

# A Miniaturized “Predicativity” – “slow growing” analogues.

Stanley S. Wainer<sup>1</sup> (Leeds UK)

HAPPY BIRTHDAY GERHARD  
December 2013.

---

<sup>1</sup>Earlier parts of this work were done jointly with Elliott Spoons and were partially supported by the 2012 Isaac Newton Institute programme: “Syntax and Semantics; the legacy of A. Turing”.

## §0. Input–Output Theories for Grzegorzczuk Hierarchy.

- ▶  $EA(I; O)$  is a 2-sorted theory with elementary strength.
- ▶  $EA(I; O) \subset EA(I; O)^+ \vdash \mathcal{E}^3(x : I) \downarrow$ .
- ▶  $EA(I_1; O)^+(I_2)^+ \vdash \mathcal{E}^4(x : I_2) \downarrow$ .
- ▶  $EA(I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k; O)^+ \vdash \mathcal{E}^{k+2}(x : I_k) \downarrow$ .
- ▶  $EA(I_1, I_2, \dots, I_\omega; O)_{\prec\Gamma_0}^\infty \vdash \mathcal{E}^\omega(x : I_\omega) \downarrow$ .

The Main Principles:

- (1) Numerical inputs govern induction-length.
- (2) Values computable from inputs only may be used as input.
- (3) There may be many “increasingly refined” levels of input.

## §1. $EA(I; O)$ – Leivant (1995), Ostrin-Wainer (2005),

- ▶ Quantified numerical “output” variables  $a, b, c, \dots$ .
- ▶ Unquantified “input” variables  $x, y, z, \dots$  (constants).
- ▶ Terms  $0, Succ, +, \times, \pi, \pi_0, \pi_1, \dots$  with usual axioms.
- ▶ “Predicative/bounded/pointwise Induction” up to  $x$ :

$$A(0) \wedge \forall a(A(a) \rightarrow A(a + 1)) \rightarrow \forall a \leq x A(a).$$

- ▶ Define  $f(x) \downarrow \equiv \exists a C_f(x, a)$  for some  $\Sigma_1$  formula  $C_f$ .
- ▶ Then  $EA(I; O) \vdash f(x) \downarrow$  if and only if  $f$  is elementary.

## $EA(I; O) \subset EA(I; O)^+ - \text{Spoors-Wainer (2012)}$

$EA(I; O)$  is not “user-friendly” since composition of functions  $f : I \rightarrow O$  cannot be proved straightforwardly – however Wirz (2005) developed a variety of derived rules showing this.

To remedy this, add a  $\Sigma_1$ -“Reflection Rule” as in Cantini (2002):

$$\frac{\Sigma(\vec{x}), \exists a A(a, \vec{x})}{\Sigma(\vec{x}), \exists y A(y, \vec{x})}$$

where the only free parameters are inputs  $\vec{x}$ . And add  $I$ -quantifiers:

$$\frac{\Gamma, A(x)}{\Gamma, \forall y A(y)} \quad \frac{\Gamma, A(t(\vec{x}))}{\Gamma, \exists y A(y)}$$

Note: the inductions are still restricted to  $EA(I; O)$  formulas only.

Then if  $\vdash f(x) \downarrow$  and  $\vdash g(x) \downarrow$  we can directly prove  $\forall y f(y) \downarrow$  and (by reflection)  $\exists y (g(x) = y)$ . Therefore  $EA(I; O)^+ \vdash f(g(x)) \downarrow$ .

## §2. $EA(I_1, I_2; O) = EA(I_1; O)^+(I_2)^+$ .

Add to  $EA(I_1; O)^+$  a new layer of  $I_2$ -inputs  $u, v, \dots$  and a new level of inductions:

$$A(0) \wedge \forall a(A(a) \rightarrow A(a+1)) \rightarrow A(u)$$

where  $A$  is now any  $EA(I_1; O)^+$  formula.

Then:

- ▶  $EA(I_1; O) \vdash 2^\times \downarrow$
- ▶  $EA(I_1; O)^+ \vdash \forall x \exists y (2^x = y)$
- ▶  $EA(I_1; O)^+ \vdash \exists y (2_a^x = y) \rightarrow \exists y (2_{a+1}^x = y)$
- ▶  $EA(I_1; O)^+(I_2) \vdash \forall x \exists y (2_u^x = y)$

Now add  $I_2$ -quantifier rules and a  $\Sigma_1$ -reflection rule for  $I_2$ . This allows compositions of the superexponential etc., so

$$EA(I_1; O)^+(I_2)^+ \vdash \mathcal{E}^4(u) \downarrow .$$

### §3. Pointwise Transfinite Induction.

Usual transfinite induction  $TI(A, \alpha)$  may be written:

$$A(0) \wedge \forall \gamma (A(\gamma) \rightarrow A(\gamma + 1)) \wedge \forall \lambda (\forall i A(\lambda_i) \rightarrow A(\lambda)) \rightarrow A(\alpha)$$

#### Definition

“Weak, pointwise transfinite induction”  $PTI(A_x, \alpha)$ :

$$A(0) \wedge \forall \gamma (A(\gamma) \rightarrow A(\gamma + 1)) \wedge \forall \lambda (\forall i \leq x A(\lambda_i) \rightarrow A(\lambda)) \rightarrow A(\alpha)$$

or  $A(0) \wedge \forall \gamma (A(\gamma) \rightarrow A(\gamma + 1)) \wedge \forall \lambda (A(\lambda_x) \rightarrow A(\lambda)) \rightarrow A(\alpha)$ .

The idea goes back to U. Schmerl (1982).

This is enough to define the Slow Growing function  $G_\alpha(x)$  and is equivalent to Bounded Induction “up to”  $G_\alpha(x)$ :

$$A(0) \wedge \forall a (A(a) \rightarrow A(a + 1)) \rightarrow \forall a \leq G_\alpha(x) A(a).$$

# Tree Ordinals $\alpha \prec \Gamma_0$ and their $G_\alpha$ 's.

## Definition

- ▶  $\alpha \in \Omega$  if  $\alpha = 0$  or  $\exists \beta \in \Omega (\alpha = \beta + 1)$  or  $\alpha : N \rightarrow \Omega$ .
- ▶  $G : N \times \Omega \rightarrow N$  is given by

$$G_n(0) = 0, \quad G_n(\beta + 1) = G_n(\beta) + 1. \quad G_n(\lambda) = G_n(\lambda_n).$$

- ▶  $\psi : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is given by

$$\psi_0(\beta) = \beta + 2^\beta, \quad \psi_{\alpha+1}(\beta) = \psi_\alpha^{2^\beta}(\beta), \quad \psi_\lambda(\beta) = \sup \psi_{\lambda_n}(\beta).$$

- ▶  $F_0(m) = m + 2^m$ ,  $F_{n+1}(m) = F_n^{2^m}(m)$ . Then  $F_\omega(n) = F_n(n)$ .

## Theorem

(i)  $|\psi_\alpha(\omega)| = \text{Veblen } \phi_\alpha(0)$  for  $\alpha \succ 0$ .

(ii)  $G_n(\psi_\alpha(\beta)) = F_{G_n(\alpha)}(G_n(\beta))$ . So  $G_n(\psi_\alpha(\alpha)) = F_\omega(G_n(\alpha))$ .

## $PTI(\alpha)$ in $EA(I, \dots; O)$ theories.

- ▶ Recall: For  $\alpha \prec \varepsilon_0$ ,  $G(\alpha) \in \mathcal{E}^3$ , but  $G(\varepsilon_0) \notin \mathcal{E}^3$ .
- ▶ Hence:  $EA(I; O) \vdash PTI(\alpha \prec \varepsilon_0)$ , but  $EA(I; O) \not\vdash PTI(\varepsilon_0)$ .
- ▶ Thus:  $\|EA(I; O)^+\|_W = \varepsilon_0 = \phi_1(0)$ .
- ▶ Similarly:  $\|EA(I_1, I_2; O)^+\|_W = \phi_2(0)$  etcetera.
- ▶ And:  $\|EA(I_1, \dots, I_\omega; O)_{\prec \Gamma_0}^\infty\|_W = \Gamma_0$ .
- ▶ Wainer-Williams (2005):  $\|ID_1(I; O)\|_W = \phi_{\varepsilon_{\Omega+1}}(0)$  but  $ID_1(I; O) \equiv PA$ .

Note: Jäger-Probst (2013) and Ranzi-Strahm (2013),  $SID_\nu$  have full (unstratified) numerical induction in the base theory.



## §4. $EA(I_1, I_2, \dots, I_\omega; O)_{\prec \Gamma_0}^\infty$ .

Sequents are:  $n : I_k ; \dots, m : I_i \vdash^\alpha \Gamma$  with  $\omega \geq k > \dots > i$ .

Logic Rules are as follows where  $\beta \prec_n \alpha \prec \Gamma_0$  :

$$(\exists I_i) \frac{n : I_k ; \dots, m : I_i \vdash_C^\beta \ell \quad n : I_k ; \dots, m : I_i \vdash^\beta \Gamma, A(\ell)}{n : I_k ; \dots, m : I_i \vdash^\alpha \Gamma, \exists x(I_i(x) \wedge A(x))}$$

$$(\forall I_i) \frac{\{ n : I_k ; \dots, \max(m, j) : I_i \vdash^\beta \Gamma, A(j) \}_j}{n : I_k ; \dots, m : I_i \vdash^\alpha \Gamma, \forall x(I_i(x) \rightarrow A(x))} \text{ level}(A) < k$$

and  $(\vee)$ ,  $(\wedge)$  and  $(\text{Cut})$  as usual, together with Computation Rules:

$$(Ax) \ n; \dots, m \vdash_C^\alpha \ell \text{ if } \ell \leq q(m) \quad (C) \frac{n; \dots m \vdash_C^\beta m' \quad n; \dots m' \vdash_C^\beta \ell}{n; \dots m \vdash_C^\alpha \ell}$$

# Reading Off Bounding Functions.

Ordinal assignment is “slow growing”:  $|\{\beta : \beta \prec_n \alpha\}| = G_n(\alpha)$ .

## Lemma

If  $n; m \vdash_C^\alpha k$  then  $k \leq q^{G_n(2^\alpha)}(m)$ .

## Theorem (Basic bounding principle)

If  $EA(I;O)^+ \vdash f(x) \downarrow$  then, by embedding and cut-reduction, there is an  $\alpha \prec \varepsilon_0$  such that for every  $x := n$ ,  $n; - \vdash_0^\alpha \exists a C_f(n, a)$ . Then  $\exists a \leq k C_f(n, a)$  where  $k = q^{G_n(2^\alpha)}(0)$ . So  $f \in \mathcal{E}^3$ .

## Lemma ( $\mathcal{E}^4$ bounding)

Let  $B_1(\alpha, n) = q^{G_n(2^\alpha)}(0)$  be the bounding function at level 1.  
Then  $B_2(\alpha, n) = B_1(\alpha)^{G_n(2^\alpha)}(n)$  is the bound at level 2:

$$n_2; n_1, - \vdash_C^\alpha k \Rightarrow k \leq B_2(\alpha, \max(n_2, n_1)).$$

This bound is  $\mathcal{E}^4$ -definable. Etcetera.

## §5. Level $\omega$ – Ackermann.

Suppressing ordinal bounds,  $EA(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_\omega; O)_\infty^+$  proves:

$$\forall x^r \exists y^r (F_r^{2^a}(x) = y) \rightarrow \forall x^r \exists y^r (F_r^{2^{a+1}}(x) = y)$$

Hence by induction on  $a$ , using repeated cuts:

$$k : l_{r+1}; \vdash \forall x^r \exists y^r (F_r(x) = y) \rightarrow \forall x^r \exists y^r (F_r^{2^k}(x) = y)$$

By Cut on  $\forall x^r \exists y^r (F_r(x) = y)$  using  $k : l_{r+1} \vdash_C k : l_r$ ,

$$k : l_{r+1} \vdash \exists y^r (F_{r+1}(k) = y)$$

Then  $k : l_{r+1} \vdash \exists y^{r+1} (F_{r+1}(k) = y)$  so  $\forall x^{r+1} \exists y^{r+1} (F_{r+1}(x) = y)$ .

So  $r : l_\omega \vdash \forall x^r \exists y^r (F_r(x) = y)$ .

But note:  $r : l_\omega \vdash_C r : l_r$ . Therefore  $r : l_\omega \vdash \exists y^\omega (F_\omega(r) = y)$ .

## §6. “Predicativity” in $EA(I_1, \dots, I_\omega; O)_{\prec \Gamma_0}^\infty$ .

- ▶ Sequents are:  $n : I_k; \dots m : I_j \vdash^\alpha \Gamma$  where ordinal bounds  $\alpha \prec \Gamma_0$  are autonomously generated according to the rule:  $PTI(\beta) \Rightarrow PTI(\psi_\beta(\beta))$ .

- ▶ This holds because if  $G_n(\beta)$  is computable in the system, so is

$$G_n(\psi_\beta(\beta)) = F_{G_n(\beta)}(G_n(\beta)) = F_\omega(G_n(\beta)).$$

Only finite iterations of  $F_\omega$  are possible, so can't reach  $\Gamma_0$ .

- ▶ Collapsing Principle:  $n : I_\omega; m : I_j \vdash_C^\alpha k \Rightarrow m : I_j; \vdash_C^a k$  where  $a = G_n(\psi_\alpha(\alpha)) = F_\omega(G_n(\alpha))$ .

Computational bounds are finite  $F$ -terms, elementary in  $F_\omega$ .



$$EA(I_1, \dots, I_\omega; O)_{\prec \Gamma_0}^\infty \vdash \mathcal{E}^\omega(x : I_\omega) \downarrow$$

$$\|EA(I_1, \dots, I_\omega; O)_{\prec \Gamma_0}^\infty\|_W = \Gamma_0.$$

## References

- 1) **A. Cantini**: “Polytime, combinatory logic and positive safe induction”. Archive for Math. Logic Vol. 41 (2002) 169-189.
- 2) **G. Jäger & D. Probst**: “A proof theoretic analysis of theories for stratified inductive definitions”, new, to appear.
- 3) **D. Leivant**: “Intrinsic theories and computational complexity”. In D. Leivant (Ed) LCC'94, LNCS Vol. 960 (1995) 177-194.
- 4) **G. Ostrin & S. Wainer**: “Elementary arithmetic”. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic Vol. 133 (2005) 275-292.
- 5) **F. Ranzi & T. Strahm**: “A note on the theory  $SID_{<\omega}$  of stratified induction”, new, to appear.
- 6) **H. Schwichtenberg & S. Wainer**: “Proofs and Computations”. ASL Perspectives in Logic, CUP (2012) 465 + xiii.
- 7) **E. Spoors & S. Wainer**: “A hierarchy of ramified theories below PRA”. To appear in a volume in honour of Helmut Schwichtenberg, Ontos Math. Logic (2012).