

Natural induction (a model-theoretic study)

SINGLE-SIDED DRAFT

Anders E.V. Lundstedt

Mon Aug 10 16:18:12 CEST 2026

Contents

1	TODOs	1
2	Introduction	2
3	Preliminaries	3
§ 3.1	Syntax of first-order logic	3
§ 3.2	Semantics of first-order logic	9
4	Languages, theories and models of arithmetic	10
§ 4.1	Languages and theories of arithmetic	10
§ 4.2	Some languages and theories of arithmetic, and some models	12
§ 4.2.1	Robinson arithmetic	12
§ 4.2.2	The theory of the non-negative parts of discretely ordered rings, and its model the non-negative part of the ordered ring of integer polynomials in one variable	13
5	Precisely and sensibly representing mathematical definitions, facts and proofs	19
6	Non-inductiveness as a tool for representing the necessity of non-straightforward induction proofs	20
7	Finitely non-standard models of Robinson arithmetic	21
§ 7.1	TODOs	21
§ 7.2	Introduction	21
§ 7.3	Finitely non-standard models of the progression fragment of Robinson arithmetic	26

Contents

§ 7.4	Some conveniences and some helpful lemmas	28
§ 7.5	Finitely non-standard models of the addition fragment of Robinson arithmetic	34
§ 7.6	Finitely non-standard models of Robinson arithmetic	46
§ 7.A	Some proofs	62
§ 7.B	The complete and explicit definition of the model from Example 7.5.30	67
§ 7.C	A Coq formalization verifying that Example 7.6.42 pro- vides a model of Robinson arithmetic	71
§ 7.D	Source of Python script referenced in Proofs 7.6.44, and the output from running it	83
§ 7.D.1	Source	83
§ 7.D.2	Output	103
8	Finitely non-standard models of weak extensions of Robinson arithmetic	115
§ 8.1	Introduction	115
§ 8.2	Commutative finitely non-standard $\mathcal{L}^+$ -models of the addition fragment of Robinson arithmetic	115
§ 8.3	Associative finitely non-standard $\mathcal{L}^+$ -models of the ad- dition fragment of Robinson arithmetic	117
9	Natural induction	119
§ 9.1	Introduction	119
§ 9.2	Proving commutativity of addition	122
§ 9.3	Proving commutativity of multiplication	124
§ 9.4	Starting from Robinson arithmetic and using successor induction, two “natural” ways of proving the semiring extension of Robinson arithmetic	127
§ 9.5	An interesting discussion on the Foundatings of Mathe- matics mailing list	128
§ 9.6	Introduction	128
§ 9.A	Proofs of Facts 9.6.13 (non-inductiveness results)	135
§ 9.A.1	Proof of Fact 9.6.13(a)(1) (a non-inductiveness of (L7))	135
§ 9.A.2	Proof of Fact 9.6.13(a)(2) (another non-inductiveness of (L7))	136
§ 9.A.3	Proof of Fact 9.6.13(b) (non-inductiveness of (A [×]))	137

Contents

§ 9.A.4	Proof of Fact 9.6.13(c)(1) (a non-inductiveness of (C^+))	138
§ 9.A.5	Proof of Fact 9.6.13(c)(2) (a non-inductiveness of (C^+))	138
§ 9.A.6	Proof of Fact 9.6.13(e) (non-inductiveness of (D_+^x))	139
§ 9.B	Proofs of Facts 9.6.11 (inductiveness results)	140
§ 9.B.1	Proof of Fact 9.6.11(a) (inductiveness of $(L4)$)	140
§ 9.B.2	Proof of Fact 9.6.11(b) (inductiveness of $(L5)$)	143
§ 9.B.3	Proof of Fact 9.6.11(c) (inductiveness of $(L6)$)	146
§ 9.B.4	Proof of Fact 9.6.11(d)(1) (an inductiveness of $(L7)$)	150
§ 9.B.5	Proof of Fact 9.6.11(d)(2) (another inductiveness of $(L7)$)	155
§ 9.B.6	Proof of Fact 9.6.11(e) (inductiveness of (A^+))	159
§ 9.B.7	Proof of Fact 9.6.11(f) (inductiveness of (A^x))	162
§ 9.B.8	Proof of Fact 9.6.11(g) (inductiveness of (C^+))	166
§ 9.B.9	Proof of Fact 9.6.11(h) (inductiveness of (C^x))	170
§ 9.B.10	Proof of Fact 9.6.11(i) (inductiveness of (D_+^x))	173
§ 9.C	Indications of non-inductiveness, by non-immediate termination of SPASS on suitable inputs	178
§ 9.C.1	Indicating a non-inductiveness of $(L7)$ (Fact 9.6.13(a)(1))	178
§ 9.C.2	Indicating another non-inductiveness of $(L7)$ (Fact 9.6.13(a)(2))	184
§ 9.C.3	Indicating non-inductiveness of (A^x) (Fact 9.6.13(b))	189
§ 9.C.4	Indicating a non-inductiveness of (C^+) (Fact 9.6.13(c)(1))	196
§ 9.C.5	Indicating another non-inductiveness of (C^+) (Fact 9.6.13(c)(2))	201
§ 9.C.6	Indicating a non-inductiveness of (C^x) (Fact 9.6.13(d)(1))	207
§ 9.C.7	Indicating another non-inductiveness of (C^x) (Fact 9.6.13(d)(2))	212
§ 9.C.8	Indicating non-inductiveness of (D_+^x) (Fact 9.6.13(e))	217
§ 9.D	Template for SPASS sources	224
10	Comparing inductive solutions	240
§ 10.1	Preliminaries	240
§ 10.2	Introduction	241
§ 10.3	Some ways to compare the logical strength of first-order formulas	242

Contents

§ 10.4 Inductive solutions that are not stronger than the formula they are an inductive solution for	243
§ 10.A Hetzl and Wong’s proof of Fact 10.4.2	244
§ 10.B Eric Johannesson’s proofs of Facts 10.4.5	245
11 Ideas for future work	248
§ 11.1 Necessarily non-analytic induction proofs	248
§ 11.2 Reverse inductive theorem proving	248
§ 11.3 Guided f.n.s. counter-model search	248
§ 11.4 Direction of proof as an explanation of our intuitive understanding of causality	248
Bibliography	249

10 Comparing inductive solutions

§ 10.1 Preliminaries

¶ 10.1.1 **Definitions [universal and partial closures]** For each formula $\varphi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ in any language:

(a) The universal closure of φ is:

$$\mathbf{C}\varphi := \forall \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \varphi.$$

(b) The α_i -free partial closure of φ is:

$$\mathbf{C}_{-\alpha_i}\varphi := \forall \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_n \varphi.$$

¶ 10.1.2 **Definition [parameter-free induction axioms]** For each language L of arithmetic, for each L -formula $\varphi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$, and for each variable α , the parameter-free induction axiom for φ in α is:

$$\mathbf{I}(\varphi, \alpha) := (\mathbf{C}_{-\alpha}\varphi)[0/\alpha] \wedge \forall \alpha (\mathbf{C}_{-\alpha}\varphi \rightarrow (\mathbf{C}_{-\alpha}\varphi)[\alpha + 1/\alpha]) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}\varphi.$$

¶ 10.1.3 **Definition [parameter-free induction schemas]** For each language L of arithmetic, the parameter-free induction scheme for L is:

$$\mathbf{I}(L) := \{ \mathbf{I}(\varphi, \alpha) : \varphi \text{ } L\text{-formula, } \alpha \text{ variable} \}.$$

¶ 10.1.4 **Definitions [inductive formulas]** For each language L of arithmetic and for each L -theory T :

(a) An L -formula $\varphi(\alpha)$ is inductive relative to T (alternatively: φ is T -inductive) if and only if:

$$T, \mathbf{I}(\varphi, \alpha) \vdash \forall \alpha \varphi(\alpha).$$

(b) An L -formula $\varphi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is inductive relative to T (alternatively: φ is T -inductive) if and only if $\mathbf{C}_{-\alpha}\varphi$ is inductive relative to T for some α in $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$.

¶ 10.1.5 **Definition [inductive solutions]** For each language L of arithmetic and for each L -theory T : an L -formula ψ is an inductive solution for an L -formula φ relative to T (alternatively: ψ is a T -inductive solution for φ) if and only if:

- ψ is inductive relative to T ; and
- $T \vdash C\psi \rightarrow C\varphi$.

§ 10.2 Introduction

¶ 10.2.1 The purpose of this short chapter is to motivate the terminology ‘non-straightforward induction proof’. As remarked earlier, in actual mathematical practice the terminology used is seldom something like ‘non-straightforward induction proof’ but almost always something like:

- ‘proof by strengthening one’s induction hypothesis’; or
- ‘(inductive) proof by generalization (of the statement to be proved)’.

And indeed, when a working mathematician encounters an arithmetic fact F seemingly requiring a non-straightforward proof it is almost always the case that:*

- F is sensibly modeled by the universal closure of a formula φ in some language L of arithmetic;
- the facts our working mathematician has at its disposal are sensibly modeled by an L -theory T of arithmetic;
- φ is non-inductive relative to T ;
- a natural non-straightforward proof of F is sensibly modeled by a T -inductive solution ψ for φ ;
- ψ is stronger than φ in an obvious sense—we typically have

$$T \vdash C(\psi \rightarrow \varphi)$$

* I here disregard those cases where a non-straightforward proof of F proceeds by straightforward induction after one or more lemmas each has been proved by induction. Me disregarding these cases does not affect the point made, since many non-straightforward induction proofs do not proceed like that.

$$T \not\vdash C(\varphi \rightarrow \psi),$$

or at least

$$T \vdash C\psi \rightarrow C\varphi$$

$$T \not\vdash C\varphi \rightarrow C\psi.$$

While perhaps not representing everyday mathematical practice, there are nonetheless theories T of arithmetic with T -non-inductive formulas φ having T -inductive solutions ψ such that, in a precise and sensible sense, ψ is not stronger relative to T than φ . Thus a more general terminology—such as ‘non-straightforward induction proof’—is motivated.

¶ 10.2.2

I present two facts in this chapter—one due to [Hetzl and Wong \(2018\)](#) and one due to Eric Johannesson ([Johannesson and Lundstedt, 2026](#)). Both facts show that there are theories T of arithmetic with T -non-inductive formulas φ having T -inductive solutions ψ such that, in a precise and sensible sense, ψ is not stronger relative to T than φ .

§ 10.3 Some ways to compare the logical strength of first-order formulas

¶ 10.3.1

In our manuscript in preparation, Eric Johannesson and I ([2026](#)) provide many ways to compare the strength of first-order formulas. For present purposes, the following definitions suffice.

¶ 10.3.2

Definitions For each language L , for each L -theory T , for each variable α , and for all L -formulas φ and ψ :

- (a) φ is at least as T -strong in α as ψ , and ψ is at least as T -weak in α as φ , if and only if:

$$T \vdash \forall\alpha: C_{-\alpha}\varphi \rightarrow C_{-\alpha}\psi.$$

- (b) φ is (strictly) T -stronger in α than ψ , and ψ is (strictly) T -weaker in α than φ , if and only if:

$$T \vdash \forall\alpha: C_{-\alpha}\varphi \rightarrow C_{-\alpha}\psi$$

$$T \not\vdash \forall\alpha: C_{-\alpha}\psi \rightarrow C_{-\alpha}\varphi.$$

(c) φ and ψ are T -incomparable in α if and only if:

$$T \not\models \forall \alpha: C_{-\alpha} \varphi \rightarrow C_{-\alpha} \psi$$

$$T \not\models \forall \alpha: C_{-\alpha} \psi \rightarrow C_{-\alpha} \varphi.$$

¶ 10.3.3 **Remark** As should be obvious and expected, for each theory T and for each variable α :

‘— is at least as T -strong in α as —’

and

‘— is at least as T -weak in α as —’

are dual non-strict partial orders; and

‘— is T -stronger in α than —’

and

‘— is T -weaker in α than —’

are the respective correspondingly induced dual strict partial orders; and

‘— and — are T -incomparable in α ’

is the correspondingly induced incomparability relation.

§ 10.4 Inductive solutions that are not stronger than the formula they are an inductive solution for

¶ 10.4.1 The following fact is a straightforward generalization of Hetzl and Wong’s (2018) Proposition 3.2. Their formulation only applies to PA^- , but their proof works for any theory of arithmetic.

¶ 10.4.2 **Fact** [Hetzl and Wong (2018)] For each language L of arithmetic and for each L -theory T of arithmetic such that $T \not\models \text{I}(L)$ there is an L -formula $\varphi(x)$ such that:

- φ has a T -inductive solution; and
- each T -inductive solution $\psi(x)$ for φ is T -weaker in x than φ .

¶ 10.4.3 Proof § 10.A.

¶ 10.4.4 The following facts are due to Eric Johannesson. Definitions 4.2.2.2, of which Definition 4.2.2.2(a) is restated in § 10.B, define ‘ $\mathcal{L}^{\text{OR}}$ ’ and ‘ PA^- ’, but for understanding the present relevance of Eric’s discoveries, it suffices to know that $\mathcal{L}^{\text{OR}}$ is a language of arithmetic and that PA^- is a theory of $\mathcal{L}^{\text{OR}}$ -arithmetic (Fact 4.2.2.4).

¶ 10.4.5 Facts [Johannesson and Lundstedt (2026)] There are $\mathcal{L}^{\text{OR}}$ -formulas $\varphi_1(x)$, $\varphi_2(x)$ and $\psi(x)$ such that:

- (a) ψ is a PA^- -inductive solution for φ_1 , and ψ is PA^- -weaker in x than φ_1 .
- (b) ψ is a PA^- -inductive solution for φ_2 , and ψ and φ_2 are PA^- -incomparable in x .

¶ 10.4.6 Proofs § 10.B.

§ 10.A Hetzl and Wong’s proof of Fact 10.4.2

¶ 10.A.1 Fact 10.4.2 (restated) For each language L of arithmetic and for each L -theory T of arithmetic such that $T \not\vdash \text{I}(L)$ there is an L -formula $\varphi(x)$ such that:

- φ has a T -inductive solution; and
- each T -inductive solution $\psi(x)$ for φ is T -weaker in x than φ .

¶ 10.A.2 Just as the above fact is a straightforward generalization of Hetzl and Wong’s (2018) Proposition 3.2, the following proof is a straightforward generalization of their proof of that result.

¶ 10.A.3 Proof [of Fact 10.4.2] Pick an L -sentence σ that is provable by $T + \text{I}(L)$ but not by T (by assumption there are such sentences). Consider

$$\varphi(x) := \sigma \vee x \neq 0.$$

Clearly φ has a T -inductive solution, since $T + \text{I}(L) \vdash \sigma$.

It remains to show that each T -inductive solution $\psi(x)$ for φ is T -weaker in x than φ . We show the equivalent that there is no T -inductive solution $\psi(x)$ for φ that is at least as T -strong in x as φ .

Suppose, towards a contradiction, that we have a $\psi(x)$ such that: (1) ψ is a T -inductive solution for φ ; and (2) ψ is at least as T -strong in x as φ . Then by (1):

$$(3) \quad T \vdash \psi(0).$$

Then by (2) (that is, by $T \vdash \forall x : \psi(x) \rightarrow \varphi(x)$) and (3):

$$(!) \quad T \vdash \varphi(0).$$

This is a contradiction since we have an L -model $M \models T \wedge \neg \sigma$ since $T \not\models \sigma$ by assumption, and then $M \not\models \varphi(0)$ —contradicting (!).

¶ 10.A.4 A problem I have not managed to solve is whether we may generalize [Fact 10.4.2](#) to allow for inductive solutions with an arbitrary set of free variables.

¶ 10.A.5 **Open problem?** For each language L of arithmetic and for each L -theory T of arithmetic such that $T \not\models I(L)$, is there an L -formula $\varphi(x)$ such that:

- φ has a T -inductive solution; and
- each T -inductive solution for φ is T -weaker in x than φ .

§ 10.B Eric Johannesson’s proofs of [Facts 10.4.5](#)

TODO

The proof uses results and definitions common to other stuff, so for purposes of harmony of terminology, definitions and results, to be fleshed it out together with that other stuff, when time for that other stuff comes. In the meantime, the manuscript of the following talk includes a rough proof in its § 5:

https://anderslundstedt.com/research/PhD-thesis/talks/lundstedt_talk_vinna_online_seminar_2021-05-12.pdf

Bibliography

- Bentkamp, Alexander, and Jon Eugster (2025): Natural Number Game.
URL (accessed 2025-04-16 UTC + 2):
<https://adam.math.hhu.de/#/g/leanprover-community/nng4>
Source code URL (accessed 2025-04-16 UTC + 2):
<https://github.com/leanprover-community/lean4game>
- Boolos, George S., and Richard C. Jeffrey (1980): Computability and Logic, edition 2; Cambridge University Press; Cambridge.
- Brox, Jose (2010): How to locate the paper that established Robinson Arithmetic?. At: MathOverflow; version: September 9, 2023.
URL (accessed 2026-03-15 UTC + 1):
<https://mathoverflow.net/q/30646>
Wayback Machine URL (archived 2026-03-15 UTC + 1):
<https://web.archive.org/web/20260315214212/https://mathoverflow.net/questions/30646/how-to-locate-the-paper-that-established-robinson-arithmetic>
- Buzzard, Kevin (2021): 870: Structural Proof Theory/2. In: The Foundations of Mathematics mailing list.
URL (accessed 2026-03-15 UTC + 1):
<https://fomarchive.ugent.be/2021-March/022579.html>
Wayback Machine URL (archived 2026-03-15 UTC + 1):
<https://web.archive.org/web/20260315212739/https://fomarchive.ugent.be/2021-March/022579.html>
- Carneiro, Mario (2021): 870: Structural Proof Theory/2. In: The Foundations of Mathematics mailing list.
URL (accessed 2026-03-15 UTC + 1):
<https://fomarchive.ugent.be/2021-March/022582.html>
Wayback Machine URL (archived 2026-03-15 UTC + 1):
<https://web.archive.org/web/20260315212739/https://fomarchive.ugent.be/2021-March/022579.html>

Bibliography

- Euler, Leonhard (1740): De summis serierum reciprocarum. In: Commentarii academiae scientiarum Petropolitanae, volume 7, pages 123–134.
- Friedman, Harvey (2021): 870: Structural Proof Theory/2. In: The Foundations of Mathematics mailing list.
URL (accessed 2026-03-15 UTC + 1):
<https://fomarchive.ugent.be/2021-February/022512.html>
Wayback Machine URL (archived 2026-03-15 UTC + 1):
<https://web.archive.org/web/20260315211732/https://fomarchive.ugent.be/2021-February/022512.html>
- Gotti, Felix (2020): Irreducibility and factorizations in monoid rings. In: Numerical Semigroups, pages 129–139; edited by Valentina Barucci, Scott Chapman, Marco D’Anna and Ralf Fröberg; Springer International Publishing.
- Johannesson, Eric, and Anders Lundstedt (2026): Comparing inductive solutions. Manuscript in preparation.
- Hetzl, Stefan, and Tin Lok Wong (2018): Some observations on the logical foundations of inductive theorem proving. In: Logical Methods in Computer Science, volume 13, number 4, pages 1–26. (Corrected version of paper originally published November 16, 2017.)
- Kaye, Richard (1991): Models of Peano Arithmetic; Clarendon Press; Oxford.
- The Lean Focused Research Organization (2025): Lean 4.
URL (accessed 2025-04-16 UTC + 2):
<https://lean-lang.org/>
- Quine, W.V. (1968): Ontological relativity. In: The Journal of Philosophy, volume 65, number 7, pages 185–212.
- Robinson, Raphael M. (1950): An essentially undecidable axiom system. In: Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, volume I, pages 729–730; American Mathematical Society; Providence 1952.
- Tarski, Alfred, and Andrzej Mostowski, and Raphael M. Robinson (1953): Undecidable Theories; North-Holland Publishing Company; Amsterdam.

Bibliography

Westerståhl, Dag (2023): Foundations of Logic: Completeness, Incompleteness, Computability; CSLI Publications; Stanford.

Wilson, Todd (1999): strengthening induction hypotheses. In: The Foundations of Mathematics mailing list.

URL (accessed 2026-06-02 UTC + 2):

<https://fomarchive.ugent.be/1999-February/002660.html>

Wayback Machine URL (archived 2026-06-12 UTC + 2):

<https://web.archive.org/web/20260602174156/https://fomarchive.ugent.be/1999-February/002660.html>