

## Solutions to exercises in Chapter 5

**E5.1** Give an estimate for the size of  $gn(\varphi)$ , where  $\varphi$  is the Peano Postulate (P1).

(P1) is the formula  $\forall v_0 \forall v_1 [\mathbf{S}v_0 = \mathbf{S}v_1 \rightarrow v_0 = v_1]$ , or as a sequence

$$\langle 4, 5, 4, 10, 2, 3, 6, 5, 6, 10, 3, 5, 10 \rangle.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} gn(\varphi) &= p_0^4 \cdot p_1^5 \cdot p_2^4 \cdot p_3^{10} \cdot p_4^2 \cdot p_5^3 \cdot p_6^6 \cdot p_7^5 \cdot p_8^6 \cdot p_9^{10} \cdot p_{10}^3 \cdot p_{11}^5 \cdot p_{12}^{10} \\ &= 2^4 \cdot 3^5 \cdot 5^4 \cdot 7^{10} \cdot 11^2 \cdot 13^3 \cdot 17^6 \cdot 19^5 \cdot 23^6 \cdot 29^{10} \cdot 31^3 \cdot 37^5 \cdot 41^{10} \\ &\approx 1.9 \cdot 10^{85}. \end{aligned}$$

**E5.2** Describe  $G(gn(v_0 = v_0))$  and express it as a product of primes.

For brevity let  $m = gn(v_0 = v_0)$ ; recall from the notes that  $m = 6,075,000$ . Now by definition,  $G(gn(v_0 = v_0)) = gn(\text{Subff}_{\overline{m}}^{v_0}(v_0 = v_0))$ ; thus  $G(gn(v_0 = v_0))$  is the Gödel number of the formula

$$\forall v_m [v_m = \overline{m} \rightarrow \forall v_0 [v_0 = v_m \rightarrow v_0 = v_0]].$$

As an actual sequence of integers, this formula is

$$\langle 4, 5(m+1), 2, 3, 5(m+1), 6(m \text{ times}), 8, 4, 5, 2, 3, 5, 5(m+1), 3, 5, 5 \rangle.$$

Hence  $G(gn(v_0 = v_0))$  is the number

$$\begin{aligned} &p_0^4 \cdot p_1^{5(m+1)} \cdot p_2^2 \cdot p_3^3 \cdot p_4^{5(m+1)} \cdot \prod_{i < m} p_{5+i}^6 \cdot p_{5+m}^8 \cdot p_{5+m+1}^4 \\ &\cdot p_{5+m+2}^5 \cdot p_{5+m+3}^2 \cdot p_{5+m+4}^3 \cdot p_{5+m+5}^5 \cdot p_{5+m+6}^{5(m+1)} \cdot p_{5+m+7}^3 \cdot p_{5+m+8}^5 \cdot p_{5+m+9}^5 \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that  $\Gamma$  is a set of sentences containing  $\mathbf{P}'$ . A formula  $\rho$  with at most  $v_0$  free is a  $\Gamma$ -provability condition iff for any sentence  $\varphi$ ,  $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$  iff  $\Gamma \vdash \rho(\overline{gn(\varphi)})$ .

**E5.3** Suppose that  $\Gamma$  is a set of sentences containing  $\mathbf{P}'$ , and  $\overline{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\omega, S, 0, +, \cdot)$  is a model of  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\chi$  be as in the proof of Gödel's incompleteness theorem, and let  $\pi$  be the formula  $\exists v_1 \chi$ . Prove that  $\pi$  is a  $\Gamma$ -provability condition.

Let  $\varphi$  be a sentence. First suppose that  $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ . Let  $\Phi$  be a  $\Gamma$ -proof with last entry  $\varphi$ . Thus  $(gn(\varphi), gn_1(\Phi)) \in \text{Prf}_\Gamma$ , so  $\mathbf{P} \vdash \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)}, \overline{gn_1(\Phi)})$ . Hence  $\mathbf{P} \vdash \exists v_1 \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)})$ , so also  $\Gamma \vdash \exists v_1 \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)})$ .

Second suppose that  $\Gamma \vdash \exists v_1 \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)})$ . Then  $\overline{M} \models \exists v_1 \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)})$ , so we can choose  $m \in \omega$  such that  $\overline{M} \models \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)}[m, m])$ . We claim that  $(gn(\varphi), m) \in \text{Prf}_\Gamma$ . Otherwise we get  $\mathbf{P} \models \neg \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)}, \overline{m})$ , hence  $\overline{M} \models \neg \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)}[m, m])$ , contradiction. This proves the claim. Let  $\Phi$  be a  $\Gamma$ -proof with last entry  $\varphi$  such that  $m = gn_1(\Phi)$ . Hence  $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ .

**E5.4** Suppose that  $\Gamma$  is a set of sentences containing  $\mathbf{P}'$ , and  $\overline{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\omega, S, 0, +, \cdot)$  is a model of  $\Gamma$ . Suppose that  $\rho$  is a  $\Gamma$ -provability condition. Apply the fixed point theorem to get a sentence  $\psi$  such that  $\mathbf{P} \vdash \psi \leftrightarrow \neg\rho(\overline{gn(\psi)})$ , as in the proof of Gödel's incompleteness theorem. Prove that  $\text{not}(\Gamma \vdash \psi)$  and  $\text{not}(\Gamma \vdash \neg\psi)$ .

Suppose that  $\Gamma \vdash \psi$ . Then  $\Gamma \vdash \rho(\overline{gn(\psi)})$  since  $\rho$  is a provability condition, but also  $\Gamma \vdash \neg\rho(\overline{gn(\psi)})$  by the choice of  $\psi$ . So  $\Gamma$  is inconsistent. This contradicts the assumption that  $\overline{M}$  is a model of  $\Gamma$ . Hence  $\text{not}(\Gamma \vdash \psi)$ . Suppose that  $\Gamma \vdash \neg\psi$ . Then by the choice of  $\psi$ ,  $\Gamma \vdash \rho(\overline{gn(\psi)})$ . It follows that  $\Gamma \vdash \psi$  since  $\rho$  is a provability condition, contradiction.

**E5.5** Let  $\chi$  be as in the proof of Gödel's incompleteness theorem, and let  $\pi$  be the formula  $\exists v_1 \chi$ . The following can be shown for  $\chi$ .

(i) For any sentences  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ ,

$$\Gamma \vdash \pi(\overline{gn(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)}) \rightarrow (\pi(\overline{gn(\varphi)}) \rightarrow \pi(\overline{gn(\psi)})).$$

(“ $\Gamma$  proves that if  $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$  is provable, then from the provability of  $\varphi$  it follows that  $\psi$  is provable”)

(ii) For any sentence  $\varphi$ ,

$$\Gamma \vdash \pi(\overline{gn(\varphi)}) \rightarrow \pi(\overline{gn(\pi(\overline{gn(\varphi)}))}).$$

(“ $\Gamma$  proves that if  $\varphi$  is provable, then it is provable that  $\varphi$  is provable.”)

By the fixed point theorem, let  $\psi$  be a sentence such that  $\Gamma \vdash \psi \leftrightarrow \pi(\overline{gn(\psi)})$ . Note that  $\psi$  says “I am provable”. By the fixed point theorem again, let  $\theta$  be a sentence such that  $\Gamma \vdash \theta \leftrightarrow (\pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}) \rightarrow \psi)$ . Thus  $\theta$  says “If I am provable, then  $\psi$  holds.”

Show that if  $\Gamma \vdash \theta$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash \psi$ .

Let  $\Phi$  be a  $\Gamma$ -proof with last entry  $\theta$ . Thus  $(gn(\theta), gn_1(\Phi)) \in \text{Prf}_\Gamma$ , and it follows that  $\mathbf{P} \vdash \chi(\overline{gn(\theta)}, \overline{gn_1(\Phi)})$ , hence  $\Gamma \vdash \pi(\overline{gn(\theta)})$ . Since also  $\Gamma \vdash \theta$ , it follows that  $\Gamma \vdash \psi$ .

**E5.6** (Continuing E5.5.) Show that  $\Gamma \vdash \pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}) \rightarrow \pi(\overline{gn(\psi)})$ .

By the choice of  $\theta$  we have  $\Gamma \vdash \theta \rightarrow (\pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}) \rightarrow \psi)$ , and then by a tautology we have  $\Gamma \vdash \pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}) \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \psi)$ . By exercise E5.3 we then get

$$\Gamma \vdash \pi(\overline{gn(\pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}) \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \psi))}),$$

and E5.5(i) gives

$$(1) \quad \Gamma \vdash \pi(\overline{gn(\pi(\overline{gn(\pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}) \rightarrow (\theta \rightarrow \psi))}))}) \rightarrow \pi(\overline{gn(\theta \rightarrow \psi)}).$$

Another instance of E5.5(i) is

$$(2) \quad \Gamma \vdash \pi(\overline{gn(\theta \rightarrow \psi)}) \rightarrow (\pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}) \rightarrow \pi(\overline{gn(\psi)})).$$

Two instances of (ii) are

$$(3) \quad \Gamma \vdash \pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}) \rightarrow \pi(\overline{gn(\pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}))}) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(4) \quad \Gamma \vdash \overline{\pi(\overline{gn(\pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}))})} \rightarrow \overline{\pi(\overline{gn(\pi(\overline{gn(\pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}))}))})}.$$

Now a simple tautology gives  $\Gamma \vdash \varphi(\overline{gn(\theta)}) \rightarrow \pi(\overline{gn(\theta \rightarrow \psi)})$ , using (3), (4), (1). The more complicated tautology

$$[S_0 \rightarrow (S_1 \rightarrow S_2)] \rightarrow [(S_1 \rightarrow S_0) \rightarrow (S_1 \rightarrow S_2)]$$

gives the desired conclusion. [Substitute  $\pi(\overline{g(\theta \rightarrow \psi)})$  for  $S_0$ ,  $\pi(\overline{gn(\theta)})$  for  $S_1$ , and  $\pi(\overline{gn(\psi)})$  for  $S_2$ .]

**E5.7** (Continuing E5.5.) Show that  $\Gamma \vdash \psi$ .

By the choice of  $\theta$  we have  $\Gamma \vdash (\pi(\overline{g(\theta)}) \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow \theta$ . Using the definition of  $\psi$  and a tautology, we get  $\Gamma \vdash (\pi(\overline{gn(\theta)}) \rightarrow \pi(\overline{gn(\psi)})) \rightarrow \theta$ . Then by exercise 5.6 it follows that  $\Gamma \vdash \theta$ . Hence by exercise 5.5,  $\Gamma \vdash \psi$ .

**E5.8** Assume that  $\Gamma \vdash \neg(\overline{m} = \overline{n})$  for all distinct  $m, n \in \omega$ . Let  $\chi$  be as in the proof of Göde's incompleteness theorem, and let  $\theta$  be the sentence  $\forall v_0(v_0 = v_0)$ . Prove that the following formula  $\rho(v_0)$  is a provability condition:

$$v_0 = \overline{gn(\theta)} \vee \exists v_1 \chi(v_0, v_1)$$

Let  $\varphi$  be any sentence. If  $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash \exists v_1 \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)}, v_1)$  by exercise E5.3, and so clearly  $\Gamma \vdash \rho(\overline{gn(\varphi)})$ . Suppose that  $\Gamma \vdash \rho(\overline{gn(\varphi)})$ . If  $\varphi = \theta$ , obviously  $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ . If  $\varphi \neq \theta$ , then  $gn(\varphi) \neq gn(\theta)$  and hence by assumption  $\Gamma \vdash \neg(\overline{gn(\varphi)} = \overline{gn(\theta)})$ , and a tautology gives  $\Gamma \vdash \exists v_1 \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)}, v_1)$ . Hence by exercise E5.3,  $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ .

**E5.9** (Continuing E5.8) Prove that  $\Gamma \vdash \theta \leftrightarrow \rho(\overline{gn(\theta)})$  (so that  $\theta$  asserts its own provability with respect to this condition).

In fact, clearly  $\Gamma \vdash \theta$ , and also  $\Gamma \vdash \rho(\overline{gn(\theta)})$ , so the conclusion follows.

**E5.10** (Continuing E5.8) Prove that  $\Gamma \vdash \theta$ .

This is clear.

**E5.11** Assume that  $\Gamma \vdash \neg(\overline{m} = \overline{n})$  for all distinct  $m, n \in \omega$ . Let  $\chi$  be as in the proof of Gödel's incompleteness theorem, and let  $\theta$  be the sentence  $\neg \forall v_0(v_0 = v_0)$ . Prove that the following formula  $\rho(v_0)$  is a provability condition:

$$\neg(v_0 = \overline{gn(\theta)}) \wedge \exists v_1 \chi(v_0, v_1)$$

Let  $\varphi$  be a sentence. Suppose that  $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ . Then by exercise E5.3,  $\Gamma \vdash \exists v_1 \chi(\overline{g(\varphi)}, v_1)$ . Now  $\varphi \neq \theta$ , since  $\Gamma \vdash \neg \theta$ , and  $\Gamma$  is consistent since  $\overline{M}$  is a model of it. Hence  $gn(\varphi) \neq gn(\theta)$ . So by assumption  $\Gamma \vdash \neg(\overline{gn(\varphi)} = \overline{gn(\theta)})$ . Hence  $\Gamma \vdash \rho(\overline{gn(\varphi)})$ .

Suppose that  $\Gamma \vdash \rho(\overline{gn(\varphi)})$ . Then also  $\Gamma \vdash \exists v_i \chi(\overline{gn(\varphi)}, v_1)$ , so by exercise E5.3,  $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ .

**E5.12** (Continuing E5.11) Show that  $\Gamma \vdash \theta \leftrightarrow \rho(\overline{g(\theta)})$ , so that  $\theta$  asserts its own provability.

In fact, clearly  $\Gamma \vdash \neg\theta$  and also  $\Gamma \vdash \neg\rho(\overline{g(\theta)})$ , so the exercise follows.

**E5.13** (Continuing E5.11) Show that  $\Gamma \vdash \neg\theta$ .

This is clear.