

DESCENDING SEQUENCES IN REFLECTION HIERARCHIES

MATEUSZ ŁEŁYK AND JAMES WALSH

ABSTRACT. There is no recursively enumerable sequence of sufficiently strong 2-consistent r.e. theories such that each proves the 2-consistency of the next. Montalbán and Shavrukov independently asked whether this result generalizes to $0'$ -recursive sequences. We consider a general version of this problem: For arbitrary n , for which complexity classes Γ are there Γ -definable sequences of n -consistent r.e. theories each of which proves the n -consistency of the next? The answer to this question depends not only on n and Γ but also on the manner in which sequences are encoded in arithmetic. We provide positive answers for certain encodings and negative answers for others.

1. INTRODUCTION

Gödel's second incompleteness theorem states that no reasonable consistent theory proves its own consistency.¹ This also prohibits a certain kind of circularity with respect to provable consistency. That is, there are no consistent reasonable theories T_0, T_1, \dots, T_n such that T_0 proves the consistency of T_1 , T_1 proves the consistency of T_2, \dots , and T_n proves the consistency of T_0 . Otherwise, T_0 could chain each of these consistency proofs together to prove its own consistency, contradicting Gödel's theorem.

Nevertheless, Gödel's theorem does not prohibit all *ill-foundedness* with respect to provable consistency. There are infinite sequences $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of theories, each of which is reasonable and consistent, such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, T_n proves the consistency of T_{n+1} . There are many means of producing such descending sequences, but they generally involve self-reference or other *ad hoc* tricks. It is not easy—if it is even possible—to define descending sequences in consistency strength consisting only of natural theories.

Why is it so difficult to find descending sequences of reasonable consistent theories? One potential explanation is that any such sequence must be recursion-theoretically complicated. Gaifman once asked whether any such sequence could be recursive. The following answer is recorded in [2, 5]. See also [3, §6].

Theorem 1.1 (H. Friedman, Smoryński, Solovay). *There is a recursive sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of sound r.e. extensions of PA such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T_n \vdash \text{Con}(T_{n+1})$.*

However, there is no recursively enumerable sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of consistent r.e. extensions of PA such that $\text{PA} \vdash \forall x \text{Pr}_{T_x}(\text{Con}(T_{x+1}))$.

Thanks to Patrick Lutz, Leszek Kołodziejczyk, Antonio Montalbán, and Albert Visser.

¹By a reasonable theory we mean an effectively axiomatized theory that interprets a modicum of arithmetic.

That is, though there are recursive descending sequences in the consistency strength hierarchy, all such sequences enjoy some high degree of non-uniformity. The interplay between uniformity considerations and the existence of descending sequences in reflection hierarchies is a recurring theme in this paper.

Surprisingly, the situation changes when one considers stronger reflection principles. Recall that a theory T is n -consistent if T is consistent with the true Π_n theory of arithmetic. We can formalize the n -consistency of an r.e. theory T using a single Π_{n+1} sentence in the language of first-order arithmetic.

$$n\text{Con}(T) := \forall \varphi \in \Pi_n (\text{True}_{\Pi_n}(\varphi) \rightarrow \text{Con}(T + \varphi))$$

Note that n -consistency is EA-provably equivalent to uniform Π_{n+1} -reflection and also to uniform Σ_n -reflection (see §2.1).

The following result comes from previous work of Pakhomov and the second-named author [4, Theorem 3.4].

Theorem 1.2 (Pakhomov–Walsh). *There is no r.e. sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of 2-consistent r.e. extensions of $\text{B}\Sigma_1$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T_n \vdash 2\text{Con}(T_{n+1})$.²*

Theorem 1.2 does not generalize to 1-consistency; there exists a recursively enumerable sequence of 1-consistent r.e. extensions of $\text{B}\Sigma_1$ each of which proves the 1-consistency of the next [4, Theorem 3.8].

Upon seeing Theorem 1.2, Montalbán and Shavrukov independently asked (in private communication) whether there exists a $0'$ -recursive or $0''$ -recursive sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of 2-consistent r.e. theories each of which proves the 2-consistency of the next; see [4, Question 3.10]. These questions introduce subtleties about what it means for each theory to prove the 2-consistency “of the next.” The theories under consideration are all Σ_1 -complete, so they have a firm grasp on recursively enumerable sequences. More precisely, given a Σ_1 presentation of a sequence and given any number n , a Σ_1 -complete theory can correctly identify the n th element of the sequence. There are multiple ways of encoding Σ_1 -definable sequences of theories in arithmetic, but choosing between them is often not important for this reason. The same does not hold for sequences that are not Σ_1 -definable. So when we turn our attention to $0'$ -recursive or $0''$ -recursive sequences, choosing between the multiple ways of encoding sequences *does* matter.

1.1. Encoding Sequences. Before summarizing the main results of the paper, it is worth saying a word about the different approaches we consider to encoding sequences. In this introduction we provide only rough intuitive glosses; for precise definitions see §2.1. Here are two ways to understand the claim that a binary formula τ defines a sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of theories.

- (1) Slice encoding: For each n , $T_n = \{k : \mathbb{N} \models \tau(n, k)\}$.
- (2) Index encoding: For each n , k is the index of the theory T_n , where k is the unique number m such that $\mathbb{N} \models \tau(n, m)$.

²[4, Theorem 3.4] is stated for extensions of EA. However, this is because that paper uses a slightly non-standard formalization of provability, sometimes called *smooth provability*. For the proof to work with the standard provability predicate requires $\text{B}\Sigma_1$.

If one adopts the index encoding, one must then say what it is for each theory to prove the m -consistency of the next. Here are two ways to understand this latter claim:

- (1) Uniform: For each n , T_n proves the formula $\forall x(\tau(n+1, x) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(x))$.
- (2) Non-uniform: For each n and k , if $\mathbb{N} \models \tau(n+1, k)$, then T_n proves the formula $m\text{Con}(k)$.

1.2. A Summary of the Main Results. The main question of this paper—informally stated—is:

Question 1.3. *Under what conditions are there sequences of m -consistent theories each of which proves the m -consistency of the next?*

We call such a sequence—that is, a sequence of m -consistent theories each of which proves the m -consistency of the next—an m -sequence. What exactly an m -sequence is depends on whether one encodes sequences via slices or indices and whether one interprets the question uniformly or non-uniformly. This leads to various refinements of Question 1.3.

Table 1 summarizes the main results of the paper. Some results mention the PPI condition; PPI stands for *pointwise provably inhabited* (PPI). A formula τ encoding a sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is PPI if for each n , $T_n \vdash \exists x \tau(n+1, x)$. Note that by a “positive result” we mean one establishing the existence of a descending sequence and by a “negative result” we mean one barring the existence of descending sequences.

Approach	Positive Results	Negative Results
Slices	For all $m \geq 0$, there is a Σ_m -definable m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_1$. (Theorem 3.2). For all $m \geq 1$, there exists a Π_{m-1} -definable m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_m$. (Theorem 3.4)	For $m \geq 2$, there is no Σ_{m-1} -definable m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_1$. (Theorem 3.5)
Indices (Uniform)	For $m \geq 0$, there is a Π_m -definable uniform m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_m$. (Theorem 4.1)	For $m \geq 2$, there is no Σ_m -definable uniform m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_1$. (Theorem 4.2)
Indices (Non-uniform)	For $m \leq 1$, there is a Σ_0 -definable PPI m -sequence over EA. (Theorem 1.1, [4, Theorem 3.8])	For $m \geq 2$, there is no Σ_m -definable PPI m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_1$. (Theorem 4.3)

TABLE 1. Summary of Results

In fact, some of the results are established in a more general form. For instance, we prove them not only relative to a fixed base theory (e.g., $\text{B}\Sigma_1$) but to all sufficiently sound extensions of that base theory.

Let’s make two observations about this table. First, the positive result for slices cannot be improved by showing that there exists a Σ_{m-1} -definable m -sequence. Indeed, in the case $m = 2$, the existence of such a sequence would contradict the

negative result. So the positive result for slices is optimal. Second, note that the positive result for indices (non-uniform) precludes us from strengthening the negative result to all m .

1.3. Outline of the Paper. Here is our plan for the rest of the paper. In §2.1 we cover some preliminaries about encodings and reflection principles. In §3 we work with the slice encoding, culminating with a proof of Theorem 3.4. In §4 we work with the index encoding. We prove Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.2, and Theorem 4.3.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Reflection Principles. Our primary objects of study are reflection principles, which are generalizations of consistency statements. The reflection principles we consider in this paper have various formulations.

Definition 2.1. A theory T is k -consistent if T is consistent with each Π_k truth.

Definition 2.2. A theory T is Γ -sound if every Γ theorem of T is true.

There are many ways of expressing the Γ -soundness of one theory within another. However, let us make an important note about this. For a theory T , any *formal* statement to the effect that T is Γ -sound will rely on some intensional presentation of the theory T . We adopt the policy in this paper that theories *are* elementary formulas defining sets of axioms. That is, theories are individuated in a very fine-grained, syntactic manner. Note that Craig's trick demonstrates that every r.e. set of formulas has an elementary presentation up to logical equivalence.

The complexity classes we are interested in (Π_n, Σ_n) have definable truth-predicates within the language of arithmetic. For these complexity classes we may axiomatize the Γ -soundness of T with a single formula:

$$\text{RFN}_\Gamma(T) := \forall \varphi \in \Gamma (\text{Pr}_T(\varphi) \rightarrow \text{True}_\Gamma(\varphi)).$$

EA proves that the single formula $\text{RFN}_\Gamma(T)$ has the same theorems as the schema consisting of all formulas

$$\forall \vec{x} (\text{Pr}_T(\varphi(\vec{x})) \rightarrow \varphi(\vec{x}))$$

for $\varphi \in \Gamma$. The connection between k -consistency and Γ -soundness is codified in the following proposition:

Proposition 2.3. *Provably in EA, for all T extending EA, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) T is n -consistent.
- (2) T is Σ_n -sound.
- (3) T is Π_{n+1} -sound.

Of course, it is impossible to express the *global* reflection principle of a theory T —according to which every theorem of T is true—without an extra truth-predicate. In this paper we will at some points need to discuss the following schematic approximation of the global reflection principle:

Definition 2.4. The *uniform reflection schema* $\text{RFN}(T)$ for T consists of all formulas

$$\forall \vec{x} (\text{Pr}_T(\varphi(\vec{x})) \rightarrow \varphi(\vec{x}))$$

where φ is a formula in the language of EA.

Before continuing, we record a trivial lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that T is m -consistent. Then T is consistent with any true Σ_{m+1} sentence.*

Proof. Suppose that T is m -consistent. Now let $\varphi \in \Sigma_{m+1}$ be true. Then φ has the form $\exists x \pi(x)$ where $\pi(x)$ is a Π_m formula. Since φ is true, then $\pi(n)$ is true for some n . Since T is m -consistent, $T + \pi(n)$ is consistent. But $\pi(n)$ implies φ , so $T + \varphi$ is consistent. \square

We will also need to deal with theories that are defined by *iterating* reflection principles.

Definition 2.6. The iterated reflection principle $m\text{Con}^{k+1}(T)$ is the statement $m\text{Con}(T + m\text{Con}^k(T))$.

2.2. The Index Encoding. First, we consider versions of the problem wherein a sequence of r.e. theories is encoded as a sequence of indices of Turing machines numerating those theories. To state this version, we introduce some terminology. First, we must say it is for a formula to define a sequence.

Definition 2.7. A binary formula τ *defines an index sequence* if there is a sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of r.e. theories such that, for each n , k is the index of the theory T_n , where k is the unique number m such that $\mathbb{N} \models \tau(n, m)$.³

That is, a formula defines an index sequence just in case it defines a sequence of indices of theories.

Remark 2.8. Note that T_n may be recursively axiomatized even when the formula $\tau(n, x)$ has high quantifier complexity. For instance, τ may define a sequence of r.e. theories even if each formula $\tau(n, x)$ is not Σ_1 .

We are particularly interested in sequences of theories meeting a certain constraint, namely:

- (\star) Each entry proves a reflection principle for the next theory.

Given the index encoding of theories, there are multiple ways of interpreting the constraint (\star).

³There are various ways of understanding what an index of a recursively axiomatized theory is, but they will not matter for us. An index could be an index of a Turing machine that numerates the axioms of the theory. It could be a Δ_0 formula that bi-numerates the axioms of the theory.

2.2.1. A Uniform Interpretation. We first provide a *uniform* interpretation of constraint (\star) . According to the uniform interpretation, the n th theory in the sequence defined by τ must prove the claim:

$$\forall x(\tau(n+1, x) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(x))$$

where $m\text{Con}$ is the relevant reflection principle. That is, each theory proves reflection for the next by recourse to the formula τ defining the sequence.

Definition 2.9. Let $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ witness that τ defines an index sequence. We say that τ is a *uniform m -sequence over T* if each of the following holds:

- (1) Each T_n is an m -consistent r.e. extension of T .
- (2) For each n , $T_n \vdash \exists x \tau(n+1, x)$.
- (3) For each n , $T_n \vdash \forall x(\tau(n+1, x) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(x))$.

Our first refinement of Question 1.3 concerns the existence of uniform m -sequences, where sequences are encoded as index sequences.

Question 2.10. *Adopt the index approach to encoding sequences. For which choices of $\langle T, \Gamma, m \rangle$ is there a Γ -definable uniform m -sequence over T ?*

Theorem 1.2 yields a negative answer for the choice $\langle \mathbf{B}\Sigma_1, \Sigma_1, 2 \rangle$. A generalization of this result shows that, given the index approach to encoding sequences, for each $m \geq 2$, there is no Σ_m -definable uniform m -sequence over $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1$ (Theorem 4.2).

2.2.2. A Non-uniform Interpretation. We now describe a *non-uniform* interpretation of constraint (\star) . According to the non-uniform interpretation, the n th theory in the sequence defined by τ must prove the claim:

$$m\text{Con}(k)$$

where $\mathbb{N} \models \tau(n+1, k)$. That is, each theory proves reflection for the next index *directly*, without recourse to the formula τ defining the sequence.

Definition 2.11. Let $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ witness that τ defines an index sequence. We say that τ is a *non-uniform m -sequence over T* if each of the following holds:

- (1) Each T_n is an m -consistent r.e. extension of T .
- (2) For each n , for the unique k such that $\mathbb{N} \models \tau(n+1, k)$, $T_n \vdash m\text{Con}(k)$.

Using this terminology, we state the non-uniform version of the question as follows:

Question 2.12. *Adopt the index approach to encoding sequences. For which choices of $\langle T, \Gamma, m \rangle$ is there a Γ -definable non-uniform m -sequence over T ?*

Remark 2.13. Note the distinction between this question and the previous one. Suppose that there is a Γ -definable non-uniform 2-sequence. This means that some Γ formula τ defines a sequence $(\tau_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of indices of 2-consistent extensions $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_2$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T_n \vdash 2\text{Con}(k)$, where k is the index of T_{n+1} . Note that the statement $2\text{Con}(k)$ that T_n proves might not make any use of the

formula τ that defines the sequence. This is why we call this version of the problem *non-uniform*.

The distinction between the uniform and non-uniform versions of the problems matters only when we consider non-r.e. sequences. Hence, Theorem 1.2 again yields a negative answer to Question 2.12 for the choice $\langle \mathbf{B}\Sigma_1, \Sigma_1, 2 \rangle$.

For the non-uniform version of the question, we prove a strong analogue of the H. Friedman, Smoryński, Solovay theorem. In particular, we answer this question in the special case of sequences that are pointwise provably inhabited.

Definition 2.14. We say that a sequence σ encoding $(T_n)_{n \in \omega}$ is pointwise provably inhabited if for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T_n \vdash \exists x \sigma(n+1, x)$.

One of our main theorems (Theorem 4.3) shows that, given the index approach to encoding sequences, for each m , there is no Σ_m -definable non-uniform m -sequence that is pointwise provably inhabited. Note that this result does not *merely* banish provably-*descending* non-uniform 2-sequences but banishes all pointwise provably *inhabited* non-uniform 2-sequences.

2.3. The Slice Encoding. In the previous subsection we encoded a sequence of theories as a sequence of indices numerating those theories. There is another common approach to encoding sequences, namely, to encode each theory in the slices of a binary relation.

Definition 2.15. A binary formula τ *defines a slice sequence* if there is a sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T_n = \{k : \mathbb{N} \models \tau(n, k)\}$.

If we adopt the slice encoding, then there is a natural uniform version of our problem, but there is no clear natural non-uniform version. Let's introduce some terminology needed to state the uniform problem.

Definition 2.16. Let $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ witness that τ defines a slice sequence. We say that τ is a *uniform m -sequence over T* if each of the following holds:

- (1) Each T_n is a m -consistent r.e. extension of T .
- (2) For each n , $T_n \vdash \exists x \tau(n+1, x)$
- (3) For each n :

$$T_n \vdash \forall x \forall y \left(x = \ulcorner \bigwedge \{ \varphi_z \mid z \leq y \wedge \tau(n+1, z) \} \urcorner \rightarrow m\text{Con}(x) \right).$$

Remark 2.17. One might wonder why we demand that T_n proves $m\text{Con}$ of all conjunctions of this form. The issue is that the τ might numerate formulas in such a way that each $\tau(n+1, k)$ is m -consistent yet their union is jointly m -inconsistent. Of course, any failure of m -consistency is witnessed by some finite conjunction of formulas. Hence, to prove that the theory numerated by $\tau(n+1, \cdot)$ is m -consistent, it suffices to show that for every k , the conjunction:

$$\bigwedge \{ \varphi_z \mid z \leq k \wedge \tau(n+1, z) \}$$

is m -consistent.

This leads to one more version of our motivating question.

Question 2.18. *Adopt the slice approach to encoding sequences. For which choices of $\langle T, \Gamma, m \rangle$ is there a Γ -definable uniform m -sequence over T ?*

Once again, Theorem 1.2 shows that there is no Σ_1 -definable uniform 2-sequence over $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1$. One of our main results (Theorem 3.4) provides a counter-point to this by producing descending sequences that are not much more complicated. In particular, if we adopt the slice approach to encoding sequences, then there is a Π_m -definable uniform $m + 1$ -sequence over $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_{m+1}$.

3. THE SLICE ENCODING

In this section we adopt the slice encoding. The ultimate goal of this section is to show that there is a Π_m -definable uniform $m + 1$ -sequence over $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_{m+1}$. The proof of this result requires a few tricks, so we build up to it in stages. We will prove a few weak versions of this theorem first since their proofs are easier to understand. Afterward we will use some tricks to modify these into a proof of the desired result.

Note that all theorems stated in this section are stated relative to the slice encoding of sequences.

3.1. Visser’s Technique. The proof of this section’s main theorem deploys a technique due to Albert Visser [6]. Visser defines a recursive sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of consistent extensions of \mathbf{PA} such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, T_n proves every instance of uniform reflection for T_{n+1} . The theories that Visser produces are not 1-consistent, so this result does not contradict Theorem 1.2.

We reproduce Visser’s theorem here with a slightly different proof (in particular, we use self-reference instead of the recursion-theoretic fixed point theorem). Whereas the original proof uses the recursion theorem, we use self-reference in arithmetic. Moreover, instead of \mathbf{PA} we change the base system to $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1$.

Theorem 3.1. *There is a recursive sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of consistent extensions of $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, T_n proves every instance of the uniform reflection schema for T_{n+1} .*

Proof. Using the Gödel–Carnap self-reference lemma, we get a sequence $(T_n)_{n < \omega}$ of theories such that

$$T_n = \begin{cases} \mathbf{RFN}(\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1 + T_{n+1}) & \forall k \leq n \neg \text{Prf}_{\text{ZF}}(k, \perp) \\ \mathbf{B}\Sigma_1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

More formally, we get a binary formula T such that $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1$ proves $T(n, x)$ iff

$$x = \ulcorner \mathbf{B}\Sigma_1 \urcorner \vee (\forall k \leq n \neg \text{Prf}_{\text{ZF}}(k, \perp) \wedge x \in \mathbf{RFN}(\{y : T(n-1, y)\})).$$

Informally speaking, we think of $T(n, x)$ as saying “ x is an axiom of theory T_n .”

Reason in ZF: Suppose $\neg \text{Con}(\text{ZF})$. Let n be the least proof of \perp in ZF. Then $T_{n+1} = \mathbf{B}\Sigma_1$. So $T_0 = \mathbf{RFN}^n(\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1)$. The latter theory is consistent. So $\text{Con}(T_0)$.

This argument shows that ZF proves $\neg \text{Con}(\text{ZF})$ implies $\text{Con}(T_0)$. So ZF proves $\neg \text{Con}(T_0)$ implies $\text{Con}(\text{ZF})$. So ZF does not prove $\neg \text{Con}(T_0)$ by Gödel’s second

incompleteness theorem. But $\neg \text{Con}(T_0)$ is Σ_1 and ZF proves all Σ_1 truths. So we can infer that $\text{Con}(T_0)$ holds. An easy induction then shows that each T_n is consistent. T_0 is consistent, which takes care of the base case. Assume T_n is consistent. Since T_n proves each instance of uniform reflection for T_{n+1} it proves, in particular, $\text{Pr}_{T_{n+1}}(\perp) \rightarrow \perp$, i.e., $\text{Con}(T_{n+1})$. But every Π_1 consequence of a consistent theory is true, so T_{n+1} is consistent. \square

3.2. The General Case. Visser's proof does not yield a 2-sequence, or even a 1-sequence, since the theories Visser defines are not 1-consistent. In this subsection we modify Visser's proof to produce a Σ_m -definable m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_1$. Lowering the complexity of the sequence to Π_{m-1} requires some additional tricks, so we defer it to the next subsection.

Note that in the statement of the theorem—as well as in the proof—we refer to iterated reflection principles. For the definition of iterated reflection see Definition 2.6.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $m \geq 0$. Let T be an r.e. extension of $\text{B}\Sigma_1$ such that $\text{I}\Sigma_m + \forall x m\text{Con}^x(T)$ is m -consistent. Then there is a Σ_m -definable uniform m -sequence over T .*

Remark 3.3. The statement of Theorem 3.2 might appear somewhat technical. Let us emphasize that every sound theory T satisfies the condition that $\text{I}\Sigma_m + \forall x m\text{Con}^x(T)$ is m -consistent. We state this theorem in this way so that we precisely calibrate the assumptions required for the proof to work. If we stated the result for all sound theories, the reader might wonder what role soundness plays in the proof. In fact, only this condition—that $\text{I}\Sigma_m + \forall x m\text{Con}^x(T)$ is m -consistent—is deployed in the proof.

Proof. Note that the case $m = 0$ is already covered by 1.1.

Let $\text{m}^\omega T$ abbreviate $\text{I}\Sigma_m + \forall x m\text{Con}^x(T)$. We want a sequence $(\tau_n)_{n < \omega}$ of theories such that:

$$\tau_n = \begin{cases} T + m\text{Con}(\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \tau_{n+1}) & \forall k \leq n \forall A \leq n \left(A \in \Sigma_m \wedge \text{Prf}_{\text{m}^\omega T}(k, A) \rightarrow \text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(A) \right) \\ T & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Again, we use the self-reference lemma. There is a binary formula τ such that: $\text{B}\Sigma_1$ proves that $\tau(n, \varphi)$ is equivalent to the disjunction of the following:

- (1) $\varphi \in T$
- (2) both of the following hold:
 - (a) $\exists s \forall k \leq n \forall A \leq n \left(A \in \Pi_{m-1} \wedge \text{Prf}_{\text{m}^\omega T}(k, \exists x A) \rightarrow \text{True}_{\Pi_{m-1}}(A(s_k)) \right)$
 - (b) $\varphi = \ulcorner m\text{Con}(\tau_{n+1}) \urcorner$

Note that (2a) is slightly different from the formula that appeared in the initial piecewise definition of T_n . The reason for the change is this: Since the existential quantifier in the initial piecewise definition occurs in the scope of bounded universal quantifiers, $\text{B}\Sigma_m$ is required to transform that formula into a Σ_m condition. By contrast (2a) places an existential quantifier in front of the bounded universal

quantifiers, so strong bounding axioms are no longer required to transform this formula into a Σ_m formula. This existential quantifier pronounces the existence of a sequence of potential witnesses to the truth of a $\text{I}\Sigma_m + \forall x \text{mCon}^x(T)$ -provable Π_{m-1} formula. Note that this is analogous to the quantifier transformations engendered by the Axiom of Choice in set theory and second-order arithmetic.

Let's explicate (2b) in more formal terms. $\text{mCon}(\tau_{n+1})$ is the formula:

$$\forall \psi \in \Pi_m (\text{True}_{\Pi_m}(\psi) \rightarrow \text{Con}(\tau_{n+1} + \psi)).$$

Where $\text{Con}(\tau_{n+1} + \psi)$ is an abbreviation for:

$$\forall x \forall y (x = \ulcorner \bigwedge \{ \varphi_z \wedge \psi \mid z \leq y \wedge \tau(n+1, z) \} \urcorner \rightarrow \text{Con}(x)).$$

Claim. τ is $\text{B}\Sigma_1$ -equivalent to a Σ_m formula.

Note that τ is the result of applying the Diagonal Lemma to a formula that is Σ_m . Applications of the Diagonal Lemma do not increase the quantifier complexity of formulas.

Claim. τ_0 is m -consistent.

First, we need to calculate some more quantifier complexities. We have already observed that $\tau(0, \varphi)$ is ($\text{B}\Sigma_1$ -equivalent to) Σ_m . Hence, the following is Π_m :

$$\text{Con}(\tau_0 + \varphi) := \forall x \forall y (x = \ulcorner \bigwedge \{ \varphi_z \wedge \varphi \mid z \leq y \wedge \tau(0, z) \} \urcorner \rightarrow \text{Con}(x)).$$

This means that the following formula is Π_{m+1} :

$$\text{mCon}(\tau_0) := \forall \varphi \in \Pi_m (\text{True}_{\Pi_m}(\varphi) \rightarrow \text{Con}(\tau_0 + \varphi)).$$

So $\neg \text{mCon}(\tau_0)$ is Σ_{m+1} .

Reason in $\text{m}^\omega T$: Suppose $\neg \text{mCon}(\text{m}^\omega T)$. Then for some n and some Σ_m sentence A , n encodes a $\text{m}^\omega T$ proof of A but A is not a Σ_m truth. By $\text{I}\Sigma_m$ we can assume that n is the least such proof of a false Σ_m -sentence. Then, by the fixed point definition, $\forall \varphi (\tau(n, \varphi) \leftrightarrow \phi \in T)$. Moreover, by Σ_m collection, there is c such that

$$\forall k \leq n-1 \forall A \leq n (A \in \Pi_{m-1} \wedge \text{Prf}_{\text{m}^\omega T}(k, \exists x A) \rightarrow \text{True}_{\Pi_{m-1}}(A(c_k))).$$

Call the above sentence $\theta(c)$ and assume observe that $\theta(c)$ is a true Π_{m-1} sentence. It follows from the definition of τ and the choice of n that for each $k < n$ we have

$$\forall \varphi (\tau(k, \varphi) \leftrightarrow (\varphi \in T \vee \varphi = \ulcorner \text{mCon}(\tau_{k+1}) \urcorner)).$$

Using the $\text{B}\Sigma_1$ -provable properties of the fixpoint definition we observe that

$$\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \neg A + \theta(c) \vdash \forall \phi (\tau(n, \phi) \leftrightarrow \phi \in T).$$

Hence,

$$\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \neg A + \theta(c) + \text{mCon}(T) \vdash \text{mCon}(\tau_n).$$

Assume that for $1 \leq k \leq n+1$

$$\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \neg A + \theta(c) + \text{mCon}^k(T) \vdash \text{mCon}(\tau_{n-k+1}).$$

Note that the statement $m\text{Con}(\tau_{n-k+1})$ is very close to the theory τ_{n-k} itself. All that is missing are the axioms of T . Hence, it follows that

$$T + \neg A + \theta(c) + m\text{Con}^k(T) \vdash \tau_{n-k}.$$

Hence, $\text{B}\Sigma_1 + m\text{Con}(T + \neg A + \theta(c) + m\text{Con}^k(T)) \vdash m\text{Con}(\tau_{n-k})$.

Since $\neg A$ and $\theta(c)$ are both Π_m :

$$\text{B}\Sigma_1 \vdash (\neg A \wedge \theta(c) \wedge m\text{Con}^{k+1}(T)) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(\neg A + \theta(c) + T + m\text{Con}^k(T)).$$

Combining the previous two lines, we infer:

$$\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \neg A + \theta(c) + m\text{Con}^{k+1}(T) \vdash m\text{Con}(\tau_{n-k}).$$

By Σ_1 induction we conclude that

$$\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \neg A + \theta(c) + m\text{Con}^n(T) \vdash m\text{Con}(\tau_1).$$

So $T + \neg A + \theta(c) + m\text{Con}^n(T) \vdash \tau_0$ and since, in $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T + \neg A + \theta(c)$, the theory on the left hand side is m -consistent, so is τ_0 .

The previous argument shows that $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T \vdash \neg m\text{Con}(\mathfrak{m}^\omega T) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(\tau_0)$. So, contraposing, $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T \vdash \neg m\text{Con}(\tau_0) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(\mathfrak{m}^\omega T)$.

It is well-known that no consistent extension of an r.e. theory S by true Σ_{m+1} sentences proves $m\text{Con}(S)$ [1, Proposition 2.16]. So no consistent extension of $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$ by true Σ_{m+1} sentences proves $\neg m\text{Con}(\tau_0)$. Since $\neg m\text{Con}(\tau_0)$ is a Σ_{m+1} sentence, this means $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T + \neg m\text{Con}(\tau_0)$ is inconsistent, whence $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$ proves $m\text{Con}(\tau_0)$. Since we assumed that $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$ is m -consistent, it follows that τ_0 is m -consistent.

Claim. For each n , $T_n \vdash m\text{Con}(\tau_{n+1})$.

Since, by assumption, $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$ is Σ_m -sound, the second disjunct of the fixed point definition of τ_n is always realized. Which is to say that, for each n , the formula $m\text{Con}(\tau_{n+1})$ belongs to the theory T_n . \square

3.3. Craig's Trick. Theorem 3.2 guarantees the existence of Σ_m -definable m -sequences over certain extensions of $\text{B}\Sigma_1$. In fact, we can secure the existence of Π_{m-1} -definable m -sequences by applying a variant of Craig's trick (also known as "padding" by recursion theorists). However, there is a cost. In particular, we can secure the existence of such sequences only over extensions of the stronger base system $\text{B}\Sigma_m$. So, strictly speaking, the following theorem is neither stronger nor weaker than Theorem 3.2 but appears to be incomparable with it.

Theorem 3.4. Let $m \geq 2$. Let T be an r.e. extension of $\text{B}\Sigma_m$ such that $\text{I}\Sigma_m + \forall x m\text{Con}^x(T)$ is m -consistent. There is a Π_{m-1} -definable uniform m -sequence over T .

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$ abbreviate $\text{I}\Sigma_m + \forall x m\text{Con}^x(T)$. Ultimately, we want to obtain a Π_{m-1} formula $\tau(n, x)$ such that $\text{B}\Sigma_m$ proves $\tau(n, x)$ iff:

- (1) $x \in T$ or
- (2) both of the following hold for some sequence $s < x$:

- (a) $\forall k \leq n \forall A \leq n (A \in \text{Form}_{\Pi_{m-1}} \wedge \text{Prf}_{\mathfrak{m}^\omega T}(k, \exists x A) \rightarrow \text{Tr}_{\Pi_{m-1}}(A(s_k)))$.
- (b) $x = \ulcorner \bigwedge_{i < s} m\text{Con}(\tau(n+1, x)) \urcorner$.

Let us now explain how we find this formula $\tau(n, x)$ in detail. We start by considering the following disjunctive formula $\psi(n, x, z)$

- (1) $x \in T$ or
- (2) both of the following hold for some sequence $s < x$:
 - (a) $\forall k \leq n \forall A \leq n (A \in \text{Form}_{\Pi_{m-1}} \wedge \text{Prf}_{\mathfrak{m}^\omega T}(k, \exists x A) \rightarrow \text{Tr}_{\Pi_{m-1}}(A(s_k)))$.
 - (b) $x = \ulcorner \bigwedge_{i < s} m\text{Con}(t(z, n)) \urcorner$.

In the above $\bigwedge_{i < z} B$ denotes the conjunction of length z of sentence B and $t(z, n)$ is a definable function which given a code z of a formula $\phi(x, y)$ (with at most two free variables) returns the code of $\phi(n+1, y)$. $\psi(n, x, z)$ is of Σ_m complexity (note that (2a) is Π_{m-1} and it is preceded by a bounded quantifier $\exists s < x$.) By applying the collection scheme, $\psi(n, x, z)$ is canonically equivalent in $\text{B}\Sigma_m$ to a Π_{m-1} formula $\tau'(n, x, z)$. That is, $\text{B}\Sigma_m$ proves

$$\psi(n, x, z) \equiv \tau'(n, x, z).$$

We then apply the Diagonal Lemma to $\tau'(n, x, z)$ obtaining a formula $\tau(n, x)$ such that $\text{B}\Sigma_m$ proves

$$\tau(n, x) \equiv \tau'(n, x, \ulcorner \tau(n, x) \urcorner).$$

(Indeed, this biconditional is provable in much weaker systems.) It is clear from the two centered biconditionals that $\tau(n, x)$ works.

Claim. τ_0 is m -consistent.

Reason in $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$: Suppose $\neg m\text{Con}(\mathfrak{m}^\omega T)$. Then for some n and some Σ_m sentence A , n encodes a $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$ proof of A but A is not a Σ_m truth. By $\text{I}\Sigma_m$ we can assume that n is the least such proof of a false Σ_m -sentence. Then, by the fixed point definition, $\forall \varphi (\tau(n, \varphi) \leftrightarrow \varphi \in T)$. Moreover, by Σ_m collection, there is c such that

$$\forall k \leq n-1 \forall A \leq n-1 (A \in \Pi_{m-1} \wedge \text{Prf}_{\mathfrak{m}^\omega T}(k, \exists x A) \rightarrow \text{True}_{\Pi_{m-1}}(A(c_k))).$$

Call the above sentence $\theta(c)$ and assume observe that $\theta(c)$ is a true Π_{m-1} sentence. It follows from the definition of τ and the choice of n that for each $k < n$ we have

$$\forall \varphi (\tau(k, \varphi) \leftrightarrow (\varphi \in T \vee \varphi = \ulcorner m\text{Con}(\tau_{k+1}) \urcorner)).$$

Note that τ_{k+1} is understood as the theory numerated by $\tau(k+1, x)$ where $k+1$ is a fixed integer and x varies.

Using the $\text{B}\Sigma_m$ -provable properties of the fixpoint definition we observe that

$$\text{B}\Sigma_m + \neg A + \theta(c) \vdash \forall \varphi (\tau(n, \varphi) \leftrightarrow \varphi \in T).$$

Hence,

$$\text{B}\Sigma_m + \neg A + \theta(c) + m\text{Con}(T) \vdash m\text{Con}(\tau_n).$$

Assume that for $1 \leq k \leq n+1$

$$\text{B}\Sigma_m + \neg A + \theta(c) + m\text{Con}^k(T) \vdash m\text{Con}(\tau_{n-k+1}).$$

Just as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, this entails the following claim:

$$\text{B}\Sigma_m + \neg A + \theta(c) + m\text{Con}^{k+1}(T) \vdash m\text{Con}(\tau_{n-k}).$$

By Σ_1 induction we conclude that:

$$\text{B}\Sigma_m + \neg A + \theta(c) + m\text{Con}^n(T) \vdash m\text{Con}(\tau_1).$$

So $T + \neg A + \theta(c) + m\text{Con}^n(T) \vdash \tau_0$ and since, in $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T + \neg A + \theta(c)$, the theory on the left-hand side is m -consistent, so is τ_0 .

The previous argument shows that $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T \vdash \neg m\text{Con}(\mathfrak{m}^\omega T) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(\tau_0)$. So, contraposing, $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T \vdash \neg m\text{Con}(\tau_0) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(\mathfrak{m}^\omega T)$.

It is well-known that no consistent extension of an r.e. theory S by true Σ_{m+1} sentences proves $m\text{Con}(S)$ [1, Proposition 2.16]. So no consistent extension of $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$ by true Σ_{m+1} sentences proves $\neg m\text{Con}(\tau_0)$. Since $\neg m\text{Con}(\tau_0)$ is a Σ_{m+1} sentence, this means $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T + \neg m\text{Con}(\tau_0)$ is inconsistent, whence $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$ proves $m\text{Con}(\tau_0)$. Since we assumed that $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$ is m -consistent, it follows that τ_0 is m -consistent.

Claim. For each n , $T_n \vdash m\text{Con}(\tau_{n+1})$.

Since, by assumption, $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T$ is m consistent, it is Σ_m -sound, so whenever $\mathfrak{m}^\omega T \vdash \exists x\phi(x)$, then there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{N} \models \phi(\underline{k})$. For any such k , the sentence $\bigwedge_{i < k} m\text{Con}(\tau_{n+1})$ is an axiom of T_n . \square

3.4. Generalizing a Negative Result. Note that Theorem 3.4 is the best possible result in light of Theorem 1.2. In particular, we cannot strengthen Theorem 3.4 to get a Σ_{m-1} -definable m -sequence over T ; this would contradict Theorem 1.2 in the case $m = 2$. The cases $m > 2$ will likewise be unachievable, in light of the following generalization of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 3.5. For each $m \geq 2$, there is no Σ_{m-1} -definable uniform m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_1$.

Remark 3.6. Note that the following proof is a relatively straightforward adaptation of the proof of [4, Theorem 3.4]. In §4 we provide some adaptations of this argument that are considerably less straightforward. Hence, the following proof may serve as a warmup for these results.

Proof. For $m = 2$, this is already covered by Theorem 1.2. So for the rest of the proof we deal only with the case $m \geq 3$.

Suppose that there is such a sequence. We can assume that each slice is closed under conjunctions. Then DS is true, where DS is the statement

$$\exists \sigma \in \Sigma_m (\theta_1(\sigma) \wedge \theta_2(\sigma) \wedge \theta_3(\sigma) \wedge \theta_4(\sigma))$$

where we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1(\sigma) &:= \forall x (\text{True}_{\Sigma_{m-1}}(\sigma(0, x)) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(x)) \\ \theta_2(\sigma) &:= \forall x (\text{True}_{\Sigma_{m-1}}\sigma(x, \mathbf{B}\Sigma_1)) \\ \theta_3(\sigma) &:= \forall x \exists y (\text{True}_{\Sigma_{m-1}}(\sigma(x, y)) \wedge \text{Pr}_y(\exists z \sigma(x+1, z))) \\ \theta_4(\sigma) &:= \forall x \exists y (\text{True}_{\Sigma_{m-1}}(\sigma(x, y)) \wedge \text{Pr}_y(\forall z (\text{True}_{\Sigma_{m-1}}(\sigma(x+1, z)) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(z))))\end{aligned}$$

Yet we will show that $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1 \vdash \neg\text{DS}$. By Gödel's second incompleteness theorem, it suffices to prove $\text{Con}(\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS})$ in $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS}$.

So let's reason in $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS}$.

Let T_n be the n -th slice of τ . Observe that T_0 proves the m -consistency of T_1 .

Now we consider the sequence σ^* that results from shifting all entries in σ one to the left. That is:

$$\forall x \forall y (\sigma^*(x, y) \leftrightarrow \sigma(x+1, y)).$$

Claim. $T_0 + \text{DS}$ is consistent.

Note that $\theta_2(\sigma^*)$, $\theta_3(\sigma^*)$, and $\theta_4(\sigma^*)$ are true Π_m claims (note that here we are using the assumption that $m \geq 3$).

$$\theta_2(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_3(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_4(\sigma^*)$$

is true Π_m . Since T_0 is m -consistent, T_0 is consistent with any true Π_m claim, so we infer that T_0 is consistent with this conjunction.

However, we know from the previous claim that T_0 proves the m -consistency of T_1 . Hence $T_0 \vdash \theta_1(\sigma^*)$. So T_0 is consistent with the conjunction:

$$\theta_1(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_2(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_3(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_4(\sigma^*)$$

whence $T_0 + \text{DS}$ is consistent.

Claim. $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS}$ is consistent.

This follows from the previous claim since $\theta_2(\sigma)$ informs us that T_0 proves $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_1$. \square

4. THE INDEX ENCODING

In this section we turn to the index encoding. Note that all theorems stated in this section are stated relative to the index encoding of sequences. However, we must now be careful about whether we are focusing on the *uniform* or *non-uniform* versions of our main question. Let's turn to the uniform version first; then we turn to the non-uniform version.

4.1. The Uniform Version. For the uniform version of our result we will present both a positive and a negative result.

4.1.1. *A Positive Result.* The theorems in the previous section all encoded sequences of theories via slices rather than via indices. Can we extract a uniform result using the index encoding *from* analogous results using the slice encoding? It is not obvious how to extract one from the theorem statements, but we can extract one from the proofs. The key is that in each case our fixed point definition was piecewise: If this condition obtains, add this r.e. set of formulas; if that condition obtains, add this other r.e. set of formulas. In both cases the r.e. sets of formulas are specified via indices. This yields a piecewise definition of a sequence of indices. However, this piecewise definition involves conditioning, which raises the complexity of the sequence's definition. These observations yield the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1. *For each $m \geq 0$ and for each r.e. $T \supseteq \mathbf{B}\Sigma_m$ such that $\mathbf{I}\Sigma_m + \forall x m\text{Con}^x(T)$ is m -consistent, there is a Π_m -definable uniform m -sequence over T .*

Proof. For $m = 0$, the statement holds by Theorem 1.1 (Friedman-Smoryński-Solovay). Though Theorem 1.1 is stated over \mathbf{PA} , the same proof generalizes to this case.

Now let's consider the case $m \geq 1$. We shall adapt the proof of Theorem 3.4 to the indices case. Let $t(z, x)$ be (as in the proof of Theorem 3.4) a primitive recursive function which, when applied to a code z of a formula $\phi(v, w)$ and a number x returns the code of a formula $\phi(x + 1, w)$. Recall that T is an elementary formula defining a set of axioms. Let e be the code of the Turing machine which lists the elements of T . Let $m^\omega T$ be $\mathbf{I}\Sigma_m + \forall x m\text{Con}^x(T)$ (as in the proof of Theorem 3.2). Finally, let $f(x, w, z)$ be a primitive recursive function which returns the w -th code of a Turing machine M such that, on input x, z , M outputs $\ulcorner \mathbf{B}\Sigma_m + m\text{Con}(\mathbf{B}\Sigma_m + t(z, x)) \urcorner$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(x, s) &:= \forall k \leq x \forall A \leq x \left(A \in \Pi_{m-1} \wedge \text{Prf}_{m^\omega T}(k, \exists x A) \rightarrow \text{True}_{\Pi_{m-1}}(A(s_k)) \right). \\ \psi(x, y, w, z, s) &:= \theta(x, s) \wedge y = f(x, w, z) \\ \mu y. \exists s, w < y \psi(x, y, w, z, s) &:= \exists s, w < y (\psi(x, y, w, z, s) \wedge \forall y' < y \forall s, w < y' \neg \psi(x, y', w, z, s)) \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\theta(x, s)$ is a Π_{m-1} formula and $\mu y. \exists s, w < y \psi(x, y, w, z, s)$ is $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_m$ -provably equivalent to a Π_m formula. Put

$$\tau'(x, y, z) := \mu y. \exists s, w < y \psi(x, y, w, z, s) \vee (\forall s \neg \theta(x, s) \wedge y = e).$$

Since we shall be working over $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_m$, we can assume that $\tau'(x, y, z)$ is a Π_m formula. By the diagonal lemma we can fix a formula $\tau(x, y)$ such that provably in Robinson's arithmetic \mathbf{Q}

$$\tau(x, y) \equiv \tau'(x, y, \ulcorner \tau(x, y) \urcorner).$$

By the canonical proof of the diagonal lemma, we can assume that the complexity of $\tau(x, y)$ is Π_m .

Note that the definition of τ' is disjunctive; so in one case, it defines one theory, in another case, another theory. By considering cases, for each n there is an index of a total Turing Machine e_n such that $\tau(n, e_n)$ holds. Let T_n be the theory computed by the index e_n (recall that a theory is an axiom set and not its deductive closure). Observe first that T_n contains $\mathbf{B}\Sigma_m$. We argue that for each n , $T_n \vdash \exists! x \tau(n + 1, x)$

(note that the uniqueness claim follows trivially from the definition of τ' , but what matters is existence). Fix n and reason in T_n . If $\forall s \neg \theta(n+1, s)$, then, by the definition of τ' , we have $\forall x (\tau(n+1, x) \leftrightarrow x = e)$. Otherwise, let $A_1(x_1), \dots, A_k(x_k)$ be all the Π_{m-1} -sentences provable in $m^\omega T$ whose proofs are below $n+1$. By the assumption that there is an s such that $\bigwedge_{i \leq k} A_i(s_i)$ holds and by Π_{m-1} induction we can choose the least such s . Now let a be the least code of a Turing Machine which is greater than s and for some $w < a$ satisfies $f(n+1, w, \ulcorner \tau(x, y) \urcorner)$. So in either case, the existence claim is verified.

The proof that T_0 is m -consistent is exactly as in the slices case (proof of Theorem 3.2). Likewise, since by assumption $m^\omega T$ is Σ_m -sound, we conclude that for each n , T_n proves

$$\forall x (\tau(n+1, x) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(x)).$$

We note that the above sentence is Π_{m+1} . Hence by induction we can prove that for each n , T_n is m -consistent. \square

4.1.2. A Negative Result.

Theorem 4.2. *For each $m \geq 2$, there is no Σ_m -definable uniform m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_1$.*

Note that this result immediately generalizes to extensions of $\text{B}\Sigma_1$ since any m -sequence over an extension of $\text{B}\Sigma_1$ is also an m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_1$.

Proof. Suppose that there is such a sequence. Then DS is true, where DS is the statement

$$\exists \sigma \in \Sigma_m (\theta_1(\sigma) \wedge \theta_2(\sigma) \wedge \theta_3(\sigma) \wedge \theta_4(\sigma))$$

where we have:

- (1) $\theta_1(\sigma) := \exists x (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(0, x)) \wedge m\text{Con}(x))$
- (2) $\theta_2(\sigma) := \forall x \forall y (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(x, y)) \rightarrow \text{Pr}_y(\text{B}\Sigma_1))$
- (3) $\theta_3(\sigma) := \forall x \forall y (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(x, y)) \rightarrow \text{Pr}_y(\exists z \sigma(x+1, z)))$
- (4) $\theta_4(\sigma) := \forall x \forall y (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(x, y)) \rightarrow \text{Pr}_y(\forall z (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(x+1, z)) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(z))))$

Yet we will show that $\text{B}\Sigma_1 \vdash \neg \text{DS}$. By Gödel's second incompleteness theorem, it suffices to prove $\text{Con}(\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS})$ in $\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS}$.

So let's reason in $\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS}$.

Let's introduce the name T_0 for some witness to $\theta_1(\sigma)$. T_0 is m -consistent. From $\theta_3(\sigma)$, we know that T_0 proves the Σ_m claim $\exists z \sigma(1, z)$. Since T_0 is m -consistent, this claim must be true. So let's introduce the name T_1 for some witness to the claim $\exists y \sigma(1, y)$.

Claim. $T_0 + \sigma(1, T_1)$ proves the m -consistency of T_1 .

Consider the instance of $\theta_4(\sigma)$ where $x = 0$:

$$\forall y (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(0, y)) \rightarrow \text{Pr}_y(\forall z (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(1, z)) \rightarrow m\text{Con}(z))).$$

Since we have $\sigma(0, T_0)$ and $\sigma(1, T_1)$, we infer:

$$\text{Pr}_{T_0}(m\text{Con}(T_1)).$$

That is, $T_0 + \sigma(1, T_1)$ proves the m -consistency of T_1 .

Now we consider the sequence σ^* that results from shifting all entries in σ one to the left. That is:

$$\forall x \forall y (\sigma^*(x, y) \leftrightarrow \sigma(x + 1, y)).$$

Claim. $T_0 + \text{DS}$ is consistent.

Note that $\theta_2(\sigma^*)$, $\theta_3(\sigma^*)$, and $\theta_4(\sigma^*)$ are true Π_m claims (note that here we are using the assumption that $m \geq 2$). On the other hand, $\sigma^*(0, T_1)$ is true Σ_m . So the conjunction:

$$\sigma^*(0, T_1) \wedge \theta_2(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_3(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_4(\sigma^*)$$

is true Σ_{m+1} . Since T_0 is m -consistent, T_0 is consistent with any true Σ_{m+1} claim, so we infer that T_0 is consistent with this conjunction.

However, we know from the previous claim that $T_0 + \sigma^*(0, T_1)$ proves the m -consistency of T_1 . Yet $\sigma^*(0, T_1) \wedge m\text{Con}(T_1)$ jointly entail that T_1 witnesses $\theta_1(\sigma^*)$. So T_0 is consistent with the conjunction:

$$\theta_1(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_2(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_3(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_4(\sigma^*)$$

whence $T_0 + \text{DS}$ is consistent.

Claim. $\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS}$ is consistent.

This follows from the previous claim since $\theta_m(\sigma)$ informs us that T_0 proves $\text{B}\Sigma_1$. \square

4.2. The Non-uniform Version. We now prove our final main theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *For $m \geq 2$, no Σ_1 non-uniform m -sequence over $\text{B}\Sigma_1$ is pointwise provably inhabited.*

Proof. Suppose that there is such a sequence. Then DS is true, where DS is the statement

$$\exists \sigma \in \Sigma_m (\theta(\sigma) \wedge \theta_2(\sigma) \wedge \theta_3(\sigma) \wedge \theta_4(\sigma))$$

where we have:

- (1) $\theta_1(\sigma) := \exists x (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(0, x)) \wedge m\text{Con}(x))$
- (2) $\theta_2(\sigma) := \forall x \forall y (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(x, y)) \rightarrow \text{Pr}_y(\text{B}\Sigma_1))$
- (3) $\theta_3(\sigma) := \forall x \forall y (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(x, y)) \rightarrow \text{Pr}_y(\exists z \sigma(x + 1, z)))$
- (4) $\theta_4(\sigma) := \forall x \forall y (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(x, y)) \rightarrow \forall z (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(x + 1, z)) \rightarrow \text{Pr}_y(m\text{Con}(z)))$

Yet we will show that $\text{B}\Sigma_1 \vdash \neg \text{DS}$. By Gödel's second incompleteness theorem, it suffices to prove $\text{Con}(\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS})$ in $\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS}$.

So let's reason in $\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS}$.

Let's introduce the name T_0 for some witness to $\theta_1(\sigma)$. T_0 is m -consistent. From $\theta_3(\sigma)$, we know that T_0 proves the Σ_m claim $\exists z\sigma(1, z)$. Since T_0 is m -consistent, this claim must be true. So let's introduce the name T_1 for some witness to the claim $\exists y\sigma(1, y)$.

Claim. T_0 proves the m -consistency of T_1 .

Consider the instance of $\theta_4(\sigma)$ where $x = 0$:

$$\forall y \left(\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(0, y)) \rightarrow \forall z (\text{True}_{\Sigma_m}(\sigma(1, z)) \rightarrow \text{Pr}_y(m\text{Con}(z))) \right).$$

Since we have $\sigma(0, T_0)$ and $\sigma(1, T_1)$, we infer:

$$\text{Pr}_{T_0}(m\text{Con}(T_1)).$$

That is, T_0 proves the m -consistency of T_1 .

Now we consider the sequence σ^* that results from shifting all entries in σ one to the left. That is:

$$\forall x \forall y (\sigma^*(x, y) \leftrightarrow \sigma(x + 1, y)).$$

Claim. $T_0 + \text{DS}$ is consistent.

Note that $\theta_2(\sigma^*)$, $\theta_3(\sigma^*)$, and $\theta_4(\sigma^*)$ are true Π_m claims. On the other hand, $\sigma^*(0, T_1)$ is true Σ_m . So the conjunction:

$$\sigma^*(0, T_1) \wedge \theta_2(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_3(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_4(\sigma^*)$$

is true Σ_{m+1} . Since T_0 is m -consistent, T_0 is consistent with any true Σ_{m+1} claim, so we infer that T_0 is consistent with this conjunction.

However, we know from the previous claim that T_0 proves the m -consistency of T_1 . Yet $\sigma^*(0, T_1) \wedge m\text{Con}(T_1)$ jointly entail that T_1 witnesses $\theta_1(\sigma^*)$. So T_0 is consistent with the conjunction:

$$\theta_1(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_2(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_3(\sigma^*) \wedge \theta_4(\sigma^*)$$

whence $T_0 + \text{DS}$ is consistent.

Claim. $\text{B}\Sigma_1 + \text{DS}$ is consistent.

This follows from the previous claim since $\theta_2(\sigma)$ informs us that T_0 proves $\text{B}\Sigma_1$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Lev D Beklemishev. Reflection principles and provability algebras in formal arithmetic. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 60(2):197, 2005.
- [2] Per Lindström. *Aspects of Incompleteness*. Lecture Notes in Logic. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1997.
- [3] Antonio Montalbán and James Walsh. On the inevitability of the consistency operator. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 84(1):205–225, 2019.
- [4] Fedor Pakhomov and James Walsh. Reflection ranks and ordinal analysis. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 86(4):1350–1384, 2021.
- [5] C Smoryński. *Self-Reference and Modal Logic*. Springer New York, 1985.
- [6] Albert Visser. A descending hierarchy of reflection principles. *Logic Group Preprint Series*, 34, 1988.

FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY, UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

Email address: `mlelyk@uw.edu.pl`

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Email address: `jmw534@nyu.edu`