The Journal of Symbolic Logic
Volume 83, Number 3, September 2018

INTERRELATION BETWEEN WEAK FRAGMENTS OF DOUBLE NEGATION SHIFT AND RELATED PRINCIPLES

MAKOTO FUJIWARA AND ULRICH KOHLENBACH

Abstract. We investigate two weak fragments of the double negation shift schema, which are motivated, respectively, from Spector's consistency proof of ACA_0 and from the negative translation of RCA_0, as well as double negated variants of logical principles. Their interrelations over both intuitionistic arithmetic and analysis are completely solved.

§1. Introduction. Proofs in mathematics which are noneffective by making use of the law of excluded middle schema (LEM) in most concrete cases use only rather restricted forms of LEM, e.g., LEM applied only to formulas of very low complexity. For a fine analysis of the specific uses of classical logic made in proofs, also a number of principles different from LEM (though being derivable from sufficiently strong forms of LEM) have been introduced and studied (see, e.g., [1]). To show that (over some intuitionistic base system) one noneffective principle P_1 does not imply another principle P_2 one typically uses so-called proof interpretations (appropriate forms of realizability or functional interpretations) to show that P_1 has a certain semi-constructive interpretation in the sense of the interpretation used which P_2 does not.

In this article, we study for the first time the interrelation between weak fragments of the double negation shift (DNS):

$$\forall x \neg\neg A \to \neg\neg \forall x\, A$$

and (mainly double negated versions) of the following three logical principles:

- The law of excluded middle: $A \vee \neg A$;
- De Morgan's law (DML): $\neg(A \wedge B) \to \neg A \vee \neg B$;
- The double negation elimination (DNE): $\neg\neg A \to A$;

over intuitionistic arithmetic and analysis.

This time the various separation results require rather subtle arguments as none of these principles causes a failure of the usual constructive properties of intuitionistic systems when added to them as they are in a specific sense computationally empty being (equivalent to) negated statements (see, e.g., Corollaries 5.16 and 5.24 in [14]).

Proof-theoretically, however, DNS (already for number variables x) is very strong as its addition to elementary intuitionistic analysis EL plus the axiom schema of

Received December 7, 2016.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03B20, 03F50, 03F10, 03F25.
Key words and phrases. double negation shift, fragments of classical logic, intuitionistic arithmetic and analysis.

© 2018, Association for Symbolic Logic
0022-4812/18/8303-0007
DOI:10.1017/jsl.2017.63

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

countable choice for numbers $\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}$ results in a system that allows for an embedding of full classical analysis (see, e.g., [14, Chapter 11], and also below) while $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}$ and even $\mathsf{HA}^{\omega}+\mathrm{AC}$ can be proof-theoretically reduced to HA and—by Goodman's theorem—in fact is conservative over Heyting arithmetic HA.

Below we will give a metamathematical interpretation of DNS restricted to the formula classes Σ^0_1 and Σ^0_2 in terms of consistency proofs to motivate our interest in these principles.

For the rest of this introduction (and mostly also throughout the whole article), x, y, z denote variables over the natural numbers, so-called type-0 variables, while α, β, γ denote variables for number-theoretic functions of some arity (so-called type-1 variables) where the arity will be clear from the context.

Spector's consistency proof of classical analysis. In [10], by using the so-called Dialectica (or functional) interpretation together with the negative translation, Gödel gave a consistency proof of Peano arithmetic (in fact, classical finite-type arithmetic) relative to a quantifier-free theory **T** of primitive recursive functionals of finite types. Later in [23], Spector extended Gödel's method to full second-order arithmetic (also called classical analysis). Their method consists of the following steps:

- first, by the negative translation, one reduces a classical theory to the corresponding (semi-)intuitionistic theory,
- second, by the Dialectica interpretation, one reduces the (semi-)intuitionistic theory to the quantifier-free functional theory **T** (+ bar recursion).

Since classical finite-type arithmetic together with the schema of comprehension over numbers

$$\mathrm{CA}^0 : \exists\gamma\,\forall x\,(\gamma(x) = 0 \leftrightarrow A(x)),$$

contains full second-order arithmetic (in the sense of [22] via the identification of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ with their characteristic functions) and CA^0 is classically derived from the axiom schema of countable choice for numbers

$$\mathrm{AC}^{0,0} : \forall x\,\exists y\,A(x,y) \to \exists\gamma\,\forall x\,A(x,\gamma(x))$$

(see, e.g., [14, Section 11.1]), by Gödel's original work which proceeds by induction on the proof, it is sufficient to give an interpretation of the additional axiom $\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}$. One can easily see that the negative translation of $\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}$ is intuitionistically derived from $\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}$ together with the numerical double negation shift schema

$$\mathrm{DNS}^0 : \forall x\,\neg\neg A(x) \to \neg\neg\forall x\,A(x)$$

(see, e.g., [14, Section 11.1]). Since $\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}$ (and even the full axiom schema of choice in all finite types) is Dialectica interpretable in **T**, the only difficulty is in the interpretation of DNS^0. In fact, the crucial step in [23] was to give the witnessing terms of the Dialectica interpretation of DNS^0 by functionals in **T** extended by bar recursion.

See, e.g., [2, 14] for more information.

Motivation for Σ^0_2-DNS^0: Consistency proof of ACA_0. It is well-known in reverse mathematics (cf. [22]) that the schema of so-called arithmetical comprehension

$$\mathrm{CA}^0_{\mathrm{ar}} : \exists\gamma\,\forall x\,(\gamma(x) = 0 \leftrightarrow A_{\mathrm{ar}}(x)),$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where $A_{\mathrm{ar}}(x)$ is an arbitrary arithmetical formula with function parameters, suffices to carry out a substantial amount of ordinary mathematics. As explained in [14, Section 11.3], it is not hard to see that $\mathrm{CA}^0_{\mathrm{ar}}$ is classically derived from (in fact, equivalent over $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{LEM}$ to) the following fragment of the axiom schema of countable choice for numbers

$$\Pi^0_1\text{-AC}: \ \forall\alpha\,(\forall x\,\exists y\,\forall z\,\alpha(x,y,z)=0\to\exists\gamma\,\forall x,z\,\alpha(x,\gamma(x),z)=0).$$

In addition, as in the general case, one can straightforwardly see that the negative translation of Π^0_1-AC is intuitionistically derived from Π^0_1-AC and the Σ^0_2-fragment of DNS^0,

$$\Sigma^0_2\text{-DNS}^0: \ \forall\alpha\,(\forall x\,\neg\neg\exists y\,\forall z\,\alpha(x,y,z)=0\to\neg\neg\forall x\,\exists y\,\forall z\,\alpha(x,y,z)=0).$$

Thus Σ^0_2-DNS^0 is the key principle for the consistency proofs of ACA as well as ACA_0 by the Gödel–Spector method (see Theorems 11.13 and 11.14 in [14], respectively), where ACA is the subsystem resulting from second-order arithmetic by restriction the schema of comprehension to arithmetical formulas and ACA_0 results by additionally weakening the induction schema also to arithmetical formulas (always with set parameters). It is known that witnessing terms of the Dialectica interpretation of Σ^0_2-DNS^0 can be given by functionals in $\mathbf{T}$ extended by bar recursion only for lowest types (see [14, Theorem 11.13]).

Motivation for Σ^0_1-DNS^0: Negative translation of RCA_0. The most popular base system RCA_0 of (classical) reverse mathematics (cf. [22]) is known to be equivalent to the fragment EL_0 (see [7]) of elementary intuitionistic analysis EL augmented with the law of excluded middle schema LEM. (Note that our EL_0 is different from that in [17]. In fact, full elementary intuitionistic analysis EL is a definitional extension of EL_0 in [17]. In addition, our EL_0 also differs from EL_0 as defined in [5], since [7] uses $\vee$ as a primitive connective; as noted by [18] this makes a difference in the absence of full induction). This is also the case for the system RCA, which includes full second-order induction schema, and elementary intuitionistic analysis EL (see [25, 1.9.10] and [7]) augmented with LEM. Then, following [5, 7, 8], we write $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{LEM}$ and $\mathsf{EL}_0+\mathrm{LEM}$ as RCA and RCA_0, respectively. Note that EL and EL_0 contain the following weak fragment of quantifier-free axiom schema of choice

$$\mathrm{QF\text{-}AC}^{0,0}: \ \forall\alpha\,(\forall x\,\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\to\exists\gamma\,\forall x\,\alpha(x,\gamma(x))=0).$$

Let us consider the soundness of negative translation for the classical systems RCA and RCA_0. As mentioned in the proof of [8, Lemma 11], the problematic point is only the verification of $\mathrm{QF\text{-}AC}^{0,0}$. As in the proof of [14, Proposition 10.6], one can show that the negative translation $(\mathrm{QF\text{-}AC}^{0,0})^{\mathrm{N}}$ of $\mathrm{QF\text{-}AC}^{0,0}$ is derived from $\mathrm{QF\text{-}AC}^{0,0}$ and the Σ^0_1-fragment of DNS^0,

$$\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0: \ \forall\alpha\,(\forall x\,\neg\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\to\neg\neg\forall x\,\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0).$$

Thus [8, Lemma 11] can be extended to the following:

PROPOSITION 1.1. *If* RCA (*resp.* RCA_0) *proves* A, *then* $\mathsf{EL}+\Sigma^0_1$-DNS^0 (*resp.* $\mathsf{EL}_0+\Sigma^0_1$-DNS^0) *proves the negative translation* A^{N} *of* A.

As a corollary, we have the following conservation result:

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

COROLLARY 1.2. *For any* $\exists$*-free formula* A (*i.e.*, A *does not contain* $\exists, \vee$), *if* RCA (*resp.* RCA_0) *proves* A, *then* $\mathsf{EL} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNS^0 (*resp.* $\mathsf{EL}_0 + \Sigma^0_1$-$\mathrm{DNS}^0$) *proves* A.

On the other hand, $(\text{QF-AC}^{0,0})^{\mathrm{N}}$ derives Σ^0_1-DNS^0. Thus $(\text{QF-AC}^{0,0})^{\mathrm{N}}$ is equivalent to Σ^0_1-DNS^0 over EL_0.

NOTATION. *As mentioned already, we basically use the lower-case letters* $n, m, x, y, z, \ldots$ *for type-*0 *variables and use the lower-case Greek letters* $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots$ *for type-*1 *variables. For finite-type systems, we employ the type notation from* [14]. *Note that from now on we use superscripts on quantified variables to indicate their types. Throughout this article, the word "primitive recursive" for functions over natural numbers is used in the ordinary sense unless otherwise stated. In particular, we frequently use primitive recursive* T, U *from the Kleene normal form theorem. In addition, we employ the notations* HA^ω *and* $\mathsf{N\text{-}HA}^\omega$ *in the sense of* [25], *while* [27] *uses* HA^ω_0 *and* HA^ω, *respectively, to denote* HA^ω *and* $\mathsf{N\text{-}HA}^\omega$ *in* [25].

§2. Fragments of classical logic.

2.1. Arithmetical hierarchy of logical principles. There are several known results, which are found in the literature [1, 9, 11, 15], on the arithmetical hierarchy of the logical principles. Although there are several motivations for studying the arithmetical hierarchy of the logical principles, one remarkable motivation comes from the intuitionistic version of reverse mathematics (cf. [22]), which investigates the relation between theorems and axioms in mathematics. The logical principles presented at the beginning of this article are frequently used (sometimes implicitly) in mathematical proofs. However, they are not accepted as universally valid principles and rejected to use in so-called constructive mathematics (see, e.g., Section 1.3 in [26]). On the other hand, it is well-known that a large amount of (Bishop's) constructive mathematics can be formalized over (many-sorted) intuitionistic arithmetic. Based on this fact, so-called constructive reverse mathematics (cf. [12]), which is reverse mathematics over (many-sorted) intuitionistic arithmetic, has been carried out. In fact, some mathematical statements have been established to be equivalent to some fragments of the logical principles over (many-sorted) intuitionistic arithmetic [3, 12, 24]. The study of fragments of the law of excluded middle schema is also relevant for the project of proof mining: if, e.g., LEM is only used for Π^0_1-formulas (or—more generally—for existential-free or even for negated formulas) or—alternatively (but not together with it)—in the form of the combination of the Markov principle (denoted by MP or Σ^0_1-DNE) with the De Morgan law for Σ^0_1-formulas (denoted by LLPO or Σ^0_1-DML), one still can—as in fully intuitionistic proofs—extract effective uniform bounds from proofs of statements of arbitrary logical complexity (see, e.g., Chapters 7 and 9 in [14]). In particular, one can extract rates of convergence from proofs of the Cauchy property of a sequence. If LEM is applied to Σ^0_1-formulas, this in general fails, while one can still learn a rate of convergence in the sense of limit computability (see, e.g., [1]).

The following fragments (or their first-order counterparts) of the logical principles have been studied in the previous literature [1, 9, 11, 15]:

- Σ^0_1-LEM: $\forall \alpha \forall x (\exists y\, \alpha(x, y) = 0 \vee \neg \exists y\, \alpha(x, y) = 0)$.
- Π^0_1-LEM: $\forall \alpha \forall x (\forall y\, \alpha(x, y) = 0 \vee \neg \forall y\, \alpha(x, y) = 0)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

- Σ^0_1-DML (or LLPO):
  $\forall\alpha,\beta\forall x(\neg(\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\wedge\exists z\,\beta(x,z)=0)\to$
  $\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\vee\neg\exists z\,\beta(x,z)=0)$.
- Π^0_1-DML:
  $\forall\alpha,\beta\forall x(\neg(\forall y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\wedge\forall z\,\beta(x,z)=0)\to$
  $\neg\forall y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\vee\neg\forall z\,\beta(x,z)=0)$.
- Σ^0_1-DNE (or MP): $\forall\alpha\forall x(\neg\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\to\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0)$.
- Δ_a-LEM:
  $\forall\alpha,\beta\forall x((\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\leftrightarrow\neg\exists z\,\beta(x,z)=0)\to$
  $\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\vee\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0)$.
- Δ_b-LEM:
  $\forall\alpha,\beta\forall x((\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\leftrightarrow\exists z\,\beta(x,z)=0)\to$
  $\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\vee\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0)$.

REMARK 2.1. In this article, we treat the logical principles over many-sorted intuitionistic arithmetic (EL or HA^ω) in parallel with their first-order counterparts, which are studied in Akama et al. [1], over first-order arithmetic HA. Since each quantifier-free formula $A_{qf}[\underline{x}]$ (in $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$) containing only $\underline{x}$ as free variables is (provably in HA) equivalent to $t(\underline{x})=0$ for some closed primitive recursive t (in the ordinary sense, not in the extended sense of Gödel's **T**), the first-order counterparts of the principles are equivalent to restricting the second-order principles to all instances where α,β are closed primitive recursive function terms. It is for this reason that always the number parameters "$\forall x$" are inserted after "$\forall\alpha$" or "$\forall\alpha,\beta$" although they are obviously redundant in the second-order formulations (cf. Remark 2.3). In particular, for the logical principles above, their function-parameter-free fragments (i.e., the restriction to primitive recursive function terms containing at most number-theoretic parameters) and their closed function-parameter-free fragments are the same and we simply say "function-parameter-free fragment" and denote this with a superscript "$-$" in the following. Moreover, in the presence of Church's thesis CT in Section 4 the full second-order versions are equivalent to the first-order counterparts.

REMARK 2.2. As mentioned in [9], there are several (classically equivalent) ways to define a formula being Δ^0_1 constructively. In this article, we consider the following two variants:

(a) $\alpha\in\Delta_a :\equiv \exists\beta\big(\exists x\,\alpha(x)=0\leftrightarrow\neg\exists x\,\beta(x)=0\big)$.
(b) $\alpha\in\Delta_b :\equiv \exists\beta\big(\neg\exists x\,\alpha(x)=0\leftrightarrow\exists x\,\beta(x)=0\big)$.

Note that Δ^0_1-LEM in [1, 15, 19] is defined in the sense of (a).

REMARK 2.3. Σ^0_1-LEM, Π^0_1-LEM, Σ^0_1-DML, and Π^0_1-DML are equivalent (over, e.g., EL) to the principles denoted by LPO, WLPO, LLPO and $\mathrm{MP}^\vee$, respectively, in Ishihara's constructive reverse mathematics (cf. [12]). In addition, Δ_a-LEM is equivalent (over, e.g., EL) to so-called Δ^0_1-LEM in [15]:

$$\forall\alpha,\beta(\forall x(\exists n\,\alpha(x,n)=0\leftrightarrow\forall n\,\beta(x,n)=0)\to\forall x(\exists n\,\alpha(x,n)=0\vee\neg\exists n\,\alpha(x,n)=0)),$$

and also to so-called IIIa in [9]:

$$\forall\alpha,\beta((\exists n\,\alpha(n)\neq0\leftrightarrow\neg\exists n\,\beta(n)\neq0)\to\exists n\,\alpha(n)\neq0\vee\neg\exists n\,\alpha(n)\neq0).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Note that the definition of Δ^0_1-LEM in [15] contains a typo. In addition, the use of nonequality in [9, 11] instead of equality is the convention from constructive mathematics, but they are equivalent over standard intuitionistic arithmetic. A similar discussion for Σ^0_1-DNE, which is called "Markov's principle (MP)" in constructive mathematics, can be found in [21].

Historically, Ishihara [11] studied Π^0_1-DML and showed that Π^0_1-DML is derivable from either Σ^0_1-DNE or Σ^0_1-DML (in another terminology). Independently, Akama et al. [1] systematically studied an arithmetical hierarchy of logical principles over first-order intuitionistic arithmetic and showed, among other things, that Δ_a-LEM is derivable from either Σ^0_1-DNE or Σ^0_1-DML (in another terminology). Recently, Fujiwara et al. [9] carried out a systematic study of weak logical principles and showed, among other things, that Π^0_1-DML implies Δ_a-LEM while Δ_b-LEM is equivalent to Σ^0_1-DNE. On the other hand, Kohlenbach [15] showed that the converse is not the case. In the end, the existing results are summarized in Figure 1, where each double arrow $\Rightarrow$ expresses that the converse direction does not hold. Note that the following picture holds over both many-sorted arithmetic and first-order arithmetic, respectively.




FIGURE 1. Arithmetical hierarchy of logical principles over EL or HA [1, 9, 11, 15].

However, as mentioned in [1, Section 4], the entire hierarchy inside constructivism is still to be discovered.

2.2. Double negation shift scheme and doubly negated variants of logical principles.

FACT 2.4 (See, e.g., [16]). *Over intuitionistic predicate logic* IQC, *the double negation shift schema*:

$$\forall x \neg\neg A(x) \to \neg\neg \forall x\, A(x)$$

is equivalent to the double negated version of the law of excluded middle schema:

$$\neg\neg \forall x (A(x) \vee \neg A(x)).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The implication from the latter to the former holds even for each fixed formula $A(x)$. However, to obtain the double negated law of excluded middle for $A(x)$ one has to apply the double negation shift to $\forall x \neg\neg(A(x) \vee \neg A(x))$, which is intuitionistically provable.

Of course, these proofs can be simulated in the setting of (many-sorted) intuitionistic arithmetic. On one hand, as in the case of pure logic, one can see that the double negated variant of Σ^0_1-LEM (note that all of our double negated principles are formalized in the following way),

$$\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-LEM} : \forall\alpha\neg\neg\forall x(\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0)$$

implies Σ^0_1-DNS^0. On the other hand, since $A \vee \neg A$ is equivalent to

$$\exists k((k = 0 \to A) \wedge (k \neq 0 \to \neg A)),$$

$\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-LEM follows from Σ^0_2-DNS^0 (see Proposition 3.1 below). Thus, if one takes the complexity of formulas into account over (many-sorted) intuitionistic arithmetic, the proof of Fact 2.4 does not give us the equivalence at each level of arithmetical hierarchy anymore. Furthermore, since Markov's principle MP (which implies Σ^0_1-DNS^0) is Dialectica interpretable in Gödel's **T** but Σ^0_2-DNS^0 is not, Σ^0_1-DNS^0 does not imply Σ^0_2-DNS^0. Therefore, a natural question arising from this observation is how the interrelation between Σ^0_2-DNS^0, Σ^0_1-DNS^0 and the double negated variant of Σ^0_1-LEM as well as the other double negated variants of the logical principles in Figure 1 looks like.

Moreover, the investigation of such weak logical principles may have importance from a viewpoint of the foundation of constructive mathematics. Although it is our common view that constructive mathematics can be seen "roughly" as mathematics based on intuitionistic logic, it is still debatable whether constructivism can be captured "exactly" by intuitionistic logic. The investigation of weak logical principles will help us to develop a more detailed discussion on the axiomatization of constructive mathematics.

The following is the list of the double negated principles studied in this article:

- $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-LEM: $\forall\alpha\neg\neg\forall x(\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0)$.
- $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-LEM: $\forall\alpha\neg\neg\forall x(\forall y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\forall y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0)$.
- $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DML:
  $\forall\alpha,\beta\neg\neg\forall x(\neg(\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \wedge \exists z\, \beta(x,z) = 0) \to$
  $\neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\exists z\, \beta(x,z) = 0)$.
- $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML:
  $\forall\alpha,\beta\neg\neg\forall x(\neg(\forall y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \wedge \forall z\, \beta(x,z) = 0) \to$
  $\neg\forall y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\forall z\, \beta(x,z) = 0)$.
- $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DNE (or $\neg\neg$MP): $\forall\alpha\neg\neg\forall x(\neg\neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \to \exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0)$.
- $\neg\neg\Delta_a$-LEM:
  $\forall\alpha,\beta\neg\neg\forall x((\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \leftrightarrow \neg\exists z\, \beta(x,z) = 0) \to$
  $\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0)$.
- $\neg\neg\Delta_b$-LEM:
  $\forall\alpha,\beta\neg\neg\forall x((\neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \leftrightarrow \exists z\, \beta(x,z) = 0) \to$
  $\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0)$.

Some short discussions on the double negated principles can be found in [19]. In addition, Ščedrov and Vesley [21] study Σ^0_1-DNS^0 in connection with Markov's principle MP in some different context.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

REMARK 2.5. In the following, we also consider the closed function-parameter-free fragments in the sense of Remark 2.1 of the above principles. For example, the closed function-parameter-free fragment $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-LEM$^-$ of $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-LEM is the following:

$$\neg\neg\forall x(\exists y\, t(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\exists y\, t(x,y) = 0),$$

where t is a closed primitive recursive function term. To allow for number parameters in the function-parameter-free fragments of the double negated principles above, i.e., to consider the seemingly more general "$\forall z\neg\neg\forall x$"-form (with number parameters z) is in fact not stronger as it intuitionistically already follows from the "$\neg\neg\forall z, x$"-form which is (coding z, x into a single variable) an instance of our form without "$\forall z$". Therefore, as in Remark 2.1, the function-parameter-free double negated principles above are equivalent to their closed function-parameter-free fragments (so we simply say "function-parameter-free fragment" and denote this with a superscript "$-$" as for the principles without double negations) and—by the same reasoning as in Remark 2.1—in turn equivalent to their first-order counterparts. In the presence of CT, even the second-order versions are equivalent to the first-order counterparts.

REMARK 2.6. In contrast to all other principles treated in this article, for our fragments of DNS^0, it makes a difference whether one only has closed instances or allows number parameters to function-parameter-free fragments. On the other hand, the full DNS^0 allowing number parameters already follows from the parameter-free version of DNS^0 via Fact 2.4 (in the language of arithmetic) and the discussion in Remark 2.5.

§3. Derivability results. In the following, we reason in standard contexts of intuitionistic arithmetic (see Remark 3.3).

PROPOSITION 3.1. Σ^0_2-DNS^0 *implies* $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-LEM.

PROOF. Fix α. Note that

$$\forall x\neg\neg(\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0) \tag{1}$$

is intuitionistically provable. Since

$$\begin{aligned}(1) &\Leftrightarrow \forall x\neg\neg\exists m((m = 0 \to \exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0) \wedge (m \neq 0 \to \forall z\, \alpha(x,z) \neq 0))\\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall x\neg\neg\exists m, y\forall z((m = 0 \to \alpha(x,y) = 0) \wedge (m \neq 0 \to \alpha(x,z) \neq 0)),\end{aligned}$$

by applying Σ^0_2-DNS^0, we have

$$\neg\neg\forall x(\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0). \qquad \dashv$$

PROPOSITION 3.2.
1. $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-LEM *is equivalent to* $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DNE + $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-LEM.
2. $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-LEM *implies* $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DML.
3. $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DML *implies* $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML.
4. $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DNE *implies* $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML.
5. $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML *implies* $\neg\neg\Delta_a$-LEM.
6. $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DNE *is equivalent to* $\neg\neg\Delta_b$-LEM.
7. $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DNE *implies* Σ^0_1-DNS^0.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROOF. The proofs for the versions without double negations work. See [1, Theorem 3.1] for (1) and (2). See [11, Proposition 1] for (3) and (4). See [9, Proposition 4] and [9, Proposition 1] for (5) and (6), respectively. (7) is straightforward.

Note that the notation Σ^0_1-LLPO is used for the first-order counterpart of Σ^0_1-DML in [1], the notations MP, SEP and $\mathrm{MP}_\vee$ are used for (the equivalents of) Σ^0_1-DNE, Σ^0_1-DML, and Π^0_1-DML, respectively, in [11], and the notations MP, $\mathrm{MP}_\vee$, IIIa and IIIb are used for (the equivalents of) Σ^0_1-DNE, Π^0_1-DML, Δ_a-LEM and Δ_b-LEM in [9]. ⊣

REMARK 3.3. The proofs can be formalized in standard intuitionistic arithmetic with two-sorted variables like EL or many-sorted variables as in HA^ω in [25]. In fact, all of our derivability results hold even in a stronger sense. Let us write the instance of each principle $\mathrm{P_i}$ for a particular α (possibly a tuple) as $\neg\neg\mathrm{P_i^-}(\alpha)$. Then, for each derivability result of $\mathrm{P_2}$ from $\mathrm{P_1}$, one can notice that HA^ω (in the sense of [25]) proves

$$\neg\neg\mathrm{P_1^-}(t\alpha) \to \neg\neg\mathrm{P_2^-}(\alpha)$$

for some closed term $t^{1\to 1}$ in $\mathbf{T_0}$, which is the subset of $\mathbf{T}$ involving only type-0 recursor R_0 (see [14, Chapter 3] for details). Therefore, since type-1 closed terms in $\mathbf{T_0}$ are just primitive recursive functions over natural numbers and each first-order counterpart is equivalent to the corresponding function-parameter-free fragment (see Remark 2.1), it follows that all of the derivability results for the first-order counterparts in the sense of [1] also hold over first-order (Heyting) arithmetic using that HA^ω is conservative over HA (see [25, 3.6.2]).

§4. Underivability results. As systems for the underivability results, we employ intuitionistic finite-type arithmetic (with extensionality) HA^ω ($\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega$) and elementary intuitionistic analysis EL from [7, 14, 25]. We first recall the following schemata (which may contain parameters of any finite types) where ρ, τ are arbitrary types and we may also have tuples of variables:

- AC: $\forall x^\rho \exists y^\tau A(x,y) \to \exists Y^{\rho\to\tau} \forall x^\rho A(x, Y(x))$.
- $\mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}}$: $(A_{\mathrm{ef}} \to \exists x^\rho B(x)) \to \exists x^\rho (A_{\mathrm{ef}} \to B(x^\rho))$, where A_{ef} is $\exists$-free (i.e., A_{ef} does not contain $\exists, \vee$) and does not contain x free.
- $\mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall$: $\big(\forall u^\tau A_{\mathrm{qf}}(u) \to \exists x^\rho B(x)\big) \to \exists x^\rho \big(\forall u^\tau A_{\mathrm{qf}}(u) \to B(x)\big)$, where A_{qf} is quantifier-free and does not contain x free.
- M^ω: $\neg\neg\exists x^\rho A_{\mathrm{qf}}(x) \to \exists x^\rho A_{\mathrm{qf}}(x)$, where $A_{\mathrm{qf}}(x)$ is quantifier-free.

The following principle, which states that every function is recursive, is in constructive mathematics sometimes called "Church's thesis".

- CT: $\forall \alpha \exists e \forall x \exists u (T(e,x,u) \wedge \alpha(x) = U(u))$ (see [25, 1.11.7]).

We also recall the principle called "extended Church's thesis".

- ECT_0: $\forall x(A \to \exists y B(x,y)) \to \exists z \forall x (A \to \exists u (T(z,x,u) \wedge B(x, U(u)))$, where A is almost negative (see [25, 3.2.14]) and moreover A, B are arithmetical formulas which contain only number parameters.
- ECT_0^+: ECT_0 with function (type-1) parameters.

While extended Church's thesis ECT_0 is usually defined in the language of HA, we also treat it in elementary intuitionistic analysis EL which is a second-order system.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Note that each instance of ECT_0 and ECT_0^+ does not contain function quantifiers in our setting.

In some proofs, we use the well-known property of Goodstein sequences that Peano arithmetic PA does not prove that every Goodstein sequence terminates (see [13] and also [4]).

THEOREM 4.1. $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Pi^0_1\text{-LEM} \nvdash \Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0$.

PROOF. Let $\forall n^0 \exists m^0\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ be a sentence which states that for all n, the Goodstein sequence starting from n terminates. Note that $G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ is quantifier-free, and hence, it can be represented as $t(n,m) = 0$ for a primitive recursive (in the ordinary sense) t. Suppose that $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Pi^0_1\text{-LEM}$ proves $\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0$. Then one can show that

$$\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Pi^0_1\text{-LEM} + \forall n \neg\neg \exists m\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m) + \neg\exists f \forall n\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n, f(n)) \vdash \bot$$

since $\forall n \neg\neg \exists m\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ implies $\neg\neg \exists f \forall n\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n, f(n))$ in the presence of $\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0$ and AC. Note that $\forall n \neg\neg \exists m\ G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ and $\neg\exists f \forall n\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n, f(n))$ are intuitionistically equivalent to $\exists$-free sentences $\forall n \neg \forall m \neg G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ and $\forall f \neg \forall n\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n, f(n))$, respectively, and also that Π^0_1-LEM is derivable from

$$(\theta) : \exists v^{1\to 0} \leq \lambda\beta.1 \forall \alpha^1((v(\alpha) = 0 \to \forall x\, \alpha(x) = 0) \wedge (v(\alpha) \neq 0 \to \neg\forall x\, \alpha(x) = 0)).$$

Since (θ) is a sentence of the form $\exists v \leq r\, \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ef}}(v)$ where B_{ef} is $\exists$-free and r is a closed term, by the monotone modified realizability interpretation [14, Theorem 7.1(1)], we have that

$$\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + (\theta) + \forall n \neg\neg \exists m\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m) + \neg\exists f \forall n\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n, f(n)) \vdash \bot\ .$$

Now it suffices to show that this system is consistent. Let $\mathcal{S}^\omega$ be the full set-theoretic model (cf. [14, Section 3.6]). Take the functional $g_v \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}}$ in $\mathcal{S}^\omega$ defined by

$$\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}((g_v(\alpha) = 0 \to \forall x\, \alpha(x) = 0) \wedge (g_v(\alpha) \neq 0 \to \neg\forall x\, \alpha(x) = 0)).$$

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of functionals in $\mathcal{S}^\omega$ built up from $g_v \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}}$ and the functionals that interpret closed terms of Gödel's $\mathbf{T}$. Note that $\forall n \exists m\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ is true in $\mathcal{M}$ and that $\exists f \forall n\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n, f(n))$ is false in $\mathcal{M}$: if $\exists f \forall n\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n, f(n))$ would be true in $\mathcal{M}$, since all functionals in $\mathcal{M}$ are majorized by some functional in $\mathbf{T}$ (cf. [14, Proposition 6.6]), one can search primitive recursively (in the sense of $\mathbf{T}$) for the terminating point for each Goodstein sequence, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}$ is a model of $\mathsf{N\text{-}HA}^\omega + (\theta) + \forall n \neg\neg \exists m\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m) + \neg\exists f \forall n\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n, f(n))$ (see [25, 1.6.3–1.6.7] for the "neutral" system $\mathsf{N\text{-}HA}^\omega$). Construct $\mathcal{M}^E$ as the extensional collapse of $\mathcal{M}$ as in the proof of [25, 2.4.5]. Note that the sets of functionals of type 0 and 1 in $\mathcal{M}^E$ are identical with those for $\mathcal{M}$, respectively. Then one can easily see that g_v is in $\mathcal{M}^E$, and hence, $\mathcal{M}^E$ is a model of $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + (\theta) + \forall n \neg\neg \exists m\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m) + \neg\exists f \forall n\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n, f(n))$. ⊣

COROLLARY 4.2. $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{AC}^{0,0} + \neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-LEM} \nvdash \Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0$, *where* $\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}$ *is the axiom schema of countable choice for numbers from Section* 1.

REMARK 4.3. In fact, the proof of Theorem 4.1 shows that $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Pi^0_1\text{-LEM}$ does not prove even the closed function-parameter-free fragment of $\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0$:

$$\forall x \neg\neg \exists y\, t(x,y) = 0 \to \neg\neg \forall x \exists y\, t(x,y) = 0 \ (t : \text{ primitive recursive}).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Therefore it follows that $\mathsf{HA} + \Pi^0_1$-LEM (in the sense of [1]) does not prove the "closed" (note Remark 2.6) first-order counterpart of Σ^0_1-DNS^0 :

$$\forall x \neg\neg \exists y \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}} \to \neg\neg \forall x \exists y \, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}},$$

where A_{qf} is a quantifier-free $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$-formula containing only x and y as its free variables.

Next we show the underivability results for $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML.

THEOREM 4.4. $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNS$^0 \nvdash \neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML.

PROOF. Suppose that $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNS$^0 \vdash \neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML. Then one can see that $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNS^0 proves

$$\begin{aligned}\neg\neg\exists f \forall x (\neg(\forall y \, s(x,y) = 0 \wedge \forall z \, t(x,z) = 0) \to \\ ((f(x) = 0 \to \neg\forall y \, s(x,y) = 0) \wedge (f(x) \neq 0 \to \neg\forall z \, t(x,z) = 0))), \quad (2)\end{aligned}$$

where s, t are primitive recursive functions defined in the proof of [15, Lemma 6]. Note that (2) is equivalent to some $\exists$-free sentence, and hence the modified realizability interpretation of (2) is intuitionistically equivalent to (2) itself (see [14, Remark 5.4(1)]). Since the modified realizability interpretation of Σ^0_1-DNS^0 is intuitionistically equivalent to

$$\forall \alpha (\forall x \neg\neg \exists y \, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \to \neg\neg \exists Y \forall x \, \alpha(x, Y(x)) = 0),$$

it is derived from Σ^0_1-DNS$^0 + \mathrm{QF\text{-}AC}^{0,0}$. Therefore, by [25, Theorem 3.4.5] (see also [14, Theorem 5.8]), we have that

$$\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{QF\text{-}AC}^{0,0} + \Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0 \vdash (2).$$

This is a contradiction since HEO (see [25, 2.4.11]) is a model of $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{QF\text{-}AC}^{0,0} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNS^0 but (2) is not true in HEO as shown in [15, Lemma 6]. ⊣

COROLLARY 4.5. $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \Delta_{\mathrm{a}}\text{-LEM} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNS$^0 \nvdash \neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML.

PROOF. Immediate from Theorem 4.4 and the fact that $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}}$ proves Δ_{a}-LEM (cf. [15, Proposition 1]). ⊣

COROLLARY 4.6. $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{AC}^{0,0} + \neg\neg\Delta_{\mathrm{a}}\text{-LEM} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNS$^0 \nvdash \neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML.

REMARK 4.7. In fact, the proof of Theorem 4.4 shows that $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNS$^0 \nvdash \neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML$^-$, where $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML$^-$ is the function-parameter-free fragment of $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML (in the sense of Remark 2.5). Then it follows from Remark 2.5 (and the proof of Corollary 4.5) that the first-order counterpart of $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML :

$$\neg\neg\forall x (\neg(\forall y \, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}} \wedge \forall z \, \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{qf}}) \to \neg\forall y \, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}} \vee \neg\forall z \, \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{qf}}),$$

where A_{qf} and B_{qf} are quantifier-free $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$-formulas, is not provable in $\mathsf{HA} + \Delta_{\mathrm{a}}\text{-LEM} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNS^0 (in the language of HA).

In the following, we show the underivability results for $\neg\neg\Delta_{\mathrm{a}}$-LEM with the use of (the proof of) the underivability results for $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML. The following decomposition is helpful in the proofs.

LEMMA 4.8. $\mathsf{EL} \vdash \mathrm{ECT}^+_0 \leftrightarrow \mathrm{ECT}_0 + \mathrm{CT}$. *Thus each instance of* ECT^+_0 *is provable in* $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{CT} + \mathrm{ECT}_0$ (*in the language of* HA).

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROOF. See [7, Lemma 6.3.7]. ⊣

Before we come to the underivability results for $\neg\neg\Delta_a$-LEM, we first provide an underivability result for Δ_a-LEM. In fact, the key idea to obtain the underivability results for $\neg\neg\Delta_a$-LEM, which is originally from [9], appears in the proof of the following theorem:

THEOREM 4.9. $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{ECT}_0^+ + \neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE} \nvdash \Delta_a\text{-LEM}$.

PROOF. Suppose that $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{ECT}_0^+ + \neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE} \vdash \Delta_a\text{-LEM}$. Then, by [9, Proposition 9] and [11, Propositions 1(1), 2], we have that $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{ECT}_0^+ + \neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE}$ proves $\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE}$ (MP), and hence, $\forall x(\neg\neg\exists z\, T(x,x,z) \to \exists z\, T(x,x,z))$. Since $\neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE}$ is equivalent to its function-parameter-free form $\neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE}^-$:

$$\neg\neg\forall x(\neg\neg\exists y\, s(x,y) = 0 \to \exists y\, s(x,y) = 0)\ (s : \text{primitive recursive})$$

in the presence of CT (see also Remark 2.5), by Lemma 4.8, we have that

$$\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{CT} + \mathrm{ECT}_0 + \neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE}^- \vdash \forall x(\neg\neg\exists z\, T(x,x,z) \to \exists z\, T(x,x,z)).$$

Since $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{CT}$ is conservative over HA for $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$-formulas (cf. [25, Theorem 3.6.2]), we have that

$$\mathsf{HA} + \mathrm{ECT}_0 + \neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE}^- \vdash \forall x(\neg\neg\exists z\, T(x,x,z) \to \exists z\, T(x,x,z)).$$

Note that the instances of $\neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE}^-$ and $\forall x(\neg\neg\exists z\, T(x,x,z) \to \exists z\, T(x,x,z))$ are almost negative. Then, by using Kleene realizability as in [9, Remark 6], we have that

$$\mathsf{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE}^- \vdash \forall x(\neg\neg\exists z\, T(x,x,z) \to \exists z\, T(x,x,z)).$$

Since $\neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE}^-$ is modified realizable in Gödel's $\mathbf{T}$ (in fact, the realizer of $\neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE}^-$ is empty) verifiably in $\mathcal{S}^\omega$, it follows that $\forall x(\neg\neg\exists z\, T(x,x,z) \to \exists z\, T(x,x,z))$ is modified realizable in $\mathbf{T}$ verifiably in $\mathcal{S}^\omega$, which is a contradiction as any *mr*-realizer could be used to decide the special halting problem $\{x : \exists z\, T(x,x,z)\}$. ⊣

REMARK 4.10. By a careful inspection, one can even show that $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{ECT}_0^+ + \neg\neg\Sigma_1^0\text{-DNE} \nvdash \Delta_a\text{-LEM}^-$, where $\Delta_a\text{-LEM}^-$ is the function-parameter-free fragment of $\Delta_a\text{-LEM}^-$:

$$\forall x((\exists y\, s(x,y) = 0 \leftrightarrow \forall z\, t(x,z) = 0) \to \exists y\, s(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\exists y\, s(x,y) = 0)\ (s,t : \text{primitive recursive}).$$

At first, one can observe that the proof of [9, Proposition 9] shows that $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{ECT}_0^+ + \Delta_a\text{-LEM}^-$ proves $\Pi_1^0\text{-DML}^-$, where $\Pi_1^0\text{-DML}^-$ is the function-parameter-free fragment of $\Pi_1^0\text{-DML}$:

$$\forall x(\neg(\forall y\, s(x,y) = 0 \wedge \forall z\, t(x,z) = 0) \to \neg\forall y\, s(x,y) = 0 \vee \neg\forall z\, t(x,z) = 0)\ (s,t : \text{primitive recursive}).$$

On the other hand, the proof of [11, Proposition 2] shows that $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{ECT}_0^+$ proves, more than WMP (Weak Markov's principle [11]), even a stronger variant WMP^+ :

$$\forall\alpha(\forall x(\neg\neg\exists n\exists m \le n\, T(x,x,m) \vee \neg\neg\exists n(\alpha(n) \neq 0 \wedge \neg\exists m \le n\, T(x,x,m))) \to \exists x\, \alpha(x) \neq 0),$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and the proof of [11, Proposition 1(1)] shows that $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{WMP}^{+}+\Pi^0_1\text{-DML}^{-}$ proves the function-parameter-free fragment of MP :

$$\forall x(\neg\neg\exists y\, s(x,y)=0\to\exists y\, s(x,y)=0)\ (s:\text{primitive recursive}).$$

Therefore, as long as $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{ECT}_0^{+}+\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNE}$ proves just $\Delta_{\mathrm{a}}\text{-LEM}^{-}$, it follows that

$$\mathsf{HA}+\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNE}^{-}\vdash\forall x(\neg\neg\exists z\, T(x,x,z)\to\exists z\, T(x,x,z)),$$

which is a contradiction from the proof of Theorem 4.9.

By the above argument, it follows that the first-order Δ_{a}-LEM in [1] is not provable in $\mathsf{HA}+\mathrm{ECT}_0$ augmented with the first-order counterpart of $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DNE.

THEOREM 4.11. $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{ECT}_0^{+}+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0\nvdash\neg\neg\Delta_{\mathrm{a}}\text{-LEM}$.

PROOF. Suppose that $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{ECT}_0^{+}+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0\vdash\neg\neg\Delta_{\mathrm{a}}\text{-LEM}$. Then, as in the proof of [9, Proposition 9], one can show that $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{ECT}_0^{+}+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0$ proves $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-DML}$, in particular,

$$\neg\neg\forall x(\neg(\forall y\, s(x,y)=0\wedge\forall z\, t(x,z)=0)\to\neg\forall y\, s(x,y)=0\vee\neg\forall z\, t(x,z)=0),\tag{3}$$

where s,t are the primitive recursive functions defined in the proof of [15, Lemma 6]. Since $\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0$ is of almost negative form and (3) is intuitionistically derived from its (Kleene) realizability interpretation, as in the proof of Theorem 4.9, one can drop ECT_0^{+} and obtain $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega}+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0(\supset\mathsf{HA}+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0)\vdash(3)$. Then we have that

$$\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega}+\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{IP}^{\omega}_{\mathrm{ef}}+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0\vdash(2)\text{ in the proof of Theorem 4.4},$$

which is a contradiction as shown in (the proof of) Theorem 4.4. ⊣

COROLLARY 4.12. $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0\nvdash\neg\neg\Delta_{\mathrm{a}}\text{-LEM}$.

PROOF. By Theorem 4.11, it suffices to show that $\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}$ is provable in $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{ECT}_0^{+}$. One can easily see that $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{ECT}_0^{+}$ proves the countable choice for all arithmetical formulas. On the other hand, it is straightforward to show that each second-order formula is equivalent to some arithmetical formula in the presence of CT and $\mathrm{QF\text{-}AC}^{0,0}$ (which is contained in EL). Therefore, by Lemma 4.8, the full axiom schema of countable choice for numbers $\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}$ is provable in $\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{ECT}_0^{+}$. ⊣

REMARK 4.13. By inspecting the proofs of [9, Proposition 9], we have that

$$\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{ECT}_0^{+}+\neg\neg\Delta_{\mathrm{a}}\text{-LEM}^{-}\vdash\neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-DML}^{-},$$

where $\neg\neg\Delta_{\mathrm{a}}\text{-LEM}^{-}$ and $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-DML}^{-}$ are function-parameter-free fragments (in the sense of Remark 2.5) of $\neg\neg\Delta_{\mathrm{a}}$-LEM and $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-DML, respectively. Therefore, by the proof of Theorem 4.11, we have that

$$\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{ECT}_0^{+}+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0\nvdash\neg\neg\Delta_{\mathrm{a}}\text{-LEM}^{-}.$$

Since $\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNS}^0$ is equivalent to its function-parameters-free fragments with number parameters:

$$\forall z(\forall x\neg\neg\exists y\, t(x,y,z)=0\to\neg\neg\,\forall x\exists y\, t(x,y,z)=0)\ (t:\text{primitive recursive})$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the presence of CT (see Remarks 2.5 and 5.2 below), it follows (using Lemma 4.8) that the first-order counterpart of $\neg\neg\Delta_a$-LEM :

$$\neg\neg\forall x((\exists y\, \mathrm{A_{qf}} \leftrightarrow \neg\exists z\, \mathrm{B_{qf}}) \to \exists y\, \mathrm{A_{qf}} \vee \neg\exists y\, \mathrm{A_{qf}})$$

is not provable in $\mathsf{HA}+\mathrm{ECT}_0$ augmented with the first-order counterpart of Σ^0_1-DNS^0 with number parameters.

Next we show the underivability results for $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DML.

Lemma 4.14. $\mathsf{HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall + \mathrm{M}^\omega \nvdash \neg\mathrm{CT}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathsf{HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall + \mathrm{M}^\omega \vdash \neg\mathrm{CT}$. Then $\mathsf{HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall + \mathrm{M}^\omega + \mathrm{CT} \vdash \bot$. By [25, 3.6.6(v)], we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \bot$, which is a contradiction. ⊣

Theorem 4.15. $\mathsf{HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall + \mathrm{M}^\omega \nvdash \neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DML.

Proof. It is straightforward to see that $\mathrm{AC}^{0,0} + \neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DML implies

$$\neg\neg\exists\alpha \le 1\forall x((\alpha(x) = 0 \to \neg\exists u(T(x,x,u) \wedge U(u) = 0) \wedge (\alpha(x) \neq 0 \to \neg\exists u(T(x,x,u) \wedge U(u) = 1)). \tag{4}$$

By using this, we claim that

$$\neg\neg\exists\alpha\neg\exists e\forall x\exists u(T(e,x,u) \wedge \alpha(x) = U(u)). \tag{5}$$

We show that the version of (4) without the double negations implies (5) without double negations from which the claim then follows since $(A \to B) \to (\neg\neg A \to \neg\neg B)$. Fix α so that the version of (4) without double negations holds and let e satisfies

$$\forall x\exists u(T(e,x,u) \wedge \alpha(x) = U(u)). \tag{6}$$

Now $\alpha(e) = 0 \vee \alpha(e) \neq 0$ holds. If $\alpha(e) = 0$, then we have $\neg\exists u(T(e,e,u) \wedge U(u) = 0)$ by (4). On the other hand, we have $\exists u(T(e,e,u) \wedge U(u) = \alpha(e) = 0)$ by (6). Thus we have a contradiction. If $\alpha(e) \neq 0$, then $\alpha(e) = 1$. Therefore we obtain a contradiction using (4) and (6) in the same manner. Our theorem follows from Lemma 4.14 since (5) implies ¬CT. ⊣

Corollary 4.16. $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{AC}^{0,0} + \neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DNE $(\neg\neg\mathrm{MP}) \nvdash \neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DML.

Remark 4.17. In fact, the proof of Theorem 4.15 shows that $\mathsf{HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall + \mathrm{M}^\omega \nvdash \neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-$\mathrm{DML}^-$, where $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DML^- is the function-parameter-free fragment of $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DML (in the sense of Remark 2.5). Then it follows from Remark 2.5 that $\mathsf{HA} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNE (in the sense of [1]) does not prove the first-order counterpart of $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-DML:

$$\neg\neg\forall x(\neg(\exists y\, \mathrm{A_{qf}} \wedge \exists z\, \mathrm{B_{qf}}) \to \neg\exists y\, \mathrm{A_{qf}} \vee \neg\exists z\, \mathrm{B_{qf}}),$$

where $\mathrm{A_{qf}}$ and $\mathrm{B_{qf}}$ are quantifier-free $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$-formulas.

Next we show the underivability results for $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-LEM.

Theorem 4.18. $\mathsf{HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall + \mathrm{M}^\omega + \Sigma^0_1$-DML $\nvdash \neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-LEM.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathsf{HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall + \mathrm{M}^\omega + \Sigma^0_1$-DML $\vdash \neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-LEM. As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, let again $\forall n\exists m\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ be the sentence which states that for all n, the Goodstein sequence starting from n terminates. Since $\forall n\exists m\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ is provable in $\mathsf{PA}^\omega + \Pi^0_1$-CA (the termination of the Goodstein sequences is equivalent

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to the 1-consistency of PA which can be proved in the system at hand, see, e.g., [6, P. 941]), where

$$\Pi^0_1\text{-CA}: \forall\alpha\exists\delta\forall x(\delta(x)=0\leftrightarrow\forall y\,\alpha(x,y)=0),$$

by negative translation (see, e.g., [14, Section 10.1]), we have that $\forall n\neg\neg\exists m\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ is provable in $\mathsf{HA}^\omega+(\Pi^0_1\text{-CA})^{\mathrm{N}}$, where $(\Pi^0_1\text{-CA})^{\mathrm{N}}$ is the negative translation of Π^0_1-CA:

$$\forall\alpha\neg\neg\exists\delta\forall x(\delta(x)=0\leftrightarrow\forall y\,\alpha(x,y)=0).$$

Note that $(\Pi^0_1\text{-CA})^{\mathrm{N}}$ is intuitionistically derived from $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-LEM + AC. Therefore, by our assumption (with the use of M^ω), we have that

$$\mathsf{HA}^\omega+\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall+\mathrm{M}^\omega+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DML}\vdash\forall n\exists m\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m).$$

Then, by the monotone Dialectica interpretation (see [14, Chapter 9]), there exists a closed term t in Gödel's $\mathbf{T}$ such that $\forall n\exists m\leq t(n)\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ is verifiable in the full set-theoretic model $\mathcal{S}^\omega$, and hence, a PA-provably recursive function h_t such that $\forall n\in\mathbb{N}\exists m\leq h_t(n)\, G_{\mathrm{qf}}(n,m)$ holds, which is a contradiction to the fact that any such h_t would have to grow faster than provably recursive functions of PA. ⊣

Corollary 4.19.
$\mathsf{EL}+\mathrm{AC}^{0,0}+\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-DNE}\,(\neg\neg\mathrm{MP})+\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-DML}\nvdash\neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-LEM}$.

In contrast to the previous underivability proofs, the proof of Theorem 4.18 does not show that $\mathsf{HA}^\omega+\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall+\mathrm{M}^\omega+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DML}\nvdash\neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-LEM}^-$ unfortunately. Nevertheless, one can establish the corresponding first-order underivability by using further elaborated arguments from proof theory. Recall that $\mathbf{T_n}$ is the subset of closed terms in $\mathbf{T}$ involving only recursors R_ρ with $deg(\rho)\leq n$ (see [14, Chapter 3]).

Theorem 4.20. $\mathsf{HA}^\omega+\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall+\mathrm{M}^\omega+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DML}\nvdash\neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-LEM}^-$, *where* $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-LEM}^-$ *is the function-parameter-free fragment of* $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-LEM:

$$\neg\neg\forall x(\forall y\, t(x,y)=0\vee\neg\forall y\, t(x,y)=0)\ (t:\textit{primitive recursive}).$$

Proof. Suppose that $\mathsf{HA}^\omega+\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall+\mathrm{M}^\omega+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DML}\vdash\neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-LEM}^-$. Note that one can write $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-LEM}^-$ (which officially is an infinite schema) as a single sentence

$$\neg\neg\forall e,x(\neg\exists z\, T(e,x,z)\vee\neg\neg\exists z\, T(e,x,z)).$$

Then there exists $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and a fragment $\mathsf{HA}^{\omega-}\supset\mathsf{HA}_0$ of HA^ω such that $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1\text{-LEM}^-$ is provable in $\mathcal{T}:=\mathsf{HA}^{\omega-}+\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{IP}^\omega_\forall+\mathrm{M}^\omega+\Sigma^0_1\text{-DML}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ has a monotone Dialectica interpretation in $\mathbf{T_n}$. Here HA_0 is the fragment of HA where the induction schema is restricted to quantifier-free formulas (which we identify with its obvious embedding into HA^ω). Then, by Parsons' result [20, Theorem 4], $\mathcal{T}^+:=\mathcal{T}+(\Pi^0_{n+1}\text{-IA})^{\mathrm{N}}$, where $(\Pi^0_{n+1}\text{-IA})^{\mathrm{N}}$ is the negative translation of the Π^0_{n+1}-induction schema (with function parameters), also has a monotone Dialectica interpretation in $\mathbf{T_n}$ (here we use that closed terms in $\mathbf{T_n}$ can be majorized by closed terms in $\mathbf{T_n}$). By our assumption (with the use of M^ω), we have that $\mathcal{T}^+$ proves $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-LEM}^-$, where $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-LEM}^-$ is the function-parameter-free fragment of $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-LEM (in the sense of Remark 2.5). Note that $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-LEM}^-$ and AC derive the double negated comprehension schema $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-CA}^-$ for Σ^{0-}_1-formulas (without

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

loss of generality we may assume the instances of $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-CA^- to be closed). In addition, Σ^0_1-CA^- and $(\Pi^0_{n+1}\text{-}\mathrm{IA})^{\mathrm{N}}$ derive the negative translation $(\Pi^0_{n+2}\text{-}\mathrm{IA}^-)^{\mathrm{N}}$ of the function-parameter-free Π^0_{n+2}-induction schema. Therefore, since $\neg\neg(\Pi^0_{n+2}\text{-}\mathrm{IA}^-)^{\mathrm{N}}$ is intuitionistically equivalent to $(\Pi^0_{n+2}\text{-}\mathrm{IA}^-)^{\mathrm{N}}$, we have that

$$\mathcal{T}^+ \vdash (\Pi^0_{n+2}\text{-}\mathrm{IA}^-)^{\mathrm{N}}.$$

Now let $\mathrm{G} := \forall m\exists k\, \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{qf}}(m,k)$ (with G_{qf} being a quantifier-free formula in $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$) be a sentence stating the totality of some function which is $\mathbf{T_{n+1}}$-definable but not $\mathbf{T_n}$-definable (when interpreted in the full set-theoretic model $\mathcal{S}^\omega$). Since the totality of $\mathbf{T_{n+1}}$-definable functions is provable in $\mathsf{PA}_0 + \Pi^0_{n+2}$-$\mathrm{IA}^-$ (see [20, Lemma 4]), where PA_0 is the fragment of PA where the induction schema is restricted to quantifier-free formulas, there is such a sentence G with

$$\mathsf{HA}_0 + (\Pi^0_{n+2}\text{-}\mathrm{IA}^-)^{\mathrm{N}} \vdash \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{N}}.$$

Therefore, by using M^ω, we have that $\mathcal{T}^+ \vdash \mathrm{G}$. By the monotone Dialectica interpretation of $\mathcal{T}^+$ by terms in $\mathbf{T_n}$ (verifiable in $\mathcal{S}^\omega$) mentioned above, there exists a closed term $t \in \mathbf{T_n}$ such that

$$\mathcal{S}^\omega \models \forall m\exists k\ \leq t(m)\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{qf}}(m,k).$$

Then the function $\tilde{t} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ defined as $\tilde{t}(m) := \min k \leq t(m)\, \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{qf}}(m,k)$ in $\mathbf{T_n}$ satisfy $\forall m\, \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{qf}}(m,\tilde{t}(m))$, which is a contradiction. ⊣

Corollary 4.21. $\mathsf{HA} + \Sigma^0_1$-DNE $+ \Sigma^0_1$-DML *does not prove the first-order counterpart of* $\neg\neg\Pi^0_1$-LEM:

$$\neg\neg\forall x(\forall y \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}} \vee \neg\forall y \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}),$$

where A_{qf} *is a quantifier-free* $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$*-formula.*

We now show underivability results for Σ^0_2-DNS^0 by using a relativized version of the proof of Theorem 4.1. For this we first need the following:

Lemma 4.22. *Let* $\alpha : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ *be defined by the property*

$$\forall e,x\big(\forall z(T(e,x,z) \to T(e,x,\alpha(e,x))) \wedge (\neg T(e,x,\alpha(e,x)) \to \alpha(e,x) = 0)\big).$$

Then there exists a true Π^0_3*-sentence* $\forall x\exists y\forall z \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}(x,y,z)$ *in* $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$ *such that for no* $f \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *that is definable by a closed term of* $\mathbf{T} + \alpha$ *(when interpreted in the full set-theoretic model* $\mathcal{S}^\omega$*) one would have that*

$$\mathcal{S}^\omega \models \forall x\exists y \leq f(x)\forall z\, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}(x,y,z).$$

Proof. In the following we identify α with the unary function $\alpha'(x) := \alpha(j_1(x), j_2(x))$, where j_i are the projections of the Cantor pairing function j.

Let $\{F_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an effective enumeration of all closed terms of type $1 \to 1$ of $\mathbf{T}$. Then

$$F(n) := \max\{F_i(\alpha, j) + 1 : i, j \leq n\}$$

defines a function $\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ which is oracle computable in α (here we identify F_n with its unique interpretation in $\mathcal{S}^\omega$). Clearly, F eventually dominates every function definable in $\mathbf{T} + \alpha$ since any such function has a definition of the form $F_n\alpha$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, but $F(m) > F_n(\alpha, m)$ for all $m \geq n$. Since F is oracle computable in α, by

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Kleene normal form theorem for oracle computations, there exists an $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$F(x) = U(\min m\, \tilde{T}(e, x, \overline{\alpha}(m), m))$$

(here $\overline{\alpha}(m)$ denotes the code for the finite sequence $\langle \alpha(0), \alpha(1), \ldots, \alpha(m-1)\rangle$) for suitable primitive recursive $\tilde{T}, U$, where we may assume that $U(n) \leq n$ since U extracts the value from the code of the terminating computation n.

Consider now (here we identify e with its numeral $\overline{e}$) the $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$-sentence

$$\forall x \exists y\, \tilde{T}(e, x, \overline{\alpha}(y), y). \tag{7}$$

Clearly, by the above, no function definable in $\mathbf{T} + \alpha$ can satisfy

$$\mathcal{S}^\omega \models \forall x \exists y \leq f(x)\, \tilde{T}(e, x, \overline{\alpha}(y), y).$$

We now show that '$\tilde{T}(e, x, \overline{\alpha}(y), y)$' can be written in Σ^0_2-form in $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$: this follows by, first, noting that (here $lth(k)$ and $(k)_i$ denotes, respectively, the length and the i-th element of k (a code for a finite sequence) where we may assume that our sequence coding is surjective as in [25])

$$\tilde{T}(e, x, \overline{\alpha}(y), y) \leftrightarrow \exists k\, (lth(k) = y \wedge \forall i < y((k)_i = \alpha(i)) \wedge \tilde{T}(e, x, k, y))$$

and, second, that (using that $T(x, y, z)$ can hold for at most one z)

$$l = \alpha(i) \leftrightarrow \forall z\, \big(T(j_1(i), j_2(i), z) \to T(j_1(i), j_2(i), l)\big) \wedge (\neg T(j_1(i), j_2(i), l) \to l = 0).$$

So (7) can be written in the form $\forall x \exists y, k \forall z\, \mathrm{A}'_{\mathrm{qf}}(x, y, k, z)$ in $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$ for some quantifier-free $\mathrm{A}'_{\mathrm{qf}}$ so that no $(\mathbf{T} + \alpha)$-definable function f can bound '$\exists y$' and so also not '$\exists y$' in

$$\forall x \exists y \forall z\, \underbrace{\mathrm{A}'_{\mathrm{qf}}(x, j_1(y), j_2(y), z)}_{\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}(x,y,z) :\equiv}$$

(here we use that $y \geq j_1(y), j_2(y)$) which finishes the proof. ⊣

THEOREM 4.23. $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Pi^0_2\text{-LEM}^- \nvdash (\Sigma^0_2\text{-DNS}^0)^-$, *where* $\Pi^0_2\text{-LEM}^-$ *is the function-parameter-free fragment of* Π^0_2-LEM:

$$\forall x(\forall y \exists z\, s(x, y, z) = 0 \vee \neg \forall y \exists z\, s(x, y, z) = 0)\ (s : \textit{primitive recursive})$$

and $(\Sigma^0_2\text{-DNS}^0)^-$ *is the "closed"* (*note Remark* 2.6) *function-parameter-free fragment of* Σ^0_2-DNS^0:

$$\forall x \neg\neg \exists y \forall z\, t(x, y, z) = 0 \to \neg\neg \forall x \exists y \forall z\, t(x, y, z) = 0\ (t : \textit{primitive recursive}).$$

PROOF. Suppose that $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Pi^0_2\text{-LEM}^- \vdash (\Sigma^0_2\text{-DNS}^0)^-$. Since every Σ^0_1-predicate $\exists z\, s(x, y, z) = 0$ for a primitive recursive s is (provably in HA) of the form $\exists z\, T(\bar{e}, j(x, y), z)$ for some $e \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Pi^0_2\text{-LEM}^-$ can be written as a single sentence

$$\forall e, x(\forall y \exists z\, T(e, j(x, y), z) \vee \neg \forall y \exists z\, T(e, j(x, y), z)).$$

Add a new function symbol α and its defining axiom (α):

$$\forall e, x\big(\forall z(T(e, x, z) \to T(e, x, \alpha(e, x))) \wedge (\neg T(e, x, \alpha(e, x)) \to \alpha(e, x) = 0)\big).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Then one can easily see that Π^0_2-LEM$^-$ is derivable from Π^0_1-LEM and (α). Therefore we have that

$$\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + \Pi^0_1\text{-LEM} + (\alpha) \vdash (\Sigma^0_2\text{-DNS}^0)^-.$$

Take the true Π^0_3-sentence $\forall x \exists y \forall z \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}(x, y, z)$ (for this α) from Lemma 4.22. By the above, we have that

$$\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + \mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{IP}^\omega_{\mathrm{ef}} + (\theta) + (\alpha) + \forall x \neg\neg \exists y \forall z\, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}(x, y, z) + \neg\exists f \forall x, z\, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}(x, f(x), z) \vdash \bot,$$

where (θ) is as in the proof of Theorem 4.1. Since (α) is $\exists$-free, by the monotone modified realizability [14, Theorem 7.1(1)], we have that

$$\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + (\theta) + (\alpha) + \forall x \neg\neg \exists y \forall z\, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}(x, y, z) + \neg\exists f \forall x, z\, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}(x, f(x), z) \vdash \bot$$

as before. However, by constructing its model as in the proof of Theorem 4.1 with "closed term of $\mathbf{T}$" replaced by "closed term of $\mathbf{T} + \alpha$" etc., we have that $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega + (\theta) + (\alpha) + \forall x \neg\neg \exists y \forall z\, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}(x, y, z) + \neg\exists f \forall x, z\, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{qf}}(x, f(x), z)$ is consistent. Here we use that by majorization every closed term $t[g_v, \alpha]$ of $\mathbf{T} + g_v + \alpha$ (with g_v being some constant representing the equally denoted functional in the proof of Theorem 4.1) can be majorized (valid in $\mathcal{S}^\omega$) by a term $t^*[1^2, \alpha^M]$ in $\mathbf{T}{+}(\alpha)$, where $\alpha^M(x) := \max\{\alpha(i) : i \leq x\}$ majorizes α (see [14, Chapter 6] for the definition of t^*). ⊣

Corollary 4.24. $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{CT} + \Pi^0_2\text{-LEM} \nvdash (\Sigma^0_2\text{-DNS}^0)^-$, *where* Π^0_2-LEM *is*

$$\forall \alpha \forall x (\forall y \exists z\, \alpha(x, y, z) = 0 \vee \neg\forall y \exists z\, \alpha(x, y, z) = 0).$$

Proof. Suppose that $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{CT} + \Pi^0_2\text{-LEM} \vdash (\Sigma^0_2\text{-DNS}^0)^-$. Note that Π^0_2-LEM is equivalent to its function-parameter-free fragment Π^0_2-LEM$^-$ in the presence of CT (see also Remark 2.1). Since $\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{CT}$ is conservative over HA for $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{HA})$-formulas (cf. [25, Theorem 3.6.2]), we have that

$$\mathsf{HA} + \Pi^0_2\text{-LEM}^- \vdash (\Sigma^0_2\text{-DNS}^0)^-,$$

which contradicts Theorem 4.23. ⊣

Since Π^0_2-LEM implies Σ^0_1-LEM, we have the following:

Corollary 4.25. $\mathsf{EL} + \neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-LEM} \nvdash \Sigma^0_2\text{-DNS}^0$. *The analogous result for the first-order counterparts also holds.*

Remark 4.26 (Warning). The situation dramatically changes in the presence of the combination of the axiom schema of countable choice for numbers and $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-LEM (where function parameters are allowed). In fact, one can show without difficulty that $\mathsf{EL} + \Pi^0_1\text{-AC} + \neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-LEM}$ proves $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_n$-LEM for any n, thus the hierarchy above $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-LEM collapses. Then, of course, $\mathsf{EL} + \Pi^0_1\text{-AC} + \neg\neg\Sigma^0_1\text{-LEM}$ proves Σ^0_2-DNS^0. Theorem 4.23 and Corollary 4.25 state that if Π^0_1-AC or the function-parameter condition for $\neg\neg\Sigma^0_1$-LEM is lacking, Σ^0_2-DNS^0 is already underivable. In this sense, our results are optimal.

§5. Some additional comments. As mentioned in Remark 2.3, there are essentially three ways of formalization of Δ_{a}-LEM and those three are pairwise equivalent over EL. This is also the case for Σ^0_1-DNE, Σ^0_1-DML, Π^0_1-DML, and Δ_{b}-LEM. In

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particular, the following three formalizations of Σ^0_1-DNE (Markov's principle) are pairwise equivalent over EL:

1. $\forall\alpha\forall x(\neg\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\to\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0)$,
2. $\forall\alpha(\forall x\neg\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\to\forall x\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0)$,
3. $\forall\alpha(\neg\neg\exists y\,\alpha(y)=0\to\exists y\,\alpha(y)=0)$.

However, this is not the case for the double negated variants. In particular, the definitions of double negated variants based on the third-type of formalizations do not make sense. This is just because

$$\forall\alpha\neg\neg(\exists n\,\alpha(n)=0\vee\neg\exists n\,\alpha(n)=0)$$

is provable intuitionistically. In this article, our definitions of double negated variants are based on the first-type of formalizations. On the other hand, if we consider the double negated variant of the second formalization of Σ^0_1-DNE, we have

$$\forall\alpha\neg\neg(\forall x\neg\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\to\forall x\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0),$$

which is intuitionistically equivalent to Σ^0_1-DNS^0. Thus Σ^0_1-DNS^0 can be seen as a different formalization of a double negated variant of Σ^0_1-DNE. Therefore it seems to be interesting to study the double negated variants of Σ^0_1-DNE, Σ^0_1-DML, Π^0_1-DML, Δ_a-LEM, Δ_b-LEM in this sense. However, here we leave it as a future work except for the equivalence between Σ^0_1-DNS^0 and

$$\begin{aligned}&\neg\neg\Delta_b\text{-LEM}'\colon\\&\forall\alpha,\beta\neg\neg(\forall x(\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\leftrightarrow\exists z\,\beta(x,z)=0)\to\\&\qquad\forall x(\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\vee\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0)).\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.1. *Σ^0_1-DNS^0 is intuitionistically equivalent to $\neg\neg\Delta_b$-LEM$'$.*

Proof. We first show that Σ^0_1-DNS^0 implies

$$\forall\alpha,\beta(\forall x(\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\leftrightarrow\exists z\,\beta(x,z)=0)\to\neg\neg\forall x(\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\vee\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0)),$$

which is intuitionistically equivalent to $\neg\neg\Delta_b$-LEM$'$. Fix α,β such that

$$\forall x(\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\leftrightarrow\exists z\,\beta(x,z)=0).\tag{8}$$

Note that

$$\forall x\neg\neg(\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\vee\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0)\tag{9}$$

is intuitionistically provable. By our assumption (8), (9) is equivalent to

$$\forall x\neg\neg(\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\vee\exists z\,\beta(x,z)=0),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\forall x\neg\neg\exists m,y,z((m=0\to\alpha(x,y)=0\wedge(m\neq0\to\beta(x,z)=0)).$$

By Σ^0_1-DNS^0, we have

$$\neg\neg\forall x\exists m,y,z((m=0\to\alpha(x,y)=0\wedge(m\neq0\to\beta(x,z)=0)),$$

which is shown to be equivalent to

$$\neg\neg\forall x(\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0\vee\neg\exists y\,\alpha(x,y)=0)$$

again by using (8).

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the following, we show that $\neg\neg\Delta_b$-LEM$'$ implies Σ^0_1-DNS^0. Fix α such that $\forall x \neg\neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0$. By $\neg\neg\Delta_b$-LEM$'$, we have

$$\forall\beta\big(\forall x(\neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \leftrightarrow \exists z\, \beta(x,z) = 0) \rightarrow \neg\neg\forall x(\neg\neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \rightarrow \exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0)\big). \tag{10}$$

One can easily show the hypothesis of (10) by taking β as constant-1 function. Then we have

$$\neg\neg\forall x(\neg\neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0 \rightarrow \exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0),$$

which implies $\neg\neg\forall x \exists y\, \alpha(x,y) = 0$ by our assumption. ⊣

REMARK 5.2. From this perspective, it is also possible to see Σ^0_1-DNS^0 as a third-type formalization of

$$\forall\alpha\forall z(\forall x\neg\neg\exists y\, \alpha(x,y,z) = 0 \rightarrow \neg\neg\forall x\exists y\, \alpha(x,y,z) = 0). \tag{11}$$

However, one can easily show that all of three formalizations of (11) and three formalizations of the double negated variants of (11) are pairwise equivalent.

§6. Summary. We have shown all the underivability results in their strongest form, namely,

$$\mathsf{EL} + \mathrm{P}_i \nvdash \mathrm{P}_j^-,$$

and so they hold, in particular, over both of EL and HA. On the other hand, as mentioned in Remark 3.3, all the derivability results also hold over both of EL and HA. Thus our results are summarized in Figure 2. Note that whenever an implication does not follow by transitivity from Figure 2 then it actually does not hold.




FIGURE 2. Interrelation between our logical principles over EL or HA.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

§7. **Acknowledgments.** The first author is partially supported by Waseda University Grant for Special Research Projects (Project number: 2016S-173) and also by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP16H07289. The second author has been partially supported by the German Science Foundation (DFG Project KO 1737/5-2).

REFERENCES

[1] Y. Akama, S. Berardi, S. Hayashi, and U. Kohlenbach, *An arithmetical hierarchy of the law of excluded middle and related principles*, ***Proceedings of the 19th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science***, LICS '04, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, 2004, pp. 192–201.

[2] J. Avigad and S. Feferman, *Gödel's functional ("Dialectica") interpretation*, ***Handbook of Proof Theory*** (S. R. Buss, editor), Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 137, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998, pp. 337–405.

[3] S. Berardi and S. Steila, *Ramsey theorem for pairs as a classical principle in intuitionistic arithmetic*, ***19th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs*** (R. Matthes and A. Schubert, editors), Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, vol. 26, Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik GmbH, Wadern, 2014, pp. 64–83.

[4] E. A. Cichon, *A short proof of two recently discovered independence results using recursion theoretic methods*. ***Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society***, vol. 87 (1983), no. 4, pp. 704–706.

[5] F. G. Dorais, *Classical consequences of continuous choice principles from intuitionistic analysis*. ***Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic***, vol. 55 (2014), no. 1, pp. 25–39.

[6] S. Feferman, *Theories of finite type related to mathematical practice*, ***Handbook of Mathematical Logic*** (J. Barwise, editor), Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 90, Elsevier, 1977, pp. 913–971.

[7] M. Fujiwara, ***Intuitionistic and uniform provability in reverse mathematics***, Ph.D. thesis, Tohoku University, 2015.

[8] ———, *Intuitionistic provability versus uniform provability in* RCA, ***Evolving Computability*** (A. Beckmann, V. Mitrana, and M. Soskova, editors), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9136, Springer, Cham, 2015, pp. 186–195.

[9] M. Fujiwara, H. Ishihara, and T. Nemoto, *Some principles weaker than Markov's principle*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic***, vol. 54 (2015), no. 7–8, pp. 861–870.

[10] K. Gödel, *Über eine bisher noch nicht benützte Erweiterung des finiten Standpunktes*. ***Dialectica***, vol. 12 (1958), pp. 280–287.

[11] H. Ishihara, Markov's principle, Church's thesis and Lindelöf's theorem. ***Indagationes Mathematicae*** (***N.S.***), vol. 4 (1993), no. 3, pp. 321–325.

[12] ———, *Constructive reverse mathematics: Compactness properties*, ***From Sets and Types to Topology and Analysis*** (L. Crosilla and P. Schuster, editors), Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 48, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005, pp. 245–267.

[13] L. Kirby and J. Paris, *Accessible independence results for Peano arithmetic*. ***Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society***, vol. 14 (1982), no. 4, pp. 285–293.

[14] U. Kohlenbach, ***Applied Proof Theory: Proof Interpretations and Their Use in Mathematics***, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.

[15] ———, *On the disjunctive Markov principle*. ***Studia Logica***, vol. 103 (2015), no. 6, pp. 1313–1317.

[16] G. Kreisel, *Proof theoretic results on intuitionistic first order arithmetic, abstract for the meeting of the Association for Symbolic Logic, Leeds 1962*, this Journal, vol. 27 (1962), no. 3, pp. 379–380.

[17] G. Kreisel and A. S. Troelstra, *Formal systems for some branches of intuitionistic analysis*. ***Annals of Pure and Applied Logic***, vol. 1 (1970), pp. 229–387.

[18] R. Kuyper, *On weihrauch reducibility and intuitionistic reverse mathematics*, this Journal, vol. 82 (2017), no. 4, pp. 1438–1458.

[19] J. R. Moschovakis, *Note on* Π^0_{n+1}-LEM, Σ^0_{n+1}-LEM, Π^0_{n+1}-DNE. ***Proceedings of 5th Panhellenic Logic Symposium***, University of Athens, Athens, Greece, 2005.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[20] C. Parsons, *On n-quantifier induction*, this Journal, vol. 37 (1972), pp. 466–482.

[21] A. Scedrov and R. E. Vesley, *On a weakening of Markov's principle*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic Grundlagenforsch***, vol. 23 (1983), no. 3–4, pp. 153–160.

[22] S. G. Simpson, ***Subsystems of Second Order Arithmetic***, second ed., Perspectives in Logic, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.

[23] C. Spector, *Provably recursive functionals of analysis: A consistency proof of analysis by an extension of principles formulated in current intuitionistic mathematics*, ***Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, vol. V*** (J. C. E. Dekker, editor), American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1962, pp. 1–27.

[24] M. Toftdal, *A calibration of ineffective theorems of analysis in a hierarchy of semi-classical logical principles* (*extended abstract*), ***Automata, Languages and Programming*** (J. Díaz, J. Karhumäki, A. Lepistö, and D. Sannella, editors), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3142, Springer, Berlin, 2004, pp. 1188–1200.

[25] A. S. Troelstra, editor, ***Metamathematical Investigation of Intuitionistic Arithmetic and Analysis***, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 344, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1973.

[26] A. S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen, ***Constructivism in Mathematics, An Introduction, vol. I***, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 121, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988. An introduction.

[27] ———, ***Constructivism in Mathematics, An Introduction, vol. II***, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 123, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988. An introduction.

WASEDA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
WASEDA UNIVERSITY
1-6-1 NISHI WASEDA, SHINJUKU-KU
TOKYO 169-8050, JAPAN
E-mail: makoto_fujiwara@aoni.waseda.jp

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK
TU DARMSTADT
SCHLOSSGARTENSTRASSE 7
D-64289 DARMSTADT, GERMANY
E-mail: kohlenbach@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press