)$ for all $u \in y$, then $[\langle \boldsymbol{\rho}, x \rangle](y) \simeq \{f(u) \mid u \in y\}$.
- $[\mathbf{i}_1](x, y, z) \simeq \{u \in x \mid y \in z\}$.
- $[\mathbf{i}_2](x, y, z) \simeq \{u \in x \mid u \in y \rightarrow u \in z\}$.
- $[\mathbf{i}_3](x, y, z) \simeq \{u \in x \mid u \in y \rightarrow z \in u\}$.

Proposition 5.2. The class \mathbb{E} can be defined in KP; \mathbb{E} is a Σ class, and for all e, x, y, y' ,

$$\langle e, x, y \rangle \in \mathbb{E} \wedge \langle e, x, y' \rangle \in \mathbb{E} \Rightarrow y = y'.$$

Proof. See [Rat12]; to prove the definability of \mathbb{E} , a theorem ([AR01] Theorem 11.14) involving *inductive definition* is quoted: the definition of \mathbb{E} is an inductive definition by Σ clauses, so the definability of \mathbb{E} in KP follows from that theorem. \square

Definition 5.3. Application terms are defined inductively as follows.

- The constants $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{s}_\mathbb{N}, \mathbf{p}_\mathbb{N}, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{N}, \bar{\mathbf{0}}, \bar{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\rho}, \boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \mathbf{i}_1, \mathbf{i}_2, \mathbf{i}_3$ are application terms.
- Variables are application terms.
- If s and t are application terms, then (st) is an application term.

A **closed** application term is an application term that does not contain variables.

Definition 5.4. If r is an application term and u is a variable, we define the formula $[r \simeq u]^\wedge$ inductively as follows.

- If r is a constant or a variable, $[r \simeq u]^\wedge$ is $r = u$.
- If r is (st) , then $[r \simeq u]^\wedge$ is $\exists xy([s \simeq x]^\wedge \wedge [t \simeq y]^\wedge \wedge [x](y) \simeq u)$.

Notation.

- $t\downarrow$ denotes $\exists x[t \simeq x]^\wedge$ (i.e. t is defined).
- $t(a_1, \dots, a_n) \simeq b$ denotes

$$\exists x_1 \dots x_n \exists y (x_1 = a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_n = a_n \wedge y = b \wedge [t(x_1, \dots, x_n) \simeq y]^\wedge).$$

- $st_1 \dots t_n$ denotes $((\dots(st_1)\dots)t_n)$ (i.e. it is the functional $s(t_1, \dots, t_n)$).

Definition 5.5. A partial n -place (class) function Υ is said to be a **partial E -recursive function** if there exists a closed application term t_Υ such that

$$\text{dom}(\Upsilon) = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mid t_\Upsilon(a_1, \dots, a_n)\downarrow\}$$

and for all sets $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \text{dom}(\Upsilon)$,

$$t_\Upsilon(a_1, \dots, a_n) \simeq \Upsilon(a_1, \dots, a_n).$$

In this case, t_Υ is said to be an **index** for Υ .

If Υ_1, Υ_2 are partial E -recursive functions, then write $\Upsilon_1(\vec{a}) \simeq \Upsilon_2(\vec{a})$ if neither $\Upsilon_1(\vec{a})$ nor $\Upsilon_2(\vec{a})$ are defined, or $\Upsilon_1(\vec{a})$ and $\Upsilon_2(\vec{a})$ are both defined and equal.

Remark 5.6. Observe that, by using $[s]$ (as well as pairing and projection functions), we have a partial recursive universal computation function U that outputs $[e](x)$ on input e, x .

In the following lemma, the application term $t[x]$ means the application term t with term x indicated; $t[y]$ is the result of replacing every occurrence of x in t by y .

Abstraction lemma 5.7. For every application term $t[x]$ there exists an application term $\lambda x.t[x]$ such that the following holds:

$$\forall x_1 \dots x_n (\lambda x.t[x]\downarrow \wedge \forall y (\lambda x.t[x])y \simeq t[y]).$$

Proof. By induction on the term t . If t is the variable x , $\lambda x.x$ is **skk**. If t is a constant or a variable other than x , $\lambda x.t$ is **kt**. If $t \equiv (uv)$, $\lambda x.uv$ is **s**($\lambda x.u$)($\lambda x.v$). \square

Recursion theorem 5.8. There exists a closed application term R such that for any application terms f, x ,

$$Rf\downarrow \wedge Rfx \simeq f(Rf)x.$$

Proof. Take R to be $\lambda f.tt$, where t is $\lambda y\lambda x.f(yy)x$. \square

In particular, given any partial E -recursive f , there is an index e such that

$$\Phi_e(x) \simeq f(e, x)$$

for all x (Φ_e stands for the same thing as $[e]$).

Remark 5.9. The reader may check that the class of partial E -recursive functions include the class of primitive-recursive set functions, defined in 2.2.

Remark 5.10. We will describe a partial E -recursive function f taking parameters e and x , where e is an index of a yet unknown function. By recursion theorem, we obtain an e such that Φ_e behaves in the same way as $f(e, \cdot)$; thus, if we want to define a partial E -recursive function g , we may assume that g already knows its own index.

For example, if we want to find a partial E -recursive function g such that $g(x) \simeq \langle e, x \rangle$ where e is an index for g , we just define $f(e, x) = \langle e, x \rangle$, and apply R to f to obtain an index e such that $\Phi_e(x) \simeq f(e, x) \simeq \langle e, x \rangle$. Therefore we may define g by simply saying “ $g(x) = \langle e, x \rangle$ where e is an index of g ”.

In the sequel, we will just say “partial recursive” instead of “partial E -recursive”.

6 Expressibility of the infinitary derivations

In this section, we show how to code the $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivations within KP. Definition 6.1 gives an idea of how the codes are structured, and the formal definition inside KP is given in 6.5.

Definition 6.1. Let us fix a natural coding function $\ulcorner \cdot \urcorner$ for formulas and finite sets of formulas, as well as a set of symbols $\ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner$, $\ulcorner \wedge \urcorner$, $\ulcorner \vee \urcorner$ etc.; we give the definition of codes of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivations *outside* KP; we will be able to read off primitive-recursively from such a code u

- (i) the name of the last inference of the proof,
- (ii) its principal formula and side formulas,
- (iii) the end sequent,
- (iv) a bound for the length of the proof,
- (v) a bound for the cut rank of the proof.

The corresponding primitive-recursive functions will be denoted by $\text{Rule}(u)$, $\text{PF}(u)$, $\text{SF}(u)$, $\text{End}(u)$, $\text{Length}(u)$, $\text{Rank}(u)$, respectively. The ordinal notation system we use is the one $\langle R, < \rangle$ we defined in 2.

- If Γ contains a true Δ_0 -formula, then

$$\langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner \rangle \tag{6.1}$$

is a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation.

- If $u, v \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(u) = \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner$, $\text{End}(v) = \ulcorner \Gamma, B \urcorner$, and $\text{Length}(u), \text{Length}(v) < a$, $\max(\text{Rank}(u), \text{Rank}(v)) \leq r$, then

$$\langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A \wedge B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle \tag{6.2}$$

is a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation.

- If $u \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(u) = \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner$, and $\text{Length}(u) < a$, $\text{Rank}(u) \leq r$, then

$$\langle \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner A \vee B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle \quad (6.3)$$

is a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation.

- If $u \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(u) = \ulcorner \Gamma, B \urcorner$, and $\text{Length}(u) < a$, $\text{Rank}(u) \leq r$, then

$$\langle \ulcorner \vee_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner A \vee B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle \quad (6.4)$$

is a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation.

- Let e be an index for a partial recursive set function. If for all s , $\Phi_e(s) =: u_s \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(u_s) = \ulcorner \Gamma, s \in t \rightarrow F(s) \urcorner$, $\text{Length}(u_s) < a$, $\text{Rank}(u_s) \leq r$, then

$$\langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle \quad (6.5)$$

is a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation.

- If $u \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(u) = \ulcorner \Gamma, s \in t \wedge F(s) \urcorner$ and $\text{Length}(u) < a$, $\text{Rank}(u) \leq r$, then

$$\langle \ulcorner b\exists \urcorner, \ulcorner (\exists x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle \quad (6.6)$$

is a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation.

- Let e be an index for a partial recursive set function. If for all t , $\Phi_e(t) =: u_t \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(u_t) = \ulcorner \Gamma, F(t) \urcorner$, $\text{Length}(u_t) < a$, $\text{Rank}(u_t) \leq r$, then

$$\langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle \quad (6.7)$$

is a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation.

- If $u \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(u) = \ulcorner \Gamma, F(s) \urcorner$, and $\text{Length}(u) < a$, $\text{Rank}(u) \leq r$, then

$$\langle \ulcorner \exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle \quad (6.8)$$

is a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation.

- If $u, v \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(u) = \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner$, $\text{End}(v) = \ulcorner \Gamma, \neg A \urcorner$, $\text{Length}(u), \text{Length}(v) < a$, $\max(\text{rank}(A) + 1, \text{Rank}(u), \text{Rank}(v)) \leq r$, then

$$\langle \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner, \ulcorner A \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle \quad (6.9)$$

is a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation. In this case, contrary to others, A is the cut formula, so it does not appear in the end sequent of (6.9).

- If $u \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(u) = \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner$, $\max(\text{Length}(u), \Omega) < a$, $\text{Rank}(u) \leq r$, then

$$\langle \ulcorner \Sigma\text{-Ref} \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists z A^z \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle \quad (6.10)$$

is a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation.

It is easy to see how the information extraction functions (End, Rank, Length, etc.) can be defined, regardless of such derivation codes being definable or not.

For the moment we haven't seen if KP can express $u \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, but KP surely can express if some set looks like a member of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation (i.e. in one of the forms (6.1)–(6.10)).

The following definitions are made in KP.

Definition 6.2. We say that w is a **quasicode of a $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation**, $w \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode, if $(w)_0 \in \{\ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner \vee_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner b\exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner, \ulcorner \Sigma\text{-Ref} \urcorner\}$, and

- if $(w)_0 = \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner$, then $w = \langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner \rangle$ and Γ is a finite set of formulas;
- if $(w)_0 = \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner$, then $w = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A \wedge B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$, where A, B are formulas, Γ is a finite set of formulas, a, r are in our ordinal notation, and u, v are sets;
- if $(w)_0 = \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner$, then $w = \langle \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner A \vee B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, where A, B are formulas, Γ is a finite set of formulas, a, r are in our ordinal notation, and u is a set;
- if $(w)_0 = \ulcorner \vee_1 \urcorner$, then $w = \langle \ulcorner \vee_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner A \vee B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, where A, B are formulas, Γ is a finite set of formulas, a, r are in our ordinal notation, and u is a set;
- if $(w)_0 = \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner$, then $w = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, where t is a set, F is a formula, Γ is a finite set of formulas, a, r are in our ordinal notation, and e is a set;
- if $(w)_0 = \ulcorner b\exists \urcorner$, then $w = \langle \ulcorner b\exists \urcorner, \ulcorner (\exists x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, where t is a set, F is a formula, Γ is a finite set of formulas, a, r are in our ordinal notation, and u is a set;
- if $(w)_0 = \ulcorner \forall \urcorner$, then $w = \langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, where F is a formula, Γ is a finite set of formulas, a, r are in our ordinal notation, and e is a set;
- if $(w)_0 = \ulcorner \exists \urcorner$, then $w = \langle \ulcorner \exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, where F is a formula, Γ is a finite set of formulas, a, r are in our ordinal notation, and u is a set;
- if $(w)_0 = \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner$, then $w = \langle \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner, \ulcorner A \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$, where A is a formula, Γ is a finite set of formulas, a, r are in our ordinal notation, and u is a set;
- if $(w)_0 = \ulcorner \Sigma\text{-Ref} \urcorner$, then $w = \langle \ulcorner \Sigma\text{-Ref} \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists z A^z \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, where A is a formula, Γ is a finite set of formulas, a, r are in our ordinal notation, and u is a set.

It is primitive-recursive to determine if $w \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode.

If w is a quasicode, we can still read off the information $\text{Rule}(w)$, $\text{PF}(w)$, etc.; this definition exists only to eliminate unnecessarily fussy case distinctions, e.g., if we know that $w \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode and $w = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A \wedge B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$, then Γ must be a finite set of formulas.

An $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation figure is a well-founded tree. This means that we can label its nodes by finite sequences of sets.

Notation. Let $\text{Set}^{<\omega}$ denote the class of all finite sequences of sets. If $\sigma \in \text{Set}^{<\omega}$ and x is a set, let σx abbreviate $\sigma \hat{\ } \langle x \rangle$.

It is easy to define a partial recursive set function N such that, if u codes an $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\sigma \in \text{Set}^{<\omega}$, and $N(u, \sigma)$ is a subderivation of u , then for appropriate collections of sets x (depending on the rule by which $N(u, \sigma)$ is derived), $N(u, \sigma x)$ are the direct subderivations of $N(u, \sigma)$.

Definition 6.3. We define the partial recursive set function $N(w, \sigma)$, for $w \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode and $\sigma \in \text{Set}^{<\omega}$.

- $N(w, \langle \rangle) = w$.
- Suppose $(N(w, \sigma))_0 \in \{\ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner \vee_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner b\exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \Sigma\text{-Ref} \urcorner\}$ and $(N(w, \sigma))_5 = u$. Then $N(w, \sigma 0) = u$.
- Suppose $(N(w, \sigma))_0 \in \{\ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner\}$ and $(N(w, \sigma))_5 = u$, $(N(w, \sigma))_6 = v$. Then $N(w, \sigma 0) = u$ and $N(w, \sigma 1) = v$.
- Suppose $(N(w, \sigma))_0 \in \{\ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall \urcorner\}$ and $(N(w, \sigma))_5 = e$. Then $N(w, \sigma x) = \Phi_e(x)$ for all sets x (see Remark 5.6).

In any other cases we set $N(w, \sigma) = \emptyset$.

Notation. From now on, we denote $N(w, \sigma)$ by w_σ .

Before we proceed to give the formal definition of the class of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivations, we mention that one can define truth predicates for formulas with bounded complexity.

Definition of the truth predicates 6.4. True_Γ , Γ being a syntactical complexity, is defined primitive-recursively.

- $\text{True}_{\Delta_0}(\ulcorner a \in b \urcorner)$ iff $a \in b$ holds; the rest of the cases are $\wedge, \vee, \neg, (\forall x \in t), (\exists x \in t)$ defined similarly to below.
- $\text{True}_{\Sigma_n}(\ulcorner \phi \urcorner)$ iff one of the following holds.
 - For some $\diamond \in \{\wedge, \vee\}$ and $\psi, \theta \in \Sigma_n$, $\ulcorner \phi \urcorner = \ulcorner \psi \diamond \theta \urcorner$, and $\text{True}_{\Sigma_n}(\ulcorner \psi \urcorner) \diamond \text{True}_{\Sigma_n}(\ulcorner \theta \urcorner)$.
 - For some $\psi \in \Pi_n$, $\ulcorner \phi \urcorner = \ulcorner \neg \psi \urcorner$, and $\neg \text{True}_{\Pi_n}(\ulcorner \psi \urcorner)$.
 - For some $\psi \in \Sigma_n$, $\ulcorner \phi \urcorner = \ulcorner (\exists x \in t) \psi(x) \urcorner$, and $(\exists x \in t) \text{True}_{\Sigma_n}(\ulcorner \psi(x) \urcorner)$.
 - For some $\psi \in \Sigma_n$, $\ulcorner \phi \urcorner = \ulcorner \exists x \psi(x) \urcorner$, and $\exists x \text{True}_{\Sigma_n}(\ulcorner \psi(x) \urcorner)$.
 - $\text{True}_{\Pi_{n-1}}(\ulcorner \phi \urcorner)$.
- $\text{True}_{\Pi_n}(\ulcorner \phi \urcorner)$ is defined in a symmetrical way.

Then in KP we have that for any formula ϕ with complexity Γ ,

$$\text{True}_\Gamma(\ulcorner \phi \urcorner) \leftrightarrow \phi.$$

Definition of an $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation within KP 6.5. A set w is a code of a $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $w \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, iff for all $\sigma \in \text{Set}^{<\omega}$, the following holds:

- If $w_\sigma \neq \emptyset$ then $w_\sigma \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode.
- If $w_\sigma = \langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner \rangle$, then Γ contains a true Δ_0 -formula (i.e. there is $A \in \Gamma$ with complexity Δ_0 , and $\text{True}_{\Delta_0}(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$); $w_{\sigma\tau} = \emptyset$ for any $\tau \neq \emptyset$.
- If $w_\sigma = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A \wedge B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$, then $\text{End}(w_{\sigma 0}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner$, $\text{End}(w_{\sigma 1}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, B \urcorner$, $\text{Length}(w_{\sigma i}) < a$ and $\text{Rank}(w_{\sigma i}) \leq r$ for $i = 0, 1$; $w_{\sigma x} = \emptyset$ for $x \neq 0, 1$.
- If $w_\sigma = \langle \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner A \vee B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, then $\text{End}(w_{\sigma 0}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner$, $\text{Length}(w_{\sigma 0}) < a$ and $\text{Rank}(w_{\sigma 0}) \leq r$; $w_{\sigma x} = \emptyset$ for $x \neq 0$.
- If $w_\sigma = \langle \ulcorner \vee_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner A \vee B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, then $\text{End}(w_{\sigma 0}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, B \urcorner$, $\text{Length}(w_{\sigma 0}) < a$ and $\text{Rank}(w_{\sigma 0}) \leq r$; $w_{\sigma x} = \emptyset$ for $x \neq 0$.

- If $w_\sigma = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, then for all s , $\text{End}(w_{\sigma s}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, s \in t \rightarrow A(s) \urcorner$, $\text{Length}(w_{\sigma s}) < a$, $\text{Rank}(w_{\sigma s}) \leq r$.
- If $w_\sigma = \langle \ulcorner b\exists \urcorner, \ulcorner (\exists x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, then $\text{End}(w_{\sigma 0}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, s \in t \wedge A(s) \urcorner$ for some s , $\text{Length}(w_{\sigma 0}) < a$ and $\text{Rank}(w_{\sigma 0}) \leq r$; $w_{\sigma x} = \emptyset$ for $x \neq 0$.
- If $w_\sigma = \langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, then for all x , $\text{End}(w_{\sigma x}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, F(x) \urcorner$, $\text{Length}(w_{\sigma x}) < a$, $\text{Rank}(w_{\sigma x}) \leq r$.
- If $w_\sigma = \langle \ulcorner \exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, then $\text{End}(w_{\sigma 0}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, F(s) \urcorner$ for some s , $\text{Length}(w_{\sigma 0}) < a$ and $\text{Rank}(w_{\sigma 0}) \leq r$; $w_{\sigma x} = \emptyset$ for $x \neq 0$.
- If $w_\sigma = \langle \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner, \ulcorner A \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$, then $\text{End}(w_{\sigma 0}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner$, $\text{End}(w_{\sigma 1}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, \neg A \urcorner$, $\text{Length}(w_{\sigma i}) < a$ and $\text{Rank}(w_{\sigma i}), \text{rank}(A) + 1 \leq r$ for $i = 0, 1$; $w_{\sigma x} = \emptyset$ for $x \neq 0, 1$.
- If $w_\sigma = \langle \ulcorner \Sigma\text{-Ref} \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists z A^z \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, then $\text{End}(w_{\sigma 0}) = \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner$, $\text{Length}(w_{\sigma 0}) < a$, $\text{Rank}(w_{\sigma 0}) \leq r$; $w_{\sigma x} = \emptyset$ for $x \neq 0$.

The reader may check that this is a Π_2 definition (recall that \mathbb{E} is $\Sigma 5.2$).

7 Formalisation of cut elimination in $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$

The lemmas 4.5–4.8 are now going to be formalised in $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$; we will define partial recursive set functions Wkn (for “weakening”), Inv (for “inversion”), Red (for “reduction”), CutElim (for “cut elimination”) that transform members of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation into the required forms. We do not care what these functions do to the sets which are not members of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation; they may simply diverge. In defining these functions, we may assume that they know their own indices (by 5.10).

The reader is advised to familiarise themselves with the standard cut elimination proofs before proceeding; though the reasoning is exactly the same, our proofs may have been obscured in formalisation.

If there is no danger of confusion, we drop the coding notation $\ulcorner \cdot \urcorner$.

Weakening 7.1. $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$ proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function f taking parameter Γ' such that, whenever Γ' is a finite set of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -formulas, $w \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(w) = \Gamma$, $\text{Length}(w) = a < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, we have $f(\Gamma', w) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(f(\Gamma', w)) = \Gamma, \Gamma'$, $\text{Length}(w) \geq \text{Length}(f(\Gamma', w))$ and $\text{Rank}(w) \geq \text{Rank}(f(\Gamma', w))$.

The function f will be referred to as Wkn .

Proof. In the following we suppress the parameter Γ' and write simply $f(w)$.

If $w \notin \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode, we set $f(w) = \emptyset$. Now we assume that $w \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner \rangle$, then

$$f(w) = \langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, \Gamma' \urcorner \rangle.$$

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A \wedge B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$ and the lengths of u, v are both $< a$, then

$$f(w) = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A \wedge B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, \Gamma' \urcorner, a, r, f(u), f(v) \rangle \text{ (using the recursion theorem).}$$

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner A \vee B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$ and the length of u is $< a$, then $f(w) = \langle \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner A \vee B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, \Gamma' \urcorner, a, r, f(u) \rangle$. The case of \vee_1 is similar.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, then $f(w) = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, \Gamma' \urcorner, a, r, e' \rangle$ where e' is the natural index of $f \circ \Phi_e$.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner b\exists \urcorner, \ulcorner (\exists x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$ and the length of u is $< a$, then $f(w) = \langle \ulcorner b\exists \urcorner, \ulcorner (\exists x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, \Gamma' \urcorner, a, r, f(u) \rangle$.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, then $f(w) = \langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, \Gamma' \urcorner, a, r, e' \rangle$ where e' is the natural index of $f \circ \Phi_e$.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$ and the length of u is $< a$, then $f(w) = \langle \ulcorner \exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, \Gamma' \urcorner, a, r, f(u) \rangle$.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner, \ulcorner A \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$ and the lengths of u, v are $< a$, then $f(w) = \langle \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner, \ulcorner A \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, \Gamma' \urcorner, a, r, f(u), f(v) \rangle$ if the cut formula A is not in Γ' , and $f(w) = f(u)$ if $A \in \Gamma'$ (in our definition we assume $A \in \text{End}(u)$).

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \Sigma\text{-Ref} \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists z A^z \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$ and the length of u is $< a$, then $f(w) = \langle \ulcorner \Sigma\text{-Ref} \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists z A^z \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, \Gamma' \urcorner, a, r, f(u) \rangle$.

One can then prove using $\text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$ that f satisfies the requirements. \square

Note that in the cases $b\forall$ and \forall , we do not check if say $\Phi_e(s)$ has length $< a$ for every set s . It is unnecessary, and we cannot do so recursively either.

Inversion 7.2. $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$ proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function g taking parameter A such that, whenever A is not Δ_0 , $A \simeq \bigwedge_{i \in y} A_i$, $w \in \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(w) = \Gamma, A$, $\text{Length}(w) = a < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, we have $g(A, w, i) \in \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(g(A, w, i)) = \Gamma, A_i$, $\text{Length}(w) \geq \text{Length}(g(A, w, i))$ and $\text{Rank}(w) \geq \text{Rank}(g(A, w, i))$, for all $i \in y$.

The function g will be referred to as Inv .

Proof. In the following we suppress the parameter $A \simeq \bigwedge_{i \in y} A_i$.

If $w \notin \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode or $A \notin \text{End}(w)$, then we set $g(w, i) = \emptyset$ for all i . Now we assume that $w \in \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode and $A \in \text{End}(w)$.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner \rangle$, then $g(w, i) = \langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, A_i \urcorner \rangle$ for all $i \in y$.

Now suppose w is not an axiom. We first assume that A is not the principal formula of the last inference of w .

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$, and the lengths of u, v are $< a$, then $g(w, i) = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, A_i \urcorner, a, r, g(u, i), g(v, i) \rangle$.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, A \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, and the length of u is $< a$, then $g(w, i) = \langle \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, A_i \urcorner, a, r, g(u, i) \rangle$. The case of \vee_1 is similar.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, A_i \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, then $g(w, i) = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, A_i \urcorner, a, r, e' \rangle$, where e' is the natural index of $g(\Phi_e(\cdot), i)$.

The rest of the cases are similar to above.

Now assume that A is the principal formula of the last inference of w .

If $A \equiv A_0 \wedge A_1$, $w = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$, and the lengths of u, v are $< a$, then $g(w, 0) = g(u, 0)$ if $A \in \Gamma$, $g(w, 0) = u$ if $A \notin \Gamma$, and similarly $g(w, 1) = g(v, 1)$ if $A \in \Gamma$, $g(w, 1) = v$ if $A \notin \Gamma$.

If $A \equiv (\forall x \in t)F(x)$, $w = \langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner A \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, then, for each s , $g(w, s) = g(\Phi_e(s), s)$ if $A \in \Gamma$ and $\Phi_e(s)$ has length $< a$, $g(w, s) = \Phi_e(s)$ if $A \notin \Gamma$.

If $A \equiv \forall x F(x)$, $w = \langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, then, for each s , $g(w, s) = g(\Phi_e(s), s)$ if $A \in \Gamma$ and $\Phi_e(s)$ has length $< a$, $g(w, s) = \Phi_e(s)$ if $A \notin \Gamma$.

Again using $\text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$ one checks that g satisfies the requirements for $w \in \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation with length $< \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$. \square

Recall the definition of natural sum $\alpha \# \beta$ for ordinals 2.6.

Reduction 7.3. $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$ proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function h taking parameter C such that, whenever $\text{rank}(C) = r > \Omega$, $w_0, w_1 \in \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(w_0) = \Gamma, C$, $\text{End}(w_1) = \Gamma, \neg C$, $\text{Length}(w_0) = a < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, $\text{Length}(w_1) = b < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, $\text{Rank}(w_0)$ and $\text{Rank}(w_1)$ are both $\leq r$, we have $h(C, w_0, w_1) \in \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(h(C, w_0, w_1)) = \Gamma$, $\text{Length}(h(C, w_0, w_1)) \leq a \# b$, $\text{Rank}(h(C, w_0, w_1)) \leq r$.

The function h will be referred to as *Red*.

Proof. We suppress the parameter C with rank $r > \Omega$. We assume that $w_0, w_1 \in \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode satisfy $\text{End}(w_0) = \Gamma, C$, $\text{End}(w_1) = \Gamma, \neg C$, $\text{Length}(w_0) = a < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, $\text{Length}(w_1) = b < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, $\text{Rank}(w_0)$ and $\text{Rank}(w_1)$ are both $\leq r$. The function h is defined by recursion on $a \# b$ along $\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$.

If $(w_0)_0 = \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner$ or $(w_1)_0 = \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner$, then $h(w_0, w_1) = \langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner \rangle$.

Now we assume that neither of w_0, w_1 is an axiom.

First assume that C is not the principal formula of the last inference of w_0 . We go through the ideas of two representative cases.

Suppose $w_0 = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \wedge A_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, C \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$; then, assuming this inference is correct, $\text{End}(u) = A_0, \Gamma, C$ and $\text{End}(v) = A_1, \Gamma, C$. By weakening, $\text{Wkn}(A_i, w_1)$ has end sequent $A_i, \Gamma, \neg C$ for $i = 0, 1$, so if both u, v have lengths $< a$, then we may apply h to get $h(u, \text{Wkn}(A_0, w_1))$ and $h(v, \text{Wkn}(A_1, w_1))$ whose end sequents are A_0, Γ and A_1, Γ respectively. Thus we may apply \wedge to $h(u, \text{Wkn}(A_0, w_1))$ and $h(v, \text{Wkn}(A_1, w_1))$ to obtain $h(w_0, w_1)$.

Suppose $w_0 = \langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, C \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$. If this inference is correct, then $\Phi_e(s)$ has end sequent $F(s), \Gamma, C$ for every set s ; also $\text{Wkn}(F(s), w_1)$ has end sequent $F(s), \Gamma, \neg C$ for every s . Therefore if $\Phi_e(s)$ has length $< a$ then $h(\Phi_e(s), \text{Wkn}(F(s), w_1))$ has end sequent $F(s), \Gamma$, thus we may apply \forall to the derivations $h(\Phi_e(s), \text{Wkn}(F(s), w_1))$ to obtain $h(w_0, w_1)$.

Now we proceed to the formal definition.

If $w_0 = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \wedge A_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, C \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$ and u, v have lengths $< a$, then $h(w_0, w_1) = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \wedge A_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a \# b, r, h(u, \text{Wkn}(A_0, w_1)), h(v, \text{Wkn}(A_1, w_1)) \rangle$.

If $w_0 = \langle \ulcorner \forall_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner A \vee B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, C \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$ and u has length $< a$, then $h(w_0, w_1) = \langle \ulcorner \forall_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner A \vee B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a \# b, r, h(u, \text{Wkn}(A, w_1)) \rangle$. The case of \forall_1 is similar.

If $w_0 = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma, C \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, then,
 $h(w_0, w_1) = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a\#b, r, e' \rangle$, where e' is the natural index of
 $\lambda s.h(\Phi_e(s), \text{Wkn}(s \in t \rightarrow F(s), w_1))$.

The other cases, as well as all the cases in which $\neg C$ is not the principal formula of the last inference of w_1 , can be similarly dealt with.

For the remainder we assume that C is the principal formula of the last inference of w_0 and $\neg C$ is the principal formula of the last inference of w_1 . We go through the idea of one representative case.

Suppose $w_0 = \langle \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \vee A_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$. Then $\text{Wkn}(C, u)$ has end sequent A_0, Γ, C ; $\text{Wkn}(A_0, w_1)$ has end sequent $A_0, \Gamma, \neg C$. Therefore if u has length $< a$, we may apply h and the derivation $h(\text{Wkn}(C, u), \text{Wkn}(A_0, w_1))$ has end sequent A_0, Γ with length $< a\#b$. Now $\text{Inv}(\neg C, w_1, 0)$ has end sequent $\neg A_0, \Gamma$, so we may apply a cut to $h(\text{Wkn}(C, u), \text{Wkn}(A_0, w_1))$ and $\text{Inv}(\neg C, w_1, 0)$.

The following is the formal definition.

If $w_0 = \langle \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \vee A_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$ and u has length $< a$, then
 $h(w_0, w_1) = \langle \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a\#b, r, h(\text{Wkn}(C, u), \text{Wkn}(A_0, w_1)), \text{Inv}(\neg C, w_1, 0) \rangle$.

If $w_0 = \langle \ulcorner b\exists \urcorner, \ulcorner (\exists x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u \rangle$, u has length $< a$ and end sequent $s \in t \wedge F(s), \Gamma$ for some set s , then

$h(w_0, w_1) = \langle \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner, \ulcorner s \in t \wedge F(s) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a\#b, r, h(\text{Wkn}(C, u), \text{Wkn}(s \in t \wedge F(s), w_1)), \text{Inv}(\neg C, w_1, s) \rangle$.
 (Note that since $\text{rank}(C) > \Omega$, F contains an unbounded quantifier, so 4.4 applies.)

The other cases are similar or symmetrical to the ones above. □

Cut elimination 7.4. $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$ proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function j such that, whenever $w \in \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(w) = \Gamma$, $\text{Length}(w) \leq a < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, $\text{Rank}(w) \leq r + 1$ with $r > \Omega$, we have $j(w) \in \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(j(w)) = \Gamma$, $\text{Length}(j(w)) \leq \omega^a$, $\text{Rank}(j(w)) \leq r$.

The function j here will be referred to as CutElim .

Proof. We assume $w \in \text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$ -quasicode, $\text{End}(w) = \Gamma$, $\text{Length}(w) \leq a < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, $\text{Rank}(w) \leq r + 1$ with $r > \Omega$.

We give the definition of j only for the representative cases.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner \rangle$, then $j(w) = w$.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \wedge A_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r + 1, u, v \rangle$, and u, v have lengths $< a$, then
 $j(w) = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \wedge A_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, \omega^a, r, j(u), j(v) \rangle$. The cases of $\vee_0, \vee_1, b\exists, \exists, \Sigma$ -Ref are similar.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r + 1, e \rangle$, then
 $j(w) = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, \omega^a, r, e' \rangle$, where e' is the natural index of $j \circ \Phi_e$. The case of \forall is similar.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner, \ulcorner A \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r + 1, u, v \rangle$ and u, v have lengths $< a$, then
 $j(w) = \langle \ulcorner \text{Cut} \urcorner, \ulcorner A \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, j(u), j(v) \rangle$ if $\text{rank}(A) < r$, $j(w) = \text{Red}(j(u), j(v))$ if $\text{rank}(A) = r$. □

8 Embedding KP into $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$

We are going to formalise, within KP, that KP can be embedded into $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$; roughly, there is a partial recursive set function P such that, if p is a KP-proof, then $P(p)$ is an $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation with the same conclusion (see 8.3). Combining this with our formalisation of cut elimination, every KP-proof can be transformed into an $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -proof with their cuts partially eliminated. Along these proof trees, we are able to carry out a transfinite induction along $\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$ which gives us the result $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}) \vdash \text{RFN}(\text{KP})$.

Notation.

- If A is any $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -formula, then $\text{no}(A) = \omega^{\text{rank}(A)}$.
- If $\Gamma = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ is a set of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -formulas, then $\text{no}(\Gamma) := \text{no}(A_1) \# \dots \# \text{no}(A_n)$.
- $\Vdash \Gamma$ abbreviates $\Vdash_0^{\text{no}(\Gamma)} \Gamma$, and $\Vdash_{\frac{\alpha}{\rho}} \Gamma$ abbreviates $\Vdash_{\frac{\text{no}(\Gamma) \# \alpha}{\rho}} \Gamma$.

Embedding lemmas 8.1.

1. $\Vdash A, \neg A$.
2. (Extensionality). $\Vdash s_1 \neq t_1, \dots, s_n \neq t_n, \neg A(s_1, \dots, s_n), A(t_1, \dots, t_n)$.
3. (Set induction). $\Vdash_{\omega^{\text{rank}(A)}} A \rightarrow \forall x F(x)$, where $A \equiv \forall x ((\forall y \in x) F(y) \rightarrow F(x))$.
4. (Pair). $\Vdash \exists z (s \in z \wedge t \in z)$.
5. (Union). $\Vdash \exists z (\forall y \in s) (\forall x \in y) (x \in z)$.
6. (Infinity). $\Vdash \exists x ((\exists z \in x) z \in x \wedge (\forall y \in x) (\exists z \in x) y \in z)$.
7. (Δ_0 -separation). If A is Δ_0 , $\Vdash \exists y ((\forall x \in y) (x \in s \wedge A(x, \vec{t})) \wedge (\forall x \in s) (A(x, \vec{t}) \rightarrow x \in y))$.
8. (Δ_0 -collection). If F is Δ_0 , $\Vdash (\forall x \in s) \exists y F(x, y, \vec{t}) \rightarrow \exists z (\forall x \in s) (\exists y \in z) F(x, y, \vec{t})$.

Lemma 8.1.1. KP proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function f such that, for any $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -formula A , $f(A) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(f(A)) = A, \neg A$, $\text{Length}(f(A)) \leq \text{no}(A, \neg A)$, $\text{Rank}(f(A)) = 0$.

The f here will be referred to as LEM.

Proof. We define f by recursion on complexity of A .

If A is Δ_0 , we set

$f(A) = \langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner A, \neg A \urcorner \rangle$. From now on we assume that A is not Δ_0 .

If A is $A_0 \vee A_1$, let

$w_0 = \langle \ulcorner \vee_0 \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \vee A_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner \neg A_0 \urcorner, \text{no}(A_0, \neg A_0) + 1, 0, f(A_0) \rangle$,
 $w_1 = \langle \ulcorner \vee_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \vee A_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner \neg A_1 \urcorner, \text{no}(A_1, \neg A_1) + 1, 0, f(A_1) \rangle$, then set
 $f(A) = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner \neg A_0 \wedge \neg A_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner A_0 \vee A_1 \urcorner, \text{no}(A, \neg A), 0, w_0, w_1 \rangle$.

If A is $(\exists x \in t)F(x)$, write $B(s)$ for $s \in t \wedge F(s)$, and let e be the natural index of the function $\Phi_e(s) = \langle \ulcorner b\exists \urcorner, \ulcorner (\exists x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner s \in t \rightarrow \neg F(s) \urcorner, \text{no}(B(s), \neg B(s)) + 1, 0, f(B(s)) \rangle$; then we set
 $f(A) = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)\neg F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner (\exists x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \text{no}(A, \neg A), 0, e \rangle$.

If A is $\exists x F(x)$, let e be the natural index of the function

$\Phi_e(s) = \langle \ulcorner \exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \neg F(s) \urcorner, \text{no}(F(s), \neg F(s)) + 1, 0, f(F(s)) \rangle$, and set
 $f(A) = \langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall x \neg F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists x F(x) \urcorner, \text{no}(A, \neg A), 0, e \rangle$.

The other cases are symmetrical. \square

Extensionality 8.1.2. KP proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function Ext such that, whenever $A(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is a KP-formula with free variables among a_1, \dots, a_n , $\vec{s} := \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle$, $\vec{t} := \langle t_1, \dots, t_n \rangle$ are sequences of terms with length n , we have $\text{Ext}(A, \vec{s}, \vec{t}) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(\text{Ext}(A, \vec{s}, \vec{t})) = s_1 \neq t_1, \dots, s_n \neq t_n, \neg A(\vec{s}), A(\vec{t})$, $\text{Length}(\text{Ext}(A, \vec{s}, \vec{t})) \leq \text{no}(s_1 \neq t_1, \dots, s_n \neq t_n, \neg A(\vec{s}), A(\vec{t}))$, $\text{Rank}(\text{Ext}(A, \vec{s}, \vec{t})) = 0$.

Proof. Define Ext by recursion on complexity of A ; we will write $\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}$ for $s_1 \neq t_1, \dots, s_n \neq t_n$.

If A is Δ_0 , set $\text{Ext}(A, \vec{s}, \vec{t}) = \langle \ulcorner \text{Axiom} \urcorner, \ulcorner \vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \neg A(\vec{s}), A(\vec{t}) \urcorner \rangle$. In this case, if $\text{Ext}(A, \vec{s}, \vec{t}) \notin \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, then by definition of $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, we have

$$\neg \text{True}_{\Delta_0}(\ulcorner \vec{s} \neq \vec{t} \urcorner) \wedge \neg \text{True}_{\Delta_0}(\ulcorner \neg A(\vec{s}) \urcorner) \wedge \neg \text{True}_{\Delta_0}(\ulcorner A(\vec{t}) \urcorner),$$

which implies $\vec{s} = \vec{t} \wedge A(\vec{s}) \wedge \neg A(\vec{t})$ and yields a contradiction in KP.

From now on we assume that A is not Δ_0 .

If A is $A_0 \wedge A_1$, $\text{Ext}(A, \vec{s}, \vec{t})$ is defined in the following way:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(v)} \frac{\text{Ext}(A_0, \vec{s}, \vec{t}) \Vdash \vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \neg A_0(\vec{s}), A_0(\vec{t})}{\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \neg A_0(\vec{s}) \vee \neg A_1(\vec{s}), A_0(\vec{t})} \quad \text{(v)} \frac{\text{Ext}(A_1, \vec{s}, \vec{t}) \Vdash \vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \neg A_1(\vec{s}), A_1(\vec{t})}{\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \neg A_0(\vec{s}) \vee \neg A_1(\vec{s}), A_1(\vec{t})} \\ \text{(}\wedge\text{)} \frac{\quad}{\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \neg A_0(\vec{s}) \vee \neg A_1(\vec{s}), A_0(\vec{t}) \wedge A_1(\vec{t})} \end{array}$$

If A is $(\forall x \in t)F(x)$, we derive $\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, (\exists x \in t(\vec{s})) \neg F(x, \vec{s}), s \notin t(\vec{t}) \vee F(s, \vec{t})$ uniformly for all s :

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(v)} \frac{\text{Ext}(s \in t(\vec{a}), \vec{s}, \vec{t}) \Vdash \vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, s \in t(\vec{s}), s \notin t(\vec{t})}{\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, s \in t(\vec{s}), s \notin t(\vec{t}) \vee F(s, \vec{t})} \quad \text{(v)} \frac{\text{Ext}(F(s, \vec{a}), \vec{s}, \vec{t}) \Vdash \vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \neg F(s, \vec{s}), F(s, \vec{t})}{\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \neg F(s, \vec{s}), s \notin t(\vec{t}) \vee F(s, \vec{t})} \\ \text{(}\wedge\text{)} \frac{\quad}{\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, s \in t(\vec{s}) \wedge \neg F(s, \vec{s}), s \notin t(\vec{t}) \vee F(s, \vec{t})} \\ \text{(b}\exists\text{)} \frac{\quad}{\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, (\exists x \in t(\vec{s})) \neg F(x, \vec{s}), s \notin t(\vec{t}) \vee F(s, \vec{t})} \end{array}$$

If this proof tree is given by $\Phi_e(s)$, we set $\text{Ext}(A, \vec{s}, \vec{t}) = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t(\vec{t}))F(x, \vec{t}) \urcorner, \ulcorner \vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, (\exists x \in t(\vec{s})) \neg F(x, \vec{s}) \urcorner, \text{no}(\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \neg A(\vec{s}), A(\vec{t})), 0, e \rangle$.

If A is $\forall x F(x)$, $\text{Ext}(A, \vec{s}, \vec{t})$ is defined as follows. For every s , $\text{Ext}(F(s, \vec{a}), \vec{s}, \vec{t})$ derives $\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \neg F(s, \vec{s}), F(s, \vec{t})$. Applying \exists gives us $\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \exists x \neg F(x, \vec{s}), F(s, \vec{t})$ for all s , and by \forall we obtain $\vec{s} \neq \vec{t}, \exists x \neg F(x, \vec{s}), \forall x F(x, \vec{t})$.

The other cases are symmetrical. \square

Set induction 8.1.3. KP proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function Ind such that, for any $\text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -formula F and $A \equiv \forall x((\forall y \in x)F(y) \rightarrow F(x))$, $\text{Ind}(F) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(\text{Ind}(F)) = A \rightarrow \forall x F(x)$, $\text{Length}(\text{Ind}(F)) \leq \text{no}(A \rightarrow \forall x F(x)) \# \omega^{\text{rank}(A)}$, $\text{Rank}(\text{Ind}(F)) = 0$.

Proof. We define a partial recursive set function f in KP such that for any term s , $f(F, s) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(f(F, s)) = \neg A, F(s)$, $\text{Length}(f(F, s)) \leq \omega^{\text{rank}(A)} \# \omega^{|s|+1}$, $\text{Rank}(f(F, s)) = 0$; f is defined by recursion on $|s|$. Given the index of $f(F, \cdot)$, it is then clear how to define Ind .

If $\frac{\omega^{\text{rank}(A)} \# \omega^{|t|+1}}{0} \neg A, F(t)$ has been proved by $f(F, t)$ for all $|t| < |s|$, then there is a partial recursive set function g such that $g(F, t)$ proves $\frac{\omega^{\text{rank}(A)} \# \omega^{|s|+1}}{0} \neg A, t \in s \rightarrow F(t)$ for all terms t (if $|t| < |s|$, this follows from $f(F, t)$; if $|t| \geq |s|$, then $t \notin s$ is an axiom). Now the derivation continues as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\neg A, t \in s \rightarrow F(t) \text{ for all } t}{\neg A, (\forall y \in s) F(y)} \quad \neg F(s), F(s)}{\neg A, (\forall y \in s) F(y) \wedge \neg F(s), F(s)}}{\neg A, \exists x((\forall y \in x) F(y) \wedge \neg F(x)), F(s)}$$

where weakening is implied where appropriate; note that $\text{no}(\neg F(s), F(s)) < \omega^{\text{rank}(A)}$, so the end sequent has length $\omega^{\text{rank}(A)} \# \omega^{|s|} + 4 < \omega^{\text{rank}(A)} \# \omega^{|s|+1}$; the end sequent is $\neg A, F(s)$ by contraction. \square

Pair 8.1.4. KP proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function Pair such that, if s, t are terms, then $\text{Pair}(s, t) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(\text{Pair}(s, t)) = \exists z(s \in z \wedge t \in z)$, $\text{Length}(\text{Pair}(s, t)) = 1$, $\text{Rank}(\text{Pair}(s, t)) = 0$.

Proof. $s \in \{s, t\} \wedge t \in \{s, t\}$ is a Δ_0 -formula true in KP. \square

Union 8.1.5. KP proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function Union such that, if s is a term, then $\text{Union}(s) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(\text{Union}(s)) = \exists z(\forall y \in s)(\forall x \in y)(x \in z)$, $\text{Length}(\text{Union}(s)) = 1$, $\text{Rank}(\text{Union}(s)) = 0$.

Proof. $(\forall y \in s)(\forall x \in y)x \in \cup s$ is a Δ_0 -formula true in KP. \square

Infinity 8.1.6. KP proves the following. There is $w \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation such that $\text{End}(w) = \exists x((\exists z \in x)z \in x \wedge (\forall y \in x)(\exists z \in x)y \in z)$ and $\text{Length}(w) = 1$, $\text{Rank}(w) = 0$; we also write w as Inf.

Proof. $(\exists z \in \omega)z \in \omega \wedge (\forall y \in \omega)(\exists z \in \omega)y \in z$ is a Δ_0 -formula true in KP. \square

Δ_0 -separation 8.1.7. KP proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function Sep such that, given $A(a, b_1, \dots, b_n)$ a Δ_0 -formula of KP with all free variables indicated, s, t_1, \dots, t_n terms, $\text{Sep}(A, \langle s, \vec{t} \rangle) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation,

$$\text{End}(\text{Sep}(A, \langle s, \vec{t} \rangle)) = \exists y((\forall x \in y)(x \in s) \wedge A(x, \vec{t}) \wedge (\forall x \in s)(A(x, \vec{t}) \rightarrow x \in y)),$$

$$\text{Length}(\text{Sep}(A, \langle s, \vec{t} \rangle)) = 1, \text{ and}$$

$$\text{Rank}(\text{Sep}(A, \langle s, \vec{t} \rangle)) = 0.$$

Proof. $(\forall x \in \{x \in s \mid A(x, \vec{t})\})(x \in s \wedge A(x, \vec{t})) \wedge (\forall x \in s)(A(x, \vec{t}) \rightarrow x \in \{x \in s \mid A(x, \vec{t})\})$ is a Δ_0 -formula true in KP. \square

Δ_0 -collection 8.1.8. KP proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function Col such that, given $F(a, b, c_1, \dots, c_n)$ a Δ_0 -formula of KP with all free variables indicated, s, t_1, \dots, t_n terms, $\text{Col}(F, \langle s, \vec{t} \rangle) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation,

$$\text{End}(\text{Col}(F, \langle s, \vec{t} \rangle)) = (\forall x \in s) \exists y F(x, y, \vec{t}) \rightarrow \exists z(\forall x \in s)(\exists y \in z) F(x, y, \vec{t}),$$

$$\text{Length}(\text{Col}(F, \langle s, \vec{t} \rangle)) = \text{no}((\forall x \in s) \exists y F(x, y, \vec{t}) \rightarrow \exists z(\forall x \in s)(\exists y \in z) F(x, y, \vec{t})),$$

$$\text{Rank}(\text{Col}(F, \langle s, \vec{t} \rangle)) = 0.$$

Proof. By LEM we have

$$\Vdash \neg(\forall x \in s)\exists y F(x, y, \vec{t}), (\forall x \in s)\exists y F(x, y, \vec{t}).$$

Applying Σ -Ref gives

$$\frac{\alpha+1}{0} \neg(\forall x \in s)\exists y F(x, y, \vec{t}), \exists z(\forall x \in s)(\exists y \in z)F(x, y, \vec{t})$$

where $\alpha = \text{no}(\neg(\forall x \in s)\exists y F(x, y, \vec{t}), (\forall x \in s)\exists y F(x, y, \vec{t}))$. Two applications of \vee gives

$$\frac{\alpha+3}{0} (\forall x \in s)\exists y F(x, y, \vec{t}) \rightarrow \exists z(\forall x \in s)(\exists y \in z)F(x, y, \vec{t});$$

note also that $\alpha + 3 < \text{no}((\forall x \in s)\exists y F(x, y, \vec{t}) \rightarrow \exists z(\forall x \in s)(\exists y \in z)F(x, y, \vec{t}))$. □

Thus we have all the proofs for [Embedding lemmas 8.1](#).

Next we define a finitary proof system for KP.

Definition of the finitary sequent calculus of KP 8.2. Let a, b etc. denote free variables, s, t etc. set terms, Γ denote a finite set of formulas. KP has the following axioms:

- (Logical axioms). $\Gamma, A, \neg A$ for any formula A .
- (Extensionality). $\Gamma, a = b \wedge B(a) \rightarrow B(b)$ for any formula $B(a)$.
- (Set induction). $\Gamma, \forall x((\forall y \in x)F(y) \rightarrow F(x)) \rightarrow \forall x F(x)$ for any formula $F(a)$.
- (Pair). $\Gamma, \exists z(a \in z \wedge b \in z)$.
- (Union). $\Gamma, \exists z(\forall y \in z)(\forall x \in y)x \in z$.
- (Infinity). $\Gamma, \exists x((\exists z \in x)z \in x \wedge (\forall y \in x)(\exists z \in x)y \in z)$.
- (Δ_0 -separation). $\Gamma, \exists y((\forall x \in y)(x \in a \wedge B(x)) \wedge (\forall x \in a)(B(x) \rightarrow x \in y))$ for any Δ_0 -formula B .
- (Δ_0 -collection). $\Gamma, (\forall x \in a)\exists y G(x, y) \rightarrow \exists z(\forall x \in a)(\exists y \in z)G(x, y)$ for any Δ_0 -formula G .

The rules of inference are

$$\begin{array}{l} (\wedge) \frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \wedge B} \\ (\vee) \frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, B}{\Gamma, A \vee B} \\ (b\forall) \frac{\Gamma, a \in t \rightarrow F(a)}{\Gamma, (\forall x \in t)F(x)} \\ (b\exists) \frac{\Gamma, s \in t \wedge F(s)}{\Gamma, (\exists x \in t)F(x)} \\ (\forall) \frac{\Gamma, F(a)}{\Gamma, \forall x F(x)} \\ (\exists) \frac{\Gamma, F(s)}{\Gamma, \exists x F(x)} \\ (\text{Cut}) \frac{\Gamma, A \quad \Gamma, \neg A}{\Gamma} \end{array}$$

In inferring a sequent by $b\forall$ or \forall , the variable a cannot appear in the lower sequents.

We say that KP proves Γ if Γ can be derived from these axioms and inference rules.

Notation. Let ϕ_0 denote the exponentiation $\alpha \mapsto \omega^\alpha$.

Embedding theorem 8.3. KP proves the following. There is a partial recursive set function P such that:

- (i) If p is a code of an axiom of KP with end sequent $\Gamma(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ where a_1, \dots, a_n are all the free variables that Γ has, then for all terms s_1, \dots, s_n ,
 - $P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation,
 - $\text{End}(P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle)) = \Gamma(s_1, \dots, s_n)$,
 - $\text{Length}(P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle)) < \Omega \cdot \omega^\omega$.
- (ii) If p is a code of a KP-proof that is not an axiom and uses $k \geq 0$ instances of $b\forall/\forall$ -inferences, with end sequent $\Gamma(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ where a_1, \dots, a_n are all the free variables that Γ has, then, there is some $m < \omega$ such that for all terms s_1, \dots, s_n ,
 - $P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation,
 - $\text{End}(P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle)) = \Gamma(s_1, \dots, s_n)$,
 - $\text{Length}(P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle)) < \Omega \cdot \phi_0^{k+1}(\omega)$,
 - $\text{Rank}(P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle)) = \Omega + m$.

Proof. P is defined by recursion on the length of p .

If p is an axiom, the value of P is given by the previously defined functions LEM, Ext, Ind, Pair, Union, Inf, Sep, Col, along with appropriate weakening. Note that, if we write $\Gamma = A_1, \dots, A_n$, by 4.2.1 (i), for some m_1, \dots, m_n , we have $\text{rank}(A_i) \leq \omega \cdot \Omega + m_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then $\text{no}(\Gamma) = \omega^{\text{rank}(A_1)} \# \dots \# \omega^{\text{rank}(A_n)} = (\Omega \cdot \omega^{m_1}) \# \dots \# (\Omega \cdot \omega^{m_n}) = \Omega \cdot (\omega^{m_1} \# \dots \# \omega^{m_n}) < \Omega \cdot \omega^m$ for $m = \max(m_1, \dots, m_n) + 1$.

Now assume p is not an axiom.

If the last inference of p is \wedge , and we are in the situation

$$\frac{p_0 \vdash \Gamma, A \quad p_1 \vdash \Gamma, B}{p \vdash \Gamma, A \wedge B}$$

then

$P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle) = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A \wedge B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle), P(p_1, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle) \rangle$, where $a = \max(\text{Length}(P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle)), \text{Length}(P(p_1, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle))) + 1$, $r = \max(\Omega, \text{Rank}(P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle)), \text{Rank}(P(p_1, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle)))$.

The cases \vee and Cut are similarly dealt with.

If the last inference of p is \exists , and we are in the situation

$$\frac{p_0 \vdash \Gamma, F(s(a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m))}{p \vdash \Gamma, \exists x F(x)}$$

and b_1, \dots, b_m are free variables that do not appear in $\Gamma, \exists x F(x)$, then we can define $P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle) = \langle \ulcorner \exists \urcorner, \ulcorner \exists x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n, c_\emptyset, \dots, c_\emptyset \rangle) \rangle$, where

$a = \text{Length}(P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n, c_\emptyset, \dots, c_\emptyset \rangle)) + 1,$
 $r = \max(\Omega, \text{Rank}(P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n, c_\emptyset, \dots, c_\emptyset \rangle))).$

The case $b\exists$ is similarly dealt with.

If the last inference of p is \forall , and we are in the situation

$$\frac{p_0 \vdash \Gamma, F(a)}{p \vdash \Gamma, \forall x F(x)}$$

and so p_0 uses $k - 1$ instances of $b\forall/\forall$ -inferences, if p uses k of them. By induction, we have some $m < \omega$ such that for all terms s_1, \dots, s_n, t ,

$$\text{End}(P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n, t \rangle)) = \Gamma(s_1, \dots, s_n), F(s_1, \dots, s_n, t),$$

$$\text{Length}(P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n, t \rangle)) < \Omega \cdot \phi_0^k(\omega),$$

$$\text{Rank}(P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n, t \rangle)) = \Omega + m.$$

Therefore, if e is an index for $\lambda t.P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n, t \rangle)$, we may define

$$P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle) = \langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, \Omega \cdot \phi_0^k(\omega), \text{Rank}(P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n, c_\emptyset \rangle)), e \rangle. 5$$

If the last inference of p is $b\forall$, and we are in the situation

$$\frac{p_0 \vdash \Gamma(\vec{s}), a \in t(\vec{s}) \rightarrow F(\vec{s}, a)}{p \vdash \Gamma(\vec{s}), (\forall x \in t(\vec{s}))F(\vec{s}, x)}$$

and p_0 uses $k - 1$ instances of $b\forall/\forall$ -inferences if p uses k of them. By induction, there is some $m < \omega$ such that for all terms \vec{s}, r ,

$$\text{End}(P(p_0, \langle \vec{s}, r \rangle)) = \Gamma(\vec{s}), r \in t(\vec{s}) \rightarrow F(\vec{s}, r),$$

$$\text{Length}(P(p_0, \langle \vec{s}, r \rangle)) < \Omega \cdot \phi_0^k(\omega),$$

$$\text{Rank}(P(p_0, \langle \vec{s}, r \rangle)) = \Omega + m.$$

Therefore, if $e(\vec{s})$ is an index (function) for $\lambda r.P(p_0, \langle \vec{s}, r \rangle)$, we may define

$$P(p, \vec{s}) = \langle \ulcorner b\forall \urcorner, \ulcorner (\forall x \in t)F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, \Omega \cdot \phi_0^k(\omega), \text{Rank}(P(p_0, \langle \vec{s}, c_\emptyset \rangle)), e(\vec{s}) \rangle. \quad \square$$

Corollary 8.4. For any finite set Γ of formulas, $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$ proves that, for all sets x_1, \dots, x_n , if $\Gamma(c_{x_1}, \dots, c_{x_n})$ is KP-provable, then there is $w \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation with end sequent $\Gamma(c_{x_1}, \dots, c_{x_n})$, $\text{Length}(w) < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, $\text{Rank}(w) \leq \Omega + 1$.

Proof. Given a KP-proof p of $\Gamma(c_{x_1}, \dots, c_{x_n})$, we have $P(p, \langle \rangle) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation, $\text{End}(P(p, \langle \rangle)) = \Gamma(c_{x_1}, \dots, c_{x_n})$, $\text{Length}(P(p, \langle \rangle)) < \Omega \cdot \varepsilon_0$, $\text{Rank}(P(p, \langle \rangle)) = \Omega + m$ for some m which we can read off from $P(p, \langle \rangle)$. Thus $w := \text{CutElim}^{m-1}(P(p, \langle \rangle)) \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation has the same end sequent as $P(p, \langle \rangle)$, the length of w is $\leq \phi_0^{m-1}(\Omega \cdot \varepsilon_0) < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, and $\text{Rank}(w) = \Omega + 1$. \square

Lemma 8.5. $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$ proves that, for any finite set Γ of Π_n -formulas ($n \geq 2$), for all sets x_1, \dots, x_n , if $w \in \text{RS}_\Omega(\mathbf{V})$ -derivation has end sequent $\Gamma(c_{x_1}, \dots, c_{x_n})$, $\text{Length}(w) < \varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$, $\text{Rank}(w) \leq \Omega + 1$, then $\text{True}_{\Pi_n}(\ulcorner \forall \Gamma(x_1, \dots, x_n) \urcorner)$.

⁵The uniformity of the ranks of the premises allows us to use $\text{Rank}(P(p_0, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n, c_\emptyset \rangle))$ as the rank of the derivation $P(p, \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle)$.

Proof. By induction on a along $\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}$.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \wedge \urcorner, \ulcorner A \wedge B \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, u, v \rangle$, by induction, the disjunctions of $\text{End}(u) = \Gamma, A$ and $\text{End}(v) = \Gamma, B$ are true, so the disjunction of $\Gamma, A \wedge B$ is true.

If $w = \langle \ulcorner \forall \urcorner, \ulcorner \forall x F(x) \urcorner, \ulcorner \Gamma \urcorner, a, r, e \rangle$, by induction the disjunctions of $\text{End}(\Phi_e(s)) = \Gamma, F(s)$ are true for all s , so the disjunction of $\Gamma, \forall x F(x)$ is true.

The other cases of logical rules are similar.

If the last inference is a cut, then the cut formula must be Σ_1/Π_1 and so the equivalence $\text{True}_{\Pi_n}(\ulcorner \forall \urcorner) \leftrightarrow \forall \Gamma$ is not violated. If the last inference is Σ -Ref, the induction is completed by the fact that KP proves $A \leftrightarrow \exists z A^z$ for any Σ -formula A . \square

This concludes the proof of our theorem:

Theorem 8.6. $\text{KP} + \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}) \vdash \text{RFN}(\text{KP})$. \square

Since the proof of Lemma 8.5 simply hinges on the fact that we may eliminate cuts above certain complexity that is only determined by the complexity of axioms in $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$, we may deduce that, if T stands for $\text{KP} + \Gamma$ -separation + Γ -collection where Γ is any given syntactic complexity,

$$\text{RFN}(T) \equiv \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}) \quad \text{over } T$$

as well; we may add the axiom schemata Γ -separation and Γ -collection into the system $\text{RS}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{V})$, forgo the comprehension terms $\{x \in s \mid A(x, \bar{t})\}$, and the cut elimination (now above the complexity of Γ -separation and Γ -collection) and the embedding theorem go through as usual.

This argument does not apply to ZF; indeed, we can show that ZF proves $\text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})$. Suppose it doesn't, then there is a formula F and a model M of ZF such that $\text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}, F)$ is false in M . By the reflection theorem of ZF, there is a set model N in M such that $\text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}, F)$ is absolute for N , and so $\neg \text{TI}(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}, F)^N$. But as $(\varepsilon_{\Omega+1})^N$ is an ordinal in M , this contradicts foundation in M .

References

- [AR01] Peter Aczel and Michael Rathjen. “Notes on constructive set theory”. In: (2001). URL: <http://www.ml.kva.se/preprints/archive2000-2001.php> (cit. on p. 11).
- [Bar75] J. Barwise. *Admissible Sets and Structures*. Perspectives in Logic. Cambridge University Press, 1975. ISBN: 9781107168336. URL: <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=3aYoDgAAQBAJ> (cit. on p. 8).
- [KL68] G. Kreisel and A. Lévy. “Reflection Principles and their Use for Establishing the Complexity of Axiomatic Systems”. In: *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 14.7-12 (1968), pp. 97–142. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/malq.19680140702>. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/malq.19680140702> (cit. on p. 2).

- [Nor78] Dag Normann. “Set Recursion”. In: *Generalized Recursion Theory II*. Ed. by J.E. Fenstad, R.O. Gandy, and G.E. Sacks. Vol. 94. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. Elsevier, 1978, pp. 303–320. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X\(08\)70938-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X(08)70938-8). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049237X08709388> (cit. on p. 10).
- [Par70] Charles D. Parsons. “On a Number Theoretic Choice Schema and its Relation to Induction”. In: *Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics* 60 (1970), pp. 459–473 (cit. on p. 2).
- [Rat12] Michael Rathjen. “From the weak to the strong existence property”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 163.10 (2012). Set Theory, Classical and Constructive – Invited papers from the meeting in Amsterdam, May 6–7, 2010, pp. 1400–1418. ISSN: 0168-0072. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2012.01.012>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/a> (cit. on pp. 10, 11).
- [Rat92] Michael Rathjen. “A Proof-Theoretic Characterization of the Primitive Recursive Set Functions”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 57.3 (1992), pp. 954–969. ISSN: 00224812. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2275441> (cit. on pp. 2, 3).
- [Sac17] Gerald E. Sacks. *Higher Recursion Theory*. Perspectives in Logic. Cambridge University Press, 2017. DOI: 10.1017/9781316717301 (cit. on p. 10).
- [Sch77] Helmut Schwichtenberg. “Proof Theory: Some Applications of Cut-Elimination”. In: *HANDBOOK OF MATHEMATICAL LOGIC*. Ed. by Jon Barwise. Vol. 90. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. Elsevier, 1977, pp. 867–895. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X\(08\)711248](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X(08)711248) (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 10).