

## MATH310101

This question paper consists of 3  
printed pages, each of which is  
identified by the reference MATH3101

No calculators allowed

©UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

Examination for the Module MATH3101

(May-June 1997)

MATHEMATICAL LOGIC II

Time allowed: **2 hours**

Do not answer more than *FOUR* questions.

All questions carry equal marks.

Throughout this paper it can be assumed that the first order theory  $\mathcal{N}$  for arithmetic has the special axioms:

$$(N1) (x_1 = x_2 \rightarrow (x_1 = x_3 \rightarrow x_2 = x_3))$$

$$(N2) (x_1 = x_2 \rightarrow (x'_1 = x'_2))$$

$$(N3) (\bar{0} \neq x'_1)$$

$$(N4) (x'_1 = x'_2 \rightarrow x_1 = x_2)$$

$$(N5) (x_1 + \bar{0} = x_1)$$

$$(N6) (x_1 + x'_2 = (x_1 + x_2)')$$

$$(N7) (x_1 \times \bar{0} = \bar{0})$$

$$(N8) (x_1 \times x'_2 = x_1 \times x_2 + x_1)$$

and the axiom scheme

(N9) If  $\phi(x_1)$  is a wf of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$ , then

$$(\phi(\bar{0}) \rightarrow ((\forall x_i)(\phi(x_i) \rightarrow \phi(x'_i)) \rightarrow (\forall x_i)\phi(x_i)))$$

is an axiom of  $\mathcal{N}$ .

1. (a) Show that if  $t_1$ ,  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  are any terms of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$ , then

$$(t_1 = t_2 \rightarrow (t_1 = t_3 \rightarrow t_2 = t_3))$$

and

$$(t_1 + \bar{0} = t_1)$$

are theorems of  $\mathcal{N}$ .

(b) Show that if  $m$  and  $n$  are natural numbers and  $\overline{m}$  and  $\overline{n}$  are the corresponding numerals, then

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{N}} (\overline{m} = \overline{m})$$

and

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{N}} (\overline{m} = \overline{n} \rightarrow \overline{n} = \overline{m}).$$

(c) If  $\mathbf{M} = \langle M, 0, ', +, \times = \rangle$  is a model of  $\mathcal{N}$ , and  $c \in M$ , we say that  $c$  is a *non-standard element* of  $\mathbf{M}$  if and only if  $c$  is not the interpretation of any numeral  $\overline{m}$ .

Show that if  $\mathbf{M}$  is a model of  $\mathcal{N}$ , and  $c$  is a non-standard element of  $\mathbf{M}$ , then  $c'$  (the successor of  $c$  in  $\mathbf{M}$ ) is also a non-standard element of  $\mathbf{M}$ .

Deduce that any non-standard model of  $\mathcal{N}$  has infinitely many non-standard elements. [You may assume that  $(x_1 \neq x'_1)$  is a theorem of  $\mathcal{N}$ .]

2. (a) Say what is meant by the terms *representable function*, *representable set*.

Show that if the sets  $S$  and  $T$  are representable in  $\mathcal{N}$ , then so is  $S \cup T$ .

(b) Assuming that  $+$  (addition of pairs of natural numbers) is a primitive recursive function, show that  $\times$  (multiplication of pairs of natural numbers) is also primitive recursive.

Show that if  $f(\overline{n}, m)$  is primitive recursive, then so is the *bounded product*  $h(\overline{n}, p)$  defined by

$$h(\overline{n}, p) = \prod_{m \leq p} f(\overline{n}, m).$$

(c) Let  $gn$  be a standard Gödel numbering for  $\mathcal{N}$ . Assume the following definitions of number theoretic relations and sets:

$\text{Form}(m) \Leftrightarrow_{\text{defn}} gn^{-1}(m)$  is a wf of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$ ,

$\text{MP}(m, n, p) \Leftrightarrow_{\text{defn}} gn^{-1}(p)$  is derived from  $gn^{-1}(m)$  and  $gn^{-1}(n)$  via Modus Ponens,

$\text{Proof}_{\mathcal{N}}(m) \Leftrightarrow_{\text{defn}} gn^{-1}(m)$  is a proof of  $\mathcal{N}$ , and

$T_{\mathcal{N}} = \{m \mid \vdash_{\mathcal{N}} gn^{-1}(m)\}$ .

Show that: (i) If  $\text{Form}$  is a recursive relation, then so is  $\text{MP}$ , and

(ii) If  $\text{Proof}_{\mathcal{N}}$  is a recursive relation, then  $T_{\mathcal{N}}$  is recursively enumerable.

[You may assume that if  $S$  is any set for which  $m \in S$  is a  $\Sigma_1^0$ -relation, then  $S$  is recursively enumerable.]

3. Write an essay on *Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem*, covering not more than about two sides.

[In it, you should mention any points of particular interest or difficulty in the proof of the theorem, and any mathematical, or more general, consequences of the theorem you can think of.]

4. (a) Define:  $A$  is *many-one reducible* to  $B$  ( $A \leq_m B$ ).

Show that if  $S \leq_m S'$  with  $S'$  recursively enumerable, then  $S$  is recursively enumerable.  
[You may assume that a set  $S$  is recursively enumerable if and only if  $m \in S$  is a  $\Sigma_1^0$ -relation]

(b) Show that if  $S$  is semi-representable in a recursively axiomatisable theory  $\mathcal{T}$  then  $S \leq_m T_{\mathcal{T}}$  (the set of Gödel numbers of theorems of  $\mathcal{T}$ ), and hence  $S$  is recursively enumerable.

[You may assume that for any recursively axiomatisable  $\mathcal{T}$  we have  $T_{\mathcal{T}}$  recursively enumerable.]

(c) Define:  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\omega$ -consistent.

Show that if  $\mathcal{T}$  is an  $\omega$ -consistent theory in the language of  $\mathcal{N}$  in which every recursive relation is representable, then every recursively enumerable set is semi-representable in  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Deduce that for any recursively axiomatisable theory  $\mathcal{T}$  we have  $T_{\mathcal{T}} \leq_m T_{\mathcal{N}}$ .

[You may assume  $\mathcal{N}$  to be an  $\omega$ -consistent theory in which every recursive relation is representable.]

5. (a) Let  $\mathcal{T}'$  be a finite extension of a first order theory  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Show that  $T_{\mathcal{T}'} \leq_m T_{\mathcal{T}}$ .

(b) We say a first order theory  $\mathcal{T}$  is *strongly undecidable* if and only if  $\mathcal{T}$  is finitely axiomatisable and every theory  $\mathcal{T}'$  in the language of  $\mathcal{T}$  that is consistent with  $\mathcal{T}$  (that is, such that  $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}'$  is consistent) is undecidable.

Show that if  $RR$  is a finitely axiomatisable theory in the language of  $\mathcal{N}$  in which every recursive relation is representable, then  $RR$  is strongly undecidable.

[You may assume *Rosser's Theorem* in the form: If  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a consistent axiomatisable first order theory in which every recursive function is representable, then  $\mathcal{T}'$  is incomplete and undecidable.]

Deduce that there is no algorithm for deciding of any given wf  $\varphi$  in the language of  $\mathcal{N}$  whether or not it is logically valid or not.

**END**