

ESSENTIAL HEREDITARY UNDECIDABILITY

ALBERT VISSER

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study *essential hereditary undecidability*. Theories with this property are a convenient tool to prove undecidability of other theories. The paper develops the basic facts concerning essentially hereditary undecidability and provides some salient examples, like a construction of essentially hereditarily undecidable theories due to Hanf and an example of a rather natural essentially hereditarily undecidable theory strictly below \mathbf{R} . We discuss the (non-)interaction of essential hereditary undecidability with recursive boolean isomorphism.

We develop a reduction relation *essential tolerance*, or, in the converse direction, *lax interpretability* that interacts in a good way with essential hereditary undecidability.

We introduce the class of Σ_1^0 -friendly theories and show that Σ_1^0 -friendliness is sufficient but not necessary for essential hereditary undecidability.

Finally, we adapt an argument due to Pakhomov, Murwanashyaka and Visser to show that there is no interpretability minimal essentially hereditarily undecidable theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

Robinson's Arithmetic \mathbf{Q} has a wonderful property: *essential hereditary undecidability*. If a theory is compatible with it, it is undecidable (and even hereditarily undecidable). This property is very useful as a tool to prove that theories are undecidable. A classical example of this method is Tarski's proof of the undecidability of group theory. See [TMR53]. As we will see, \mathbf{Q} shares this property with many other theories ...

In this paper, we study *essential hereditary undecidability*. The paper is partly an exposition of some of the literature, but it also contains original results and analyses. We will provide a number of examples of essentially hereditarily undecidable theories, both from the literature and new.

We will connect the notion with two reduction relations: *interpretability* and *lax interpretability* (aka *converse essential tolerance*). Lax interpretability will be introduced in the present paper. Specifically, we show that essential hereditary undecidability is upward preserved under lax interpretability. We study the interaction of the Tarski-Mostowski-Robinson theory \mathbf{R} with lax interpretability. We show that, in some sense, \mathbf{R} is equal to the false Σ_1^0 -sentences.

We develop the notion of Σ_1^0 -friendliness and show that it is sufficient but not necessary for essential hereditary undecidability.

Date: December 8, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 03F25,03F30,03F40.

Key words and phrases. interpretability, essential hereditary undecidability.

I thank Yong Cheng and Fedor Pakhomov for enlightening discussions. I am grateful to Fedor for his kind permission to use a proof-idea of his.

Finally, we demonstrate that there is no interpretability minimal essentially hereditarily undecidable theory. The proof is a minor adaptation of the proof that there is no interpretability minimal essentially undecidable theory in [PMV22].

2. BASICS

2.1. Theories. A theory is, in this paper, an RE theory of classical predicate logic in finite signature. A theory is given by an index of an RE axiom set. Here we confuse the sentences of a theory with numbers. We will usually work with a bijective Gödel numbering of the sentences. We adapt the Gödel numbering in each case to the signature at hand.

If U is a theory, we write U_P for the set of its theorems and U_R for the set of its refutable sentences, i.e., $U_R := \{\varphi \mid U \vdash \neg\varphi\}$.

We write id_U for the finitely axiomatised theory of identity for the signature of U . This theory is a built-in feature of predicate logic. However, if we work with interpretations, we need to check that it holds for the equivalence relation posing as the identity of the interpreted theory.

The theory R , introduced in [TMR53], is a primary example of an essentially hereditarily undecidable theory. The language of R is the usual arithmetical one. We define $t \leq u$ by $\exists x x + t = u$, for any terms t and u . Here are the axioms of R . The underlining stands for the usual unary numeral function.

$$R1. \vdash \underline{m} + \underline{n} = \underline{m + n}$$

$$R2. \vdash \underline{m} \cdot \underline{n} = \underline{m \cdot n}$$

$$R3. \vdash \underline{m} \neq \underline{n}, \text{ for } m \neq n$$

$$R4. \vdash x \leq \underline{n} \rightarrow \bigvee_{i \leq n} x = \underline{i}$$

$$R5. \vdash x \leq \underline{n} \vee \underline{n} \leq x$$

An important tool in the present paper is the theory of a number. There are various ways to develop this. E.g., we can treat the numerical operations as partial functions. Here we will employ a version using total functions. This version was developed by Johannes Marti, Nal Kalchbrenner, Paula Henk and Peter Fritz in *Interpretability Project Report* of 2011, the report of a project they did under my guidance in the Master of Logic in Amsterdam.¹ The language of TN is the usual arithmetical one extended with a primitive binary relation symbol $<$. Here are the axioms of TN .

$$TN1. \vdash x \not\leq 0$$

$$TN2. \vdash (x < y \wedge y < z) \rightarrow x < z$$

$$TN3. \vdash x < y \vee x = y \vee y < x$$

$$TN4. \vdash x = 0 \vee \exists y x = Sy$$

$$TN5. \vdash Sx \not\leq x$$

$$TN6. \vdash x < y \rightarrow (x < Sx \wedge y \not\leq Sx)$$

$$TN7. \vdash x + 0 = 0$$

$$TN8. \vdash x + Sy = S(x + y)$$

$$TN9. \vdash x \cdot 0 = 0$$

$$TN10. \vdash x \cdot Sy = x \cdot y + x$$

¹I simplified the axioms of Marti, Kalchbrenner, Henk and Fritz a bit and also implemented three nice simplifications suggested by the referee of a previous paper.

Since **TN6** implies $x \not\prec x$, a model of **TN** is a linear ordering that either represents a finite ordinal or starts with a copy of ω . Moreover, on a finite domain the successor function will behave normally, except on the maximum \mathbf{m} , where we have $\mathbf{S}\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}$.

We will be interested in the theory of a witness of a Σ_1^0 -sentence σ . There is a minor problem here. Even if the witness exists as a non-maximal element of a model, the value of a term may stick out. We can avoid this in several ways. We discussed one such way in our paper [Vis17]. We follow the same strategy in the present paper. We define *pure* Δ_0 -formulas as follows:

- $\delta ::= \perp \mid \top \mid x < y \mid 0 = u \mid \mathbf{S}u = v \mid u + v = w \mid u \cdot v = w \mid \neg \delta \mid$
 $(\delta \wedge \delta) \mid (\delta \vee \delta) \mid (\delta \rightarrow \delta) \mid \forall u < v \delta \mid \exists u < v \delta \mid \forall u \leq v \delta \mid \exists u \leq v \delta.$

A *pure* Σ_1^0 -formula is of the form $\exists \vec{u} \delta$, where δ is pure Δ_0 . In [Vis17], we showed that every ordinary Σ_1^0 -sentence can always be rewritten modulo $\mathbf{EA} + \mathbf{B}\Sigma_1$ -provable equivalence to a pure one. We call something a 1 - Σ_1^0 -formula if it starts with precisely one single existential quantifier.

Let $\sigma := \exists \vec{x} \delta$, where δ is pure Δ_0 with at most the \vec{x} free. Here $\vec{x} := x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$. We define:

- $[\sigma] := \mathbf{TN} + \exists z \exists x_0 < z \dots \exists x_{n-1} < z \delta.$

Since everything relevant to the evaluation of the sentence happens strictly below z , the sentence σ has its usual arithmetical meaning.

A subtlety occurs in the treatment of substitution: consider a pure Σ_1^0 -formula σ and, e.g., a substitution of a numeral in it, $\sigma[x := \underline{n}]$. Here we will always assume that the result of substitution is rewritten to an appropriate pure Σ_1^0 normal form.

We will employ witness comparison notation. Suppose α is of the form $\exists x \alpha_0(x)$ and β is of the form $\exists y \beta_0(y)$. We define:

- $\alpha < \beta := \exists x (\alpha_0(x) \wedge \forall y \leq x \neg \beta_0(y)).$
- $\alpha \leq \beta := \exists x (\alpha_0(x) \wedge \forall y < x \neg \beta_0(y)).$
- If γ is $\alpha < \beta$, then γ^\perp is $\beta \leq \alpha$.
- If δ is $\alpha \leq \beta$, then δ^\perp is $\beta < \alpha$.

We note that witness comparisons between pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -formulas are again pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -formulas. The following is immediate.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose σ and σ' are pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -sentences. Then,*

- i. $[\sigma \leq \sigma'] \vdash \neg(\sigma' < \sigma)$ and $[\sigma < \sigma'] \vdash \neg(\sigma' \leq \sigma)$.
- ii. *Suppose $\sigma \leq \sigma'$. Then, $[\sigma' < \sigma]$ is inconsistent. Suppose $\sigma < \sigma'$. Then, $[\sigma' \leq \sigma]$ is inconsistent.*

Open Question 2.2. The reader of this paper will develop some feel of the subtleties involved in our strategy to handle Σ_1^0 -sentences in the context of theories of a number. See also Appendix A. Of course, one can think of many other strategies. For example, we can work with the usual definition of Σ_1^0 , but demand that the maximum element, if there is one, is larger than a suitable function of the Gödel number of σ and the maximum of the witnesses. It would be good to have more experimentation with alternative strategies to see which is the most convenient.

One can also develop theories of a number using partial functions. This leads again to different possibilities to define the theories $[\sigma]$. See, e.g., [Vis12] for an attempt to treat theories of a number in this style. \circ

2.2. Interpretations and Interpretability. An interpretation K of a theory U in a theory V is based on on a *translation* of the U -language into the V -language.

This translation commutes with the propositional connectives. In some broad sense, it also commutes with the quantifiers but here there are a number of extra features.

- Translations may be more-dimensional: we allow a variable to be translated to an appropriate sequence of variables.
- We may have domain relativisation: we allow the range of the translated quantifiers to be some domain definable in the V -language.
- We may even allow the new domain to be built up from pieces of possibly, different dimensions.

A further feature is that identity need not be translated to identity but can be translated to a congruence relation. Finally, we may also allow parameters in an interpretation. To handle these the translation may specify a parameter-domain.

We can define the obvious identity translation of a language in itself, composition of translations and a disjunctive translation $\tau\langle\varphi\rangle\nu$. E.g., in case τ and ν have the same dimension and are non-piecewise, the domain of $\tau\langle\varphi\rangle\nu$ becomes $(\varphi \wedge \delta_\tau(\vec{x})) \vee (\neg\varphi \wedge \delta_\nu(\vec{x}))$.

We refer the reader for details to [Vis17].

An *interpretation* is a triple $\langle U, \tau, V \rangle$, where τ is a translation of the U -language in the V -language such that, for all φ , if $U \vdash \varphi$, then $V \vdash \varphi^\tau$.²

We write:

- $K : U \triangleleft V$ for: K is an interpretation of U in V .
- $U \triangleleft V$ for: there is a K such that $K : U \triangleleft V$. We also write $V \triangleright U$ for: $U \triangleleft V$.
- $U \triangleleft_{\text{loc}} V$ for: for every finitely axiomatisable sub-theory U_0 of U , we have $U_0 \triangleleft V$.
- $U \triangleleft_{\text{mod}} V$ for: for every V -model \mathcal{M} , there is a translation τ from the U -language in the V -language, such that τ defines an internal U -model $\mathcal{N} = \tilde{\tau}(\mathcal{M})$ of U in \mathcal{M} .
- We write $U \bowtie V$ for: $U \triangleleft V$ and $V \triangleleft U$. Similarly, for the other reduction notions.

Given two theories U and V we form $W := U \otimes V$ in the following way. The signature of W is the disjoint union of the signatures of U and V with an additional fresh zero-ary predicate P . The theory W is axiomatised by the axioms $P \rightarrow \varphi$ if φ is a U -axiom and $\neg P \rightarrow \psi$ if ψ is a V -axiom. One can show that $U \otimes V$ is the infimum of U and V in the interpretability ordering \triangleleft . This result works for all choices of our notion of interpretation.

The following theorem is a significant insight concerning the theories $[\sigma]$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let σ and σ' be pure $1\text{-}\Sigma_1$ -sentences. We have:*

- Suppose σ is true. Then, if we allow piecewise interpretations, we have $\top \triangleright [\sigma]$.
If we do not allow piecewise interpretations, we still have $(\exists x \exists y x \neq y) \triangleright [\sigma]$.*
- If $\sigma \leq \sigma'$, then $[\sigma'] \vdash \sigma$.*

2.3. Recursive Boolean Isomorphism. Two theories U and V are *recursively boolean isomorphic* iff, there is a bijective recursive function Φ , considered as a function from the sentences of the U language to the V -language, such that:

²In case we have parameters with parameter-domain α this becomes: $V \vdash \exists \vec{x} \alpha(\vec{x})$ and, for all φ , if $U \vdash \varphi$, then $V \vdash \forall \vec{x} (\alpha(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \varphi^\tau, \vec{x})$

- i. Φ commutes with the boolean connectives, so, e.g., $\Phi(\perp) = \perp$ and $\Phi(\varphi \wedge \psi) = (\Phi(\varphi) \wedge \Phi(\psi))$,
- ii. $U \vdash \varphi$ iff $V \vdash \Phi(\varphi)$.

We note that it follows that, e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{-1}(\varphi' \wedge \psi') &= \Phi^{-1}(\Phi\Phi^{-1}(\varphi') \wedge \Phi\Phi^{-1}(\psi')) \\ &= \Phi^{-1}\Phi(\Phi^{-1}(\varphi') \wedge \Phi^{-1}(\psi')) \\ &= \Phi^{-1}(\varphi') \wedge \Phi^{-1}(\psi') \end{aligned}$$

So Φ^{-1} is indeed the inverse isomorphism.

The demands on recursive boolean isomorphism are rather stringent. So it is good to know that the presence of an object satisfying far weaker demands implies the presence of an recursive boolean isomorphism.

Let us write \vdash of U -derivability and \vdash' for U' -derivability. We also write \sim for U -provable equivalence and \sim' for U' -provable equivalence. We let φ, ψ, \dots range over U -sentences and φ', ψ', \dots over U' -sentences.

Let us say that an RE relation \mathcal{E} between numbers, considered as a relation between U - and U' -sentences, *witnesses a recursive Lindenbaum isomorphism* iff we have:

- a. For all φ , there are χ and χ' such that $\varphi \sim \chi \mathcal{E} \chi'$;
- b. For all φ' , there are χ and χ' such that $\chi \mathcal{E} \chi' \sim' \varphi'$;
- c. If $\varphi_0 \mathcal{E} \varphi'_0$ and $\varphi_1 \mathcal{E} \varphi'_1$, then $\varphi_0 \sim \varphi_1$ iff $\varphi'_0 \sim' \varphi'_1$;
- d. If $\varphi \sim \varphi'$ and $\psi \sim \psi'$ and $(\varphi \wedge \psi) \sim \chi \mathcal{E} \chi'$, then $\chi' \sim' (\varphi' \wedge \psi')$. Similarly, for the other boolean connectives.

The dual form of (d) follows from (a,c,d). Suppose $\varphi \sim \varphi'$ and $\psi \sim \psi'$ and $\chi \mathcal{E} \chi' \sim' (\varphi' \wedge \psi')$. By (a) and (d), we can find ρ and ρ' such that $(\varphi \wedge \psi) \sim \rho \mathcal{E} \rho' \sim' (\varphi' \wedge \psi')$. It follows that $\rho' \sim \chi'$, and, hence, by (c), that $\rho \sim \chi$.

It is easy to see that if \mathcal{E} witnesses recursive Lindenbaum isomorphism, then so does $\sim \circ \mathcal{E} \circ \sim'$.

Let us say that a sentence is a *pseudo-atom* iff it is either atomic or if it has a quantifier as main connective.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose \mathcal{E} witnesses recursive Lindenbaum isomorphism between U and U' . Then, we can effectively find from an index of \mathcal{E} an index of a recursive boolean isomorphism Φ between U and U' .*

Proof. This is by a straightforward back-and-forth argument. Suppose \mathcal{E} witnesses recursive Lindenbaum isomorphism. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\mathcal{E} = \sim \circ \mathcal{E} \circ \sim'$. Let us employ enumerations of sentences that enumerate boolean sub-sentences before sentences.

We construct Φ in steps. Suppose we already have constructed

$$(\varphi_0, \varphi'_0), \dots, (\varphi_{k-1}, \varphi'_{k-1}).$$

(Here k may be 0.) Suppose k is even. Let φ_k be the first sentence in the enumeration of the U -sentences not among the φ_i , for $i < k$. In case φ_k is a pseudo-atom, we take φ'_k the first pseudo-atom in the enumeration of the ψ' such that $\varphi_i \mathcal{E} \psi'$. It is easy to see that there will always be such a pseudo-atom since we can always add vacuous quantifiers to a sentence. If φ_k is, e.g., a conjunction, it will be of the form $(\varphi_i \wedge \varphi_j)$, for $i, j < k$, and we set $\varphi'_k := (\varphi'_i \wedge \varphi'_j)$. The case that k is odd, is, of course, the dual case.

Clearly, this construction indeed delivers a recursive boolean isomorphism. \square

Let us write $U \approx U'$ for U is recursively isomorphic to U' . An important insight is that \approx is a bisimulation w.r.t. theory extension (in the same language). This means that:

- zig:** If $U \approx V$ and $U \subseteq U'$, then there is a $V' \supseteq V$, such that $U' \approx V'$;
- zag:** If $U \approx V$ and $V \subseteq V'$, then there is a $U' \supseteq U$, such that $U' \approx V'$.

Theorem 2.5. \approx is a bisimulation for \subseteq .

Proof. We prove the zig case. Zag is similar. Suppose $U \approx V$ and $U \subseteq U'$. Let Φ be a witnessing isomorphism. We define V' as $\{\Phi(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in U'\}$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
V' \vdash \Phi(\psi) &\Leftrightarrow \exists U'_0 \subseteq_{\text{fin}} U' \quad V \vdash \bigwedge_{\varphi \in U'_0} \Phi(\varphi) \rightarrow \Phi(\psi) \\
&\Leftrightarrow \exists U'_0 \subseteq_{\text{fin}} U' \quad V \vdash \Phi\left(\bigwedge_{\varphi \in U'_0} \varphi \rightarrow \psi\right) \\
&\Leftrightarrow \exists U'_0 \subseteq_{\text{fin}} U' \quad U \vdash \bigwedge_{\varphi \in U'_0} \varphi \rightarrow \psi \\
&\Leftrightarrow U' \vdash \psi \qquad \qquad \qquad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose \mathcal{P} is a property of theories. We say that U is *essentially* \mathcal{P} if all consistent RE extensions (in the same language) of U are \mathcal{P} . We say that U is *hereditarily* \mathcal{P} if all consistent RE sub-theories of U (in the same language) are \mathcal{P} . We say that U is *potentially* \mathcal{P} if some consistent RE extension (in the same language) of U is \mathcal{P} .

If \mathcal{R} is a relation between theories the use of *essential* and *hereditary* and *potential* always concerns the first component aka the subject. Thus, e.g., we say that U *essentially tolerates* V meaning that U essentially has the property of tolerating V . Tolerance itself is defined as potential interpretation. So U essentially tolerates V if U essentially potentially interprets V .

The following insight follows immediately from Theorem 2.5.

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose \mathcal{P} is a property of theories that is preserved by \approx . Then, so is the complement of \mathcal{P} and the property of being essentially \mathcal{P} . Moreover, if \mathcal{Q} is also a property of theories preserved by \approx , then so is the intersection of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} .*

We will see that we do not have an extension of Theorem 2.6 to include hereditarity.

Remark 2.7. Of course, the development above of recursive boolean isomorphism is very incomplete. It should be embedded in a presentation of appropriate categories. However, in the present paper, we restrict ourselves to the bare necessities. \circ

Remark 2.8. Recursive boolean isomorphism is implied by sentential congruence (the interpretation equivalent of elementary equivalence). However, it is not preserved by mutual interpretability. \circ

Here is a truly heavy result due to Mikhail Peretyat'kin: [Per97, Theorem 7.1.3]

Theorem 2.9 (Peretyat'kin). *Suppose U is an RE theory with index i . Then, there is a finitely axiomatised theory $A := \text{pere}(i)$ such that there is a recursive boolean morphism Φ between U and A . Moreover, A and an index of Φ can be effectively found from i .*

There is a much simpler result that is also useful. We need a bit of preparation to formulate it. The result is due to Janiczak [Jan53]. See also [PMV22]. Let Jan be the theory in the language with one binary relationsymbol E with the following (sets of) axioms.³

- J1. E is an equivalence relation.
- J2. There is at most one equivalence class of size precisely n
- J3. There are at least n equivalence classes with at least n elements.

We define A_n to be the sentence: there exists an equivalence class of size precisely $n + 1$. It is immediate that the A_n are mutually independent over J .

Theorem 2.10 (Janiczak). *Over Jan , every sentence is equivalent with a boolean combination of the A_n .*

Jan will not be recursively boolean isomorphic to propositional logic with countably propositional variables in our narrow sense, since, in Jan , there will be sentences equivalent to e.g. A_0 that are not *identical* to a boolean combination of A_i . However, Jan will be recursively Lindenbaum isomorphic to propositional logic.

Let U be any theory. We define $\text{jprop}(U)$ by Jan plus all sentences of the form $A_{\varphi \wedge \psi} \leftrightarrow (A_\varphi \wedge A_\psi)$, plus similar sentences for the other boolean connectives, plus all A_φ , whenever $U \vdash \varphi$. Clearly, we can effectively find an index of $\text{jprop}(U)$ from an index of U . We find:

Theorem 2.11. *U is recursively boolean isomorphic with $\text{jprop}(U)$.*

Proof. We define $\varphi \mathcal{E} \varphi'$ iff $\varphi' = A_\varphi$. It is easily seen that \mathcal{E} witnesses recursive Lindenbaum isomorphism between U and $\text{jprop}(U)$. So, U and $\text{jprop}(U)$ are recursively isomorphic, by Theorem 2.4. \square

2.4. Incompleteness and Undecidability. We write W_i for the RE set with index i . We define the following notions. We assume in all cases that U is consistent and RE.

- U is *recursively inseparable* iff U_P and U_R are recursively inseparable.
- U is *effectively inseparable* iff U_P and U_R are effectively inseparable. This means that there is a partial recursive function Φ such that, whenever $U_P \subseteq W_i$, $U_R \subseteq W_j$, and $W_i \cap W_j = \emptyset$, we have $\Phi(i, j)$ converges and $\Phi(i, j) \notin W_i \cup W_j$. We can easily show that Φ can always taken to be total.
- U is *effectively essentially undecidable*, iff, there is a partial recursive Ψ , such that, for every consistent RE extension V of U with index i , we have $\Psi(i)$ converges and $\Psi(i) \notin V_P \cup V_R$.

The second and third of these notions turn out to coincide. This was proven by Marian Boykan Pour-El. See [BPE68].

Theorem 2.12 (Pour-El). *A theory is effectively inseparable iff it is effectively essentially undecidable.*

³Our theory differs slightly from the theory considered by Janiczak in that we added J3. We did this to make the characterisation in Theorem 2.10 as simple as possible.

Clearly, recursively inseparable implies essentially undecidable. Andrzej Ehrenfeucht, in his paper [Ehr61], provides an example of an essentially undecidable theory that is not recursively inseparable. So there is no non-effective equivalent of Theorem 2.12.

The next theorem is due to Marian Boykan Pour-El and Saul Kripke. See [BPEK67, Theorem 2].

Theorem 2.13 (Pour-El & Kripke). *Consider any two effectively inseparable theories U_0 and U_1 . Then, U_0 and U_1 are recursively boolean isomorphic. Moreover, an index of the isomorphism can be found effectively from the indices of the theories and the indices of the witnesses of effective inseparability.*

The following result is [TMR53, Chapter I, Lemma, p15] and [TMR53, Chapter I, Theorem 1].

Theorem 2.14 (Tarski, Mostowski, Robinson). *Suppose the theory U is decidable. Then, U has a complete decidable extension U^* . In other words, decidable theories are potentially complete. As a direct consequence, potential decidability and potential completeness coincide, or, equivalently, essential undecidability and essential incompleteness are extensionally the same.*

Caveat emptor: If we, e.g., restrict ourselves to finite extensions, the equivalence between essential undecidability and essential incompleteness fails. So, it is good to recognise these as different notions even if they are extensionally the same.

The next result is fundamental is the study of hereditariness. It is [TMR53, Chapter I, Theorem 5].

Theorem 2.15 (Tarski, Mostowski, Robinson). *Suppose the theory U is decidable and φ is a sentence in the U -language. Then, $U + \varphi$ is also decidable.*

3. ESSENTIAL HEREDITARY UNDECIDABILITY: A FIRST LOOK

In this section, we collect the basic facts about Essential Hereditary and provide a selection of examples.

3.1. Characterisations. We give with two pleasant characterisations of essential hereditary undecidability.

Theorem 3.1. *A theory U is essentially hereditarily undecidable iff U is consistent and, for every W in the U -language, if $U + W$ is consistent, then W is undecidable.*

Proof. This is immediate since W is consistent with U iff, for some consistent V , we have $U \subseteq V \supseteq W$. \square

We say that V *tolerates* U if V potentially interprets U . In other words, V tolerates U iff there is a consistent $V' \supseteq V$ such that $V' \triangleright U$. Equivalently, V tolerates U iff, there is a translation τ of the U -language into the V -language such $V + U_\tau^\tau$ is consistent. Finally, V tolerates U iff, there is a translation τ of the U -language into the V -language such $V + \text{id}_U^\tau + U^\tau$ is consistent.⁴

⁴We need small adaptations of the characterisations in terms of a translation in case we allow parameters. For example, we have: V tolerates U iff there is a translation τ such that

$$V + \exists \vec{x} \alpha_\tau(\vec{x}) + \{\forall \vec{x} (\alpha_\tau(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \varphi^{\tau, \vec{x}}) \mid U \vdash \varphi\}$$

is consistent.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose U is consistent. The theory U is essentially hereditarily undecidable iff every V that tolerates U is undecidable.*

Proof. We treat the argument for the parameter-free case. The case with parameters only requires a few obvious adaptations.

Suppose U is essentially hereditarily undecidable and $V + \text{id}_U^\tau + U^\tau$ is consistent. Let W be the theory in the U -language axiomatised by $\{\varphi \mid V + \text{id}_U^\tau \vdash \varphi^\tau\}$.

We find that $W \vdash \varphi$ iff $V + \text{id}_U^\tau \vdash \varphi^\tau$ and that $U + W$ is consistent. Hence W is not decidable. Suppose that V is decidable. Then, $V + \text{id}_U^\tau$ is decidable and so is W . *Quod non.* So V is undecidable.

The other direction is immediate. \square

3.2. Essential Hereditary Incompleteness. Clearly, incompleteness is not the same as undecidability. However, essential incompleteness is the same as essential undecidability (by Theorem 2.14). On the other hand, essential hereditary incompleteness turns out to be the same as essential undecidability. We will see below that essential undecidability is not equivalent to essential hereditary undecidability.

Theorem 3.3. *Essential hereditary incompleteness coincides with essential undecidability.*

Proof. Clearly, essential hereditary incompleteness implies essential incompleteness, which, by Theorem 2.14, implies essential undecidability.

In the other direction, suppose U is essentially undecidable. Let W be consistent with U . In case W were complete, then W would extend U . Hence W would be undecidable, but that is impossible by our convention that all theories are RE. \square

3.3. Closure Properties. We prove closure of the essentially hereditarily undecidable theories under interpretability infima.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose U_0 and U_1 are essentially hereditarily undecidable. Then $U_0 \circledast U_1$ is essentially hereditarily undecidable.*

Proof. Let P be the 0-ary predicate that ‘chooses’ between U_0 and U_1 in $U := U_0 \circledast U_1$ and let e_i be the identical translation of the U_i -language into the $U_0 \circledast U_1$ -language. Suppose V is consistent with U . Clearly, one of $U + V + P$ or $U + V + \neg P$ is consistent. Say it is $U + V + P$. It follows that V tolerates U_0 as witnessed by the interpretation of U_0 in $U + V + P$ based on e_0 . So V is undecidable. The other case is similar. \square

We show that the essentially hereditarily undecidable theories are upwards closed under interpretability.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose U is consistent and essentially hereditarily undecidable and $V \triangleright U$. Then V is essentially hereditarily undecidable.*

Proof. Suppose that U is essentially hereditarily undecidable and U is interpretable in V , say via K . Suppose further that W is a theory in the V -language that is decidable and consistent with V . Let $Z := \{\varphi \mid W + \text{id}_V^K \vdash \varphi^K\}$. It is easy to see that Z is decidable and consistent with V . *Quod non.*

Our proof is easily adapted to the case with parameters. \square

Theorem 4.12 of this paper will be a strengthening of this result.

3.4. Hereditary Undecidability. If a theory tolerates an essentially hereditarily undecidable theory, then it is not just undecidable, but hereditarily undecidable.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose U is essentially hereditarily undecidable and that V tolerates U . Then V is hereditarily undecidable.*

Proof. This is immediate from the fact that toleration is downward closed in both arguments. \square

It would be great when the above theorem had a converse. However, the example below shows that this is not the case. The example is a minor variation of Theorem 3.1 of [Han65].

Example 3.7. (Hanf). We provide an example of a theory that is hereditarily undecidable but does not tolerate any essentially undecidable theory (and, so, *a fortiori* does not tolerate an essentially hereditarily undecidable theory). We consider Putnam's example of a theory that is undecidable such that all its complete extensions are decidable. See [Put57, Section 6].

We start by specifying a theory in the language of identity. Let:

$$\bullet \tilde{n} := \exists x_0 \dots \exists x_{n-1} (\bigwedge_{i < j < n} x_i \neq x_j \wedge \forall y \bigvee_{k < n} y = x_k).$$

Let \mathcal{X} be any non-recursive set. We take: $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{X}} := \{\neg \tilde{n} \mid n \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Clearly, $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is non-recursive.

The theory $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$ has the following complete extensions: \tilde{n} , for $n \notin \mathcal{X}$ and $\{\neg \tilde{n} \mid n \in \omega\}$. So there are no non-recursive complete extensions. The theory $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$ cannot be consistent with an essentially undecidable U in the same language (and, hence cannot tolerate an essentially undecidable V), since $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{X}} + U$ would have a complete and recursive extension.

We now apply Theorem 2.9 (Peretyat'kin's result), to obtain a finitely axiomatised theory $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathcal{X}}$ that is recursively boolean isomorphic to $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Clearly, $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathcal{X}}$ will inherit the undecidability and the lack of non-recursive complete extensions from $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Since, $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is finitely axiomatised and undecidable, it will be hereditarily undecidable.

We note that the original theory $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$ extends the theory of pure identity in the language of pure identity. So, $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$ itself is *not* hereditarily undecidable. \circ

Example 3.8. We provide an example of a theory, say Z , that is essentially undecidable and hereditarily undecidable but not essentially hereditarily undecidable.

The language of Z is given by a binary predicate E . Let α be a single axiom for Adjunctive Set Theory AS in this language and let $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots$ be axioms for a theory $W := \text{Jan} + \{A_n \mid n \in \mathcal{X}\} + \{\neg A_n \mid n \in \mathcal{Y}\}$, where \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are recursively inseparable RE sets. Our theory Z is axiomatized by the axioms $\alpha \vee \varphi_n$.

Let U be any consistent RE extension of Z in the same language. Clearly, one of $U + \alpha$ and $U + \neg \alpha$ is consistent. Suppose $U + \alpha$ is consistent. Then, $U + \alpha$ is undecidable, since it extends α . It follows that U must also be undecidable. The other case is similar.

Suppose V is a sub-theory of Z . It follows that V is a sub-theory of AS and, by the contraposition of Theorem 2.15, that V is undecidable.

Finally, Z is consistent with the decidable theory Jan . \circ

3.5. Essentially Hereditarily Undecidable Theories. In this subsection, we give an overview of some essentially hereditarily undecidable theories.

A first insight is given by Theorem 2.15 and [TMR53, Chapter I, Theorem 6].

Theorem 3.9 (Tarki, Mostowski, Robinson). *Suppose the theory A is finitely axiomatizable. If A is undecidable, then it is hereditarily undecidable. If A is essentially undecidable, then A is essentially hereditarily undecidable.*

Theorems 3.9, 2.9 and 2.11 give us immediately the following insight:

Theorem 3.10. *Suppose U is an (essentially) undecidable theory. Then, there are (essentially) undecidable theories U_0 and U_1 that are recursively boolean isomorphic to U of which the first is (essentially) hereditarily undecidable and the second has a decidable sub-theory. Indices for U_0 and U_1 can be effectively found from and index of U . Specifically, we can take $U_0 := \text{pere}(i)$, where i is an index of U and $U_1 := \text{jprop}(U)$.*

The use of Theorem 2.9 delivers many examples of (essentially) hereditarily undecidable theories, Here is, for example, Theorem 3.3 of [Han65].

Theorem 3.11 (Hanf). *Let d be any non-zero RE Turing degree. Then there is a finitely axiomatised essentially hereditarily undecidable theory A of degree d .*

Proof. By the results of [Sho58], there is an essentially undecidable RE theory U of degree d . Clearly, $\text{pere}(U)$ fulfils the bill. \square

Using the ideas of [PMV22], we can even arrange it so that the Turing degree of every theory that interprets the theory A of Theorem 3.11 is $\geq d$.

Corollary 3.1. *There are essentially hereditarily undecidable theories that do not interpret \mathbb{R} and, hence, there are essentially hereditarily undecidable theories strictly below \mathbb{R} .*

Proof. The theory $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$ of Section 6 provides an example of an essentially hereditarily undecidable theory strictly below \mathbb{R} . A different class of examples is given as follows. Suppose d is an RE Turing degree strictly between 0 and $0'$. By Theorem 3.11, we can find an essentially hereditarily undecidable theory A of RE degree d . If $A \triangleright \mathbb{R}$, then the degree of A would be $0'$, so, $A \not\triangleright \mathbb{R}$. By Theorem 3.4, the theory $B := A \odot \mathbb{R}$ is essentially hereditarily undecidable. Moreover, since $A \not\triangleright \mathbb{R}$, the theory B is strictly below \mathbb{R} . \square

A well-trodden path is the construction of essentially undecidable theories using recursively inseparable sets. We give the basic lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose Φ is a recursive function from the natural numbers to the sentences of U . Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} be a pair of recursively inseparable sets. Suppose Φ maps \mathcal{X} to $U_{\mathbb{P}}$ and \mathcal{Y} to the $U_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then, U is essentially undecidable.*

From the proof of Theorem 3.2 of [Han65] we can extract the following analogue of Lemma 3.1 for the case of essentially hereditarily undecidable theories.

Lemma 3.2 (Hanf). *Let U be a consistent RE theory and let U_0 be a finitely axiomatised sub-theory of the U . Suppose Φ is a recursive function from the natural numbers to the sentences of U . Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} be a pair of recursively inseparable sets. Suppose Φ maps \mathcal{X} to U_{0P} and \mathcal{Y} to the U_R . Then, U is essentially hereditarily undecidable.*

Proof. Let $U, U_0, \Phi, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ be as in the statement of the theorem. Suppose W is a theory in the language of U that is consistent with U . Suppose W is decidable. By Theorem 2.15, we find that $W^* := W + U_0$ is decidable. Moreover, W^* is consistent with U . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} n \in \mathcal{X} &\Rightarrow U_0 \vdash \Phi(n) \\ &\Rightarrow W^* \vdash \Phi(n). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} m \in \mathcal{Y} &\Rightarrow U \vdash \neg \Phi(m) \\ &\Rightarrow W^* \not\vdash \Phi(m). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\{k \mid W^* \vdash \Phi(k)\}$ is decidable and separates \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . A contradiction. \square

As we will see, in Section 4, the essential hereditary undecidability of the salient theory R is directly connected with the essential hereditary undecidability of certain finitely axiomatised theories. The following example, due to Hanf in [Han65, Theorem 3.2], shows that there are very un- R -like essentially hereditarily undecidable theories.

Example 3.12. (Hanf). We produce an essentially hereditarily undecidable RE theory U that does not tolerate any finitely axiomatisable essentially undecidable theory A .

Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be recursively inseparable sets. Let $V := \text{Jan} + \{A_n \mid n \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Let B be $\text{pere}(i)$, where i is an index of V . Let Ψ be the boolean isomorphism from V to B . Let $B_i := \Psi(A_i)$. We define: $U := B + \{\neg B_j \mid j \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. By Lemma 3.2, the theory U is essentially hereditarily undecidable.

Suppose U tolerates a finitely axiomatised essentially undecidable theory A . Then, some finite theory C in the language of U is consistent with U and interprets A . Clearly, C must itself be essentially undecidable. Now $\Psi^{-1}(C)$ is equivalent to a boolean combination of the A_i over V , so C is equivalent to a boolean combination of the B_i over B . Let the set of the i so that B_i occurs in this boolean combination be \mathcal{F} . Let $W := B + C + \{B_i \mid i \notin \mathcal{F}\}$. Clearly W is consistent and decidable. A contradiction with the fact that C is essentially undecidable.

We note that we can get our example in any desired non-zero RE Turing degree by choosing the right \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . \circ

The next example is due to Cobham. This result is presented in [Vau62]. See also [Vis17] for an alternative presentation. We will prove the result in Section 4.

Theorem 3.13 (Cobham). *The theory R is essentially hereditarily undecidable.*

In [Vis22], we show that effectively Friedman-reflexive theories are essentially hereditarily undecidable. We state it here as a theorem. The theorem will be a direct consequence of Theorem 5.4 of this paper.

Theorem 3.14. *Suppose U is consistent, RE, and effectively Friedman-reflexive. Then, U is essentially hereditarily undecidable.*

4. ESSENTIAL TOLERANCE AND LAX INTERPRETABILITY

In this section we study a reduction relation that interacts very well with essential hereditary undecidability. We will prove a number of theorems that illustrate these connections.

4.1. Basic Definitions and Facts. Suppose U is a consistent RE theory. We remind the reader that U *tolerates* V or $U \uparrow V$ iff U potentially interprets V , in other words, if for some consistent RE theory $U' \supseteq U$, we have $U' \triangleright V$. We find that U *essentially tolerates* V iff U essentially potentially interprets V , explicitly: iff, for all consistent RE theories $U' \supseteq U$, there is a consistent RE theory $U'' \supseteq U'$, such that $U'' \triangleright V$. We write $U \blacktriangleright V$ for U essentially tolerates V .

We note that essential tolerance is analogous to the converse of interpretability. In other words, ‘essentially tolerates’ is analogous to ‘interprets’. We will call the converse of essential tolerance: *lax interpretability*.

Below we establish that essential tolerance is a *bona fide* reduction relation—unlike tolerance that fails to be transitive.

Remark 4.1. The notion of *tolerance* was introduced in [TMR53] under the name of *weak interpretability*. We like ‘tolerates’ more since it is more directly suggestive of the intended meaning. Japaridze uses tolerance in a more general sense. See [DJ92] and [DJ93], or the handbook paper [JdJ98]. \circ

Example 4.2. We illustrate the intransitivity of tolerance. In fact, our counterexample shows a bit more.

Presburger Arithmetic essentially tolerates Predicate Logic in the language with a binary relation symbol. Predicate Logic in the language of a binary relation symbol tolerates full Peano Arithmetic. However, Presburger Arithmetic does not tolerate Peano Arithmetic. \circ

Remark 4.3. The definition of \blacktriangleright suggests several variations, where we demand that some promised ingredients are effectively found from appropriate indices. We will not explore such variations in the present paper. \circ

The first two insights are that lax interpretability is (strictly) between two good notions of interpretability, to wit, model interpretability and local interpretability.

Theorem 4.4. *If $U \triangleright_{\text{mod}} V$, then $U \blacktriangleright V$.*

Proof. Suppose $U \triangleright_{\text{mod}} V$. Let $U' \supseteq U$. Consider any model \mathcal{M} of U' . There is an internal model of V , say, given by translation τ . Let $U'' := U' + \{\psi^\tau \mid V \vdash \psi\}$. Clearly, U'' is consistent and RE and $U'' \triangleright V$ as witnessed by τ . \square

In Section 6, we develop the theory $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$. This theory is a sub-theory of R . We have $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^- \blacktriangleright \text{R}$, but $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^- \not\triangleright_{\text{mod}} \text{R}$. This tells us that the inclusion of model interpretability in lax interpretability is strict.

Open Question 4.5. Are there sequential U and V such that we have $U \blacktriangleright V$, but $U \not\triangleright_{\text{mod}} V$? \circ

We turn to the comparison of lax and local interpretability.

Theorem 4.6. *If $U \blacktriangleright V$, then $U \triangleright_{\text{loc}} V$.*

Proof. Suppose $U \blacktriangleright V$. Let V_0 be a finitely axiomatised sub-theory of V . Let φ be a single axiom of V_0 which includes id_V . Suppose $U \not\blacktriangleright V_0$. Consider $U' := U + \{\neg\varphi^\tau \mid \tau : \Sigma_V \rightarrow \Sigma_U\}$.⁵ The theory U' is consistent since, if not, U would prove a finite disjunction of sentences of the form φ^τ . Say the translations involved are $\tau_0, \dots, \tau_{n-1}$. We define:

$$\tau^* := \tau_0(\varphi^{\tau_0})(\tau_1(\varphi^{\tau_1})(\dots(\tau_{n-2}(\varphi^{\tau_{n-1}})\tau_{n-1})\dots)).$$

We find that $U \vdash \varphi^{\tau^*}$. *Quod non.* So, U' is consistent. Clearly U' is RE and no consistent RE extension of U' can interpret the theory axiomatised by φ . But this contradicts $U \blacktriangleright V$. \square

Example 4.7. Consider a consistent finitely axiomatised sequential theory A . We do have $A \triangleright_{\text{loc}} \mathcal{U}(A)$. Here $\mathcal{U}(A)$ is the theory $S_2^1 + \{\text{Con}_n(A) \mid n \in \omega\}$, where Con_n means consistency w.r.t. proofs where all formulas in the proof have depth of quantifier alternations complexity $\leq n$. See e.g. [Vis11] for more on \mathcal{U} .

In, e.g., [Vis14a] it is verified in detail that A has a consistent RE extension \tilde{A} such that every interpretation of S_2^1 in A contains a restricted inconsistency statement for A . We call such an extension a *Krajíček-theory based on A* . Clearly, no consistent extension of \tilde{A} in the same language can interpret $\mathcal{U}(A)$. So $A \not\blacktriangleright \mathcal{U}(A)$. This gives us our desired separating example between \blacktriangleright and $\triangleright_{\text{loc}}$.

We note that $A \not\blacktriangleright \mathcal{U}(A)$ in fact expresses the existence of a Krajíček extension.

Another example is as follows. Consider any complete and decidable theory U . We do have $U \triangleright_{\text{loc}} \mathbb{R}$. However, $U \not\blacktriangleright \mathbb{R}$. Since no complete RE theory does interpret \mathbb{R} . \circ

It turns out that it is useful to lift \blacktriangleright to a relation between sets of theories. We define:

- $\mathcal{X} \blacktriangleright \mathcal{Y}$ iff for all $U \in \mathcal{X}$ and for all consistent RE theories $U' \supseteq U$, there is a consistent RE theory $U'' \supseteq U$ and a $V \in \mathcal{Y}$, such that $U'' \triangleright V$.

We note that $U \blacktriangleright V$ is equivalent to $\{U\} \blacktriangleright \{V\}$. We will write $U \blacktriangleright \mathcal{Y}$ for $\{U\} \blacktriangleright \mathcal{Y}$, etcetera.

- Theorem 4.8.**
- Suppose $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}'$ and $\mathcal{X}' \blacktriangleright \mathcal{Y}'$ and $\mathcal{Y}' \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. Then, $\mathcal{X} \blacktriangleright \mathcal{Y}$.*
 - We have: $\mathcal{X} \blacktriangleright \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{X}' \blacktriangleright \mathcal{Y}$ iff $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}') \blacktriangleright \mathcal{Y}$.*
 - The relation \blacktriangleright between sets of theories is transitive. As a consequence, \blacktriangleright as a relation between theories is transitive.*

Proof. We just treat (c). Suppose $\mathcal{X} \blacktriangleright \mathcal{Y} \blacktriangleright \mathcal{Z}$. Consider $U \in \mathcal{X}$ and let U' be any consistent RE extension of U . Let U'' be a consistent RE extension of U' such that $U'' \triangleright V$, for some $V \in \mathcal{Y}$. Say, we have $K : U'' \triangleright V$. Let $V' := \{\psi \mid U'' \vdash \psi^K\}$. We find that V' is a consistent RE extension of V . Let V'' be a consistent extension of V' such that $V'' \triangleright W$, for some $W \in \mathcal{Z}$.

We consider $U^* := U'' + \{\psi^K \mid V'' \vdash \psi\}$. Clearly U^* is RE, $U^* \supseteq U'$ and $U^* \triangleright V'' \triangleright W$, so $U^* \triangleright W$. We claim that U^* is consistent. If not, there would be

⁵In case we are allowing parameters, we should replace φ^τ in the argument by

$$\exists \vec{v} (\alpha_\tau(\vec{v}) \wedge \forall \vec{u} (\alpha_\tau(\vec{u}) \rightarrow \varphi^{\tau, \vec{u}})).$$

Here α_τ is the parameter domain. In the case of finitely axiomatised theories, we can even omit the parameter domain, so $\exists \vec{u} \varphi^{\tau, \vec{u}}$ already works.

a ψ such that $V'' \vdash \psi$ and $U'' \vdash (\neg\psi)^K$. It follows that $V' \vdash \neg\psi$ and, hence, that $V'' \vdash \neg\psi$, contradicting the fact that V'' is consistent. Thus, $U^* \supseteq U'$ and W are our desired witnesses. \square

We write $U \uparrow \mathcal{Y}$ for U tolerates some element of \mathcal{Y} . Inspection of the above proof also tells us that:

Theorem 4.9. *Suppose $U \uparrow V$ and $V \triangleright \mathcal{Z}$. Then, $U \uparrow \mathcal{Z}$.*

Theorem 4.10. *i. $(U \otimes V) \triangleright W$ iff $U \triangleright W$ and $V \triangleright W$.
ii. $(U \otimes V) \blacktriangleright \{U, V\}$.*

Proof. We just do (i). Claim (ii) is similar. From left-to-right is immediate, since $U \triangleright (U \otimes V)$ and $V \triangleright (U \otimes V)$, and, hence, $U \triangleright (U \otimes V)$ and $V \triangleright (U \otimes V)$. So we are done by transitivity.

Let $Z := U \otimes V$. Suppose $U \triangleright W$ and $V \triangleright W$. Let $Z' \supseteq Z$ be RE and consistent. The theory Z' is either consistent with P or with $\neg P$. Suppose it is consistent with P . Let U' be the set of U -sentences that follow from $Z' + P$. Clearly, $U' \supseteq U$ and U' is RE and consistent. So, there is a $U'' \supseteq U'$ that is RE and consistent such that $U'' \triangleright W$. We take Z'' the theory axiomatised by $Z' + P + U''$ in the Z -language. Clearly, $Z'' \supseteq Z'$ and Z'' is consistent and RE and $Z'' \triangleright W$. The argument in case $\neg P$ is consistent is similar. \square

We note that the above theorem tells us that the embedding functor of interpretability into lax interpretability preserves infima.

Open Question 4.11. Of course, the new notion of *lax interpretability* raises many questions. E.g.: is there a good supremum for lax interpretability? And: does the embedding functor of interpretability into lax interpretability have a right or left adjoint? \circ

4.2. Essential Hereditary Undecidability meets Lax Interpretability. We start with the main insight concerning the relation between Essential Hereditary Undecidability and Lax Interpretability.

Theorem 4.12. *Let U be RE and consistent.*

- i. Suppose \mathcal{V} is a class of essentially undecidable theories and $U \triangleright \mathcal{V}$. Then, U is essentially undecidable.*
- ii. Suppose \mathcal{V} is a class of essentially hereditarily undecidable theories and $U \triangleright \mathcal{V}$. Then, U is essentially hereditarily undecidable.*

Proof. Ad (i). Suppose \mathcal{V} is a class of essentially undecidable theories and $U \triangleright \mathcal{V}$. Suppose U has a consistent decidable extension W . then, W has a decidable consistent complete extension W^* . It follows that $W^* \triangleright V$, for some V in \mathcal{V} . *Quod impossibile.*

Ad (ii). Suppose \mathcal{V} is a class of essentially hereditarily undecidable theories and $U \triangleright \mathcal{V}$. Suppose W is an RE theory in the language of U and suppose $U' := U \cup W$ is consistent. We have to show that W is undecidable.

Let U'' be a consistent RE extension of U' such that $K : U'' \triangleright V$, for some $V \in \mathcal{V}$. Consider the theory $Z := \{\psi \mid W + \text{id}_V^K \vdash \psi^K\}$. We have $Z \vdash \psi$ iff $W + \text{id}_V^K \vdash \psi^K$.

Clearly Z is a sub-theory of V . If W were decidable then so would Z , contradicting the fact that V is essentially hereditarily undecidable.⁶ \square

Remark 4.13. Inspection of the example provided by Ehrenfeucht in [Ehr61], shows that his construction provides an example where $U \triangleright \mathcal{V}$, each element of \mathcal{V} is recursively inseparable (if we wish, even effectively inseparable), but U is not recursively inseparable. The theory U of the example is essentially undecidable. \circ

We now turn to the result that motivates looking at classes of theories a relation \triangleright . Let \mathfrak{S} be the set of all theories $[\sigma]$, where σ is a false pure Σ_1^0 -sentence and $[\sigma]$ is consistent.⁷

Theorem 4.14. *We have $R \blacktriangleleft \mathfrak{S}$.*

Proof. From left-to-right. Let U' be a consistent RE extension of R . Clearly, $U' \vdash [\sigma]$, for all true pure Σ_1^0 -sentences σ . So, if no $[\sigma] \in \mathfrak{S}$, would be consistent with U' , we could decide Σ_1^0 -truth. *Quod non.* Consider any such $[\sigma]$ that is consistent with U' . Let $U'' := U' + [\sigma]$. Clearly, $U'' \triangleright [\sigma]$.

From right-to-left. Consider $[\sigma] \in \mathfrak{S}$. Clearly, $[\sigma] \triangleright R$ and we are easily done. \square

Of course, the extension U'' in the proof of Theorem 4.14 can be found effectively from an index of U' . E.g., let \square be U' -provability. By the Gödel Fixed Point Lemma, we can find j that is equivalent to $\square \neg j$. Here we assume that j is written in pure Σ_1^0 -form. Suppose j were true, then both $\square j$ and $\square \neg [j]$, contradiction the consistency of U' . So j is false and $[j]$ is consistent with U' . We take $U'' := U' + [j]$.

Since all $[\sigma] \in \mathfrak{S}$ extend R , they are essentially undecidable. Moreover, since the $[\sigma]$ are finitely axiomatised, they are essentially hereditarily undecidable. It follows from Theorem 4.12, that R is essentially hereditarily undecidable. So, this gives us a proof of Theorem 3.13.

Open Question 4.15. Suppose $U \blacktriangleright \mathfrak{S}$. Does it follow that U is recursively inseparable? \circ

Let \mathfrak{F} be the set of all finitely axiomatised essentially hereditarily undecidable theories. Example 3.12 shows that there is an essentially hereditarily undecidable theory U such that $U \blacktriangleright \mathfrak{F}$.

5. Σ_1^0 -FRIENDLINESS AND Σ_1^0 -REPRESENTATIVITY

In this section, we have a brief look at a rather natural property of theories that implies essential hereditary undecidability.

Consider a consistent RE theory U and a recursive function Φ from pure Σ_1^0 -sentences to U -sentences. We give three possible properties of Φ . Let σ range over pure 1- Σ_1^0 -sentences.

$\Sigma 1$. If σ is true, then $U \vdash \Phi(\sigma)$.

$\Sigma 2$. $(U + \Phi(\sigma)) \triangleright [\sigma]$.

⁶We need small adaptations of the argument in case we allow parameters. See also Footnote 4.

⁷We can also allow the inconsistent theory in \mathfrak{S} .

$\Sigma 3$. Suppose $\sigma \leq \sigma'$. Then, $U \vdash \neg \Phi(\sigma' < \sigma)$. Similarly, suppose $\sigma < \sigma'$. Then, $U \vdash \neg \Phi(\sigma' \leq \sigma)$.

We say that U is Σ_1^0 -friendly iff, there is a recursive Φ satisfying $\Sigma 1$ and $\Sigma 2$. We say that U is Σ_1^0 -representative if there is a recursive Φ satisfying $\Sigma 1$ and $\Sigma 3$.

The next theorem is, in a sense, a generalisation of the First Incompleteness Theorem. We just need $\Sigma 1$.

Theorem 5.1. *Consider a consistent RE theory U and a recursive function Φ from pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -sentences to U -sentences. Suppose Φ satisfies $\Sigma 1$. Let U_i be a recursive sequence of consistent RE extensions of U . Then, we can effectively find a false pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -sentence j , such that $\Phi(j)$ is consistent with each of the U_i .*

Proof. We stipulate the conditions of the theorem. We can find a pure Δ_0 -formula $\pi(i, p, \varphi)$ such that $U_i \vdash \varphi$ iff $\exists p \pi(i, p, \varphi)$. Let

$$\Delta \varphi := \exists u \exists i < u \exists p < u \pi(i, p, \varphi).$$

Using the Gödel Fixed Point Construction, we find a pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -sentence j such that j is true iff $\Delta \neg \Phi(j)$. Suppose j is true. Then, $U \vdash \Phi(j)$ and, for some i , we have $U_i \vdash \neg \Phi(j)$, contradicting the consistency of U_i . Thus, j is false and consistent with each of the U_i . \square

Remark 5.2. (Kripke). We immediately get Kripke's version of the First Incompleteness Theorem from Theorem 5.1. Let **School** be the theory in the language of arithmetic (without $<$ as primitive) of all true closed equations. We get Kripke's result by setting $U := \text{School}$ and Φ the transformation from Matiyasevich's theorem that sends a pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -sentence to a purely existential sentence.

E.g., it follows that there is a Diophantine equation that has solutions in all finite rings and in some non-standard model of PA, but no solutions in \mathbb{N} . \circ

Lemma 5.1. *Every Σ_1^0 -friendly theory U is Σ_1^0 -representative.*

Proof. Let Φ witness that U is Σ_1^0 -friendly. We prove $\Sigma 3$. Let σ and σ' be pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -sentences. We have: $(U + \Phi(\sigma' < \sigma)) \triangleright [\sigma' < \sigma]$. Suppose $\sigma \leq \sigma'$. Since, by Theorem 2.1, $[\sigma' < \sigma]$ is inconsistent, we find that $U \vdash \neg \Phi(\sigma' < \sigma)$. The other case is similar. \square

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose U is RE, consistent, and Σ_1^0 -friendly. Then, $U \triangleright \mathfrak{S}$, and, hence, $U \triangleright \mathbf{R}$.*

Proof. We note that any consistent RE extension of a Σ_1^0 -friendly RE theory is again Σ_1^0 -friendly. So it is sufficient to show that U tolerates a theory $[\sigma]$, for false pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -sentences σ .

Suppose U does not tolerate any false $[\sigma]$. If σ is true, we have $U \vdash \Phi(\sigma)$. Suppose σ is false. We have $(U + \Phi(\sigma)) \triangleright [\sigma]$. So, if $U + \Phi(\sigma)$ were consistent, then U would tolerate $[\sigma]$. *Quod non, ex hypothesi.* So, $U \vdash \neg \Phi(\sigma)$. Since U is RE, we can now decide the halting problem. *Quod impossibile.* \square

We note that we can effectively find a sentence σ such that $\Phi(\sigma)$ is consistent with U from indices for U and Φ . Let $\Box \neg \Phi(s)$ be a pure $1\text{-}\Sigma_1^0$ -formula representing the U -provability of $\neg \Phi(s)$. Then, we can take σ to be j , (a pure $1\text{-}\sigma_1^0$ version of) the Gödel fixed point that is equivalent to $\Box \neg \Phi(j)$. It is easy to see that $U + \Phi(j)$ is indeed consistent.

The following result employs the notions and notations of [Vis22].

Theorem 5.4. *Every consistent RE effectively Friedman-reflexive theory U is Σ_1^0 -friendly.*

Proof. We can take $\Phi(\sigma) := \diamond \sigma$ □

We note that Theorems 5.3 and 5.4 immediately give Theorem 3.14.

The theory R is Σ_1^0 -friendly via the mapping $\sigma \mapsto \bigwedge[\sigma]$. So this again shows that $R \triangleright \mathfrak{S}$.

It turns out that Σ_1^0 -representativity coincides with a familiar notion.

Theorem 5.5. *Consider a consistent RE theory U . Then, U is Σ_1^0 -representative iff U is effectively inseparable.*

Proof. Suppose U is RE and consistent.

Suppose U is Σ_1^0 -representative as witnessed by Ψ . Let \mathcal{X}_0 and \mathcal{X}_1 be any pair of effectively inseparable sets. Let $\sigma_0(x)$ be a pure $1\text{-}\Sigma_1^0$ -formula that represents \mathcal{X}_0 and let $\sigma_1(x)$ be a pure $1\text{-}\Sigma_1^0$ -formula that represents \mathcal{X}_1 . We write $\sigma_i(\underline{n})$ for a pure 1-representation of the result of substituting \underline{n} in σ_i . We define

$$\Theta(n) := \Phi(\sigma_0(\underline{n}) \leq \sigma_1(\underline{n})).$$

Suppose $n \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, $\sigma_0(\underline{n}) \leq \sigma_1(\underline{n})$ is true and, hence, $U \vdash \Theta(n)$. Suppose $n \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then, $\sigma_1(\underline{n}) < \sigma_0(\underline{n})$ is true, and, hence, $U \vdash \neg \Theta(n)$.

For the converse, suppose U is effectively inseparable. Then, by [BPEK67, Theorem 2], we find that there is a recursive boolean isomorphism Ψ from R to U . We can take Ψ restricted to pure $1\text{-}\Sigma_1^0$ -sentences as the function witnessing the Σ_1^0 -representativity of U . □

The first part of the proof of Theorem 5.4 can also be done via a Rosser argument. We have to be somewhat more careful with the details if we follow that road. We will give the argument in Appendix A.

Open Question 5.6. It would be quite interesting to replace the $[\sigma]$ in our definitions of friendliness and representativity by some other class of theories. However, the demands on the $[\sigma]$ use both witness comparison and truth. So, it is not at all obvious here what more general analogues could be. ○

Example 5.7. At this point the time is ripe to give some separating examples. We consider properties: P1: undecidable, P2: essentially undecidable, P3: essentially hereditarily undecidable, P4: recursively inseparable, P5: effectively inseparable, P6: Σ_1^0 -friendly. We first give the list and then the description of the examples below it.

example	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6
U_0	-	-	-	-	-	-
U_1	+	-	-	-	-	-
U_2	+	+	-	-	-	-
U_3	+	+	+	-	-	-
U_4	+	+	-	+	-	-
U_5	+	+	-	+	+	-
U_6	+	+	+	+	+	-
U_7	+	+	+	+	+	+

- a. We can take U_0 be any decidable theory like Presburger Arithmetic.
- b. We can take U_1 e.g. the theory of groups, which, by results of Tarski ([TMR53, Chapter III]) and Szmielew ([Szm55]), is hereditarily but not essentially undecidable.
- c. We can take U_2 to be Ehrenfeucht's theory (see [Ehr61]) which is essentially undecidable, but neither hereditarily undecidable, nor recursively separable.
- d. We can take U_3 to be a finitely axiomatised theory that is recursively boolean isomorphic to U_1 . This theory is hereditarily undecidable, but not recursively separable.
- e. Let d be an RE Turing degree with $0 < d < 0'$. Suppose \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} is a recursively inseparable pair of RE sets as constructed by Shoenfield (see [Sho58] or [PMV22]), where the Turing degree of \mathcal{A} is d and the Turing degree of \mathcal{B} is $\leq d$. Let

$$U_4 := \text{Jan} + \{\mathcal{A}_n \mid n \in \mathcal{A}\} + \{\neg \mathcal{A}_n \mid n \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Then, U_4 is recursively inseparable, but cannot be effectively inseparable. Also, since U_4 contains a decidable sub-theory in the same language it cannot be essentially hereditarily undecidable.

- f. We define U_5 like U_4 only now we take \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} to be effectively inseparable.
- g. We can take U_6 to be the theory of Hanf's example (Example 3.12 in this paper) for the case that the recursively unseparable sets on which the construction is based are effectively undecidable.
- h. We can take U_7 to be, e.g., \mathbb{Q} .

We note that our list shows that the evident dependencies of the concepts are all possible dependencies. \circ

Open Question 5.8. Is there a *finitely axiomatised* theory that is both effectively inseparable and essentially hereditarily undecidable, but not Σ_1^0 -friendly? \circ

6. SEPARATING MODEL-INTERPRETABILITY AND LAX INTERPRETABILITY

In this section, we introduce the theory $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$ and prove some of its salient properties. Most importantly, it will be an example of a Σ_1^0 -friendly theory U such that U is a sub-theory of \mathbb{R} , modulo definitional extension of \mathbb{R} with $<$, and $U \blacktriangleright \mathbb{R}$, and $U \not\blacktriangleright_{\text{mod}} U$.

We define the theory $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$ as follows. It has the relational signature of arithmetic with $<$ minus the zero. We write $\tilde{n}(x)$ for the theory TN with 0 replaced by the parameter x plus 'there are at least n elements' relativised to the domain of the y such that $x \leq y$. We note that number and theory fix each other uniquely. $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$ is axiomatised by the axioms $\exists x \tilde{n}(x)$ for $n \in \omega$.

Let R_{succ} be the theory in the language with 0 and S, axiomatised by $\underline{n} \neq \underline{m}$, where $n \neq m$. We prove the following theorem. Let $R_{<}$ be R extended with the symbol $<$ and the axiom $\vdash x < y \leftrightarrow \exists z z + Sx = y$.

Theorem 6.1. *We have:*

- a. $R_{<} \supseteq \text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$ and, hence, $R \triangleright \text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$.
- b. $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$ is Σ_1^0 -friendly and, hence, $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^- \blacktriangleright R$.
- c. $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^- \not\equiv_{\text{mod}} R_{\text{succ}}$.

We note that it follows that $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^- \blacktriangleleft R$, and, hence, $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^- \blacktriangleright R$.

We prove our theorem via a sequence of lemmas. The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 6.1. $R_{<} \supseteq \text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$ and, hence, $R \triangleright \text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$.

For any pure 1- Σ_1^0 -sentence, σ we define $[\sigma]_x$ as the theory of σ with zero replaced by the free parameter x on the domain of the y such that $x \leq y$. We show the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *The theory $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$ is Σ_1^0 -friendly. Hence, $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^- \blacktriangleright \mathfrak{G}$ and $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^- \blacktriangleright R$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that the mapping $\sigma \mapsto \exists x [\sigma]_x$ fulfils the conditions for Φ in the definition of Σ_1^0 -freeness.⁸ \square

To prove Theorem 6.1(c), we need a counter-model. We define \mathbb{N}_{scat} , the model of the scattered numbers, for the signature of $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$ as follows. It is the disjoint sum of the natural numbers considered as models of the theory of a number (in relational signature). Modulo isomorphism, we can also define \mathbb{N}_{scat} concretely as follows.

- The domain of \mathbb{N}_{scat} is the set of $\langle n, m \rangle$ with $m < n$.
- $\langle n, m \rangle < \langle n', m' \rangle$ iff $n = n'$ and $m < m'$.
- $S(\langle n, m \rangle, \langle n', m' \rangle)$ iff $n = n'$ and $m' = \min(m + 1, n - 1)$.
- $A(\langle n, m \rangle, \langle n', m' \rangle, \langle n'', m'' \rangle)$ iff $n = n' = n''$ and $m'' = \min(m + m', n - 1)$.
- $M(\langle n, m \rangle, \langle n', m' \rangle, \langle n'', m'' \rangle)$ iff $n = n' = n''$ and $m'' = \min(m \times m', n - 1)$.
- $\langle n, m \rangle < \langle n', m' \rangle$ iff $n = n'$ and $m < m'$.

Let \sim be the equivalence relation on \mathbb{N}_{scat} given by $x < y \vee y \leq x$. We write $[x]$ for (the purely syntactic representation of) the \sim -equivalence class of x . Let $\varphi^{[x]}$ be the relativisation of the quantifiers of φ to $[x]$.⁹ We write \hat{n} for the submodel (of the theory of n) with as domain the \sim -equivalence class of size n .

Consider a finite set of free variables X . Let \simeq be any equivalence relation on X . So, \simeq is a purely syntactic relation. We say that a formula is θ is \simeq -good if it is of the form $\chi^{[x]}$, for some $x \in X$ and all free variables of θ are \simeq -equivalent to x . We say that a formula is \simeq -friendly iff it is a boolean combination of \simeq -good formulas of the form $\chi^{[x]}$, where $x \in X$. We define E_{\simeq} to be the conjunction of all $x \sim x'$ in case $x \simeq x'$ and $x \not\sim x'$ in case $x \not\simeq x'$, for $x, x' \in X$. (We assume that X is part of the data for \simeq .)

We prove our third lemma. The lemma and its proof are well known for the case of binary disjoint sums of models. The present result is just an adaptation.

⁸This uses interpretations with parameters. At the end of the section, we explain how to obtain the result, for a variant of $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-$, in a parameter-free way. Here we loose the fact that our theory is contained in $R_{<}$, but we still have that R interprets it.

⁹To be precise: we first rename the variables in φ so that there is no bound variable labeled x and then relativise.

Lemma 6.3. *Let X be some finite set of variables and let \vec{x} be some enumeration of X . Consider a formula φ with free variables among X and an equivalence relation \simeq on X . Then, there is an \simeq -friendly ψ such that*

$$\mathbb{N}_{\text{scat}} \models \forall \vec{x} (\mathbf{E}_{\simeq} \rightarrow (\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi)).$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on φ .

We treat $Axyz$ as a prototypical atomic formula, where A stands for addition. In case $Axyz$ is \simeq -good, we can take $Axyz$ itself as ψ noting that $(Axyz)^{[x]}$ is identical to $Axyz$. In case $Axyz$ is not \simeq -good, we can take ψ to be \perp , seeing that $Axyz$ is equivalent to \perp under the assumption \mathbf{E}_{\simeq} and $\perp = \perp^{[x]}$.

We treat $(\varphi_0 \wedge \varphi_1)$ as a prototypical case. In $\text{Th}(\mathbb{N}_{\text{scat}})$, under the assumption \mathbf{E}_{\simeq} , by the Induction Hypothesis, each of the φ_i is equivalent to an \simeq -friendly ψ_i . So, $(\varphi_0 \wedge \varphi_1)$ is equivalent to $(\psi_0 \wedge \psi_1)$, which is \simeq -friendly.

Finally, consider the case of $\exists z \varphi'$. Since we always can rename bound variables, we can assume that $z \notin X$. Let $X' := X \cup \{z\}$. We write $\simeq \sqsubset_z \simeq'$ if \simeq' is an equivalence relation on X' and \simeq' restricted to X is \simeq .

We reason in $\text{Th}(\mathbb{N}_{\text{scat}})$ under the assumption \mathbf{E}_{\simeq} . We note that $\exists z \varphi'$ is equivalent to $\bigvee_{\simeq \sqsubset_z \simeq'} \exists z (\mathbf{E}_{\simeq'} \wedge \varphi')$. We zoom in on some $\alpha := (\mathbf{E}_{\simeq'} \wedge \varphi')$. By the induction hypothesis, this can be rewritten as the conjunction of $\mathbf{E}_{\simeq'}$ and a disjunction of formulas of the form $(\theta_0 \wedge \theta_1)$, where θ_0 is \simeq -friendly and θ_1 is \simeq' -good and of the form $\chi^{[y]}$, where $y \simeq z$. If the \simeq' -equivalence class of z contains at least two elements, we choose y different from z . Given our assumption that \mathbf{E}_{\simeq} , the formula α is equivalent to a disjunction of formulas of the form $(\theta_0 \wedge (\mathbf{E}_{\simeq'} \wedge \theta_1))$. It follows that $\exists z \alpha$ is equivalent to a disjunction of formulas of the form $(\theta_0 \wedge \exists z (\mathbf{E}_{\simeq'} \wedge \theta_1))$. It clearly suffices to show that $\exists z (\mathbf{E}_{\simeq'} \wedge \theta_1)$ is equivalent to an \simeq -friendly formula.

There are two cases. The \simeq' -equivalence class of z contains at least two elements or precisely one.

In the first case we can replace $\exists z (\mathbf{E}_{\simeq'} \wedge \theta_1)$ by $\exists z \in [y] \theta_1$, where θ_1 is of the form $\chi^{[y]}$. Clearly, $\exists z \in [y] \theta_1$ is \simeq -good.

In the second case, at most z occurs freely in θ_1 . Suppose $X = \{x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$. Let θ_1 be $\chi^{[z]}$. In the context of \mathbf{E}_{\simeq} , we can rewrite $\exists z (\mathbf{E}_{\simeq'} \wedge \theta_1)$ to the formula $\exists z (\bigwedge_{i < k} z \not\sim x_i \wedge \theta_1)$. In case $\chi^{[z]}$ can be fulfilled in more than k submodels corresponding to numbers, $\exists z (\bigwedge_{i < k} z \not\sim x_i \wedge \theta_1)$ will be true. So we can replace $\exists z (\bigwedge_{i < k} z \not\sim x_i \wedge \theta_1)$ by \top . If not $\chi(z)$ will be fulfilled in precisely $\hat{n}_0, \dots, \hat{n}_{s-1}$. Let

$$\mathbf{c}_n(u) := \exists v_0 \dots \exists v_{n-1} \left(\bigwedge_{i < j < n} v_i \neq v_j \wedge \forall w (w = u \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i < n} w = v_i) \right).$$

We find that $\exists z (\bigwedge_{i < k} z \not\sim x_i \wedge \theta_1)$ is equivalent to $\bigvee_{j < s} \bigwedge_{i < k} \neg \mathbf{c}_{n_j}^{[x_i]}(x_i)$, which is clearly \simeq -friendly.¹⁰ \square

Lemma 6.4. *There is no inner model of \mathbf{R}_{succ} in \mathbb{N}_{scat} .*

Proof. Since \mathbb{N}_{scat} has at least two elements, we do not need to consider piece-wise interpretations. Moreover, every element in \mathbb{N}_{scat} is definable. So, we can always eliminate parameters. Thus it is sufficient to prove our result for many-dimensional relativised interpretations without parameters.

¹⁰Note that if $s = 0$, this formula becomes \perp .

Suppose we had an inner model of \mathbf{R}_{succ} given by an interpretation M . Say M is m -dimensional and suppose 0 is given by a formula $\mathfrak{z}(\vec{x})$ and \mathbf{S} by $\mathfrak{s}(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$. We note that in the sequence \vec{x}, \vec{y} all the variables are pairwise disjoint. There are two conventional aspects. The variables in \mathfrak{s} need only be among the \vec{x}, \vec{y} , but not all need to occur. Secondly, the order of the variables \vec{x}, \vec{y} as exhibited need not be given by anything in \mathfrak{s} .

Our proof strategy is to obtain a contradiction by finding a finite set of numbers \mathcal{N} and an infinite sequence of pairwise different sequences length m with components in the \hat{n} for $n \in \mathcal{N}$. We work in \mathbb{N}_{scat} .

- i. We fix an m -sequence \vec{a} such that $\mathfrak{z}(\vec{a})$, in other words \vec{a} represents 0^M . We put the n_i such that $\mathfrak{c}_{n_i}(a_i)$ in \mathcal{N} .
- ii. For each equivalence relation on the elements of \vec{x}, \vec{y} we add a set of numbers to \mathcal{N} . Consider a relation \simeq on the elements of \vec{x}, \vec{y} . Under the assumption \mathbf{E}_{\simeq} , we can rewrite \mathfrak{s} as $\bigvee_{q < r} \bigwedge_{p < s_q} \theta_{qp}$, where θ_{qp} is \simeq -good, say, it is of the form $(\chi_{qp})^{\lceil w_{qp} \rceil}$. We can clearly arrange it so that (i) w_{qp} is always the first in the sequence \vec{x}, \vec{y} of its \simeq -equivalence class and (ii) if $p < p'$, then w_{qp} occurs strictly earlier in \vec{x}, \vec{y} than $w_{qp'}$. So, if $p \neq p'$, we have $w_{qp} \neq w_{qp'}$. Consider any θ_{qp} where w_{qp} is one of the y_i . There are two possibilities.
 - I. Suppose the number of \hat{n} in which χ_{qp} is satisfiable is $< 2m + 1$. In this case we add all n such that χ_{qp} is satisfiable in \hat{n} to \mathcal{N} .
 - II. Suppose the number of \hat{n} in which χ_{qp} is satisfiable is $\geq 2m + 1$. In this case we add the first $2m + 1$ such n to \mathcal{N} .
- iii. Nothing more will be in \mathcal{N} .

Let \mathcal{N}^* be the elements in the \hat{n} , for $n \in \mathcal{N}$. Clearly \mathcal{N} is finite and so is the number of elements in \mathcal{N}^* .

We are now ready and set to define our infinite sequence in order to obtain the desired contradiction. The sequence starts with \vec{a} . We note that \vec{a} is in the domain of M and that the components of \vec{a} are in \mathcal{N}^* . Each element of the sequence will be in the domain of M and its components will be in \mathcal{N}^* . Suppose we have constructed the sequence up to \vec{b} . Since \vec{b} is in the domain of M , there is a \vec{c} with $\mathfrak{s}(\vec{b}, \vec{c})$. We define \simeq on the elements of \vec{x}, \vec{y} as follows. We will say that b_i is the value of x_i and c_j is the value of y_j . Let $\vec{d} = \vec{b}, \vec{c}$ and $\vec{v} = \vec{x}, \vec{y}$. We take $v_i \simeq v_j$ iff $d_i \sim d_j$. We note that we have $\mathbf{E}_{\simeq}[\vec{v} : \vec{d}]$. We construct the formula $\bigvee_{q < r} \bigwedge_{p < s_q} \theta_{qp}$ as before for \simeq . So, for some $q < r$, we have $\bigwedge_{p < s_q} \theta_{qp}[\vec{v} : \vec{d}]$.

Consider the variable w_{qp} . If it is an x_i , then all variables y_i that are \simeq -equivalent to it, will have values that are \sim -equivalent to b_i . So they will be in \mathcal{N}^* . If it is a y_i and we are in case (ii.I) of the construction of \mathcal{N} the values of the variables equivalent to it will be in \mathcal{N}^* . The final case is that w_{qp} is a y_i and we are in case (ii.II) of the construction of \mathcal{N} . Since there are at least $2m + 1$ numbers n such that \hat{n} satisfies χ_{qp} , we can always choose an n^* among these numbers such that no d_i is in \hat{n}^* such that \hat{n}^* satisfies θ_{qp} . We assign to y_i in the equivalence class of w_{qp} the value e_i so that under this assignment $\chi_{q,p}$ is satisfied. We now modify our sequence \vec{b}, \vec{c} by replacing the c_j by the e_j for the cases where y_j is in the equivalence class of w_{qp} . Say the new sequence is \vec{b}, \vec{c}' . We note that the new sequence has strictly less elements outside \mathcal{N}^* and that we still have $\mathfrak{s}(\vec{b}, \vec{c}')$. We repeat this procedure for all w_{qp} that are among the y_i . The final sequence we obtain will only have values in \mathcal{N}^* .

By the axioms of R_{succ} , we cannot have two elements in our sequence that are the same. A contradiction. \square

We end this section by describing how we can make the result work for parameter-free interpretations. A first step is to modify the definition of $[\sigma]$, say, to $[\sigma]^*$. We remind the reader that we assume our σ are in pure form. In the definition of $[\sigma]$ we just asked for there to be a witness of σ . For $[\sigma]^*$ we ask that the witness w is the smallest one and that $w + 1$ is the maximum element.

We now define $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-!$ as the theory axiomatised by $\exists!x [\sigma]^*(x)$. We note that \mathbb{N}_{scat} also satisfies $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-!$. The new theory is not a sub-theory of $R_{<}$. However, the theory is locally finite, i.e., every finitely axiomatised sub-theory has a finite model. So, by the main result of [Vis14b], we have $R \triangleright \text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-!$.¹¹ All our other arguments work with $\exists!x [\sigma]^*(x)$ replacing $\exists x [\sigma](x)$. We note that $\text{PA}_{\text{scat}}^-! + \exists!x [\sigma]^*(x)$ interprets $[\sigma]^*$ in a parameter-free way. E.g., the definition of the domain becomes: $\delta(y) := \exists x ([\sigma]^*(x) \wedge x \leq y)$.

7. NON-MINIMALITY

There is no interpretability minimal essentially hereditarily undecidable theory. There is a quick proof of this due to Fedor Pakhomov and a slow proof. Since, the slow proof yields different information, I do reproduce it here. See also Remark 7.3.

Here is the quick proof. The proof is a minor adaptation of the proof of [PMV22, Theorem 1.1] as given in Section 4.4 of that paper.

Theorem 7.1. *There is no interpretability minimal essentially hereditarily undecidable RE theory.*

Proof. Since, by Theorem 3.4, the essentially hereditarily undecidable theories are closed under interpretability suprema, it is sufficient to show that there is no *minimum* essentially hereditarily undecidable RE theory. Suppose, to obtain a contradiction, that U^* is such a minimum theory.

Let i be an index of an RE sets. By [PMV22, Theorem 4.8], we can effectively find an index j of the theory $\text{sh}(i)$ such that W_i is not recursive iff $\text{sh}(i)$ is essentially undecidable. We can effectively find an index k of the theory $\text{pere}(j)$. Let us call this theory $\text{shpe}(i)$. Let Rec be the set of indices of recursive sets. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} i \notin \text{Rec} &\text{ iff } \text{shpe}(i) \text{ is hereditarily essentially undecidable} \\ &\text{ iff } \text{shpe}(i) \triangleright U^*. \end{aligned}$$

By a result of Rogers and, independently, Mostowski, Rec is complete Σ_3^0 . See [Rog67, Chapter 14, Theorem XVI] or [Soa16, Corollary 4.3.6]. We have reduced the complement of Rec , a Π_3^0 -complete predicate, to an interpretability statement: a Σ_3^0 -predicate. *Quod impossibile.* \square

We prove the non-minimality result w.r.t. interpretability for essentially hereditarily RE theories again using the idea behind the construction from the proof of [Han65, Theorem 3.2], following the plan of the proof of [PMV22, Theorem 1.1.] as given in Section 4.2 of that paper.

¹¹We can also provide an interpretation in a more direct way by mimicking the definition of \mathbb{N}_{scat} in R .

We will need a variation on Kleene's well known construction of two effectively inseparable sets. We write $x \cdot y$ for Kleene application. For $i = 0, 1$, let $\text{Km}_i := \{\langle n, x \rangle \mid x \cdot \langle n, x \rangle \simeq i\}$.

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose \mathcal{W} is a recursive set. Let Θ be a 0,1-valued recursive function such that $\Theta(x) = 1$ iff $x \in \mathcal{W}$. We can find an index c of Θ effectively from an index i of \mathcal{W} . Then, for any n , we have $\langle n, c \rangle \in \text{Km}_0 \setminus \mathcal{W}$ or $\langle n, c \rangle \in \text{Km}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}$.*

Proof. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n, c \rangle \notin \mathcal{W} &\Leftrightarrow c \cdot \langle n, c \rangle \simeq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \langle n, c \rangle \in \text{Km}_0 \end{aligned}$$

And:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n, c \rangle \in \mathcal{W} &\Leftrightarrow c \cdot \langle n, c \rangle \simeq 1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \langle n, c \rangle \in \text{Km}_1 \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 7.2. *Suppose \mathcal{Z} is an RE set such that, for every m , there is an n such that $\langle n, m \rangle \in \mathcal{Z}$. Then $\text{Km}_0 \cap \mathcal{Z}$ and $\text{Km}_1 \cap \mathcal{Z}$ are effectively inseparable.*

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{W} with index i is decidable and that \mathcal{W} separates $\text{Km}_0 \cap \mathcal{Z}$ and $\text{Km}_1 \cap \mathcal{Z}$. Let Θ and c be as in Lemma 7.1. We find n such that $\langle n, c \rangle \in \mathcal{Z}$. By Lemma 7.1, we have $\langle n, c \rangle \in \text{Km}_0 \setminus \mathcal{W}$ or $\langle n, c \rangle \in \text{Km}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}$. In the first case $\langle n, c \rangle \in (\text{Km}_0 \cap \mathcal{Z}) \setminus \mathcal{W}$. *Quod non*, by our assumption that \mathcal{W} separates $\text{Km}_0 \cap \mathcal{Z}$ and $\text{Km}_1 \cap \mathcal{Z}$. In the second case, we have $\langle n, c \rangle \in \text{Km}_1 \cap \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{W}$, again contradicting the assumption. \square

Theorem 7.2. *Consider any essentially undecidable RE theory U . Then, we can effectively find (an index of) an essentially hereditarily undecidable RE theory V such that $V \not\preceq U$. Moreover, we can take V to be effectively inseparable.*

Proof. Let $T := \text{Jan} + \{A_n \mid n \in \mathbb{K}_0\}$. Let s be an index of T . We take $A := \text{pere}(s)$. So, A is finitely axiomatised and recursively boolean isomorphic to T . Let Φ be the witnessing recursive isomorphism from V to A and let $B_i := \Phi(A_i)$. Clearly, over A , every sentence is provably equivalent to a boolean combination of the B_i .

Let $C_{n,0}, \dots, C_{n,2^n-1}$ be an enumeration of all conjunctions of $\pm B_i$, for $i < n$. Suppose U is an essentially undecidable RE theory. Let v_0, v_1, \dots be an effective enumeration of the theorems of U . Let τ_0, τ_1, \dots be an effective enumeration of all translations from the U -language into the A -language.¹²

Consider n, τ_i and $C_{n,j}$, for $j < 2^n$. Let $V_{n,j} := A + C_{n,j} + \{B_k \mid k \geq n\}$. Clearly, $V_{n,j}$ is either inconsistent or consistent and complete. We claim that, for some k , we have $V_{n,j} \vdash \neg v_k^{\tau_i}$. Suppose this were not the case. Then, $V_{n,j}$ is consistent and τ_i carries an interpretation of U in $V_{n,j}$, but this is impossible since $V_{n,j}$ is decidable and U is essentially undecidable.

Thus, we can effectively find a number $p_{n,i,j}$ as follows. We find the first k such that $V_{n,j} \vdash \neg v_k^{\tau_i}$. Then, we reduce, the sentence $v_k^{\tau_i}$ to a boolean combination of B_s over A . Let $p_{n,i,j}$ the smallest number of the form $\langle r, n \rangle$ that is strictly larger than the s such that B_s occurs in this boolean combination.

¹²We will do the argument for the case of parameter-free translations. By a minor adaptation, we can add parameters.

We define $\eta(n, i)$ to be the maximum of the $p_{n,i,j}$, for $j < 2^n$. Let $\Psi(0) := 0$ and let $\Psi(k+1) := \eta(\Psi(k), k)$. Clearly, Ψ is recursive and strictly increasing. Let \mathcal{Z} be the range of Ψ . The set \mathcal{Z} is obviously recursive.

We define $V := A + \{\neg B_i \mid i \in \text{Km}_1 \cap \mathcal{Z}\}$. Suppose, to obtain a contradiction, that we have $K : V \triangleright U$. Let the underlying translation of K be τ_{n^*} .

Clearly, there is a j^* such that $V + C_{\Psi(n^*),j^*}$ is consistent. (This is a non-constructive step.) By construction, there is a φ with $U \vdash \varphi$ and $V_{\Psi(n^*),j^*} \vdash \neg \varphi^K$. Moreover, $A \vdash \varphi^K \leftrightarrow \rho$, where ρ is a boolean combination of B_s with $s < \Psi(n^*)$. We note that no $\neg B_r$ with $\Psi(n^*) < r < \Psi(n^* + 1)$ occurs in the axiomatisation of V . By our assumption on K , we have $V \vdash \varphi^K$ and, so, $V \vdash \rho$. It follows that

$$A + \{\neg B_i \mid i \in \text{Km}_1 \cap \mathcal{Z} \text{ and } i < \Psi(n^* + 1)\} \vdash \rho.$$

Hence, also $V_{\Psi(n^*),j^*} \vdash \rho$, i.e., $V_{\Psi(n^*),j^*} \vdash \varphi^K$, A contradiction.

We verify that V is essentially hereditarily undecidable and effectively inseparable. We note that Ξ with $\Xi(n) := B_n$ maps Km_0 into $A_{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\text{Km}_1 \cap \mathcal{Z}$ into $V_{\mathbb{R}}$. It is immediate from Lemma 7.2 that Km_0 and $\text{Km}_1 \cap \mathcal{Z}$ are effectively inseparable, hence so is V . Finally, by Lemma 3.2, we find that V is essentially hereditarily undecidable. \square

Since the essentially hereditarily undecidable RE theories are closed under interpretability infima, we again obtain Theorem 7.1 from Theorem 7.2.

Remark 7.3. Yong Cheng notes that the argument of [PMV22, Section 4.2] yields more information concerning the possible classes for which the no minimality result holds. See [Che22]. His insight works in our case. For example, we find that Theorem 7.2 tells us that there is no interpretability minimal element among essentially hereditarily undecidable theories that are also effectively inseparable. \circ

REFERENCES

- [BPE68] M. Boykan Pour-El. Effectively extensible theories. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 33(1):56–68, 1968.
- [BPEK67] M. Boykan Pour-El and S. Kripke. Deduction-preserving “Recursive Isomorphisms” between theories. *Fundamenta Mathematicæ*, 61:141–163, 1967.
- [Che22] Y. Cheng. There are no minimal effective inseparable theories. *arXiv*, 2022.
- [DJ92] G. Dzhaparidze (Japaridze). The logic of linear tolerance. *Studia Logica*, 51:249–277, 1992.
- [DJ93] G. Dzhaparidze (Japaridze). A generalized notion of weak interpretability and the corresponding logic. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 61:113–160, 1993.
- [Ehr61] A. Ehrenfeucht. Separable theories. *Bulletin de l’Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Série des sciences mathématiques, astronomiques et physiques*, 9(1):17–19, 1961.
- [GV20] B. Grabmayr and A. Visser. Self-reference upfront: a study of self-referential Gödel numberings. *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, pages 1–40, 2020.
- [Han65] W. Hanf. Model-theoretic methods in the study of elementary logic. In J.W. Addison, L. Henkin, and A. Tarski, editors, *The Theory of Models, Proceedings of the 1963 International Symposium at Berkeley*, pages 132–145. North Holland, Amsterdam, 1965.
- [Jan53] A. Janiczak. Undecidability of some simple formalized theories. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 22(2), 1953.
- [JdJ98] G. Japaridze and D. de Jongh. The logic of provability. In S. Buss, editor, *Handbook of proof theory*, pages 475–546. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1998.
- [Kri21] S.A. Kripke. Gödel’s theorem and direct self-reference. *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, pages 1–5, 2021.

- [Per97] M. G. Peretyat'kin. *Finitely axiomatizable theories*. Consultants Bureau, New York, 1997.
- [PMV22] F. Pakhomov, J. Murwanashyaka, and A. Visser. There are no minimal essentially undecidable theories. *arXiv*, 2022.
- [Put57] H. Putnam. Decidability and essential undecidability. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 22(1):39–54, 1957.
- [Rog67] H. Rogers. *Theory of recursive functions and effective computability*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1967.
- [Sho58] J. R. Shoenfield. Degrees of formal systems 1. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 23(4):389–392, 1958.
- [Soa16] Robert I Soare. *Turing computability: Theory and applications*. Springer, Berlin, 2016.
- [Szm55] W. Szmielew. Elementary properties of Abelian groups. *Fundamenta Mathematicæ*, 41(2):203–271, 1955.
- [TMR53] A. Tarski, A. Mostowski, and R.M. Robinson. *Undecidable theories*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1953.
- [Vau62] R.L. Vaught. On a theorem of Cobham concerning undecidable theories. In E. Nagel, P. Suppes, and A. Tarski, editors, *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science. Proceedings of the 1960 International Congress*, pages 14–25. Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1962.
- [Vis11] A. Visser. Can we make the Second Incompleteness Theorem coordinate free? *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 21(4):543–560, 2011.
- [Vis12] A. Visser. Vaught's theorem on axiomatizability by a scheme. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 18(3):382–402, 2012.
- [Vis14a] A. Visser. The interpretability of inconsistency, Feferman's theorem and related results. Logic Group Preprint Series 318, Faculty of Humanities, Philosophy, Utrecht University, Janskerkhof 13, 3512 BL Utrecht, <http://www.phil.uu.nl/preprints/lgps/>, 2014.
- [Vis14b] A. Visser. Why the theory R is special. In Neil Tennant, editor, *Foundational Adventures. Essays in honour of Harvey Friedman*, pages 7–23. College Publications, UK, 2014. Originally published online by Templeton Press in 2012. See <http://foundationaladventures.com/>.
- [Vis17] A. Visser. On Q. *Soft Computing*, 21(1):39–56, 2017.
- [Vis22] A. Visser. Friedman-reflexivity. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 173(9):103160, 2022.

APPENDIX A. AN ALTERNATIVE PROOF OF THEOREM 5.5

We show that if U is Σ_1^0 -representative, then it is effectively inseparable. Let Φ witness that U is Σ_1^0 -representative. Suppose \mathcal{X}_0 and \mathcal{X}_1 are disjoint RE sets. Via a bijective Gödel numbering, we can view these as sets of U -sentences. Suppose that $U_P \subseteq \mathcal{X}_0$ and $U_R \subseteq \mathcal{X}_1$.

Suppose $\exists u \delta_i(u, x)$ represents $\Phi(x) \in \mathcal{X}_i$ where δ_i is a pure Δ_0 -formula.

We need a special form of the Gödel fixed point construction. We substitute a formula ρ in $\sigma_0(v) < \sigma_1(v)$ in the following way. First we substitute the numeral of the Gödel number of ρ in each of the σ_i . Then, we rewrite each of the resulting formulas to pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -form and, subsequently, we apply witness comparison. Suppose Sub is this function. Let $\text{sub}(x, y, z)$ be a pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -representation of the graph of Sub . Say $\text{sub}(x, y, z)$ is $\exists w \nu(w, x, y, z)$, where ν is pure Δ_0 and the witness w will always majorise x , y and z . We consider the formula $\varphi(v)$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\exists a \exists w < a \exists z < a (\nu(w, v, v, z) \wedge \exists u < a \delta_1(u, z))) < \\ (\exists b \exists w < a \exists z < b (\nu(w, v, v, z) \wedge \exists u < b \delta_0(u, z))). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\rho := \text{Sub}(\varphi, \varphi)$. We note that ρ is of the literal form $\rho_1 < \rho_0$, where the ρ_i are pure 1 - Σ_1^0 -sentences.

Suppose $\Phi(\rho) \in \mathcal{X}_i$. Then ρ_i . So either ρ or ρ^\perp . If we have ρ , then $\Phi(\rho) \in \mathcal{X}_1$. Moreover, by $\Sigma 0$, we find $U \vdash \Phi(\rho)$, and, hence, $\Phi(\rho) \in \mathcal{X}_0$. *Quod impossibile*. If we have ρ^\perp , then $\Phi(\rho) \in \mathcal{X}_0$. Moreover, by $\Sigma 3$, we have $U \vdash \neg\Phi(\rho)$ and, hence, $\Phi(\rho) \in \mathcal{X}_1$. *Quod impossibile iterum*. Ergo, the formula ρ is in none of the \mathcal{X}_i .

Remark A.1. Inspection of the proof shows that in order to derive Rosser's theorem we do not need the formalisation of the Fixed Point Lemma inside the given theory. \circ

Remark A.2. The above proof can be somewhat simplified by employing a self-referential Gödel numbering. See, e.g., [Kri21] or [GV20]. However, even with this strategy, there will be some detail on how to handle substitution of numerals. \circ

PHILOSOPHY, FACULTY OF HUMANITIES, UTRECHT UNIVERSITY, JANSKERKHOF 13, 3512BL UTRECHT,
THE NETHERLANDS

Email address: a.visser@uu.nl