

## art.1 Derivations in Natural Deduction

inc:art:pnd:  
sec In order to arithmetize **derivations**, we must represent **derivations** as numbers. explanation Since **derivations** are trees of **formulas** where each inference carries one or two labels, a recursive representation is the most obvious approach: we represent a **derivation** as a tuple, the components of which are the number of immediate sub-**derivations** leading to the premises of the last inference, the representations of these sub-**derivations**, and the end-**formula**, the discharge label of the last inference, and a number indicating the type of the last inference.

**Definition art.1.** If  $\delta$  is a **derivation** in natural deduction, then  $\# \delta^\#$  is defined inductively as follows:

1. If  $\delta$  consists only of the assumption  $\varphi$ , then  $\# \delta^\#$  is  $\langle 0, \# \varphi^\#, n \rangle$ . The number  $n$  is 0 if it is an **undischarged** assumption, and the numerical label otherwise.
2. If  $\delta$  ends in an inference with one, two, or three premises, then  $\# \delta^\#$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle 1, \# \delta_1^\#, \# \varphi^\#, n, k \rangle, \\ &\langle 2, \# \delta_1^\#, \# \delta_2^\#, \# \varphi^\#, n, k \rangle, \text{ or} \\ &\langle 3, \# \delta_1^\#, \# \delta_2^\#, \# \delta_3^\#, \# \varphi^\#, n, k \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Here  $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3$  are the sub-**derivations** ending in the premise(s) of the last inference in  $\delta$ ,  $\varphi$  is the conclusion of the last inference in  $\delta$ ,  $n$  is the discharge label of the last inference (0 if the inference does not discharge any assumptions), and  $k$  is given by the following table according to which rule was used in the last inference.

|       |                     |                    |                 |                |
|-------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Rule: | $\wedge$ Intro      | $\wedge$ Elim      | $\vee$ Intro    | $\vee$ Elim    |
| $k$ : | 1                   | 2                  | 3               | 4              |
|       |                     |                    |                 |                |
| Rule: | $\rightarrow$ Intro | $\rightarrow$ Elim | $\neg$ Intro    | $\neg$ Elim    |
| $k$ : | 5                   | 6                  | 7               | 8              |
|       |                     |                    |                 |                |
| Rule: | $\perp_I$           | $\perp_C$          | $\forall$ Intro | $\forall$ Elim |
| $k$ : | 9                   | 10                 | 11              | 12             |
|       |                     |                    |                 |                |
| Rule: | $\exists$ Intro     | $\exists$ Elim     | $=$ Intro       | $=$ Elim       |
| $k$ : | 13                  | 14                 | 15              | 16             |

**Example art.2.** Consider the very simple **derivation**

$$1 \frac{\frac{[\varphi \wedge \psi]^1}{\varphi} \wedge\text{Elim}}{(\varphi \wedge \psi) \rightarrow \varphi} \rightarrow\text{Intro}$$

The Gödel number of the assumption would be  $d_0 = \langle 0, \# \varphi \wedge \psi^\#, 1 \rangle$ . The Gödel number of the **derivation** ending in the conclusion of  $\wedge$ Elim would

be  $d_1 = \langle 1, d_0, \# \varphi^\#, 0, 2 \rangle$  (1 since  $\wedge\text{Elim}$  has one premise, the Gödel number of conclusion  $\varphi$ , 0 because no assumption is discharged, and 2 is the number coding  $\wedge\text{Elim}$ ). The Gödel number of the entire **derivation** then is  $\langle 1, d_1, \#((\varphi \wedge \psi) \rightarrow \varphi)^\#, 1, 5 \rangle$ , i.e.,

$$\langle 1, \langle 1, \langle 0, \#(\varphi \wedge \psi)^\#, 1 \rangle, \# \varphi^\#, 0, 2 \rangle, \#((\varphi \wedge \psi) \rightarrow \varphi)^\#, 1, 5 \rangle.$$

**explanation**

Having settled on a representation of **derivations**, we must also show that we can manipulate Gödel numbers of such **derivations** primitive recursively, and express their essential properties and relations. Some operations are simple: e.g., given a Gödel number  $d$  of a **derivation**,  $\text{EndFmla}(d) = (d)_{(d)_0+1}$  gives us the Gödel number of its end-**formula**,  $\text{DischargeLabel}(d) = (d)_{(d)_0+2}$  gives us the discharge label and  $\text{LastRule}(d) = (d)_{(d)_0+3}$  the number indicating the type of the last inference. Some are much harder. We'll at least sketch how to do this. The goal is to show that the relation “ $\delta$  is a **derivation** of  $\varphi$  from  $\Gamma$ ” is a primitive recursive relation of the Gödel numbers of  $\delta$  and  $\varphi$ .

**Proposition art.3.** *The following relations are primitive recursive:*

1.  $\varphi$  occurs as an assumption in  $\delta$  with label  $n$ .
2. All assumptions in  $\delta$  with label  $n$  are of the form  $\varphi$  (i.e., we can **discharge** the assumption  $\varphi$  using label  $n$  in  $\delta$ ).

*Proof.* We have to show that the corresponding relations between Gödel numbers of **formulas** and Gödel numbers of **derivations** are primitive recursive.

1. We want to show that  $\text{Assum}(x, d, n)$ , which holds if  $x$  is the Gödel number of an assumption of the **derivation** with Gödel number  $d$  labelled  $n$ , is primitive recursive. This is the case if the **derivation** with Gödel number  $\langle 0, x, n \rangle$  is a sub-**derivation** of  $d$ . Note that the way we code **derivations** is a special case of the coding of trees introduced in ??, so the primitive recursive function  $\text{SubtreeSeq}(d)$  gives a sequence of Gödel numbers of all sub-**derivations** of  $d$  (of length at most  $d$ ). So we can define

$$\text{Assum}(x, d, n) \Leftrightarrow (\exists i < d) (\text{SubtreeSeq}(d))_i = \langle 0, x, n \rangle.$$

2. We want to show that  $\text{Discharge}(x, d, n)$ , which holds if all assumptions with label  $n$  in the **derivation** with Gödel number  $d$  all are the **formula** with Gödel number  $x$ . But this relation holds iff  $(\forall y < d) (\text{Assum}(y, d, n) \rightarrow y = x)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition art.4.** *The property  $\text{Correct}(d)$  which holds iff the last inference in the **derivation**  $\delta$  with Gödel number  $d$  is correct, is primitive recursive.*

*inc:art:pnd:  
prop:followsby*

*Proof.* Here we have to show that for each rule of inference  $R$  the relation  $\text{FollowsBy}_R(d)$  is primitive recursive, where  $\text{FollowsBy}_R(d)$  holds iff  $d$  is the Gödel number of **derivation**  $\delta$ , and the end-**formula** of  $\delta$  follows by a correct application of  $R$  from the immediate sub-**derivations** of  $\delta$ .

A simple case is that of the  $\wedge\text{Intro}$  rule. If  $\delta$  ends in a correct  $\wedge\text{Intro}$  inference, it looks like this:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \delta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \varphi \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \delta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \psi \end{array}}{\varphi \wedge \psi} \wedge\text{Intro}$$

Then the Gödel number  $d$  of  $\delta$  is  $\langle 2, d_1, d_2, \#(\varphi \wedge \psi)\#, 0, k \rangle$  where  $\text{EndFmla}(d_1) = \# \varphi \#, \text{EndFmla}(d_2) = \# \psi \#, n = 0$ , and  $k = 1$ . So we can define  $\text{FollowsBy}_{\wedge\text{Intro}}(d)$  as

$$(d)_0 = 2 \wedge \text{DischargeLabel}(d) = 0 \wedge \text{LastRule}(d) = 1 \wedge \\ \text{EndFmla}(d) = \#(\# \frown \text{EndFmla}((d)_1) \frown \# \wedge \# \frown \text{EndFmla}((d)_2) \frown \#)\#.$$

Another simple example is the  $=\text{Intro}$  rule. Here the premise is an empty **derivation**, i.e.,  $(d)_1 = 0$ , and no discharge label, i.e.,  $n = 0$ . However,  $\varphi$  must be of the form  $t = t$ , for a closed term  $t$ . Here, a primitive recursive definition is

$$(d)_0 = 1 \wedge (d)_1 = 0 \wedge \text{DischargeLabel}(d) = 0 \wedge \\ (\exists t < d) (\text{CITerm}(t) \wedge \text{EndFmla}(d) = \#(=\# \frown t \frown \#, \# \frown t \frown \#)\#)$$

For a more complicated example,  $\text{FollowsBy}_{\rightarrow\text{Intro}}(d)$  holds iff the end-**formula** of  $\delta$  is of the form  $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$ , where the end-**formula** of  $\delta_1$  is  $\psi$ , and any assumption in  $\delta$  labelled  $n$  is of the form  $\varphi$ . We can express this primitive recursively by

$$(d)_0 = 1 \wedge \\ (\exists a < d) (\text{Discharge}(a, (d)_1, \text{DischargeLabel}(d)) \wedge \\ \text{EndFmla}(d) = (\#(\# \frown a \frown \# \rightarrow \# \frown \text{EndFmla}((d)_1) \frown \#)\#))$$

(Think of  $a$  as the Gödel number of  $\varphi$ ).

For another example, consider  $\exists\text{Intro}$ . Here, the last inference in  $\delta$  is correct iff there is a **formula**  $\varphi$ , a closed term  $t$  and a **variable**  $x$  such that  $\varphi[t/x]$  is the end-**formula** of the **derivation**  $\delta_1$  and  $\exists x \varphi$  is the conclusion of the last inference. So,  $\text{FollowsBy}_{\exists\text{Intro}}(d)$  holds iff

$$(d)_0 = 1 \wedge \text{DischargeLabel}(d) = 0 \wedge \\ (\exists a < d) (\exists x < d) (\exists t < d) (\text{CITerm}(t) \wedge \text{Var}(x) \wedge \\ \text{Subst}(a, t, x) = \text{EndFmla}((d)_1) \wedge \text{EndFmla}(d) = (\# \exists \# \frown x \frown a)).$$

We then define  $\text{Correct}(d)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sent}(\text{EndFmla}(d)) \wedge \\ (\text{LastRule}(d) = 1 \wedge \text{FollowsBy}_{\wedge\text{Intro}}(d)) \vee \dots \vee \\ (\text{LastRule}(d) = 16 \wedge \text{FollowsBy}_{=\text{Elim}}(d)) \vee \\ (\exists n < d) (\exists x < d) (d = \langle 0, x, n \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

The first line ensures that the end-formula of  $d$  is a sentence. The last line covers the case where  $d$  is just an assumption.  $\square$

**Problem art.1.** Define the following properties as in [Proposition art.4](#):

1.  $\text{FollowsBy}_{\rightarrow\text{Elim}}(d)$ ,
2.  $\text{FollowsBy}_{=\text{Elim}}(d)$ ,
3.  $\text{FollowsBy}_{\vee\text{Elim}}(d)$ ,
4.  $\text{FollowsBy}_{\vee\text{Intro}}(d)$ .

For the last one, you will have to also show that you can test primitive recursively if the last inference of the derivation with Gödel number  $d$  satisfies the eigenvariable condition, i.e., the eigenvariable  $a$  of the  $\vee\text{Intro}$  inference occurs neither in the end-formula of  $d$  nor in an open assumption of  $d$ . You may use the primitive recursive predicate  $\text{OpenAssum}$  from [Proposition art.6](#) for this.

**Proposition art.5.** *The relation  $\text{Deriv}(d)$  which holds if  $d$  is the Gödel number of a correct derivation  $\delta$ , is primitive recursive.* inc:art:pnd:  
prop:deriv

*Proof.* A derivation  $\delta$  is correct if every one of its inferences is a correct application of a rule, i.e., if every one of its sub-derivations ends in a correct inference. So,  $\text{Deriv}(d)$  iff

$$(\forall i < \text{len}(\text{SubtreeSeq}(d))) \text{Correct}((\text{SubtreeSeq}(d))_i) \quad \square$$

**Proposition art.6.** *The relation  $\text{OpenAssum}(z, d)$  that holds if  $z$  is the Gödel number of an undischarged assumption  $\varphi$  of the derivation  $\delta$  with Gödel number  $d$ , is primitive recursive.* inc:art:pnd:  
prop:openassum

*Proof.* An occurrence of an assumption is discharged if it occurs with label  $n$  in a sub-derivation of  $\delta$  that ends in a rule with discharge label  $n$ . So  $\varphi$  is an undischarged assumption of  $\delta$  if at least one of its occurrences is not discharged in  $\delta$ . We must be careful:  $\delta$  may contain both discharged and undischarged occurrences of  $\varphi$ .

Consider a sequence  $\delta_0, \dots, \delta_k$  where  $\delta_0 = d$ ,  $\delta_k$  is the assumption  $[\varphi]^n$  (for some  $n$ ), and  $\delta_i$  is an immediate sub-derivation of  $\delta_{i+1}$ . If such a sequence exists in which no  $\delta_i$  ends in an inference with discharge label  $n$ , then  $\varphi$  is an undischarged assumption of  $\delta$ .

The primitive recursive function  $\text{SubtreeSeq}(d)$  provides us with a sequence of Gödel numbers of all sub-derivations of  $\delta$ . Any sequence of Gödel numbers of sub-derivations of  $\delta$  is a subsequence of it. Being a subsequence of is a primitive recursive relation:  $\text{Subseq}(s, s')$  holds iff  $(\forall i < \text{len}(s)) \exists j < \text{len}(s') (s)_i = (s')_j$ . Being an immediate sub-derivation is as well:  $\text{Subderiv}(d, d')$  iff  $(\exists j < (d')_0) d = (d')_j$ . So we can define  $\text{OpenAssum}(z, d)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} (\exists s < \text{SubtreeSeq}(d)) (\text{Subseq}(s, \text{SubtreeSeq}(d)) \wedge (s)_0 = d \wedge \\ (\exists n < d) ((s)_{\text{len}(s)-1} = \langle 0, z, n \rangle \wedge \\ (\forall i < (\text{len}(s) - 1)) (\text{Subderiv}((s)_i, (s)_{i+1})] \wedge \\ \text{DischargeLabel}((s)_{i+1} \neq n))). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition art.7.** *Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a primitive recursive set of sentences. Then the relation  $\text{Prf}_\Gamma(x, y)$  expressing “ $x$  is the code of a derivation  $\delta$  of  $\varphi$  from undischarged assumptions in  $\Gamma$  and  $y$  is the Gödel number of  $\varphi$ ” is primitive recursive.*

*Proof.* Suppose “ $y \in \Gamma$ ” is given by the primitive recursive predicate  $R_\Gamma(y)$ . We have to show that  $\text{Prf}_\Gamma(x, y)$  which holds iff  $y$  is the Gödel number of a sentence  $\varphi$  and  $x$  is the code of a natural deduction derivation with end formula  $\varphi$  and all undischarged assumptions in  $\Gamma$  is primitive recursive.

By [Proposition art.5](#), the property  $\text{Deriv}(x)$  which holds iff  $x$  is the Gödel number of a correct derivation  $\delta$  in natural deduction is primitive recursive. Thus we can define  $\text{Prf}_\Gamma(x, y)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prf}_\Gamma(x, y) \Leftrightarrow \text{Deriv}(x) \wedge \text{EndFmla}(x) = y \wedge \\ (\forall z < x) (\text{OpenAssum}(z, x) \rightarrow R_\Gamma(z)). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

## Photo Credits

## Bibliography