

A Note on Always Decidable Propositional Forms

Merlin Carl

January 14, 2021

Abstract

We ask the following question: If all instantiations of a propositional formula $A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in n propositional variables are decidable in some sufficiently strong recursive theory, does it follow that A is tautological or contradictory? and answer it in the affirmative. We also consider the following related question: Suppose that for some propositional formula $A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, there is a Turing program P such that $P([\phi_1], \dots, [\phi_n]) \downarrow = 1$ iff $\mathbb{N} \models A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ and otherwise $P([\phi_1], \dots, [\phi_n]) \downarrow = 0$ (where $[\phi]$ denotes the Gödel number of ϕ), does it follow that the truth value of $A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ is independent of ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n and hence that A is tautological or contradictory?

1 Decidability in PA and related systems

Definition 1. Let T be a theory. A propositional formula $A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is always decidable in T iff T decides every sentence of the form $A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$, where ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n are closed formulas (without free variables) in the language of T .

We formulate our claims for the case of PA , but they can be transferred to arbitrary recursive axiom systems that allow Gödel coding.

Lemma 2. For each $n \in \omega$, there is a set of n mutually exclusive non-refutable formulas, i.e. a set $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$ of closed \mathcal{L}_{PA} formulas such that no $\neg\theta_i$ is provable in PA and such that $\theta_i \rightarrow \bigwedge_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \neg\theta_j$ is provable in PA for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Proof. We write $\phi <_p \psi$ for the statement ‘There is a PA -proof of $\neg\phi$ and the smallest Gödel number n of such a proof is smaller than the smallest Gödel

number of a proof of $\neg\psi$, provided there is one', i.e. $\exists x(\text{Bew}(x, [\neg\phi]) \wedge \forall y < x \neg \text{Bew}(y, \neg\psi))$, where $\text{Bew}(a, b)$ denotes 'a is the Gödel number of a proof of the closed formula with Gödel number b'. Consider the following system of statements (we confuse formulas with their Gödel numbers):

- (1) $\bigwedge_{i=2}^n z_1 <_p z_i$
- (2) $\bigwedge_{i=1, i \neq 2}^n z_2 <_p z_i$
- ... (n) $\bigwedge_{i=1, i \neq n}^n z_n <_p z_i$

Applying the Gödel fixpoint theorem generalized to n -tuples of formulas (see e.g. [1]), we get statements $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ such that

$$(*) \theta_i \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \theta_j <_p \theta_i$$

is provable in PA for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We claim that $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$ is as desired.

First, if θ_i and θ_j are both true (where $i \neq j$), then there are by (*) (Gödel numbers of) proofs β_i for θ_i and β_j for θ_j . Now, again by (*), we have $\beta_i < \beta_j$ and $\beta_j < \beta_i$, which is impossible. Hence θ_i implies $\neg\theta_j$ for all $j \neq i$. This argument can easily be carried out in PA .

Second, suppose that $\neg\theta_i$ is provable in PA for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. If $\neg\theta_i$ is provable, then there is $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\neg\theta_j$ is provable and the minimal Gödel number of a proof of $\neg\theta_j$ is minimal among the minimal Gödel numbers of proofs of $\neg\theta_k$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let β be the minimal Gödel number of a proof of $\neg\theta_j$. Then PA proves $\neg\theta_j$. Moreover, it is easily provable in PA that no $k' < k$ is a proof for any of the θ_l , $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Hence, by (*), PA proves θ_j , so PA proves $\theta_j \wedge \neg\theta_j$, a contradiction. □

Lemma 3. For each $n \in \omega$, there are n formulas ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n in the language of arithmetic such that for no Boolean combination C of any $n - 1$ of them, $PA + C$ decides the remaining one.

Proof. Let $n \in \omega$. By Lemma 2, pick a set $S := \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{2^n}\}$ of 2^n non-refutable, mutually exclusive formulas. We will construct ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n as disjunctions $\bigvee R$ over subsets of S . By choice of the θ_i , it is clear that $\theta_i \implies \bigvee R$ iff $\theta_i \in R$: Clearly, if $\theta_i \in R$, then $\theta_i \implies \bigvee R$; on the other hand, θ_i implies $\neg\theta_j$ for all $j \neq i$, so $\theta_i \implies \neg\bigvee R$ if $\theta_i \notin R$.

Let f be some bijection between $\mathfrak{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, n\})$ and S . We proceed to define subsets S_1, \dots, S_n of S as follows: We put θ_i in S_j iff $j \in f^{-1}(\theta_i)$. Hence each subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is 'marked' as the set of j for which S_j contains a particular θ_i . Set $\phi_i := \bigvee S_j$. We claim that $\{\phi_i | 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is as desired.

To see this, consider a combination $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \delta_i \phi_i$ where each δ_i is either \neg or nothing (i.e. each ϕ_i appears once, either plain or negated). Then $E := \{i | 1 \leq i \leq n \wedge \delta_i \neq \neg\}$ is a subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\theta_j = f(E)$.

Then by what we just observed, θ_j implies all elements of E and implies the negation of all elements of $S \setminus E$. Hence θ_j implies $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \delta_i \phi_i$ (and this implication is provable in PA). Now, if $PA + \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \delta_i \phi_i$ was inconsistent, so was $PA + \theta_j$. But then, PA would prove $\neg \theta_j$, contradicting the choice of θ_j . Hence $PA + \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \delta_i \phi_i$ is consistent. As $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \delta_i \phi_i$ was arbitrary, $\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n\}$ is indeed as desired. \square

Remark: This is a generalization of a construction for the case $n = 2$ given in [3] (p. 19), there attributed to E. Jerabek.

Definition 4. A set S of closed \mathcal{L}_{PA} -formulas is independent iff for no finite $S' \subseteq S$, $\phi \in S \setminus S'$ and no Boolean combination C of S' , $PA + C$ decides ϕ .

Lemma 5. If S is a finite set of closed \mathcal{L}_{PA} formulas, then S is and independent over PA , iff for every Boolean combination C of the elements of S (conjunction in which each element of S appears once, either plain or negated), $PA + C$ is consistent (provided PA is consistent).

Proof. If some combination C was inconsistent and $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{n-1}$ were the first $n-1$ conjuncts of C (i.e. $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{n-1}$, either plain or negated), then ϕ_n would be decided by $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{n-1}$, contradicting the assumption of independence. \square

Theorem 6. Every always decidable formula is either tautological or contradictory, i.e.: Let $A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a propositional formula in n propositional variables x_1, \dots, x_n . Assume that for each n -tuple of \mathcal{L}_{PA} -formulas without free variables (ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n) , we have that PA decides $A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ (i.e. PA either proves the sentence or refutes it). Then A is either a tautology or contradictory.

Proof. Write A in disjunctive normal form. Suppose A is neither tautological nor contradictory. Let $B_1 : \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be an assignment of truth values to the proposition variables that makes A true and $B_2 : \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ another one that makes it false. By Lemma 3, let $\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n\}$ be an independent set of \mathcal{L}_{PA} -formulas of cardinality n . Let C_1 and C_2 be the Boolean combinations corresponding to B_1 and B_2 , respectively. Then $PA + C_1$ and $PA + C_2$ are both consistent by Lemma 5; however, in $PA + C_1$, $A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ is true and in $PA + C_2$, $A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ is false. Hence $A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ is not decidable in PA , contradicting the assumption. \square

2 Algorithmical Decidability of Propositional Forms

We ask a question analogous to that of the preceding section, where decidability is now taken to mean decidability by a Turing machine: Sup-

pose that for some propositional formula $A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, there is a Turing program P such that $P([\phi_1], \dots, [\phi_n]) \downarrow = 1$ iff $\mathbb{N} \models A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ and otherwise $P([\phi_1], \dots, [\phi_n]) \downarrow = 0$, does it follow that the truth value of $A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ is independent of ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n and hence that A is tautological or contradictory? It turns out that the answer is yes:

Theorem 7. Let A be a propositional form and let P be a Turing program such that $P([\phi_1], \dots, [\phi_n]) \downarrow = 1$ iff $\mathbb{N} \models A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ and otherwise $P([\phi_1], \dots, [\phi_n]) \downarrow = 0$. Then A is tautological or contradictory.

Proof. Assume that P is such a program for a propositional formula A . We build a recursive extension T of PA that can roughly be stated as $PA + 'P$ is always right'. As ' P is always right' is true by assumption, T is consistent. T consists of PA together with the sentence $S_{(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)} := (A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) \rightarrow P([\phi_1], \dots, [\phi_n]) \downarrow = 1) \wedge (\neg A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) \rightarrow P([\phi_1], \dots, [\phi_n]) \downarrow = 0)$ for every n -tuple (ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n) of closed formulas. Clearly, T is recursive.

Now, as, by assumption, P halts with output 0 or 1 on every n -tuple (ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n) of closed formulas, PA will prove this for every single instance; moreover, T will, via the extra assumptions, know that P decides correctly and hence decide $A(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ for every such n -tuple. As Theorem 6 is valid for recursive extensions of PA , it is valid for T , so A is either a tautology or contradictory, as desired. \square

References

- [1] [H] R. Heck. Formal background for theories of truth. Notes published on http://frege.brown.edu/heck/philosophy/pdf/notes/formal_background.pdf
- [2] [HP] Hajek, Pudlak. Metamathematics of first-order arithmetic.
- [3] [P] P. Pajas. Structure of Submodels - Diagonal Indiscernibility in Models of Arithmetic. PhD Thesis. Prague 2007.