

Automorphisms of Models of Bounded Arithmetic*

Ali Enayat
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
American University
4400 Mass. Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20016-8050
e-mail: enayat@american.edu

May 15, 2006

Abstract

We establish the following model theoretic characterization of the fragment $I\Delta_0 + Exp + B\Sigma_1$ of Peano arithmetic in terms of *fixed points* of automorphisms of models of bounded arithmetic (the fragment $I\Delta_0$ of Peano arithmetic with induction limited to Δ_0 -formulae).

Theorem A. *The following two conditions are equivalent for a countable model \mathfrak{M} of the language of arithmetic:*

- (a) \mathfrak{M} satisfies $I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1 + Exp$.
- (b) $\mathfrak{M} = I_{fix}(j)$ for some nontrivial automorphism j of an end extension \mathfrak{N} of \mathfrak{M} that satisfies $I\Delta_0$.

Here $I_{fix}(j)$ is the largest initial segment of the domain of j that is pointwise fixed by j , Exp is the axiom asserting the totality of the exponential function, and $B\Sigma_1$ is the Σ_1 -collection scheme consisting of the universal closure of formulae of the form

$$[\forall x < a \exists y \varphi(x, y)] \rightarrow [\exists z \forall x < a \exists y < z \varphi(x, y)],$$

where φ is a Δ_0 -formula. Theorem A was inspired by a theorem of Smoryński, but the method of proof of Theorem A is quite different and yields the following strengthening of Smoryński's result:

Theorem B. *Suppose \mathfrak{M} is a countable recursively saturated model of PA and I is a proper initial segment of \mathfrak{M} that is closed under exponentiation. There is a group embedding $j \mapsto \hat{j}$ from $Aut(\mathbb{Q})$ into*

*2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03F30, 03C62, 03H15; Secondary 03C15, 20B27.

$Aut(\mathfrak{M})$ such that $I = I_{fix}(\hat{j})$ for every nontrivial $j \in Aut(\mathbb{Q})$. Moreover, if j is fixed point free, then the fixed point set of \hat{j} is isomorphic to \mathfrak{M} .

Here $Aut(X)$ is the group of automorphisms of the structure X , and \mathbb{Q} is the ordered set of rationals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION
2. PRELIMINARIES
 - FIRST ORDER ARITHMETIC
 - SET THEORY AND COMBINATORICS WITHIN BOUNDED ARITHMETIC
 - RECURSIVE SATURATION
3. AUTOMORPHISMS AND $I\Delta_0 + EXP + B\Sigma_1$
 - THE PROOF OF $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$ OF THEOREM A
 - THE PROOF OF $(b) \Rightarrow (a)$ OF THEOREM A
4. SMORYŃSKI'S THEOREM, REVISITED
5. A REFINEMENT OF THEOREM A

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent work [E-1, E-2] the author has embarked upon the project of characterizing *strong* foundational axiomatic systems of set theory and arithmetic in terms of the fixed point sets of automorphisms of models of *weak* systems of set theory and arithmetic. For example [E-1, Theorem B] shows that if j is a nontrivial automorphism of a model \mathfrak{N} of a weak system of set theory whose set of fixed points form an *initial segment* of \mathfrak{N} , then the set of fixed points gives rise to a model of full Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory ZFC that additionally satisfies the scheme Φ asserting the existence of Σ_n -reflective n -Mahlo cardinals of all finite orders n . Moreover, this result has a strong “reversal”: every completion of $ZFC + \Phi$ has a model

\mathfrak{M} which has an elementary end extension to a model \mathfrak{N} that possesses a nontrivial automorphism whose set of fixed points is precisely the universe of \mathfrak{M} [E-1, Theorem A]. As explained in [E-1, E-2], this project is intimately linked to the study of the metamathematics of the system NFU , the system introduced by Jensen [J] as a modification of Quine’s unorthodox *New Foundations (NF)* system of set theory with a universal set introduced in [Q]. However, the fruits of the project can equally well be viewed as contributions to the chapter of model theory that focuses on structural characterizations of axiomatic theories, especially foundational ones¹.

The paper [E-2] extended the set theoretical ideas initiated in [E-1] to the realm of arithmetic and exhibited model theoretic characterizations of PA (Peano arithmetic), ACA_0 (arithmetical comprehension schema with restricted induction), and Z_2 (full second order arithmetic) in terms of automorphisms of models of bounded arithmetic (the fragment $I\Delta_0$ of PA). The characterization of PA in [E-2] is analogous to the aforementioned characterization of $ZFC + \Phi$: [E-2, Theorem B] shows that if j is a nontrivial automorphism of a model \mathfrak{N} of $I\Delta_0$ whose set of fixed points M form an initial segment of \mathfrak{N} , then $(M, \oplus^{\mathfrak{N}}, \odot^{\mathfrak{N}})$ is a model of PA . Moreover, every model \mathfrak{M} of PA has an elementary end extension to a model \mathfrak{N} that possesses a nontrivial automorphism j whose set of fixed points is precisely M (the latter result is implicit in Gaifman’s [Ga], but it is given a new proof in [E-2, Theorem A]).

In this paper we take a further step in the arithmetical realm of our project by characterizing the important fragment $I\Delta_0 + Exp + B\Sigma_1$ of PA in terms of automorphisms of models of $I\Delta_0$. More specifically, in Theorem A of Section 3 we prove that countable models of the language of first order arithmetic that satisfy $I\Delta_0 + Exp + B\Sigma_1$ are precisely countable models of the form

$$I_{fix}(j) := \{x \in dom(j) : \forall y \leq x \ j(y) = y\},$$

where j is a nontrivial automorphism of a model of $I\Delta_0$. This result was motivated by a theorem, due to Smoryński [Sm], that shows that any proper initial segment of a countable recursively saturated model \mathfrak{M} of PA that is

¹Two prominent sources of work in this direction that deal with arithmetical theories are those by Ressayre [R] and Kaye [Ka-1]. Ressayre’s work provides characterizations of PA , and its fragment $I\Sigma_1$, in terms of *endomorphisms* of models of $I\Delta_0$ onto proper initial segments of themselves. Kaye’s work, on the other hand, characterizes PA amongst extensions of $I\Delta_0 + Exp$ in terms of the behavior of elementary extensions of its models.

closed under exponentiation can be realized as $I_{fix}(j)$ for some automorphism j of \mathfrak{M} . However, our methods are quite different from Smoryński's, and as shown in Theorem B of Section 4, they yield a perspicuous proof of an extension of his result. In Section 5 we discuss further work which characterizes the conservative *second order* extension WKL_0^* of $I\Delta_0 + Exp + B\Sigma_1$.

Acknowledgments. I am indebted to the anonymous referee for helpful comments on earlier drafts of the paper, and most importantly, for detecting a gap in my initial attempt in establishing part (a) of Lemma 3.7. I am also grateful to Roman Kossak and Jim Schmerl for steady encouragement, to Zosia Adamowicz, Jeremy Avigad, Jerry Keisler, Joe Mileti, Steve Simpson, and Robert Solovay for stimulating correspondence, and to Mauro Di Nasso for inviting me to present my work in Pisa during June 2004.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we review key notions and results regarding the metamathematics of first order arithmetic that are central to this paper. We refer the reader to the texts of Hájek-Pudlák [HP] and Kaye [Ka-2] for further elaboration.

First Order Arithmetic

- The language of first order arithmetic, \mathcal{L}_A , is $\{+, \cdot, Succ(x), <, 0\}$.
- Models of \mathcal{L}_A are of the form $\mathfrak{M} = (M, \oplus^{\mathfrak{M}}, \cdot^{\mathfrak{M}}, \dots)$, $\mathfrak{N} = (N, \oplus^{\mathfrak{N}}, \cdot^{\mathfrak{N}}, \dots)$, etc. For models \mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{N} of \mathcal{L}_A , we say that \mathfrak{N} *end extends* \mathfrak{M} (equivalently: \mathfrak{M} is an *initial* submodel of \mathfrak{N}), written $\mathfrak{M} \subseteq_e \mathfrak{N}$, if \mathfrak{M} is a submodel of \mathfrak{N} and $a < b$ for every $a \in M$, and $b \in N \setminus M$. \mathfrak{N} is a *cofinal extension* of \mathfrak{M} , written $\mathfrak{M} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{N}$ if for every $b \in N$ there is some $a \in M$ with $a < b$.
- Given a language $\mathcal{L} \supseteq \mathcal{L}_A$, an \mathcal{L} -formula φ is said to be a $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$ -*formula* if all the quantifiers of φ are bounded by terms of \mathcal{L} , i.e., they are of the form $\exists x \leq t$, or of the form $\forall x \leq t$, where t is a term of \mathcal{L} not involving x . $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$ -formulae are also known as *bounded* formulas of \mathcal{L} . A $\Sigma_1(\mathcal{L})$ -formula is of the form $\exists x \varphi$, where φ is a $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$ formula. We shall omit the reference to \mathcal{L} if $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_A$, e.g., the set of Δ_0 -formulas are simply the set of $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_A)$ -formulas.

- *Bounded arithmetic*, or $I\Delta_0$, is the fragment of Peano arithmetic with the induction scheme limited to Δ_0 -formulae. More specifically, it is a theory formulated in the language \mathcal{L}_A , and is obtained by adding the scheme of induction for Δ_0 -formulae to Robinson's arithmetic Q . When $\mathcal{L} \supseteq \mathcal{L}_A$, we shall use $I\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$ to refer to the extension of $I\Delta_0$ which includes induction for $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$ -formulas. The metamathematical study of bounded arithmetic has close ties with the subject of computational complexity, see [HP] or [Kr] for thorough introductions.
- Every model \mathfrak{M} of $I\Delta_0$ has an initial segment \mathbb{N} consisting of the standard elements of \mathfrak{M} . We use \mathbb{N}^+ to denote $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, and use ω for the order type of \mathbb{N} .
- Bennett [Ben] showed that the graph of the exponential function $y = 2^x$ can be defined by a Δ_0 -predicate in the standard model of arithmetic. This result was later fine-tuned by Paris² who found another Δ_0 -predicate $Exp(x, y)$ which has the additional feature that $I\Delta_0$ can prove the familiar algebraic laws about exponentiation for $Exp(x, y)$ [DG, Appendix 1], in particular:

Lemma 2.1. $I\Delta_0$ proves the following statements:

- (a) $\forall x \exists \leq^1 y Exp(x, y)$;
- (b) $\forall x (\exists y Exp(x, y) \rightarrow \forall z < x \exists y Exp(z, y))$;
- (c) $\forall x \forall y (Exp(x, y) \rightarrow Exp(x + 1, 2y))$.

- By a classical theorem of Parikh, $I\Delta_0$ can only prove the totality of functions with a polynomial growth rate, hence

$$I\Delta_0 \not\vdash \forall x \exists y Exp(x, y).$$

- $I\Delta_0 + Exp$ is the extension of $I\Delta_0$ obtained by adding the axiom

$$Exp := \forall x \exists y Exp(x, y).$$

The theory $I\Delta_0 + Exp$ might not appear to be particularly strong since it cannot even prove the totality of the superexponential function, but experience has shown that it is a remarkably robust theory that is able to prove an extensive array of theorems of number theory and finite

²Independently, Pudlák [Pu] also provided an $I\Delta_0$ -treatment of the exponential function. There is also a detailed treatment of this topic in [Bu] and [HP, Section V3(c)].

combinatorics. This has prompted Harvey Friedman to put forth the conjecture that all “arithmetical theorems” proved in the journal *Annals of Mathematics* (such as Wiles’ proof of Fermat’s Last Theorem), can be implemented within $I\Delta_0 + Exp$. The reader interested in further pursuing this topic is referred to Avigad’s thorough discussion in [Av-2].

- For $\mathcal{L} \supseteq \mathcal{L}_A$, $B\Sigma_1(\mathcal{L})$ is the scheme consisting of the universal closure of formulae of the form

$$[\forall x < a \exists y \varphi(x, y)] \rightarrow [\exists z \forall x < a \exists y < z \varphi(x, y)],$$

where $\varphi(x, y)$ is a $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$ -formula. It has been known since the work of Parsons [Pars] that there are instances of $B\Sigma_1$ that are unprovable in $I\Delta_0 + Exp$; indeed Parson’s work shows that even strengthening $I\Delta_0 + Exp$ with the set of Π_2 -sentences that are true in the standard model of arithmetic fails to prove all instances of $B\Sigma_1$. However, Harvey Friedman and Jeff Paris have shown, independently, that adding $B\Sigma_1$ does not increase the Π_2 -consequences of $I\Delta_0 + Exp$ [Ka-2, Corollary 10.9]. See also [Sie], [Av-1], [Ka-3], [Bek], and [H] for further refinements.

- I is a *cut* of \mathfrak{M} if I is a nonempty *proper* initial segment of \mathfrak{M} with no last element.
- If I is a cut of a model \mathfrak{M} of $I\Delta_0$ that is closed under addition and multiplication, then we continue to use I to refer to the model

$$(I, \oplus^{\mathfrak{M}}, \odot^{\mathfrak{M}}, \dots).$$

The following results will be useful in this paper.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose \mathfrak{M} is a model of $I\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$, and let S_φ be the solution set of some $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$ -formula $\varphi(x, \mathbf{a})$ in \mathfrak{M} , where \mathbf{a} is a sequence of parameters from M . If $S_\varphi \neq \emptyset$, then:*

- (a) [Δ_0 -MIN] S_φ has a minimum element;
- (b) [Δ_0 -MAX] If S_φ is bounded in \mathfrak{M} , then S_φ has a maximum element;
- (c) [Δ_0 -OVERSPILL] If S_φ includes a cut I of \mathfrak{M} , then for some $b \in M \setminus I$, $\{x \in M : x < b\} \subseteq S_\varphi$.

Proof: A routine proof by contradiction proves (a), with $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$ induction applied to $\varphi^*(v) := \forall x \leq v \neg \varphi(x)$; (b) follows from (a) since the maximum of S_φ is the least upper bound of S_φ , and (c) follows from (b).

□

Lemma 2.3. (Folklore, see [WP, Theorem 1]) *If I is a cut of a model of $I\Delta_0$ that is closed under multiplication, then I satisfies $I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1$.*

Theorem 2.4. (Wilkie-Paris [WP], see [Ad-1] for refinements). *Every countable model of $I\Delta_0 + Exp + B\Sigma_1$ has an end extension to a model of $I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1$.*

Remark 2.4.1. Theorem 2.4 above is slightly stronger than the original form of the Paris-Wilkie result, which makes no mention of arranging the end extension to satisfy $B\Sigma_1$. However, using Δ_0 -OVERSPILL and Lemma 2.3, one can easily derive Theorem 2.4 from the original Paris-Wilkie result as follows. Suppose \mathfrak{M} is a countable model of $I\Delta_0 + Exp + B\Sigma_1$, and let \mathfrak{M}^* be an end extension of \mathfrak{M} which satisfies $I\Delta_0$. Choose $d \in M^* \setminus M$, and consider the Δ_0 -formula $\varphi(x) := \exists y < d \text{ Exp}(x, y)$. Since every $m \in M$ is a solution of $\varphi(x)$, there is some $c \in M^* \setminus M$ for which 2^c exists in \mathfrak{M}^* . The desired end extension of \mathfrak{M} satisfying $I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1$ is the submodel of \mathfrak{M}^* consisting of elements of M^* that are less than c^n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 2.5. (Dimitracopoulos-Gaifman [DG, Prop. 2.3], see also [Bu, Theorem 1.2.7.3, and its corollary]). *Suppose \mathfrak{M} is a model of $I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1$ and \mathcal{F} is the family of all M -valued functions $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ on M^n (where $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$) such that for some Σ_1 -formula $\delta(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$, δ defines the graph of f in \mathfrak{M} and for some term³ $t(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \leq t(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ for all $a_i \in M$. Then the expanded structure*

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{F}} := (\mathfrak{M}, f)_{f \in \mathcal{F}}$$

satisfies $I\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}) + B\Sigma_1(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$, where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the result of augmenting the language of arithmetic with names for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

Remark 2.5.1. Since for each $m \in M$, the constant function $c_m : M \rightarrow \{m\}$ is a member of \mathcal{F} , for all intents and purposes $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$ has a name for each element of M .

³In this context, the notation $t(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is employed for a term whose variables form a *subset* of the displayed variables.

Set Theory and Combinatorics within Bounded Arithmetic

One can use *Ackermann coding* to simulate finite set theory and combinatorics within $I\Delta_0$ by using a Δ_0 -predicate $E(x, y)$ that reasonably expresses

“the x -th digit in the binary expansion of y is 1”,

see [HP]. E in many ways behaves like the membership relation \in ; indeed, it is well-known that \mathfrak{M} is a model of PA iff (M, E) is a model of $ZF \setminus \{\text{Infinity}\} \cup \{\neg\text{Infinity}\}$.

- We shall reserve the symbol E throughout the paper to refer to “Ackermann’s \in ”.

When \mathfrak{M} is a model of $I\Delta_0$, then (M, E) is still a model of a decent fragment of set theory, as witnessed by the following result (see [DG], [HP, I.1(B)] for more detail):

Theorem 2.6 *If $\mathfrak{M} \models I\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$, and E is Ackermann’s \in , then \mathfrak{M} satisfies the following axioms:*

(a) *Extensionality:*

$$\forall x \forall y [(\forall z (zEx \longleftrightarrow zEy)) \rightarrow x = y];$$

(b) *Conditional Pairing* [$\forall x \forall y$ “if $x < y$ and 2^y exists, then $\{x, y\}$ exists”]:

$$\forall x \forall y ((x < y) \wedge \exists u \text{Exp}(y, u)) \rightarrow \exists t \forall w (wEt \longleftrightarrow (w = x) \vee (w = y));$$

(c) *Union:*

$$\forall x \exists y [\forall z (zEy \longleftrightarrow \exists u (zEu \wedge uEx))];$$

(d) *Conditional Power Set* [$\forall x$ (“If 2^x exists, then the power set of x exists”)]:

$$\forall x (\exists y \text{Exp}(x, y) \rightarrow (\exists z \forall w (wEz \longleftrightarrow w \subseteq x))).$$

where $w \subseteq x$ abbreviates $\forall t (tEw \rightarrow tEx)$;

(e) *Conditional $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$ -Comprehension Scheme:* for each formula $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L})$ -formula $\varphi(x, y)$, and any z for which 2^z exists, “ $\{xEz : \varphi(x, y)\}$ exists”, i.e.,

$$\forall y \forall z [\exists s \text{Exp}(z, s) \rightarrow \exists u \forall t (tEu \longleftrightarrow (tEz \wedge \varphi(x, y)))].$$

- We shall say that $X \subseteq M$ is *coded* in \mathfrak{M} , if there is some $c \in M$ such that $X = c_E := \{m \in M : mEc\}$.

- Given $c \in M$, $\bar{c} := \{x \in M : x < c\}$. Note that \bar{c} is coded in a $\mathfrak{M} \models I\Delta_0$ provided 2^c exists in \mathfrak{M} .
- Suppose I is a cut of \mathfrak{M} , $SSy_I(\mathfrak{M}) := \{c_E \cap I : c \in N\}$. When I is the *standard cut* \mathbb{N} of \mathfrak{M} , then $SSy_I(\mathfrak{M})$ is what is known in the literature as the *standard system* of \mathfrak{M} .
- Within $I\Delta_0$ one can define a *partial* function $Card(x) = t$, expressing “the cardinality of the set coded by x is t ”. More specifically $Card(x) = t$ expresses “there is a bijection between x_E and \bar{t} ”. It is important to note that $I\Delta_0$ can prove that $Card(x)$ is defined (and is well-behaved) if 2^x exists (this is implicit in [HP, p.42, Theorem 1.41]).
- In light of the above discussion, finite combinatorial statements have reasonable arithmetical translations in models of bounded arithmetic provided “enough powers of 2 exist”. We shall therefore use the Erdős notation $a \rightarrow (b)_d^n$ for the *arithmetical* translation of the set theoretical statement “if $Card(X) = a$ and $f : [X]^n \rightarrow \bar{d}$, then there is $H \subseteq X$ with $Card(H) = b$ such that H is f -monochromatic.” Here $[X]^n$ is the collection of *increasing* n -tuples from X (where the order on X is inherited from the ambient model of arithmetic), and H is f -monochromatic iff f is constant on $[H]^n$.
- We also write $a \rightarrow *(b)^n$ for the arithmetical translation of the following canonical partition relation: if $Card(X) = a$ and $f : [X]^n \rightarrow Y$, then there is $H \subseteq X$ with $Card(H) = b$ which is f -canonical, i.e., there is some $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that for all sequences $s_1 < \dots < s_n$, and $t_1 < \dots < t_n$ of elements of H ,

$$f(s_1, \dots, s_n) = f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \iff \forall i \in S (s_i = t_i).$$

Note that if $S = \emptyset$, then f is constant on $[H]^n$, and if $S = \{1, \dots, n\}$, then f is injective on $[H]^n$.

- We need certain quantitative forms of Ramsey’s partition theorem, as well as its canonical generalization by Erdős and Rado. Before stating them, let us review the definition of the iterated exponential function, dubbed the superexponential function $Superexp(n, x)$ in this paper: $Superexp(0, x) = x$, and

$$Superexp(n + 1, x) = 2^{Superexp(n, x)}.$$

Thus for $n \geq 1$, $Superexp(n, x)$ is the exponential stack of length $n+1$, where the top element is x , and the remaining n entries form a tower of 2's.

Theorem 2.7. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, the following is provable in $I\Delta_0$:*

- (a) [Ramsey] $a \rightarrow (b)_c^n$, if $a = Superexp(2n, bc)$ and $b \geq n^2$;
- (b) [Erdős-Rado] $a \rightarrow *(b)^n$, if $a = Superexp(4n, b \cdot 2^{2^{2n^2-n}})$ and $b \geq 4n^2$.

Proof: Part (a) follows immediately from Ramsey's original proof (reproduced in [GRS]). Part (b) can be obtained by coupling (a) with the proof of the Erdős-Rado canonical partition theorem [ER, Sec. 6]. More specifically, the Erdős-Rado proof shows that $a \rightarrow *(b)^n$ is derivable from $a \rightarrow (b)_{f(n)}^{2n}$, where $f(n)$ is the number of *partitions* of $[2n]^2$, i.e.,

$$f(n) := B(2n^2 - n) < 2^{2^{2n^2-n}}.$$

Here $B(s)$ is the number of partitions of an s -element set (by elementary considerations $B(s) < 2^{2^s}$). For example, if $a \rightarrow (b)_{203}^4$, then $a \rightarrow *(b)^2$ since $f(2) = B(6) = 203$ (see [GRS, Theorem 2, Sec. 5.5]).

□

Recursive Saturation

- \mathfrak{M} is *recursively saturated* if for every finite sequence \mathbf{m} of elements of M , every recursive finitely realizable type over the expanded model $(\mathfrak{M}, \mathbf{m})$ is realized in \mathfrak{M} .
- For $\mathfrak{M} \models PA$ let $F \subseteq M$ be the set of Gödel numbers of \mathcal{L}_A -formulas, as computed in \mathfrak{M} (note that F will include nonstandard elements if \mathfrak{M} is nonstandard). A *satisfaction class* of \mathfrak{M} is a subset S of M satisfying the following two conditions:

- (a) $(\mathfrak{M}, S) \models PA(S)$, and
- (b) S correctly codes the satisfaction relation of \mathfrak{M} for all standard formulas.

Condition (b) can be written as a scheme consisting of the sentence (1) below plus the collection of sentences (2_n) below (for each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$).

- (1) S consists of coded ordered pairs of the form $\langle a, b \rangle$, where $a \in F$ and $b \in M$;

(2_n) [S is n -correct] S satisfies Tarski's inductive conditions for a truth predicate for all formulas of quantifier rank n (including any nonstandard ones).

It is well-known that for each standard n there is a parameter free definable subset S_n of \mathfrak{M} that satisfies (1) and (2_n), but of course Tarski's undefinability of truth theorem dictates that any \mathfrak{M} -definable S that satisfies (1) must fail (2_n) for some n . Note that if S is a satisfaction class of a nonstandard model of PA , then S is s -correct for some *nonstandard* s . This follows from overspill and the fact that (2_n) can be uniformly expressed by a single formula $\varphi(S, n)$ with parameter n in the language of arithmetic augmented with the unary predicate S .

The following two theorems tie the notion of recursive saturation with satisfaction classes, and with cofinal extensions.

Theorem 2.8. (Barwise-Schlipf [BS]) *A countable \mathfrak{M} model of PA is recursively saturated iff \mathfrak{M} has a satisfaction class.*

Theorem 2.9. (Smoryński-Stavi [Sm-St]) *A cofinal extension of a recursively saturated model of PA remains recursively saturated.*

Theorem 2.8 can be derived from Theorem 2.7, coupled with the following theorem (see also [Ka-2, Exercise 14.9]).

Theorem 2.10. (Kotlarski [Kot], Schmerl [Sc-1]) *If \mathfrak{M}^* is a cofinal elementary extension of a model \mathfrak{M}^* of PA , and $X \subseteq M$ is piecewise coded (i.e., for every $m \in M$, $\bar{m} \cap X$ is coded in \mathfrak{M}), then there is a (unique) X^* such that*

$$(\mathfrak{M}, X) \prec (\mathfrak{M}^*, X^*).$$

3. AUTOMORPHISMS AND $I\Delta_0 + Exp + B\Sigma_1$

Our point of departure is the following result that characterizes cuts of countable recursively saturated models \mathfrak{M} of PA that are closed under exponentiation as precisely those of the form $I_{fix}(j)$, for some automorphism j of \mathfrak{M} .

Theorem 3.1⁴. *Suppose \mathfrak{M} is a model of PA .*

- (a) *If $j \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M})$, then $I_{\text{fix}}(j) \models \text{Exp}$;*
- (b) *(Smoryński [Sm]) If \mathfrak{M} is countable and recursively saturated, and I is a cut of \mathfrak{M} that satisfies Exp , then there are continuum-many $j \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M})$ such that $I = I_{\text{fix}}(j)$.*

The first principal result of this section (Lemma A.2) improves part (a) of Theorem 3.1 by showing that part (a) remains valid upon replacing the assumption $\mathfrak{M} \models PA$ with the weaker assumption $\mathfrak{M} \models I\Delta_0$. This result shows that the mere existence of a nontrivial automorphism j of a model \mathfrak{M} of $I\Delta_0$ produces the cut $I_{\text{fix}}(j)$ of \mathfrak{M} that satisfies the robust theory $I\Delta_0 + \text{Exp} + B\Sigma_1$. We shall then establish a “reversal” of this result as follows: beginning with a cut I of a countable model \mathfrak{M} of $I\Delta_0$ that is closed under exponentiation, we fine-tune an Ehrenfeucht-Mostowski-type construction of Paris and Mills [PM] in order to build an extension of \mathfrak{M} that (i) satisfies $I\Delta_0$, (ii) does not introduce new elements below any $i \in I$, and (iii) possesses an automorphism j such that $I_{\text{fix}}(j) = I$. Coupled with Wilkie and Paris’s fundamental Theorem 2.4, this yields the reversal. To summarize, in this section we shall prove:

Theorem A. *The following two conditions are equivalent for a countable model \mathfrak{M} of the language \mathcal{L}_A of arithmetic:*

- (a) *$\mathfrak{M} = I_{\text{fix}}(j)$ for some nontrivial automorphism j of a model \mathfrak{M}^* of $I\Delta_0$;*
- (b) *$\mathfrak{M} \models I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1 + \text{Exp}$.*

The Proof of (a) \Rightarrow (b) of Theorem A

The proof of (a) implies (b) of Theorem B is subdivided into the following three lemmas.

Lemma A.0. *$I_{\text{fix}}(j) \models I\Delta_0$.*

Proof: We first verify that $I_{\text{fix}}(j)$ is closed under the operations of the ambient structure \mathfrak{M} . Suppose x and y are elements of $I_{\text{fix}}(j)$ with $x \leq y$ and, without loss of generality, assume that x and y are both nonstandard elements. Since $x + y < xy \leq y^2$, it suffices to show that $y^2 \in I_{\text{fix}}(j)$. Observe that $I\Delta_0$ can prove that any number $z < y^2$ can be written as $z = qy + r$, where both q and r are less than y (since the division algorithm

⁴Smoryński established the much harder part (b) of Theorem 3.1 and left the status of part (a) as an open problem. It is not clear who first established part (a) of Theorem 3.1, but by now it is considered part of the folklore, e.g., see [Ka-4, Proposition 2.2].

can be implemented in $I\Delta_0$, so q and r are respectively the quotient and remainder of the division of z by y). Therefore,

$$j(z) = j(qy + r) = j(q)j(y) + j(r) = qy + r = z.$$

This shows that $I_{fix}(j)$ is closed under the operations of \mathfrak{M} . Since $I_{fix}(j)$ is end extended by \mathfrak{M} (by definition), and Δ_0 -predicates are absolute for end extensions, this shows that \mathfrak{M} inherits $I\Delta_0$ from \mathfrak{N} .

□

Lemma A.1. $I_{fix}(j) \models B\Sigma_1$.

Proof: This lemma immediately follows from Lemma 2.3 and A.0 since j is assumed to be a nontrivial automorphism, and therefore $I_{fix}(j)$ must be a cut of \mathfrak{M} that is closed under multiplication.

□

Lemma A.2. $I_{fix}(j) \models Exp$.

Proof: The proof has three stages.

Stage 1: The argument establishing part (a) of Theorem 3.1 can be carried out in the present context, i.e.,

- (1) If $a \in I_{fix}(j)$ and 2^a is defined in \mathfrak{M} , then $2^a \in I_{fix}(j)$.

To see this, we first observe that the usual proof of the existence of the base 2 expansion for a positive integer y can be implemented within $I\Delta_0$ provided some power of 2 exceeds y (see [HP] or [Bu]). Therefore, for every $y < 2^a$, there is some element c that codes a subset of $\{0, 1, \dots, a - 1\}$ such that

$$y = \sum_{i \in c} 2^i.$$

The next observation is that $j(c) = c$. This hinges on the fact that E satisfies Extensionality, and that $i \in c$ implies $j(i) = i$ (since $a \in I_{fix}(j)$, and $i \in c$ implies that $i < a$). Therefore,

$$j(y) = j\left(\sum_{i \in c} 2^i\right) = \sum_{i \in j(c)} 2^i = \sum_{i \in c} 2^i = y.$$

So every $y < 2^a$ is fixed by j and therefore $2^a \in I_{fix}(j)$.

Stage 2: Let $J := \{m \in M : 2^m \text{ is defined in } \mathfrak{M}\}$. Note that J forms an initial segment of \mathfrak{M} by Lemma 2.1. We claim:

(2) $\{2^m : x \in J\}$ is cofinal in M .

(2) is established by contradiction: if some $c \in M$ is an upper bound of K , then K is the solution set of the Δ_0 -predicate $\varphi(x, c)$, where

$$\varphi(x, c) := [x < c \text{ and } \exists y < c \text{ Exp}(x, y)].$$

Therefore by $I\Delta_0$ -MAX, there is a *last* power of 2 in \mathfrak{M} , which is absurd.

Stage 3: We now use (1) and (2) to prove that if $a \in I_{fix}(j)$, then 2^a is defined and is a member of $I_{fix}(j)$. In light of (1), it suffices to show that $I_{fix}(j) \subsetneq J$, where J is the cut defined in stage 2. To see that $I_{fix}(j) \subsetneq J$ assume to the contrary that $J \subseteq I_{fix}(j)$. It follows from (1) and (2) that $I_{fix}(j) = M$, which contradicts the assumption that j is a nontrivial automorphism.

□

Remark 3.2. If I is a cut closed under exponentiation, then I is closed under addition and multiplication. To see this, note that $I\Delta_0$ can prove that if $1 < x \leq y$, then

$$x + y \leq xy \leq 2^{x+y} \leq 2^{2^y}.$$

This shows that Lemma A.0 follows from Lemma A.2.

The Proof of (b) \Rightarrow (a) of Theorem A

The initial step of our proof of (b) \Rightarrow (a) of Theorem A involves the construction of an appropriate ultrafilter, accomplished in Theorem 3.3 below.

- Throughout this section, \mathfrak{M} is a model of $I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1$, I is a cut of \mathfrak{M} that satisfies *Exp* and $c \in M \setminus I$ such that 2^c exists in \mathfrak{M} (such an element c exists by Δ_0 -OVERSPILL, see Remark 2.4.1).
- \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$ are as in Theorem 2.5, and \mathcal{F}_c is the family of all M -valued functions $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ on $[c]^n$ (where $n \in \mathbb{N}$) obtained by restricting the domains of n -ary functions in \mathcal{F} to $[c]^n$.
- Recall that \bar{c} is the set of predecessors of c . For a coded subset X of \bar{c} , $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is the power set of X in the sense of (M, E) .

- $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ is a *filter* if \mathcal{U} is closed under intersections and is upward closed.
- A filter $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ is *I-complete*, if for every $f \in \mathcal{F}_c$ and $i \in I$, if $f : \bar{c} \rightarrow \bar{i}$, then there is some $X \in \mathcal{U}$ such that f is constant on X . Note that if \mathcal{U} is *I-complete*, then \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$, since for each $Y \in \mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ the characteristic function χ_Y of Y is constant on some member of \mathcal{U} . We therefore refer to *I-complete* filters as *ultrafilters*.
- An ultrafilter $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ is *nonprincipal*, if \mathcal{U} does not contain any singletons.
- A filter $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ is *Ramsey* if for every $f \in \mathcal{F}_c$, and every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, if $f : [\bar{c}]^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, then there is some f -monochromatic $H \in \mathcal{U}$.
- A filter $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ is *canonically Ramsey* if for every $f \in \mathcal{F}_c$, and every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, if $f : [\bar{c}]^n \rightarrow M$, then there is some $H \in \mathcal{U}$ such that H is f -canonical. It is easy to see that if \mathcal{U} is canonically Ramsey, then \mathcal{U} is Ramsey.
- A filter $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ is *I-tight* if for every $f \in \mathcal{F}_c$, and every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, if $f : [\bar{c}]^n \rightarrow M$, then there is some $H \in \mathcal{U}$ such either f is constant on H , or there is some $m_0 \in M \setminus I$ such that $f(\mathbf{x}) > m_0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in [H]^n$.

Theorem 3.3. $\mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ carries a nonprincipal ultrafilter \mathcal{U} satisfying the following four properties:

- \mathcal{U} is *I-complete*;
- \mathcal{U} is *canonically Ramsey*;
- \mathcal{U} is *I-tight*;
- $\{\text{Card}(X) : X \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is downward cofinal in $M \setminus I$.

- Let us say that $X \in \mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ is *I-large* iff $\text{Card}(X) \notin I$. The proof of Theorem 3.3 is based on Lemmas 3.3.1 through 3.3.3 which reveal salient combinatorial features of *I-large* sets.

Lemma 3.3.1. *If X is I-large, and $f : \bar{c} \rightarrow \bar{m}$ for some nonzero $m \in I$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}_c$, then there is some I-large subset of X on which f is constant.*

Proof: Let $\left\lfloor \frac{x}{y} \right\rfloor = \max\{t \leq x : ty \leq x\}$. First observe that, in light of Remark 3.2, I is closed under multiplication and therefore if $b \notin I$ and

$m \in I$, then $\lfloor \frac{b}{m} \rfloor \notin I$. Now suppose that for some $b \in M \setminus I$, $\text{Card}(X) = b$, and let

$$S_i := \{x \in X : f(x) = i\}.$$

Note that by Theorems 2.5 and 2.6(e) each S_i is coded in \mathfrak{M} . It is easy to see that there is some i for which $\text{Card}(S_i) \geq \lfloor \frac{b}{m} \rfloor$, since otherwise for all $i \leq m$,

$$\text{Card}(S_i) < \left\lfloor \frac{b}{m} \right\rfloor - 1,$$

which, coupled with $X = \bigcup_{i < m} S_i$ implies the following contradiction:

$$b = \text{Card}(X) < m \left(\left\lfloor \frac{b}{m} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) \leq b - m.$$

□

Lemma 3.3.2. *If $f : [X]^n \rightarrow M$, where X is I -large, $f \in \mathcal{F}_c$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, then there is an I -large subset of X that is f -canonical.*

Proof: Suppose $i \in I$. The closure of I under exponentiation implies that

$$\exists j \in I \ \mathfrak{M} \models j = \text{Superexp}(4n, i \cdot 2^{2^{2n^2-n}}).$$

Therefore by part (b) of Theorem 2.7 if $i \geq 4n^2$, then i is a solution of the $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ -predicate “there is an f -canonical subset of X cardinality i ” (this is a bounded statement since the monochromatic subset will be an element of $\mathcal{P}(X)$, and $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is coded). By Theorem 2.5 and $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ -OVERSPILL, therefore, there is an I -large subset of X that is f -canonical.

□

Lemma 3.3.3. *If X and f are as in Lemma 3.3.2, then there is an I -large $Y \subseteq X$ such that either (a) f is constant on Y , or (b) there is some $m_0 \in M \setminus I$ such that $f(\mathbf{x}) > m_0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in [Y]^n$.*

Proof: For $m \in M$ define the function $f_m : [X]^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ in \mathfrak{M} by defining $f_m(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ iff $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq m$. By Lemma 3.3.2, each f_m has an I -large monochromatic subset $Y_m \subseteq X$. We now consider two cases:

Case I: For some $i \in I$, $f(Y_i) = \{0\}$;

Case II: For every $i \in I$, $f(Y_i) = \{1\}$.

Suppose Case I holds, and $f(Y_i) = \{0\}$ for some $i \in I$. Then by Lemma 3.3.1, there is an I -large subset of Y_i on which f is constant. Therefore (a) is true if Case I holds. Case II, on the other hand, requires an overspill argument. Consider the following $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ -formula $\varphi(v)$:

$$\varphi(v) := \exists Y \in \mathcal{P}(X) \text{ (Card}(Y) > v \text{ and } f_v(\mathbf{x}) = 1 \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in [Y]^n).$$

If Case II holds then every element of I is a solution of $\varphi(v)$ and therefore by $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ -OVERSPILL there is some $m_0 \in M \setminus I$ that is a solution of $\varphi(v)$, i.e., there is some $Y \subseteq X$ such $\text{Card}(Y) = m_0 \notin I$ and for all $\mathbf{x} \in [Y]^n$, $f(\mathbf{x}) > m_0$. This shows that (b) is true if Case II holds.

□

We are now in a position to present:

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Let $\langle f_n : n < \omega \rangle$ enumerate all maps in \mathcal{F}_c whose domain is \bar{c} and whose range is bounded in I ; $\langle g_n : n < \omega \rangle$ enumerate all maps in \mathcal{F}_c , with $g_n : [\bar{c}]^{k_n} \rightarrow M$ (note that for a fixed n , k_n is also fixed); and fix a sequence $\langle a_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ of elements of M which is downward cofinal in $M \setminus I$ with $a_0 \leq c$. Using Lemmas 3.3.1 through 3.3.3, and truncation, we can inductively build four sequences $\langle W_n : n < \omega \rangle$, $\langle X_n : n < \omega \rangle$, $\langle Y_n : n < \omega \rangle$, and $\langle Z_n : n < \omega \rangle$ of I -large elements of $\mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ such that for all $n < \omega$:

1. $W_n \supseteq X_n \supseteq Y_n \supseteq Z_n \supseteq W_{n+1}$;
2. f_n is constant of W_n ;
3. X_n is g_n -canonical;
4. g_n is constant on Y_n , or $\exists m_0 \in M \setminus I$ such that $g_n(\mathbf{x}) > m_0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in [Y_n]^{k_n}$;
5. $\text{Card}(Z_n) < a_n$.

This desired ultrafilter \mathcal{U} is $\{S \in \mathcal{P}(\bar{c}) : \exists n \in \omega (W_n \subseteq S)\}$.

□

In the next step, we use the ultrafilter \mathcal{U} constructed in Theorem 3.3 to build a family of models $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ where \mathbb{L} is a prescribed linear order, such that $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ is an extension of \mathfrak{M} that satisfies $I\Delta_0$ and possesses desirable automorphisms.

- Let \mathcal{U} be the ultrafilter produced in Theorem 3.3, and For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, consider the family of (partial) n -types $\Gamma_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ over $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$ defined via: $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Gamma_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ iff $\exists S \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ for all sequences $a_1 < \dots < a_n$ from S .
- $T_{\mathcal{U}} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \Gamma_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

- Given a linear order \mathbb{L} , $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{L}}$ is the language obtained from augmenting $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$ with constant symbols l for each $l \in \mathbb{L}$.
- The theory $T_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ is formulated within $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{L}}$ via:

$$T_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}} := \{\varphi(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n) : \varphi \in T_{\mathcal{U}} \text{ and } l_1 <_{\mathbb{L}} l_2 <_{\mathbb{L}} \dots <_{\mathbb{L}} l_n\}.$$

Lemma 3.4. $T_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ is consistent and is $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{L}})$ -complete.

Proof: $T_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ is consistent since it is finitely satisfiable in \mathfrak{M} . To verify $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{L}})$ -completeness of $T_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$, suppose $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ -formula and consider

$$S := \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (\bar{c})^n : \mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \models \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)\}.$$

It is easy to see that the characteristic function χ_S of S is a member of \mathcal{F} . Therefore, by the Ramsey property of \mathcal{U} there is some $H \in \mathcal{U}$ on which χ_S is constant. Hence either $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ or its negation is in $\Gamma_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. \square

- $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ is the model of arithmetic described by $T_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$, more specifically:
 - (a) The universe $N_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ of $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ consists of the equivalence classes $[\tau]$ of terms τ of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$ of the form $\tau = f(l_1, \dots, l_n)$, where $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n) \in [\mathbb{L}]^n$, and equivalence relation \sim at work is defined via

$$f(l_1, \dots, l_r) \sim g(l'_1, \dots, l'_s) \iff (f(l_1, \dots, l_r) = g(l'_1, \dots, l'_s)) \in T_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}};$$

- (b) The operations and the ordering relation of $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ are those naturally given by $T_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$, e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} [f(l_1, \dots, l_r)] \oplus [g(l'_1, \dots, l'_s)] &= [h(l''_1, \dots, l''_t)] \\ &\Downarrow \\ (f(l_1, \dots, l_r) + g(l'_1, \dots, l'_s)) &= h(l''_1, \dots, l''_t) \in T_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$[f(l_1, \dots, l_r)] \triangleleft [g(l'_1, \dots, l'_s)] \iff (f(l_1, \dots, l_r) < g(l'_1, \dots, l'_s)) \in T_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}},$$

(it is routine to verify that the operations and relation of $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ are well-defined.

- There is an embedding $e_1 : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ given by

$$m \mapsto_{e_1} [c_m(l)],$$

where $l \in \mathbb{L}$. Moreover, there is an embedding $e_2 : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow (N_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}, \triangleleft)$ via

$$l \mapsto_{e_2} [id(l)],$$

where $id : M \rightarrow M$ is the identity function. In this light, we shall identify the element $[c_m(l)]$ of $N_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ with m , and the element $[id(l)]$ with l .

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is a Σ_1 -formula of \mathcal{L}_A with the indicated free variables, and $[\tau_1], \dots, [\tau_k]$ are elements of $N_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$. The following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}} \models \varphi([\tau_1], \dots, [\tau_k])$;
- (b) $\varphi([\tau_1], \dots, [\tau_k]) \in T_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$.

Proof: The proof of Lemma 3.5 is reminiscent of the proof of the fundamental theorem of ultraproducts and employs induction on the complexity of formulas. When φ is atomic, the equivalence of (a) and (b) is trivially implied by the definition of the operations and the ordering relation on $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$. The inductive argument establishing the equivalence of (a) and (b) also easily goes through when φ is of the form $\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2$. However, the negation and existential quantification steps merit a brief explanation. For the negation step, suppose $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is a Δ_0 -formula such that (a) and (b) are equivalent for any choice of k elements from $N_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ with $\varphi = \theta$. The equivalence of (a) and (b) for $\varphi = \neg\theta$ can then be easily established by considering the $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{L}}$ -formula $\theta(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k)$, and invoking Lemma 3.4 to get hold of some $A \in \mathcal{U}$ such that either $\theta(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k)$ or its negation is in $T_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$. For the existential quantification step, the inductive proof of (a) \Rightarrow (b) is easy to establish, but the proof of (b) \Rightarrow (a) is more delicate and requires the following claim regarding the existence of Δ_0 -Skolem functions in \mathcal{F} .

Claim ♣. *If for some $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ -formula $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$,*

- (i) $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \models \forall x_1 \dots \forall x_n ((x_1 < \dots < x_n < c) \rightarrow \exists y \psi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y))$,

then there exists $g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that:

- (ii) $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \models \forall x_1 \dots \forall x_n ((x_1 < \dots < x_n < c) \rightarrow \psi(x_1, \dots, x_n, g(x_1, \dots, x_n)))$.

To verify Claim ♣, assume (i) and let $\delta(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$ abbreviate the following $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ -formula:

$$(\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y) \wedge \forall z < y \neg \psi(x_1, \dots, x_n, z)).$$

By $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ -MIN and $B\Sigma_1(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$, there is some $b \in M$ such that

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \models \forall x_1 \cdots \forall x_n ((x_1 < \cdots < x_n < c) \rightarrow \exists! y < b \delta(a_1, \cdots, a_n, y)).$$

Let g be the function on M^n whose graph is defined by $g(a_1, \cdots, a_n) = a_{n+1}$ iff

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \models ((a_1 < \cdots < a_n < c) \wedge \delta(a_1, \cdots, a_n, a_{n+1})) \vee (\neg(a_1 < \cdots < a_n < c) \wedge (a_{n+1} = 0)).$$

It is easy to see that $g \in \mathcal{F}$ and g satisfies (ii). This concludes the verification of Claim \clubsuit .

Going back to the existential quantification step of the proof of Lemma 3.5, suppose that for some formula $\exists y \theta(x_1, \cdots, x_k, y)$, where θ is a Δ_0 -formula, the equivalence of (a) and (b) holds for $\varphi = \theta(x_1, \cdots, x_k, y)$ for any choice of $k + 1$ elements from $N_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$. To verify that (b) \Rightarrow (a), suppose (b) holds for $\varphi = \exists y \theta$ for some choice $[\tau_1], \cdots, [\tau_k]$ of elements from $N_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$. To simplify notation, we shall assume that for some choice of $(l_1, l_2, \cdots, l_n) \in [\mathbb{L}]^n$, each τ_i can be written as $f_i(l_1, l_2, \cdots, l_n)$. The definition of $T_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ shows that there is some $A \in \mathcal{U}$ such that for all $(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \in [A]^n$,

$$\mathfrak{M} \models \exists y \theta(f_1(a_1, \cdots, a_n), \cdots, f_k(a_1, \cdots, a_n), y).$$

Let $d \in M$ be an element coding A , $\alpha(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ be the formula

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (x_i E d) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} (x_i < x_{i+1}),$$

and $\psi(x_1, \cdots, x_n, y)$ be the conjunction of the formula

$$\alpha(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \rightarrow \theta(f_1(x_1, \cdots, x_n), \cdots, f_k(x_1, \cdots, x_n), y)$$

with the formula

$$(\neg \alpha(x_1, \cdots, x_n)) \rightarrow y = 0.$$

Note that $\psi(x_1, \cdots, x_n, y)$ is a $\Delta_0(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ -formula since E has a Δ_0 -definition and we have access to a name for d in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$ (see Remark 2.5.1). By Claim \clubsuit , there is some $g(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that for every $(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \in [A]^n$,

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \models \psi(a_1, \cdots, a_n, g(a_1, \cdots, a_n)).$$

Coupled with the inductive hypothesis, this shows the following, thus concluding the proof of (b) \Rightarrow (a) of the existential quantification step:

$$\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}} \models \theta([\tau_1], \cdots, [\tau_k], [g(l_1, \cdots, l_n)]).$$

□

Lemma 3.6.

- (a) \mathfrak{M} is cofinal in $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$;
- (b) $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ satisfies $I\Delta_0$;
- (c) \mathbb{L} is a set of Σ_1 -indiscernibles in $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$;
- (d) $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ end extends I ;
- (e) $M \setminus I$ is downward cofinal in $N_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}} \setminus I$.

Proof: (a) is a consequence of $\mathfrak{M} \models B\Sigma_1$, and Lemma 3.5 immediately implies (b) and (c). The I -completeness of \mathcal{U} , coupled with Lemma 3.5, yields (d). To verify (e), suppose

$$[f(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n)] \in N_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}} \setminus I.$$

Since \mathcal{U} is I -tight, there is some $H \in \mathcal{U}$ such either f is constant on H or there is some $m_0 \in M \setminus I$ such that $f(\mathbf{x}) > m_0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in [H]^n$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.5 there is some $m_0 \in M \setminus I$ such that $m_0 \leq [f(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n)]$.

□

- In what follows, $fix(\hat{j})$ is the fixed point set of \hat{j} .

Lemma 3.7. *Every automorphism j of \mathbb{L} induces an automorphism \hat{j} of $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ such that $j \mapsto \hat{j}$ is a group embedding of $Aut(\mathbb{L})$ into $Aut(\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}})$. Moreover,*

- (a) $I_{fix(\hat{j})} = I$ for every nontrivial $j \in Aut(\mathbb{L})$;
- (b) $fix(\hat{j}) = M$ for every fixed point free $j \in Aut(\mathbb{L})$.

Proof: The fact that an automorphism j of \mathbb{L} induces an automorphism \hat{j} of $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ follows from the same line of reasoning used in the classical argument of Ehrenfeucht and Mostowski and is based on the fact that $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ is generated by a copy of \mathbb{L} via the functions in \mathcal{F} . In other words, since each element of $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ can be represented as $[f(l_1, \dots, l_n)]$ for an appropriate choice of $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and l_1, \dots, l_n of \mathbb{L} , the desired \hat{j} can be defined via:

$$(*) \quad \hat{j}([f(l_1, \dots, l_n)]) = [f(j(l_1), \dots, j(l_n))].$$

It is easy to see, using (*) above, that the correspondence $j \mapsto \hat{j}$ indeed defines a group embedding of the automorphism group $Aut(\mathbb{L})$ of \mathbb{L} into the automorphism group $Aut(\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}})$ of $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$.

We now verify that for a nontrivial automorphism j of \mathbb{L} , \hat{j} fixes members of I , but moves elements arbitrarily close to I . First note that if $j \in Aut(\mathbb{L})$,

then \widehat{j} fixes each element of M (since each element of M is represented by a constant function of \mathcal{F}). This shows, *a fortiori*, that \widehat{j} fixes members of I . Recall from Theorem 3.3 that there is a sequence $\langle a_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ of elements of $M \setminus I$ that are downward cofinal in $M \setminus I$, and a sequence $\langle Z_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ of elements of \mathcal{U} such that $\text{Card}(Z_n) < a_n$. Consider the sequence of terms $\langle \tau_n(x) : n \in \omega \rangle$ of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$ defined by:

$$\tau_n(x) := y \text{ iff } x \text{ is the } y\text{-th element of } Z_n \text{ under its natural ordering.}$$

Note that $\tau_n(x) < a_n$. Now, if $j \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$ with $j(k) = l \neq k$, then

$$\widehat{j}(\tau_n(k)) = \tau_n(l).$$

By the definition of $T_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$, k and l are (distinct) members of X_n . But since $\tau_n(x)$ defines a one-to-one map, \widehat{j} moves an element below a_n , namely $\tau_n(\widehat{k})$. In light of the fact that the a_n 's were chosen to be downward cofinal in $M \setminus I$, and $M \setminus I$ is downward cofinal in $N_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}} \setminus I$ (by Lemma 3.6(e)), this shows that $I_{\text{fix}(\widehat{j})} = I$.

We now verify (b). We already know that $M \subseteq \text{fix}(\widehat{j})$ for every $j \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$. To see that $\text{fix}(\widehat{j}) \subseteq M$ for a fixed point free j , suppose that for some element $[f(l_1, \dots, l_n)]$ of $N_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$

$$(1) [f(j(l_1), \dots, j(l_n))] = [f(l_1, \dots, l_n)],$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and \mathcal{U} is \mathcal{F} -canonically Ramsey, there is some $H \in \mathcal{U}$ and some $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that for all sequences $x_1 < \dots < x_n$ and $y_1 < \dots < y_n$ of elements of H ,

$$(2) f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(y_1, \dots, y_n) \iff \forall i \in S (x_i = y_i).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.5,

$$(3) \text{ For all } l_1 < \dots < l_n \text{ and } k_1 < \dots < k_n \text{ from } \mathbb{L},$$

$$[f(l_1, \dots, l_n)] = [f(k_1, \dots, k_n)] \iff \forall i \in S (l_i = k_i).$$

Coupled with (1), (3) shows that $S = \emptyset$. So f must be *constant* on H , thereby showing that $[f(l_1, \dots, l_n)] \in M$, as desired.

□

Putting Lemmas 3.4 through 3.7 together, we obtain the following general result.

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose \mathbb{L} is a linearly ordered set, and \mathcal{U} satisfies properties (a), (b), (c) and (d) of Theorem 3.3. The model $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ satisfies the following properties:*

- (a) $\mathfrak{M} \subseteq \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$ and $I \subseteq_e \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$;
- (b) *For a Σ_1 -formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, and $(l_1, \dots, l_n) \in [\mathbb{L}]^n$, $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}} \models \varphi(l_1, \dots, l_n)$ iff*

$$\exists S \in \mathcal{U} \forall (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in [S]^n \mathfrak{M} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n);$$

- (c) \mathbb{L} is a set of Σ_1 -indiscernibles in $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}}$;
- (d) *Every $j \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$ induces an automorphism $\hat{j} \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}})$ such that $j \mapsto \hat{j}$ is a group embedding of $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$ into $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{L}})$;*
- (e) *If $j \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$ is nontrivial, then $I_{\text{fix}(\hat{j})} = I$;*
- (f) *If $j \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$ is fixed point free, then $\text{fix}(\hat{j}) = M$.*

Remark 3.8.1. If \mathfrak{M} is a model of full PA , then the restriction to Σ_1 -formulas in Lemma 3.5, and to Δ_0 -formulas in Lemma 3.6 can be both eliminated. This in turn allows the restriction to the corresponding restrictions to be eliminated from Theorem 3.8.

We are now in a position to complete the proof of Theorem A.

Proof of (b) \implies (a) of Theorem A:

Suppose \mathfrak{M}_0 is a countable model of $I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1 + Exp$. By Theorem 2.4, \mathfrak{M}_0 can be end extended to a model \mathfrak{M} that satisfies $I\Delta_0$. This allows us to invoke Theorem 3.3 (with $I := M_0$) to produce an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} satisfying conditions (1) through (3) of Theorem 3.3. By Theorem 3.8, the ultrafilter \mathcal{U} can be used to give rise to the model $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{Z}}$, where \mathbb{Z} is the ordered set of integers (note that $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies $I\Delta_0$ and $\mathfrak{M}_0 \subseteq_e \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{Z}}$). Let j be any nontrivial automorphism of \mathbb{Z} , e.g., $j(n) = n + 1$. By Theorem 3.8(e), \hat{j} is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{Z}}$ with the property $I_{\text{fix}(\hat{j})} = M$, as desired.

□

Theorem A, combined with the downward Löwenheim-Skolem theorem, yields:

Corollary 3.9. *$I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1 + Exp$ is the theory of the class of models whose universes are of the form $I_{\text{fix}(j)}$ for some nontrivial automorphism j of a model of $I\Delta_0$, i.e., the following are equivalent for sentences φ in \mathcal{L}_A :*

- (a) $I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1 + Exp \vdash \varphi$.

(b) φ holds in every model of the form $I_{fix}(j)$, where j is a nontrivial automorphism of some model of $I\Delta_0$.

Remark 3.10. By a theorem of Solovay [Pari, Theorem 4] every countable recursively saturated model \mathfrak{M} of $I\Delta_0 + B\Sigma_1$ is isomorphic to a proper initial segment of itself, and therefore \mathfrak{M} has an end extension that satisfies $I\Delta_0$. This result can be substituted for the Wilkie-Paris theorem (Theorem 2.4) in the proof of Corollary 3.9 since every consistent countable theory has a countable recursively saturated model.

4. SMORYŃSKI'S THEOREM, REVISITED

Smoryński's theorem (part (b) of Theorem 3.1) was established in [Sm] by an elaborate back and forth argument (see also [Ka-4]). We now explain how to derive an extension of this result with an entirely different proof, using our work in the previous section. This new proof can be summarized as follows:

- (1) If \mathfrak{M} is a model of PA , then as pointed out in Remark 3.8.1 the model $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ of Theorem 3.8 turns out to be a cofinal *elementary extension* of \mathfrak{M} . Indeed, this is precisely what is accomplished by Paris and Mills in [PM, Theorem 6];
- (2) By an appropriate choice of ultrafilter \mathcal{U} , \mathfrak{M} and $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ can be arranged to have the same I -standard system;
- (3) If \mathfrak{M} and $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ have the same I -standard system, \mathfrak{M} is recursively saturated, and \mathbb{L} is countable, then \mathfrak{M} can be shown to be isomorphic to $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ via an isomorphism that is the identity on I . Smoryński's theorem now follows from Theorem 3.8 by representing \mathfrak{M} as $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{Q}}$, where \mathbb{Q} is the ordered set of rationals (recall: $|Aut(\mathbb{Q})| = 2^{\aleph_0}$).

- To set the stage, suppose $\mathfrak{M} \models I\Delta_0$, I is a cut of \mathfrak{M} closed under exponentiation, and $c \in M \setminus I$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $2^{(c^n)}$ exists. This will ensure that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there is an element in \mathfrak{M} that codes all subsets of the Cartesian product $(\bar{c})^n$ that are coded in \mathfrak{M} (in other words: $\mathcal{P}(c^n)$ exists in \mathfrak{M}). Thanks to Δ_0 -OVERSPILL, this is easy to arrange since every member of I is a solution of the Δ_0 -predicate $\varphi(x) := "2^{2^x}$ exists" and therefore there is $c \in M \setminus I$ for which $2^{(2^c)}$ exists in \mathfrak{M} (recall that for nonstandard c and $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $c^n < 2^c$).

- A subset X of \bar{c} *decides* a subset K of $[\bar{c}]^n$ (where $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$) if either $[X]^n \subseteq K$ or $[X]^n \subseteq [\bar{c}]^n \setminus K$.
- A filter $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ is *I-conservative* if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and every \mathfrak{M} -coded sequence $\langle K_i : i < c \rangle$ of subsets of $[\bar{c}]^n$ there is some $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and some $d \in M$ with $I < d \leq c$ such that $\forall i < d$ X decides K_i .

The following result explains the importance of *I-conservative* ultrafilters. In what follows \mathfrak{M} , \mathcal{U} , and $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ are as in the previous section.

Lemma 4.1. *If \mathcal{U} is I-conservative, then $SSy_I(\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}) = SSy_I(\mathfrak{M})$.*

Proof: Since $I \subseteq_e \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ and $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ extends \mathfrak{M} , $SSy_I(\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}) \supseteq SSy_I(\mathfrak{M})$. To see that $SSy_I(\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}) \subseteq SSy_I(\mathfrak{M})$, suppose $[f(l_1, \dots, l_n)]$ is a member of $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$, and define $A_{f(l_1, \dots, l_n)}$ via:

$$A_{f(l_1, \dots, l_n)} := \{i \in I : \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}} \models iE[f(l_1, \dots, l_n)]\}.$$

We wish to show

$$(1) \quad A_{f(l_1, \dots, l_n)} \in SSy_I(\mathfrak{M}).$$

Consider the \mathfrak{M} -coded sequence $\langle K_i : i < c \rangle$ defined by

$$K_i := \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in [\bar{c}]^n : \mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \models iEf(a_1, \dots, a_n)\}.$$

Note that by Lemma 3.5,

$$(2) \quad A_{f(l_1, \dots, l_n)} = \{i \in I : \exists X \in \mathcal{U} \text{ such that } [X]^n \subseteq K_i\}.$$

Invoking the *I-conservativity* of \mathcal{U} , for some $X_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ and $d \in M$ with $I < d \leq c$, $\forall i < d$ X_0 decides K_i .

Therefore $A_{f(l_1, \dots, l_n)} = \{i \in I : [X_0]^n \subseteq K_i\}$, which makes it evident that (1) holds and the proof is complete.

□

In order to show that the ultrafilter \mathcal{U} employed in the construction of $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}}$ can be arranged to be *I-conservative* we need to establish another combinatorial property of *I-large* sets in the next lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose S is I-large and $\langle K_i : i < c \rangle$ is an \mathfrak{M} -coded sequence of subsets of $[S]^n$ for some fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Then there is some d with $I < d \leq c$, and some *I-large* subset S' of S such that S' decides K_i for all $i < d$.*

Proof: Given any $i < c$ consider the map

$$F_i : [S]^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^i,$$

defined by: for $1 \leq j \leq i$, the j -th coordinate of $F_i(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ iff $\mathbf{x} \in K_j$ (where $\mathbf{x} \in [S]^n$). Since I is closed under exponentiation, and $\text{Card}(\{0, 1\}^i) = 2^i$, F_i can be viewed as $F_i : [S]^n \rightarrow \bar{k}$ for $k := 2^i \in I$. Therefore, by part (a) of Theorem 2.7, for every $i \in I$, the following Δ_0 -formula holds in \mathfrak{M} :

- (1) There is some F_i -monochromatic $X \subseteq S$ such that $\text{Card}(X) > i$.

It is easy to see that (1) implies that for each $i \in I$, the following Δ_0 -formula holds in \mathfrak{M} :

- (2) $\exists X \subseteq S$ such that $\forall j \leq i$, X is χ_{K_j} -monochromatic and $\text{Card}(X) > i$ (here χ_{K_j} is the *characteristic function* of K_j).

By coupling Δ_0 -OVERSPILL and (2), we obtain

- (3) For some $d > I$, $\exists S' \subseteq S$ such that $\forall j \leq d$, S' is χ_{K_j} -monochromatic and $\text{Card}(S') > d$.

It is now easy to see that the S' of (3) will serve as the desired I -large subset of S .

□

Theorem 4.3. *Theorem 3.3 can be strengthened by requiring that the ultrafilter \mathcal{U} be additionally I -conservative.*

Proof: Enumerate all \mathfrak{M} -coded sequences of length c of subsets of finite Cartesian powers of \bar{c} as $\langle h_n : n < \omega \rangle$. More specifically, each h_n codes a sequence of the form $\langle S_i : i < c \rangle$, where every S_i is a subset of $[\bar{c}]^{m_n}$ and $m_n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ only depends on n . Thanks to Lemma 4.2, we can now modify the proof of Theorem 3.3 by inductively constructing *five* sequences $\langle V_n : n < \omega \rangle$, $\langle W_n : n < \omega \rangle$, $\langle X_n : n < \omega \rangle$, and $\langle Y_n : n < \omega \rangle$ and $\langle Z_n : n < \omega \rangle$ of I -large elements of $\mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ such that for all $n < \omega$,

1. $V_n \supseteq W_n \supseteq X_n \supseteq Y_n \supseteq Z_n \supseteq V_{n+1}$;
2. V_n decides every member of the sequence coded by h_n ;
3. f_n is constant on W_n ;
4. X_n is g_n -canonical;

5. g_n is constant on Y_n , or $\exists m_0 \in M \setminus I$ such that $g_n(\mathbf{x}) > m_0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in [Y_n]^{k_n}$;
6. $\text{Card}(Z_n) \leq a_n$.

This desired ultrafilter \mathcal{U} is $\{S \in \mathcal{P}(\bar{c}) : \exists n \in \omega (V_n \subseteq S)\}$.

□

Suppose \mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{M}^* are two models of bounded arithmetic that share a cut I closed under exponentiation. It is clear that if there is an isomorphism between \mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{M}^* that is the identity on I , then $\text{Th}(\mathfrak{M}, i)_{i \in I} = \text{Th}(\mathfrak{M}^*, i)_{i \in I}$, and $\text{SSy}_I(\mathfrak{M}) = \text{SSy}_I(\mathfrak{M}^*)$. As shown by the next lemma, this result has a converse if \mathfrak{M}^* is a *cofinal* elementary extension of \mathfrak{M} , and both \mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{M}^* are countable recursively saturated models of PA .

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose I is a cut closed under exponentiation in a countable recursively saturated model \mathfrak{M} of PA , and \mathfrak{M}^* is a cofinal countable elementary extension of \mathfrak{M} such that $I \subseteq_e \mathfrak{M}^*$ with $\text{SSy}_I(\mathfrak{M}) = \text{SSy}_I(\mathfrak{M}^*)$. Then \mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{M}^* are isomorphic over I , i.e., there is an isomorphism between \mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{M}^* that is the identity on I .*

Proof: The desired isomorphism can be constructed via a routine back-and-forth argument, once we establish the following central claim:

Claim: *Suppose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\mathfrak{M}, a_1, \dots, a_n, i)_{i \in I} \equiv (\mathfrak{M}^*, b_1, \dots, b_n, i)_{i \in I}$.*

(a) *For every $c \in M$ there is $d \in M^*$ such that*

$$(\mathfrak{M}, a_1, \dots, a_n, c, i)_{i \in I} \equiv (\mathfrak{M}^*, b_1, \dots, b_n, d, i)_{i \in I};$$

(b) *For every $d \in M^*$ there is $c \in M$ such that*

$$(\mathfrak{M}, a_1, \dots, a_n, c, i)_{i \in I} \equiv (\mathfrak{M}^*, b_1, \dots, b_n, d, i)_{i \in I}.$$

We shall prove part (b) of the claim only. The proof of part (a) is left as an exercise for the reader (it is similar and does not need the assumption $\text{SSy}_I(\mathfrak{M}) = \text{SSy}_I(\mathfrak{M}^*)$). It is well-known that the isomorphism type of a countable recursively saturated model \mathfrak{M} of arithmetic is uniquely determined by $\text{Th}(\mathfrak{M})$ and $\text{SSy}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathfrak{M})$. We may therefore assume, without loss of generality, that I is longer than \mathbb{N} . By Theorem 2.8 there is a satisfaction class S on \mathfrak{M} that is s -correct for some nonstandard s . Since $I \neq \mathbb{N}$, by shortening S and s , if necessary, we can also safely assume that

- (1) $s \in I$ and $\langle \lceil \varphi \rceil, a \rangle \in S \implies \lceil \varphi \rceil < s$.

Theorem 2.9 implies that there is some s -correct satisfaction class S^* on \mathfrak{M}^* such that $(\mathfrak{M}, S) \prec (\mathfrak{M}^*, S^*)$ and (1) holds with S replaced by S^* .

Suppose that $\mathbf{a} := (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, $\mathbf{b} := (b_1, \dots, b_n)$, and

$$(2) \quad (\mathfrak{M}, \mathbf{a}, i)_{i \in I} \equiv (\mathfrak{M}^*, \mathbf{b}, i)_{i \in I}.$$

Given $d \in M^*$ we wish to find some $c \in M$ such that

$$(\mathfrak{M}, \mathbf{a}, c, i)_{i \in I} \equiv (\mathfrak{M}^*, \mathbf{b}, d, i)_{i \in I}.$$

To do so, first consider $Y \subseteq I$ defined as follows:

$$Y := \{ \langle i, \lceil \varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z) \rceil \rangle : i \in I \text{ and } \langle \lceil \varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z) \rceil, \langle i, \mathbf{b}, d \rangle \rangle \in S^* \}.$$

Recall that, intuitively speaking, $\langle \lceil \varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z) \rceil, \langle i, \mathbf{b}, d \rangle \rangle \in S^*$ if the potentially nonstandard formula $\varphi(i, \mathbf{b}, d)$ is true in the sense of S^* . It is easy to see, using that fact that (\mathfrak{M}^*, S^*) satisfies $PA(S^*)$, that $Y \in SSy_I(\mathfrak{M}^*)$. Furthermore, for any $i \in I$ and any standard formula $\varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z)$ with $\mathbf{y} := (y_1, \dots, y_n)$,

$$\mathfrak{M}^* \models \varphi(i, \mathbf{b}, d) \iff \langle i, \lceil \varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z) \rceil \rangle \in Y.$$

For each $i \in I$, let

$$Y_i := \{ \langle j, \lceil \varphi \rceil \rangle \in Y : j < i \}.$$

The assumption that I is closed under exponentiation together with (1) implies that for each $i \in I$ there is some $m_i \in I$ such that

$$Y_i = (m_i)_E.$$

Clearly

$$(3) \quad \text{If } \lceil \varphi \rceil < s \text{ and } i \in I, \text{ then } (\mathfrak{M}^*, \mathbf{b}, d) \text{ satisfies:} \\ \forall j < i \quad (\langle \lceil \varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z) \rceil, \langle j, \mathbf{b}, d \rangle \rangle \in S^* \iff \langle j, \lceil \varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z) \rceil \rangle \in Em_i).$$

Therefore

$$(4) \quad \text{If } \lceil \varphi \rceil < s \text{ and } i \in I, \text{ then } (\mathfrak{M}^*, \mathbf{b}) \text{ satisfies:} \\ \exists z_0 \forall j < i \quad (\langle \lceil \varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z) \rceil, \langle j, \mathbf{b}, z_0 \rangle \rangle \in S^* \iff \langle j, \lceil \varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z) \rceil \rangle \in Em_i).$$

Let $f : I \rightarrow I$ by $f(i) = m_i$. The fact that $(\mathfrak{M}^*, S^*) \models PA(S^*)$ makes it evident that for some $\bar{f} \in M$, $\bar{f} \upharpoonright I = f$. Since f can be canonically coded as a subset of I and $SSy_I(\mathfrak{M}^*) = SSy_I(\mathfrak{M})$, this shows that there is some $\tilde{f} \in M^*$ such that

$$(5) \quad \forall i \in I \quad \tilde{f}(i) = \bar{f}(i) = m_i.$$

Thanks to (2), (4), and (5),

$$(6) \quad \forall i \in I \quad (\mathfrak{M}, \mathbf{a}, \bar{f}, S) \models \theta(i), \text{ where } \theta(i) \text{ denotes the formula below} \\ \exists z_0 \forall j < i \langle [\varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z)], \langle j, \mathbf{a}, z_0 \rangle \rangle \in S \longleftrightarrow \forall j < i \langle \langle j, [\varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z)] \rangle E\bar{f}(i) \rangle.$$

So by overspill applied to $\theta(i)$, for some $k \in M^* \setminus I$, there is some $c \in M^*$ such that

$$(7) \quad \text{For all standard } \varphi, (\mathfrak{M}, \mathbf{a}, c) \models \forall j < k \langle \varphi(j, \mathbf{a}, c) \longleftrightarrow \langle j, \varphi(x, \mathbf{y}, z) \rangle Em_k \rangle$$

This completes the proof of part (b) of the claim since (7) and (3) together imply that

$$(\mathfrak{M}, \mathbf{a}, c, i)_{i \in I} \equiv (\mathfrak{M}^*, \mathbf{b}, d, i)_{i \in I}.$$

□

We are now ready to establish the following strengthening of Smoryński's theorem.

Theorem B. *Suppose \mathfrak{M} is a countable recursively saturated model of PA and I is a cut of \mathfrak{M} that is closed under exponentiation. There is a group embedding*

$$j \mapsto \tilde{j}$$

from $Aut(\mathbb{Q})$ into $Aut(\mathfrak{M})$ such that:

- (a) $I_{fix}(\tilde{j}) = I$ for every nontrivial $j \in Aut(\mathbb{Q})$;
- (b) $fix(\tilde{j}) \cong \mathfrak{M}$ for every fixed point free $j \in Aut(\mathbb{Q})$.

Proof: Choose $c \in M \setminus I$ and let \mathcal{U} be the I -conservative ultrafilter over $\mathcal{P}(\bar{c})$ constructed in Theorem 4.3. Use \mathcal{U} to build the cofinal elementary extension $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{Q}}$ of \mathfrak{M} , where \mathbb{Q} is the ordered set of rationals (see Remark 3.8.1). Invoking parts (d), (e), and (f) of Theorem 3.8, there is a group embedding

$$j \xrightarrow{\lambda} \hat{j}$$

from $Aut(\mathbb{Q})$ into $Aut(\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{Q}})$ such that $I_{fix}(\hat{j}) = I$ for every nontrivial $j \in Aut(\mathbb{Q})$, and $fix(\hat{j}) \cong \mathfrak{M}$ for every fixed point free $j \in Aut(\mathbb{Q})$. On the

other hand, by Theorem 2.8 recursive saturation is preserved in the passage from \mathfrak{M} to $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{Q}}$ and therefore by Lemmas 4.1 and 4.4, \mathfrak{M} and $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{Q}}$ are isomorphic over I via an isomorphism $\theta : \mathfrak{M} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{Q}}$. This allows us to define the desired embedding $j \xrightarrow{\alpha} \tilde{j}$ by:

$$\alpha = \theta^{-1} \circ \lambda \circ \theta.$$

This is illustrated by the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{j}=\alpha(j)} & \mathfrak{M} \\ \downarrow \theta & & \uparrow \theta^{-1} \\ \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{Q}} & \xrightarrow{\hat{j}=\lambda(j)} & \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{U},\mathbb{Q}} \end{array}$$

□

Remark 4.5.

(a) As shown by Kossak [Kos], if \mathbb{N} is not a strong cut of a countable recursively saturated model \mathfrak{M} of PA , then the fixed point set of any automorphism of \mathfrak{M} is isomorphic to \mathfrak{M} itself. On the other hand, [E-3] confirms a conjecture of Schmerl by showing that if \mathbb{N} is strong in \mathfrak{M} , then the isomorphism type of every elementary substructure of \mathfrak{M} can be realized by a fixed point set of \mathfrak{M} . [E-3] also includes other results regarding automorphisms of models of PA , including refinements of some of the major results of [KKK].

(b) The existence of a *group embedding* of $Aut(\mathbb{Q})$ into $Aut(\mathfrak{M})$, where \mathfrak{M} is a countable recursively saturated model of PA , was first established as corollary of a deep theorem of Schmerl [Sc-2], which states that every countable recursively saturated model with a definable β -function f (i.e., a function f coding finite sequences) is generated via f from a set of order indiscernibles of any prescribed countable order type with no last element. Elementary considerations show that $Aut(\mathfrak{M})$ is also embeddable in $Aut(\mathbb{Q})$. Indeed, as shown in [KKK, Theorem 4.4] there is an embedding of $Aut(\mathfrak{M})$ into $Aut(\mathbb{Q})$ whose range is dense in $Aut(\mathbb{Q})$ (under its natural topology). It is known, however, that $Aut(\mathbb{Q}) \not\cong Aut(\mathfrak{M})$, since for example, $Aut(\mathbb{Q})$ is a divisible group (see [Gl]), but $Aut(\mathfrak{M})$ is not (see [KB]). Indeed, as shown in [KKK, Theorem 4.7] $Aut(\mathfrak{M})$ is not isomorphic to the automorphism group of any countable \aleph_0 -categorical structure with the small-index property.

(c) Nurkhaidarov [N-1, N-2] has established that for a (fully) saturated model \mathfrak{M} of PA of power \aleph_1 , a cut I of \mathfrak{M} is of the form $I_{fix}(j)$ for some non-trivial $j \in Aut(\mathfrak{M})$ iff I is closed under exponentiation and the downward

cofinality of $M \setminus I$ is \aleph_1 . It is easy to see that if PA has a saturated model of power \aleph_α , then the unique saturated linear order of power \aleph_α , dubbed η_α by Hausdorff, exists. As shown in [E-6], the method of proof of Theorem B can be adapted to extend the right-to-left direction of Nurkhaidarov's result by showing that there is a group embedding $j \mapsto \widehat{j}$ of $Aut(\eta_1)$ into $Aut(\mathfrak{M})$ such that $Fix(\widehat{j}) = I$ for every nontrivial $j \in Aut(\eta_1)$.

(d) By a corollary of a theorem of Kossak and Kotlarski [KK, Theorem 2.1, Corollary 2.3], the conclusion of Lemma 4.4 continues to hold if the assumption $\mathfrak{M} \prec_{\text{cofinal}} \mathfrak{M}^*$ is replaced with the assumption that I is not coded from above by \mathbb{N} in neither \mathfrak{M} nor \mathfrak{M}^* . In light of the fact that the aforementioned result of Kossak and Kotlarski is framed within the more general context of extendability of automorphisms, the referee has suggested that the strategy of the proof of Lemma 4.4 should also yield an extendability result. The author concurs with the referee's opinion, but has not verified the nitty gritty details of the argument.

(e) As shown by Togha and the author [To, Theorem 3], Smoryński's theorem has a natural analogue for models of ZFC set theory. The proof of Theorem B can be adapted to models of ZFC (with the Erdős-Rado partition theorem taking the place of the finite Ramsey's theorem) to prove an analogue of Theorem B for models of ZFC . This is accomplished in a forthcoming paper [E-4], which also includes a set theoretical analogue of Theorem A of this paper.

5. A REFINEMENT OF THEOREM A

The author has recently established a refinement of Theorem A by characterizing the subsystem WKL_0^* of second order arithmetic in terms of automorphisms of models of $I\Delta_0$. WKL_0^* is a weakening of the well-known subsystem WKL_0 of second order arithmetic in which the Σ_1^0 -induction scheme is replaced by $I\Delta_0 + Exp$. WKL_0^* was introduced by S. Simpson and R. Smith in [Si-Sm] (see also [Sim, Chapter X.4]) who proved, among other things, that $I\Delta_0 + Exp + B\Sigma_1$ is the first order part of WKL_0^* (in contrast to WKL_0 , whose first order part is $I\Sigma_1$). More specifically:

Theorem 5.1. (Simpson-Smith [Si-Sm])

- (a) If $(\mathfrak{M}, \mathcal{A})$ is a model of WKL_0^* , then $\mathfrak{M} \models I\Delta_0 + Exp + B\Sigma_1$;
- (b) Every countable model of $I\Delta_0 + Exp + B\Sigma_1$ can be expanded to a model of WKL_0^* .

In light of Theorem 5.1, the following result is a refinement of Theorem A.

Theorem C. [E-5] *The following two conditions are equivalent for a countable model $(\mathfrak{M}, \mathcal{A})$ of the language of second order arithmetic:*

- (a) $\mathfrak{M} = I_{fix}(j)$ for some nontrivial automorphism j of a model \mathfrak{N} of $I\Delta_0$ and $\mathcal{A} = SSy_M(\mathfrak{N})$
- (b) $(\mathfrak{M}, \mathcal{A}) \models WKL_0^*$.

The direction (a) \Rightarrow (b) of Theorem C easily follows Lemmas A.0 - A.2 and known results. The direction (b) \Rightarrow (a), however, is much harder and uses the methods of this paper and the following result, which generalizes the Wilkie-Paris theorem (Theorem 2.4) and improves a key result of Tanaka [Ta]:

Theorem 5.2. [E-5] *Suppose $(\mathfrak{M}, \mathcal{A})$ is a countable model of WKL_0^* . There is an end extension \mathfrak{N} of \mathfrak{M} that satisfies $I\Delta_0$ such that $\mathcal{A} = SSy_M(\mathfrak{N})$.*

References

- [Ad-1] Z. Adamowicz, *A recursion-theoretic characterization of instances of $B\Sigma_1$ provable in $\Pi_{n+1}(\mathbb{N})$* , **Fundamenta Mathematicae**, vol. 129 (1988), pp. 231-236.
- [Ad-2] -----, *End extending models of $I\Delta_0 + \exp + B\Sigma_1$* , **Fundamenta Mathematicae**, vol. 136 (1990), no. 3, pp. 133-145.
- [Av-1] J. Avigad, *Saturated models of universal theories*, **Annals of Pure and Applied Logic**, vol. 118 (2002), pp. 219-234.
- [Av-2] ----, *Number theory and elementary arithmetic*, **Philosophia Mathematica**, vol. 11, issue 3 (2002), pp. 257-284.
- [BS] J. Barwise and J. Schlipf, *On recursively saturated models of arithmetic*, in **Model Theory and Algebra: a tribute to A. Robinson** (edited by D. Saracino and V. Weipsfennig), Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 498, 1976.
- [Bek] L. Beklemishev, *A proof theoretic analysis of collection*, **Archive for Mathematical Logic**, vol. 37 (1998), pp. 275-296.
- [Ben] J. H. Bennett, **On Spectra**, Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1962.

- [Bu] S. Buss, *Proof theory of arithmetic*, in **Handbook of Proof Theory** (S. Buss, ed.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998.
- [DG] C. Dimitracopoulos and H. Gaifman, *Fragments of Peano's Arithmetic and the MRDP theorem*, in **Logic and Algorithmic**, Monogr. Enseign. Math. University of Geneva, 1982, pp. 187-206.
- [E-1] A. Enayat, *Automorphisms, Mahlo cardinals, and NFU*, in **Non-standard Models of Arithmetic and Set Theory** (A. Enayat and R. Kossak ed.), Contemporary Mathematics Series, vol. 361, American Mathematical Society, 2004.
- [E-2] -----, *From bounded arithmetic to second order arithmetic via automorphisms*, **Logic in Tehran**, Proceedings of the Conference and Workshop of Logic, Arithmetic, and Algebra (A. Enayat, I. Kalantari, and M. Moniri, ed.), Lecture Notes in Logic Series, vol. 26, ASL and A.K. Peters, 2006.
- [E-3] -----, *Automorphisms of models of arithmetic: a unified view*, to appear in **Annals of Pure and Applied Logic**.
- [E-4] -----, *Automorphisms of models of set theory*, in preparation.
- [E-5] -----, *Automorphisms and WKL_0^** , in preparation.
- [E-6] -----, *Automorphisms of saturated models of arithmetic*, in preparation.
- [ER] P. Erdős and R. Rado, *A combinatorial theorem*, **Journal of the London Mathematical Society**, vol. 25 (1950), pp. 249-255.
- [Ga] H. Gaifman, *Models and types of arithmetic*, **Annals of Mathematical Logic**, vol. 9 (1976), pp. 223-306.
- [Gl] A. Glass, **Ordered Permutation Groups**, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981.
- [GRS] R. Graham, B. Rothschild, and J. Spencer, **Ramsey Theory**, Wiley-Interscience publications, New York, 1980.
- [H] P. Hájek, *Interpretability and fragments of arithmetic*, in **Arithmetic, Proof Theory and Computational Complexity** (P. Clote and J. Krajíček, ed.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1993.

- [HP] P. Hájek and P. Pudlák, **Metamathematics of First Order Arithmetic**, Springer, Heidelberg, 1993.
- [J] R. B. Jensen, *On the consistency of a slight (?) modification of Quine's New Foundations*, **Synthese**, vol. 19 (1969), pp. 250-263.
- [Ka-1] R. Kaye, *Model-theoretic properties characterizing Peano arithmetic*, **Journal of Symbolic Logic**, vol. 56, pp. 949-963 (1991).
- [Ka-2] ----, **Models of Arithmetic**, vol. 15 of *Oxford Logic Guides*, Oxford University Press.
- [Ka-3] ----, *Using Herbrand-type theorems to separate strong fragments of arithmetic*, in **Arithmetic, Proof Theory and Computational Complexity** (P. Clote and J. Krajíček, ed.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1993.
- [Ka-4] ----, *A Galois correspondence for countable recursively saturated models of Peano arithmetic*, in [KM].
- [KKK] R. Kaye, R. Kossak, and H. Kotlarski, *Automorphisms of recursively saturated models of arithmetic*, **Annals of Pure and Applied Logic**, vol. 55 (1991), pp. 67-99.
- [KM] R. Kaye and D. MacPherson, **Automorphisms of First-Order Structures**, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1994.
- [Kos] R. Kossak, *Automorphisms of recursively saturated models of peano arithmetic: fixed point sets*, L.J. of IGPL, Vol. 5, No 6, pp. 787-794 (1997).
- [KB] R. Kossak and N. Bamber, *On two questions concerning the automorphism groups of countable recursively saturated models of PA*, **Archive for Mathematical Logic**, vol. 36 (1996), pp. 73-79.
- [KK] R. Kossak and H. Kotlarski, *Results on automorphisms of recursively saturated models of PA*, **Fundamenta Mathematicae**, vol. 129 (1988), no. 1, pp. 9-15.
- [Kot] H. Kotlarski, *On cofinal extensions of models of arithmetic*, **Journal of Symbolic Logic**, vol. 48 (1983), pp. 311-319.
- [Kr] J. Krajíček, **Bounded Arithmetic, Propositional Logic, and Complexity Theory**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

- [N-1] E. Nurkhaidarov, **On Automorphisms of Models of Arithmetic**, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, 2004.
- [N-2] -----, *Automorphism groups of saturated models of PA of cardinality \aleph_1* , to appear.
- [Pari] J. Paris, *Some conservation results for fragments of arithmetic*, in **Lecture Notes in Mathematics**, vol. 890, Springer-Verlag, 1981, pp. 251-262.
- [PM] J. Paris and G. Mills, *Closure properties of countable nonstandard integers*. **Fundamenta Mathematicae** vol. 103 (1979), no. 3, pp. 205–215.
- [Pars] C. Parsons, *On a number theoretic choice schema and its relation to induction*, in **Intuitionism and Proof Theory** (Proc. Conf., Buffalo, N.Y., 1968) pp. 459–473 North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- [Pu] P. Pudlák, *A definition of exponentiation by a bounded arithmetical formula*, **Comm. Math. Univ. Carol.** vol. 24 (1983), pp. 667-671.
- [Q] W.V.O. Quine, *New foundations for mathematical logic*, **American Mathematical Monthly**, vol. 44 (1937), pp. 70-80.
- [R] J. P. Ressayre, *Nonstandard Universes with strong embeddings*, in **Contemporary Mathematics** (S. Simpson, ed.), vol. 65, American Mathematical Society, 1987.
- [Sc-1] J. Schmerl, *Recursively saturated rather classless models of Peano arithmetic*, In **Logic Year 1979-80**, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 859, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York 1981 pp. 268-282.
- [Sc-2] -----, *Recursively saturated models generated by indiscernibles*, **Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic**, vol. 25 (1985), pp. 99-105.
- [Sie] W. Sieg, *Fragments of arithmetic*, **Annals of Pure and Applied Logic**, vol. 28 (1985), pp. 33-72.
- [Sim] S. Simpson, **Subsystems of Second Order Arithmetic**, Springer, Heidelberg 1999.
- [Si-Sm] S. Simpson and R. Smith, *Factorization of polynomials and Σ_1^0 -induction*, **Annals of Pure and Applied Logic**, vol. 31 (1986), pp. 289-306.

- [Sm] C. Smoryński, *Back-and-forth in a recursively saturated model of arithmetic*, in **Logic Colloquium '80** (edited by D. van Dalen, D. Lascar, and J. Smiley), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.
- [Sm-St] C. Smoryński and J. Stavi, *Cofinal extension preserves recursive saturation*, **Model theory of algebra and arithmetic** (Proc. Conf., Karpacz, 1979), pp. 338–345, Lecture Notes in Math., 834, Springer, Berlin, 1980.
- [Ta] K. Tanaka, *The self-embedding theorem of WKL_0 and a non-standard method*, **Annals of Pure and Applied Logic**, vol. 84 (1997), pp. 41-49.
- [To] A. Togha, *Automorphisms of recursively saturated models of set theory*, in **Nonstandard Models of Arithmetic and Set Theory** (A. Enayat and R. Kossak ed.), Contemporary Mathematics Series, vol. 361, American Mathematical Society, 2004.
- [WP] A. Wilkie and J. Paris, *On the existence of end extensions of models of bounded induction*, in **Logic, methodology and philosophy of science, VIII** (Moscow, 1987), pp. 143–161, Stud. Logic Found. Math., 126, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989.