Exposition by William Gasarch—U of MD

Peano Arithmetic is a finite set of axioms and rules of inference.

Peano Arithmetic is a finite set of axioms and rules of inference.

Language

- ▶ Usual Logic Symbols \land , \neg , \exists .
- ▶ Variables $x_1, x_2, ...$ that range over \mathbb{Z} .
- \blacktriangleright Math relations: =, <, >
- ▶ Math operations: $+, -\times, \div$

Peano Arithmetic is a finite set of axioms and rules of inference.

Language

- ► Usual Logic Symbols ∧, ¬, ∃.
- ▶ Variables $x_1, x_2, ...$ that range over \mathbb{Z} .
- ightharpoonup Math relations: =,<,>
- ▶ Math operations: $+, -\times, \div$

Peano Arithmetic is a finite set of axioms and rules of inference.

Language

- ▶ Usual Logic Symbols \land , \neg , \exists .
- ▶ Variables $x_1, x_2, ...$ that range over \mathbb{Z} .
- \blacktriangleright Math relations: =, <, >
- ▶ Math operations: $+, -\times, \div$

Axioms

1) = is symmetric, reflexive, transitive.

Peano Arithmetic is a finite set of axioms and rules of inference.

Language

- ▶ Usual Logic Symbols \land , \neg , \exists .
- ▶ Variables $x_1, x_2, ...$ that range over \mathbb{Z} .
- \blacktriangleright Math relations: =, <, >
- ▶ Math operations: $+, -\times, \div$

- 1) = is symmetric, reflexive, transitive.
- 2) $0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $n+1, n-1 \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Peano Arithmetic is a finite set of axioms and rules of inference.

Language

- ▶ Usual Logic Symbols \land , \neg , \exists .
- ▶ Variables $x_1, x_2, ...$ that range over \mathbb{Z} .
- \blacktriangleright Math relations: =, <, >
- ▶ Math operations: $+, -\times, \div$

- 1) = is symmetric, reflexive, transitive.
- 2) $0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $n + 1, n 1 \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- 3) Let $\phi(x)$ be a fml. Then

Peano Arithmetic is a finite set of axioms and rules of inference.

Language

- ▶ Usual Logic Symbols \land , \neg , \exists .
- ▶ Variables $x_1, x_2, ...$ that range over \mathbb{Z} .
- \blacktriangleright Math relations: =, <, >
- ▶ Math operations: $+, -\times, \div$

- 1) = is symmetric, reflexive, transitive.
- 2) $0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $n+1, n-1 \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- 3) Let $\phi(x)$ be a fml. Then

$$\phi(0) \wedge (\forall n) [\phi(n) \implies (\phi(n+1) \wedge \phi(n-1))] \implies (\forall n) [\phi(n)].$$

Peano Arithmetic is a finite set of axioms and rules of inference.

Language

- ► Usual Logic Symbols ∧, ¬, ∃.
- ▶ Variables $x_1, x_2, ...$ that range over \mathbb{Z} .
- \blacktriangleright Math relations: =, <, >
- ▶ Math operations: $+, -\times, \div$

- 1) = is symmetric, reflexive, transitive.
- 2) $0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $n+1, n-1 \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- 3) Let $\phi(x)$ be a fml. Then
- $\phi(0) \wedge (\forall n) [\phi(n) \implies (\phi(n+1) \wedge \phi(n-1))] \implies (\forall n) [\phi(n)].$
- 4) The usual logical rules of inference.

Lemma The following is **decidable:**

Lemma The following is **decidable**:

Given a formula ϕ which you are promised is provable in PA, find the proof in PA of ϕ .

Lemma The following is **decidable**:

Given a formula ϕ which you are promised is provable in PA, find the proof in PA of $\phi.$

FIND-PROOF ALGORITHM

Lemma The following is **decidable**:

Given a formula ϕ which you are promised is provable in PA, find the proof in PA of ϕ .

FIND-PROOF ALGORITHM

1) Input ϕ

Lemma The following is **decidable**:

Given a formula ϕ which you are promised is provable in PA, find the proof in PA of $\phi.$

FIND-PROOF ALGORITHM

- 1) Input ϕ
- 2) For n=1 to ∞

Lemma The following is **decidable**:

Given a formula ϕ which you are promised is provable in PA, find the proof in PA of ϕ .

FIND-PROOF ALGORITHM

- 1) Input ϕ
- 2) For n=1 to ∞ For all strings x of length n(There are a finite number of x.)

Lemma The following is **decidable**:

Given a formula ϕ which you are promised is provable in PA, find the proof in PA of ϕ .

FIND-PROOF ALGORITHM

- 1) Input ϕ
- 2) For n = 1 to ∞

For all strings x of length n

(There are a finite number of x.)

Determine if x encodes a proof of ϕ in PA.

If it does then output x and STOP.

Lemma The following is **decidable**:

Given a formula ϕ which you are promised is provable in PA, find the proof in PA of ϕ .

FIND-PROOF ALGORITHM

- 1) Input ϕ
- 2) For n = 1 to ∞

For all strings x of length n

(There are a finite number of x.)

Determine if x encodes a proof of ϕ in PA.

If it does then output x and STOP.

END OF ALGORITHM

Lemma The following is **decidable**:

Given a formula ϕ which you are promised is provable in PA, find the proof in PA of ϕ .

FIND-PROOF ALGORITHM

- 1) Input ϕ
- 2) For n=1 to ∞

For all strings x of length n

(There are a finite number of x.)

Determine if x encodes a proof of ϕ in PA.

If it does then output x and STOP.

END OF ALGORITHM

Note If you are given a ϕ that has no proof in PA then this algorithm will run forever.

Lemma The following is **decidable**:

Given a formula ϕ which you are promised is provable in PA, find the proof in PA of ϕ .

FIND-PROOF ALGORITHM

- 1) Input ϕ
- 2) For n=1 to ∞

For all strings x of length n

(There are a finite number of x.)

Determine if x encodes a proof of ϕ in PA.

If it does then output x and STOP.

END OF ALGORITHM

Note If you are given a ϕ that has no proof in PA then this algorithm will run forever. Thats fine.

Lemma The following is **decidable**:

Given a formula ϕ which you are promised is provable in PA, find the proof in PA of ϕ .

FIND-PROOF ALGORITHM

- 1) Input ϕ
- 2) For n=1 to ∞

For all strings x of length n

(There are a finite number of x.)

Determine if x encodes a proof of ϕ in PA.

If it does then output x and STOP.

END OF ALGORITHM

Note If you are given a ϕ that has no proof in PA then this algorithm will run forever. Thats fine.

Note All we use about PA is that it has a finite number of axioms and rules of inference.

1) Virtually all truths about $\mathbb N$ can be derived from PA.

- 1) Virtually all truths about \mathbb{N} can be derived from PA.
- 2) It may have been thought that all truths about $\mathbb N$ can be derived from PA.

- 1) Virtually all truths about $\mathbb N$ can be derived from PA.
- 2) It may have been thought that all truths about $\mathbb N$ can be derived from PA.
- 3) It was definitely thought that **some** system of axioms would suffice to prove all theorems about $\mathbb N$ and with some care all Theorems in Math.

- 1) Virtually all truths about $\mathbb N$ can be derived from PA.
- 2) It may have been thought that all truths about $\mathbb N$ can be derived from PA.
- 3) It was definitely thought that **some** system of axioms would suffice to prove all theorems about $\mathbb N$ and with some care all Theorems in Math.
- 4) They were wrong.

 $\begin{tabular}{lll} \textbf{Godel's Incompleteness Theorem} & There exists a sentence ϕ \\ & \text{such that} \\ \end{tabular}$

Godel's Incompleteness Theorem $\;$ There exists a sentence ϕ such that

1) ϕ is true of the natural numbers.

Godel's Incompleteness Theorem There exists a sentence ϕ such that

- 1) ϕ is true of the natural numbers.
- 2) ϕ is not provable in PA.

Godel's Incompleteness Theorem There exists a sentence ϕ such that

- 1) ϕ is true of the natural numbers.
- 2) ϕ is not provable in PA.

This theorem would not be so impressive if it was tied to PA. However, we will see after the proof that it applies to **any** proof system with a finite number of axioms and rules of inference.

1) Godel's Inc Theorem stunned the math world who thought that there was a proof system that could derive all of math.

- 1) Godel's Inc Theorem stunned the math world who thought that there was a proof system that could derive all of math.
- 2) The Proof of Godel's Inc Theorem was very hard and very clever

- 1) Godel's Inc Theorem stunned the math world who thought that there was a proof system that could derive all of math.
- 2) The Proof of Godel's Inc Theorem was very hard and very clever
- 3) We will prove it in **TWO** slides.

- 1) Godel's Inc Theorem stunned the math world who thought that there was a proof system that could derive all of math.
- 2) The Proof of Godel's Inc Theorem was very hard and very clever
- 3) We will prove it in **TWO** slides. How is that possible?

- 1) Godel's Inc Theorem stunned the math world who thought that there was a proof system that could derive all of math.
- 2) The Proof of Godel's Inc Theorem was very hard and very clever
- 3) We will prove it in **TWO** slides. How is that possible?
- a) A lot of the proof involves coding math statements into numbers. Today we just assume that all works out.

Godel's Inc Theorem: Then and Now

- 1) Godel's Inc Theorem stunned the math world who thought that there was a proof system that could derive all of math.
- 2) The Proof of Godel's Inc Theorem was very hard and very clever
- 3) We will prove it in **TWO** slides. How is that possible?
- a) A lot of the proof involves coding math statements into numbers. Today we just assume that all works out.
- b) We will use that Hilbert's Tenth Problem is undecidable.

Recall Hilberts' Tenth Problem

H10 Given $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ determine if

$$(\exists \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) = 0].$$

Recall Hilberts' Tenth Problem

H10 Given $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ determine if

$$(\exists \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) = 0].$$

Thm H10 is undecidable.

We restate Godel's Theorem in Concrete Terms.

We restate Godel's Theorem in Concrete Terms.

Thm There exists a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that

We restate Godel's Theorem in Concrete Terms. **Thm** There exists a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that 1) $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$.

We restate Godel's Theorem in Concrete Terms.

Thm There exists a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that

- 1) $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$.
- 2) Statement 1 cannot be proven in PA.

Assume, BWOC, that for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, there is a proof in PA of this.

Assume, BWOC, that for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, there is a proof in PA of this.

We use this to obtain an algorithm for H10.

Assume, BWOC, that for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, there is a proof in PA of this.

We use this to obtain an algorithm for H10.

ALGORITHM FOR H10

Assume, BWOC, that for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, there is a proof in PA of this.

We use this to obtain an algorithm for H10.

ALGORITHM FOR H10

1) Input $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$.

Assume, BWOC, that for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, there is a proof in PA of this.

We use this to obtain an algorithm for H10.

ALGORITHM FOR H10

- 1) Input $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$.
- 2) Do the following simultaneously

Assume, BWOC, that for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, there is a proof in PA of this.

We use this to obtain an algorithm for H10.

ALGORITHM FOR H10

- 1) Input $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$.
- 2) Do the following simultaneously
 - a) For all $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z}$ compute $p(\vec{a})$.

If you ever get 0, output YES and STOP.

Assume, BWOC, that for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, there is a proof in PA of this.

We use this to obtain an algorithm for H10.

ALGORITHM FOR H10

- 1) Input $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$.
- 2) Do the following simultaneously
 - a) For all $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z}$ compute $p(\vec{a})$.

If you ever get 0, output YES and STOP.

b)Run FIND-PROOF on the statement $(\forall \vec{a})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$. If produces proof that $(\forall \vec{a})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, output NO and STOP.

Assume, BWOC, that for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, there is a proof in PA of this.

We use this to obtain an algorithm for H10.

ALGORITHM FOR H10

- 1) Input $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$.
- 2) Do the following simultaneously
 - a) For all $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z}$ compute $p(\vec{a})$.

If you ever get 0, output YES and STOP.

b)Run FIND-PROOF on the statement $(\forall \vec{a})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$. If produces proof that $(\forall \vec{a})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, output NO and STOP.

END OF ALGORITHM

Assume, BWOC, that for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, there is a proof in PA of this.

We use this to obtain an algorithm for H10.

ALGORITHM FOR H10

- 1) Input $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$.
- 2) Do the following simultaneously
 - a) For all $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z}$ compute $p(\vec{a})$.

If you ever get 0, output YES and STOP.

b)Run FIND-PROOF on the statement $(\forall \vec{a})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$. If produces proof that $(\forall \vec{a})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, output NO and STOP.

END OF ALGORITHM

Since we are assuming that for every $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$. there is a proof of that in PA, the above algorithm always halts with the correct answer and hence solves H10. This is a contradiction.

Assume, BWOC, that for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, there is a proof in PA of this.

We use this to obtain an algorithm for H10.

ALGORITHM FOR H10

- 1) Input $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$.
- 2) Do the following simultaneously
 - a) For all $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z}$ compute $p(\vec{a})$.

If you ever get 0, output YES and STOP.

b)Run FIND-PROOF on the statement $(\forall \vec{a})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$. If produces proof that $(\forall \vec{a})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$, output NO and STOP.

END OF ALGORITHM

Since we are assuming that for every $p \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{x}]$ such that $(\forall \vec{a})[p(\vec{a}) \neq 0]$. there is a proof of that in PA, the above algorithm always halts with the correct answer and hence solves H10. This is a contradiction.

DONE in two slides!



Philosophically Yes It had been thought that math was decidable. Now they knew there may be some statements that cannot be proven.

Philosophically Yes It had been thought that math was decidable. Now they knew there may be some statements that cannot be proven.

Mostly No The statement Godel showed was true-but-not-provable-in-PA was unnatural. It was constructed for the sole point of being true-but-not-provable.

Philosophically Yes It had been thought that math was decidable. Now they knew there may be some statements that cannot be proven.

Mostly No The statement Godel showed was true-but-not-provable-in-PA was unnatural. It was constructed for the sole point of being true-but-not-provable.

Are There Any Natural Statements That Are True But Not Provable in PA?

Philosophically Yes It had been thought that math was decidable. Now they knew there may be some statements that cannot be proven.

Mostly No The statement Godel showed was true-but-not-provable-in-PA was unnatural. It was constructed for the sole point of being true-but-not-provable.

Are There Any Natural Statements That Are True But Not Provable in PA?

A few.

Philosophically Yes It had been thought that math was decidable. Now they knew there may be some statements that cannot be proven.

Mostly No The statement Godel showed was true-but-not-provable-in-PA was unnatural. It was constructed for the sole point of being true-but-not-provable.

Are There Any Natural Statements That Are True But Not Provable in PA?

A few.

The Large Ramsey Theorem is one. Take my course next spring to find out more about that.