

# **Logic, Computability and Incompleteness**

## The Unprovability of Consistency

---

Wolfgang Schwarz

27 November 2025

# Consistency Proofs

---

## Consistency Proofs

At the turn of the 20th century, set-theoretic concepts became central to many areas of mathematics.

But these concepts give rise to paradoxes.

Frege's axiomatization of arithmetic turned out to be inconsistent, due to its endorsement of unrestricted comprehension.

ZFC was developed to avoid these paradoxes.

But does it?

# Consistency Proofs



## **Hilbert's vision:**

Provide finitary consistency proofs for ZFC and other foundational theories.

All we need to show is that  $\perp$  is not provable from the axioms.



### **Gödel's Second Incompleteness Theorem (1931):**

*No sufficiently powerful and consistent axiomatic theory can prove its own consistency.*

Therefore: If ZFC is consistent then no theory weaker than ZFC can prove the consistency of ZFC.

## The Second Incompleteness Theorem

---

# The Second Incompleteness Theorem

## Theorem 8.3

*All recursive functions and relations are representable in every extension of  $Q$ .*

Let  $\text{Prf}_{\text{PA}}$  be the relation that holds between  $n$  and  $m$  iff  $n$  codes a PA-proof of the sentence coded by  $m$ .

By Theorem 8.3, there is a formula  $\text{PRF}_{\text{PA}}(x, y)$  such that for all natural numbers  $n$  and  $m$ ,

- (i) If  $\text{Prf}_{\text{PA}}(n, m)$ , then  $\vdash_{\text{PA}} \text{PRF}_{\text{PA}}(\bar{n}, \bar{m})$ ;
- (ii) If not  $\text{Prf}_{\text{PA}}(n, m)$ , then  $\vdash_{\text{PA}} \neg \text{PRF}_{\text{PA}}(\bar{n}, \bar{m})$ .

Define  $\text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(x)$  as  $\exists y \text{PRF}_{\text{PA}}(y, x)$ .

# The Second Incompleteness Theorem

## The Diagonal Lemma

*For every PA-formula  $A(x)$ , there is a sentence  $G$  such that*

$$\vdash_{\text{PA}} G \leftrightarrow A(\ulcorner G \urcorner).$$

Apply the diagonal lemma to  $\neg \text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(x)$ .

This gives us a sentence  $G$  such that  $\vdash_{\text{PA}} G \leftrightarrow \neg \text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner G \urcorner)$ .



# The Second Incompleteness Theorem

## Half of Gödel's First Incompleteness Theorem

*If PA is consistent, then PA does not prove G.*

Suppose PA proves G.

Then it **proves**  $\neg \text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner G \urcorner)$  because it proves  $G \leftrightarrow \neg \text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner G \urcorner)$ .

But also, there is a proof of G, coded by some number  $n$ .

So  $\text{Prf}_{\text{PA}}(n, \ulcorner G \urcorner)$  holds.

So PA proves  $\text{PRF}_{\text{PA}}(\bar{n}, \ulcorner G \urcorner)$ ,

So PA **proves**  $\text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner G \urcorner)$ .

So PA is inconsistent.

# The Second Incompleteness Theorem

## Half of Gödel's First Incompleteness Theorem

*If PA is consistent, then PA does not prove G.*

We can translate this into  $\mathcal{L}_A$ :

$$\neg \text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner \perp \urcorner) \rightarrow \neg \text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner G \urcorner)$$

This sentence is provable in PA.

Suppose PA proves  $\neg \text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner \perp \urcorner)$ .

Then it proves  $\neg \text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner G \urcorner)$ .

So it proves G.

So it is inconsistent.

# Provability Logic

---

$$\neg \text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner \bot \urcorner) \rightarrow \neg \text{PROV}_{\text{PA}}(\ulcorner G \urcorner)$$

$$\neg \Box \bot \rightarrow \neg \Box G.$$

This is provable in any theory in which the box satisfies the Hilbert–Bernays–Löb conditions:

*P1* If  $\vdash_T A$ , then  $\vdash_T \Box A$ .

*P2*  $\vdash_T \Box(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\Box A \rightarrow \Box B)$ .

*P3*  $\vdash_T \Box A \rightarrow \Box \Box A$ .

*P1 If  $\vdash_T A$ , then  $\vdash_T \Box A$ .*

*P2  $\vdash_T \Box(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\Box A \rightarrow \Box B)$ .*

*P3  $\vdash_T \Box A \rightarrow \Box \Box A$ .*

## **Löb's Theorem**

*If  $\vdash_T \Box A \rightarrow A$ , then  $\vdash_T A$ , provided that the box satisfies P1–P3.*

# Provability Logic

The full logic of provability:

*Nec*    If  $\vdash_T A$ , then  $\vdash_T \Box A$ .

*K*         $\vdash_T \Box(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\Box A \rightarrow \Box B)$ .

*4*         $\vdash_T \Box A \rightarrow \Box \Box A$ .

*GL*       $\vdash_T \Box(\Box A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow \Box A$ .

# Exam

---

# Exam

In class there is a preview of the exam here.



# **PPLS Semester 1 Course Survey**

## **Honours and Postgraduate**



<https://edin.ac/4ou0ttk>

**Opens: 17 November 2025**

**Closes: 5 December 2025**