

On Herbrand Consistency of Bounded Arithmetics

Saeed Salehi

University of Tabriz

<http://SaeedSalehi.ir/>

Logic Colloquium 2011
June 2011 – Barcelona, Spain

Glad To Be Back

My Last Talk in Logic Colloquium:

2001, Vienna, Austria

“Unprovability of Herbrand Consistency in Weak Arithmetics”

LC’2000, Paris, France – “A Generalized Realizability for Constructive Arithmetics”

LC’1999, Utrecht, Holland – “Intuitionistic Axiomatization of End-Extension Kripke Models”

Bounded Quantifiers

- All $\exists x$ are in the form $\exists x \leq t$
- All $\forall y$ are in the form $\forall y \leq s$

t, s are \dots terms

Bounded Formula: all quantifiers are bounded.

- ▶ Relations definable by bounded formulas are
 - Decidable
 - Primitive Recursive
 - Recognizable in Linear Space [$\text{LinSpace} \equiv \text{Space} \in \mathcal{O}(n)$]
 - Recognizable in the Linear Time Hierarchy

Peano Arithmetic

Robinson's Arithmetic Q :

- $S(x) = S(y) \Rightarrow x = y$
- $x + 0 = x$
- $x \cdot 0 = 0$
- $x \leq y \iff \exists z(z + x = y)$
- $S(x) \neq 0$
- $x + S(y) = S(x + y)$
- $x \cdot S(y) = (x \cdot y) + x$
- $x \neq 0 \Rightarrow \exists y[x = S(y)]$

Plus the Induction Axioms:

$$\varphi(0) \wedge \forall x[\varphi(x) \rightarrow \varphi(S(x))] \implies \forall y\varphi(y)$$

Bounded Arithmetic

Definition

$Q + \text{Induction Axiom for Bounded Formulas} = I\Delta_0$

Theorem (*R.J. Parikh 1971*)

$I\Delta_0 \vdash \forall \bar{x} \exists y \eta(\bar{x}, y) \ \& \ \eta \in \Delta_0 \implies I\Delta_0 \vdash \forall \bar{x} \exists y \leq t(\bar{x}) \eta(\bar{x}, y)$
 t -term

Provably Recursive Functions of $I\Delta_0$ are Polynomially Bounded

$I\Delta_0 \vdash \underbrace{\forall \bar{x} \exists y \eta(\bar{x}, y)}_{\Delta_0} \implies I\Delta_0 \vdash \forall \bar{x} \exists y \leq \underbrace{t(\bar{x}) \eta(\bar{x}, y)}_{\Delta_0}$

Why Bounded Arithmetic ?

$$x \mid y \equiv \exists z(x \cdot z = y) \quad \text{Prime}(x) \equiv \forall y(y \mid x \Rightarrow y = 1 \vee y = x)$$

PA=Peano Arithmetic

$$\text{PA} \vdash \forall x \exists y (y > x \wedge \text{Prime}(y))$$

Open Problem:

$$\text{I}\Delta_0 \vdash? \forall x \exists y (y > x \wedge \text{Prime}(y))$$

$$\text{Exp} = \forall x \exists y [y = 2^x]$$

$$\text{EA} = \text{I}\Delta_0 + \text{Exp}$$

Elementary Arithmetic

$$“y = 2^x” \in \Delta_0$$

$$\text{EA} \vdash \forall x \exists y (y > x \wedge \text{Prime}(y))$$

More Bounded Arithmetic

Definition

$$\begin{cases} \omega_0(x) = x^2 \\ \omega_{n+1}(x) = 2^{\omega_n(\log x)} \end{cases} \quad \omega_1(x) = 2^{\log x \cdot \log x} \sim x^{\log x}$$

$$\omega_m(x) = \exp^m([\log^m x]^2) \quad f^m(x) = \underbrace{f \dots f}_m(x)$$

$$\text{polynomial}(x) \ll \omega_1(x) \ll \omega_2(x) \ll \dots \ll 2^x$$

Definition

$$\Omega_m = \forall x \exists y [y = \omega_m(x)] \quad \text{“} y = \omega_m(x) \text{”} \in \Delta_0$$

$$I\Delta_0 \not\subseteq I\Delta_0 + \Omega_1 \not\subseteq I\Delta_0 + \Omega_2 \not\subseteq \dots \not\subseteq I\Delta_0 + \bigwedge_j \Omega_j \not\subseteq I\Delta_0 + \text{Exp}$$

Unprobability of Consistency

$$\text{Con}(T) = \text{“ } T \text{ is consistent ”} = \forall z \neg \underbrace{\text{Proof}_T(z, \ulcorner 0 = 1 \urcorner)}_{\Delta_0} \in \Pi_1$$

Gödel's Second Incompleteness Theorem

$\text{PA} \not\vdash \text{Con}(\text{PA})$

$\text{ZFC} \vdash \text{Con}(\text{PA})$

$\text{I}\Delta_0 \not\vdash \text{Con}(\text{I}\Delta_0)$

$\text{PA} \vdash \text{Con}(\text{I}\Delta_0)$

But $\text{I}\Delta_0 + \text{Exp} \not\vdash \text{Con}(\text{I}\Delta_0)$!

How $\text{I}\Delta_0 + \text{Exp} \not\stackrel{\Pi_1}{\equiv} \text{I}\Delta_0$?

Open Problem: Π_1 -Separating the Hierarchy $\{\text{I}\Delta_0 + \Omega_m\}_m$

Herbrand Consistency 1

- Skolemizing: $\exists y \rightsquigarrow$ eliminate \exists & $[f(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow y]$ f new symbol
 \bar{x} all the universal variables before y
 then eliminating the remaining \forall quantifiers

Examples:

- $\forall x \exists y \varphi(x, y) \xrightarrow{\text{Sk}} \varphi(x, f(x))$
- $\exists y \forall u \exists z \varphi(y, u, z) \xrightarrow{\text{Sk}} \varphi(c, u, f(u))$

► T is Consistent $\iff T^{\text{Sk}}$ is Consistent
 First-Order \iff Propositional

Herbrand Consistency 2

Definition

Herbrand Consistency of T = Propositional Satisfiability of every finite set of (Skolem) instances of T

$$I\Delta_0 + \text{SupExp} \vdash \mathcal{H}\text{Con}(T) \longleftrightarrow \text{Con}(T)$$

$$I\Delta_0 + \text{Exp} \not\vdash \mathcal{H}\text{Con}(T) \longleftrightarrow \text{Con}(T)$$

$$I\Delta_0 + \text{Exp} \vdash \mathcal{H}\text{Con}(I\Delta_0)$$

Presumably ... $I\Delta_0 \not\vdash \mathcal{H}\text{Con}(I\Delta_0)$

Unprobability of Herbrand Consistency 1

Theorem (*Z. Adamowicz 2001,2002*)

$I\Delta_0 + \Omega_m \not\vdash \mathcal{HCon}(I\Delta_0 + \Omega_m)$ for $m \geq 2$.

Theorem (*S. Salehi 2002*)

$I\Delta_0 + \Omega_1 \not\vdash \mathcal{HCon}(I\Delta_0 + \Omega_1)$.

Theorem (*D.E. Willard 2002*)

$I\Delta_0 \not\vdash \mathcal{HCon}(I\Delta_0 + \Omega_0)$.

$\Omega_0 = \forall x \exists y [y = x^2]$

Theorem (*L.A. Kołodziejczyk 2006*)

$\bigcup_n (I\Delta_0 + \Omega_n) \not\vdash \mathcal{HCon}(I\Delta_0 + \Omega_m)$ for $m \geq 1$.

Unprobability of Herbrand Consistency 2

Theorem (*Z. Adamowicz 1996*)

$I\Delta_0 + \Omega_1 \not\vdash \text{TableauCon}(I\Delta_0 + \Omega_1)$.

Theorem (*S. Salehi 2002*)

$U \not\vdash \text{HCon}(U)$.

$U \in \Pi_2(I\Delta_0)$

Theorem (*D.E. Willard 2002*)

$I\Delta_0 \not\vdash \text{TableauCon}(I\Delta_0)$. $V \not\vdash \text{HCon}(V)$ for some $V \in \Pi_1(I\Delta_0)$.

Theorem (*L.A. Kołodziejczyk 2006*)

$I\Delta_0 + \bigwedge_j \Omega_j \not\vdash \text{HCon}(T)$.

$T \subseteq_{\text{finite}} I\Delta_0 + \Omega_1$

Π_1 -Separation ?

- ▶ So, $I\Delta_0 + \text{Exp}$ is NOT Π_1 -conservative over $I\Delta_0$
and \mathcal{HC}_{on} can Π_1 -separate them.
- ▶ $I\Delta_0 + \text{Exp}$ is NOT Π_1 -conservative over even $I\Delta_0 + \bigwedge_j \Omega_j$
but can \mathcal{HC}_{on} Π_1 -separate them?
- ▶ However, \mathcal{HC}_{on} cannot Π_1 -separate $I\Delta_0 + \bigwedge_j \Omega_j$ from $I\Delta_0$!

New Results 1

Theorem (*S. Salehi 2010+*)

$I\Delta_0 \not\vdash \mathcal{HCon}(I\Delta_0)$.

Theorem (*S. Salehi 2010+*)

$(I\Delta_0 + \bigwedge_j \Omega_j) \not\vdash \mathcal{HCon}(I\Delta_0)$.

New Results 2

Theorem (S. Salehi 2011+)

$$\text{I}\Delta_0 \not\vdash \mathcal{H}\text{Con}(S). \quad S \subseteq_{\text{finite}} \text{I}\Delta_0$$

Corollary $\text{I}\Delta_0 \not\vdash \mathcal{H}\text{Con}(U)$, for some $U \in \Pi_1(\text{I}\Delta_0)$.

Theorem (S. Salehi 2011+)

$$\text{I}\Delta_0 + \bigwedge_j \Omega_j \not\vdash \mathcal{H}\text{Con}(S). \quad S \subseteq_{\text{finite}} \text{I}\Delta_0$$

Corollary $\text{I}\Delta_0 + \bigwedge_j \Omega_j \not\vdash \mathcal{H}\text{Con}(U)$, for some $U \in \Pi_1(\text{I}\Delta_0)$.

Thank You!

Thanks to

The Participants For Listening...

and

The Organizers ... For Taking Care of Everything...

SAEEDSALEHI.ir