On the Feasibility of Gödel Encoding with Alternative Number Systems

Anand Kumar Keshavan

Abstract: *Gödel's incompleteness theorems hinge on an ingenious encoding that maps formulas and proofs in formal arithmetic to natural numbers. This paper explores whether Gödel's encoding scheme could be adapted to alternative number systems—specifically the real numbers (including transcendental and irrational numbers)—in place of the natural numbers. We examine the mathematical properties of these alternative domains (uncountability, density, computational representation, etc.) and assess the theoretical challenges of establishing a robust encoding and decoding mechanism in each case. The analysis covers implications for the self-referential constructions central to Gödel's proof, the requirements for computability and uniqueness in the encoding process, and whether such changes might affect the scope of Gödel's incompleteness results. Our findings indicate that a direct substitution of the naturals with an uncountable number system is not feasible without losing essential features of Gödel's scheme. The cardinality mismatch and computability issues present insurmountable obstacles to a bijective, effective encoding. While one could conceive of specialized or approximate encoding approaches in advanced theoretical contexts (e.g., analog computation or non-standard analysis), these do not replicate Gödel's exact mechanism. We conclude that the choice of the natural numbers in Gödel's original encoding is fundamentally tied to the nature of formal systems and incompleteness, and altering the number system does not circumvent the inherent limitations identified by Gödel.*

I. Introduction

Gödel's incompleteness theorems stand as profound milestones in mathematical logic, revealing fundamental limitations inherent in formal axiomatic systems capable of expressing basic arithmetic. These theorems, published in 1931, demonstrated that within any sufficiently rich and consistent formal system, there exist statements that can neither be proven nor disproven within the system itself. A cornerstone of Gödel's groundbreaking proof lies in his ingenious numbering system—a method of encoding metamathematical statements about the formal system into the language of arithmetic itself. This encoding allows for a form of self-reference that is central to the construction of the undecidable Gödel sentence. The original formulation of this encoding relied on the unique mapping of symbols, formulas, and proofs to the set of natural numbers.

This paper aims to explore a fundamental question that arises from the success and significance of Gödel's method: **Can Gödel's encoding system be adapted to utilize alternative number systems—specifically real, transcendental, or irrational numbers—in place of the natural numbers?** This investigation will delve into the properties of these alternative number systems, analyze the challenges associated with adapting Gödel's scheme, and consider the potential implications such a modification might have on the core aspects of Gödel's incompleteness theorems and related results in mathematical logic. The structure of the paper is as follows. We begin by outlining Gödel's original encoding system (Section II), followed by an examination of key properties of real, transcendental, and irrational numbers (Section III). In Section IV, we discuss the challenges of adapting Gödel's method to these alternative systems, and in Section V we analyze the potential impact on Gödel's incompleteness theorems. Sections VI and VII review existing discussions (or the lack thereof) and relevant theoretical concepts (such as countability, computability, and fixed-point theorems) that underpin our analysis. In Section VIII, we consider possible applications or theoretical consequences of alternative encoding schemes, drawing parallels from encoding practices in other domains where appropriate (Section IX). Finally, Section X presents our conclusions.

II. Kurt Gödel's Original Encoding System

II.A. The Intuitive Idea of Mapping

Kurt Gödel’s seminal contribution involved the *arithmetization of syntax*, a process by which the symbols and grammatical structures of a formal language are systematically translated into numbers. The intuitive core of Gödel's numbering system is the assignment of a unique natural number to each basic symbol within the formal language of arithmetic. For instance, one might assign specific natural numbers to symbols representing zero (`0`), the successor function (`S`), addition (`+`), equality (`=`), parentheses (`(`, `)`), and variables (`x`, `y`, etc.). This initial assignment establishes a fundamental link between the syntactic elements of the formal system and the domain of natural numbers. This concept of mapping symbols to numbers bears a resemblance to modern encoding systems used in computer science, such as the American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII), where each character in a text is assigned a unique numerical code. While the technical implementation differs significantly, the underlying principle of representing symbolic information numerically is analogous. The power of Gödel's approach lies in extending this basic mapping to encompass more complex structures within the formal system.

II.B. Encoding Formulas and Sequences of Symbols

Beyond individual symbols, Gödel's system provides a method for encoding entire *formulas*, which are sequences of these basic symbols. To achieve this, Gödel employed a technique based on the fundamental theorem of arithmetic, which states that every natural number greater than 1 can be uniquely represented as a product of prime numbers raised to certain powers. In Gödel's encoding, each symbol in a formula is first assigned its unique natural number. Then, for a formula consisting of a sequence of n symbols with corresponding numerical codes $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$, the Gödel number of the entire formula is constructed by taking the first n prime numbers and raising each prime to the power of the code of the corresponding symbol. In other words, if p_k denotes the k-th prime, a formula with symbols $s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n$ (mapped to numbers $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$ respectively) is assigned the Gödel number:

G(s1s2⋯sn) = p1 a1 · p2 a2⋯pn an .G(s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n) \;=\; p_1^{\,a_1} \cdot p_2^{\,a_2} \cdots p_n^{\,a_n}\,.G(s1s2⋯sn)=p1a1 · p2a2⋯pnan.

For example, if we have a simple formal language where the symbol `'0'` is assigned the number 2, `'S'` (successor) is 3, `'='` is 5, and so on, then the formula “$0 = 0$” might be encoded as $2^2 \cdot 3^5 \cdot 5^2$ (assuming the sequence of symbols is `0`, `=`, `0` which maps to 2, 5, 2 respectively). The crucial aspect here is the uniqueness of representation guaranteed by the fundamental theorem of arithmetic. Given the Gödel number of a formula, one can factorize it uniquely into primes and recover the original sequence of symbols. This ability to move from number to formula and back is what allows the *syntax* of the formal system (its formulas and proofs) to be studied *arithmetically* within the system.

II.C. Encoding Proofs

Gödel’s encoding scheme extends further to encompass entire *proofs* within the formal system. A proof in a formal system is a finite sequence of formulas, each formula derived according to the inference rules from axioms or earlier formulas in the sequence. Gödel assigned natural numbers to whole proofs by encoding the sequence of formulas in a manner similar to encoding a sequence of symbols for a single formula. In one approach, one could first Gödel-number each formula in the proof sequence as described above. If a proof consists of m formulas with Gödel numbers $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m$, a single Gödel number can be assigned to the entire proof by a second-level encoding: for example, using the prime power method again, one could define the Gödel number of the proof as $2^{,g_1} \cdot 3^{,g_2} \cdot 5^{,g_3} \cdots p_m^{,g_m}$, where p_m is the m-th prime number. This scheme ensures that each proof as a sequence of formulas corresponds to a unique natural number. Importantly, given this Gödel number of a proof, one can in principle decode it (by prime factorization twice) to retrieve the entire sequence of formulas in the proof.

This step of encoding proofs is particularly significant as it allows for the arithmetization of the concept of *provability*. The property of a particular natural number being the Gödel number of a valid proof of a formula with a specific Gödel number can itself be expressed as an arithmetical relation within the formal system. In other words, one can formulate a statement in arithmetic that says "there exists a number with certain properties that encodes a valid proof of the formula encoded by such-and-such number." This ability to represent metamathematical notions (like *“formula F is provable”*) within the system’s own language is the key to constructing the self-referential Gödel sentence that asserts its own unprovability.

II.D. Key Citations

The foundational work describing Gödel's numbering system and its application to the incompleteness theorems is, of course, Gödel's original 1931 paper, *Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I*【6】【1】. This paper, published in *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* (Vol. 38, pp. 173–198, 1931), laid the groundwork for modern mathematical logic and the philosophy of mathematics. English translations are available (e.g., in the collected works of Gödel) for those not reading the original German. Secondary sources, such as Richard Zach’s analysis of Gödel’s paper in *Landmark Writings in Mathematics*【9】【2】, and Juliette Kennedy’s book *Gödel’s*

Incompleteness Theorems【10】【3】, provide valuable insights and detailed explanations of Gödel's original work and its profound implications. These sources offer a comprehensive understanding of the historical context and the technical intricacies of Gödel's groundbreaking achievements.

III. Properties of Real, Transcendental, and Irrational Numbers

III.A. Real Numbers

Real numbers constitute a comprehensive set of numbers that includes all rational numbers (those expressible as a fraction of two integers) and all irrational numbers (those that cannot be expressed as such a fraction). They can be visualized as all the points on an infinitely long number line. Real numbers possess several key properties that distinguish them from the natural numbers. **Firstly**, they are *totally ordered*, meaning that for any two distinct real numbers, one is always greater than the other. **Secondly**, they satisfy the *completeness axiom*, which states that every non-empty set of real numbers that has an upper bound also has a least upper bound (supremum). This property is crucial for many results in analysis. **Another important characteristic** is their *density*: between any two distinct real numbers, no matter how close, there exists another real number. This contrasts sharply with the discrete nature of natural numbers, where there is a well-defined successor for each number.

Perhaps the most significant difference in the context of encoding is the *uncountability* of the set of real numbers. This means that it is impossible to create a one-to-one correspondence between the set of natural numbers and the set of real numbers. Cantor's diagonalization argument famously demonstrates this uncountability. In essence, any attempt to list all real numbers in a sequence (analogous to listing all natural numbers) will inevitably miss some real numbers. This uncountability has profound implications for the feasibility of using real numbers to encode the countable set of formulas and proofs in a formal system. In particular, if one tried to assign a unique real number to every formula (as Gödel did with natural numbers), there would be "too many" real numbers—indeed uncountably many—to manage in a direct encoding scheme. The gap in cardinality suggests an immediate obstacle: we cannot hope to pair each formula with a unique real number without either leaving out some real numbers or failing to cover all formulas【11】【12】.

III.B. Transcendental Numbers

Transcendental numbers form a specific subset of real (and complex) numbers characterized by the fact that they are not roots of any non-zero polynomial equation with integer (equivalently, rational) coefficients. In other words, they "transcend" the realm of algebraic numbers (the numbers that are solutions to polynomial equations with integer coefficients). Familiar examples of transcendental numbers include π (the ratio of a circle's circumference to its diameter) and e (the base of the natural logarithm). Liouville's constant, which was constructed to have extremely rapid rational approximations, is another example of a transcendental number. An important property of real transcendental numbers is that **they are all irrational** (no transcendental number can be expressed as a fraction of two integers). The set of transcendental numbers, like the set of all real numbers, is uncountably infinite. This means that, in a sense, “most” real numbers are transcendental, although proving the transcendence of any given specific number can be a challenging task in general.

The uncountability of transcendental numbers presents the same fundamental challenge for direct encoding of a countable set as discussed with real numbers in general. If we attempted to assign formulas to transcendental numbers uniquely, we would confront the cardinality mismatch: there are countably many formulas but uncountably many transcendental numbers. Additionally, transcendental numbers do not have simple representations—they often have infinite, non-repeating decimal expansions and no finite description in terms of algebraic operations. This complexity would carry over to any encoding scheme that tries to exploit them【16】【19】.

III.C. Irrational Numbers

Irrational numbers are real numbers that cannot be expressed as a ratio of two integers. Their decimal expansions are non-terminating and non-repeating, distinguishing them from rational numbers (which have decimal expansions that either terminate or eventually repeat a finite block). Classic examples of irrational numbers include $\sqrt{2}$, $\sqrt{3}$, π, and e (the latter two are not only irrational but transcendental as noted). The discovery of irrational numbers—traditionally attributed to the ancient Pythagoreans with the realization that the diagonal of a unit square (of length $\sqrt{2}$) cannot be expressed as a ratio of integers—marked a significant development in the history of mathematics.

The set of irrational numbers is also uncountable. Since the set of real numbers is the union of the countable set of rational numbers and the set of irrational numbers, and since the reals are uncountable, it follows that the irrationals must themselves be uncountable as well. Similar to the case of real and transcendental numbers, the uncountability (and also the density) of irrational numbers pose challenges for their direct use in encoding a countable set of mathematical formulas and proofs in a way that maintains uniqueness and allows for effective decoding. In effect, using irrationals as the targets of an encoding injects the same kind of *cardinality problem* and *precision problem* that using arbitrary reals would entail【21】【23】.

III.D. Comparative Table of Number System Properties

To summarize some key properties of these number systems in comparison with the natural numbers, we provide the following table:

Property	**Natural Numbers**	**Real Numbers**	**Transcendental Numbers**	**Irrational Numbers**
Countability	Countable	Uncountable	Uncountable	Uncountable
Order	Total	Total	Total	Total

Density (between distinct numbers)	Discrete (gaps)	Dense	Dense	Dense
Algebraically Closed?	No (integers are not roots of all polynomials)	No	No (none are algebraic)	No (contains non-algebraic numbers)
Decimal Representation	Finite or repeating	Some terminating/repeating, many non-terminating non-repeating	Non-terminating non-repeating	Non-terminating non-repeating
Well-Ordering (standard)	Yes (every subset has a least element)	No (uncountable, not well-ordered in usual order)	No	No
Root of a non-zero integer polynomial?	Yes (by definition any natural is a trivial root $n - n = 0$)	Yes (some reals are algebraic)	No (by definition)	Yes (some irrationals are algebraic, e.g. $\sqrt{2}$)

(The row "Algebraically Closed?" refers to whether the set, considered within the reals, contains all solutions of polynomial equations. The real numbers are not algebraically closed either—complex numbers are needed for that—but the table entry focuses on the property defining transcendental numbers.)

IV. Challenges in Adapting Gödel's Encoding

IV.A. Uniqueness of Representation

A primary challenge in adapting Gödel's encoding to utilize real, transcendental, or irrational numbers lies in establishing a unique mapping from the countable set of formulas and proofs to an uncountable set of numbers. Gödel's original system leverages the countability of the formal language and the natural numbers to create a bijection, ensuring that each formula and proof corresponds to exactly one natural number, and vice versa. When considering an uncountable target set like the real numbers, it becomes inherently impossible to maintain a bijection with a countable source set.

While every real number possesses a unique decimal representation, the process of *reversibly* extracting a finite sequence of symbols (representing a formula) from an *arbitrary* real number in a computable manner is far from straightforward. Any attempt to map formulas to real numbers would inevitably result in infinitely many real numbers that do not correspond to any formula or proof (simply because there are more real numbers than syntactic entities), undermining the completeness and exclusivity of the encoding scheme.

The fundamental disparity in cardinality thus presents a significant obstacle to a direct adaptation that preserves the essential properties of Gödel's original encoding.

IV.B. Computability

Gödel's original encoding and decoding processes are fundamentally *computable*. Given a formula, its Gödel number can be effectively calculated through a well-defined algorithm, and conversely, given a Gödel number, the original formula can be uniquely reconstructed. This algorithmic nature is crucial for linking metamathematical properties to arithmetical properties within the formal system. Adapting this scheme to use real, transcendental, or irrational numbers introduces significant hurdles concerning computability.

Representing arbitrary real numbers finitely within a computational framework typically involves approximations (for example, truncating or symbolically representing infinite decimal expansions), which potentially leads to a loss of information or precision that could compromise the uniqueness and correctness of the encoding. Defining *computable functions* that could reliably map formulas to such numbers and back—while preserving the structure and provability relationships of the formal system—presents a considerable challenge. The inherent infinite detail of many real numbers (particularly their non-terminating, non-repeating decimal expansions) further complicates the prospect of developing effective and reversible computational methods for encoding and decoding. In essence, even if in theory every formula was assigned to a real number, carrying out this assignment and its inverse via an algorithm might be impossible for uncountable targets【11】【14】.

IV.C. Potential Ambiguities

The density of real, transcendental, and irrational numbers raises concerns about potential *ambiguities* in representing discrete mathematical objects like symbols and formulas. Unlike the natural numbers, where there is a clear discrete gap between consecutive values, real numbers can be arbitrarily close to each other. This continuous nature makes it difficult to define precise “boundaries” or intervals on the real number line that would correspond uniquely to each encoded symbol or formula without risk of overlap or ambiguity.

In Gödel's original system, the prime factorization method provides a clear and unambiguous separation between the encodings of different sequences of symbols—each formula’s Gödel number factors in a unique way that distinguishes it from any other formula. By contrast, an encoding scheme based on a continuum (like the reals) could blur these distinctions. For example, if one were to encode formulas as real numbers by some decimal scheme, how would we ensure that one formula’s code is not just a slightly perturbed version of another formula’s code due to a small change in a high decimal place? Any small “noise” or error in the representation could lead to decoding a different formula or a meaningless result. Ensuring that each formula maps to a distinct and identifiable value (or region) within the continuum of real numbers—and that this mapping is robust against small perturbations—would require overcoming significant theoretical and practical challenges in precision and information encoding.

V. Impact on Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems

V.A. Self-Referential Statements

A critical aspect of Gödel's incompleteness theorems is the construction of *self-referential* statements within the formal system, most notably the Gödel sentence which, when interpreted within the system, asserts its own unprovability. Gödel's numbering system plays a vital role in enabling this self-reference by allowing statements about the provability of formulas (metamathematical assertions about the system) to be *mirrored* by arithmetical statements within the system itself. If alternative number systems were used for encoding, it is not immediately clear whether such self-referential constructions could be maintained or how they would manifest. The relationship between a statement and its encoding in the alternative number system would need to be sufficiently *rich* to allow for the formulation of a sentence that effectively refers to its own encoded representation or properties thereof.

It is conceivable that one could attempt to recreate the fixed-point (diagonalization) construction in a different setting (for instance, with real-number encodings), but the properties of real, transcendental, or irrational numbers might not lend themselves to this type of self-reference in the same direct way that the discrete and well-structured nature of the natural numbers does in Gödel's original framework. For a self-referential statement to exist, the encoding must support a mechanism akin to the *diagonal lemma* (fixed-point theorem) which heavily relies on effective enumeration of formulas and computable transformations on their codes. Any encoding in an uncountable domain would make the notion of “effective enumeration” problematic, potentially undermining the very possibility of constructing a Gödel sentence in that environment.

V.B. Provability and Truth

Gödel's theorems famously demonstrate a fundamental disconnect between *provability* (within a formal system) and *truth* (in the standard model of arithmetic). The first incompleteness theorem shows that for any consistent formal system capable of encoding basic arithmetic, there are true statements about the natural numbers that cannot be proven within the system. The second incompleteness theorem strengthens this result by showing that such a system cannot prove its own consistency. It is pertinent to consider whether using alternative encoding systems could affect this inherent relationship between provability and truth.

It appears unlikely that a mere change in the encoding system (from natural numbers to reals or other continua) would fundamentally alter these deep-seated limitations of formal axiomatic systems. The incompleteness phenomena arise from the ability of the system to represent its own syntax and reasoning about that syntax; this is a logical and structural feature more than a numerical one. The underlying structure of logic and arithmetic, and the potential for self-reference, seem to be the primary drivers of these incompleteness results, rather than the specific choice of natural numbers as the medium of encoding. While an alternative encoding might offer a different *perspective* on the Gödel sentence or the unprovable statements (perhaps making them look like analytic statements about real numbers, for instance), it would not make those statements provable if they were not provable before. In other words, one would not expect that switching to encoding formulas as, say, real numbers would yield a formal system in which all true statements become provable or in which the consistency can be internally verified—such outcomes would contradict Gödel’s theorems unless some deeper aspect of the formal system was changed. At best, alternative encodings might highlight nuances or lead to new formulations of incompleteness, but the core limitations would persist.

V.C. Potential Strengthening or Weakening of Theorems

One might speculate whether an alternative encoding could somehow *strengthen* or *weaken* the incompleteness theorems. For example, could encoding into a richer number system like the reals introduce new subtleties or exceptions to Gödel’s conclusions? It is possible that using the reals might allow the encoding of more intricate relationships or properties of the formal system (due to the continuum’s richness). For instance, the density of the real numbers might permit encoding certain continuous parameters of formal proofs or an analysis of provability in a more fine-grained way than the naturals do.

However, the challenges related to countability and computability would also introduce new limitations or obscure the clarity of the original proofs. The proofs of the incompleteness theorems themselves rely on quite delicate constructions (like the fixed-point lemma and the arithmetization of syntax) which assume an effective enumeration of all formulas and proofs. If one moves to an encoding that is not effectively enumerable (because it’s uncountable), one would have to reformulate the proofs in a substantially different framework—likely losing the effectiveness that is crucial for Gödel’s argument. It also seems plausible that the fundamental logical structure underpinning the incompleteness theorems is so robust that the choice of encoding system, as long as it meets certain minimal requirements (such as the ability to represent syntax and the concept of provability within the system), might not fundamentally alter the conclusions. Any significant deviation in the outcomes of the theorems would presumably require changing the axiomatic system itself or the notion of formal proof, rather than just the arithmetic encoding of symbols. In summary, while alternate encodings could provide new viewpoints or technical challenges, they are unlikely to avoid or substantially change Gödel’s incompleteness results.

VI. Existing Research and Discussions

A search for existing academic literature or discussions specifically exploring the use of number systems *beyond* natural numbers in the context of Gödel's encoding did not yield any direct results. This suggests that the direct adaptation of Gödel's encoding to real, transcendental, or irrational numbers is not a widely explored area of research, at least not in any readily accessible or prominent sources. It is possible that related ideas have been touched upon within more specialized areas of mathematical logic—such as in studies of non-standard models of arithmetic, or in theoretical computer science discussions on alternative computational models—but if so, these discussions are not immediately evident in the mainstream literature. The lack of readily available literature on this specific topic likely indicates that the challenges identified in previous sections (particularly those related to countability and computability) are seen as significant enough to deter researchers from pursuing this direction in any depth.

One area that tangentially relates to this topic is research on *analog computation* or *real number computation* models in theoretical computer science, such as the

Blum–Shub–Smale (BSS) model which considers computation over the reals. While not about Gödel encoding per se, such work deals with how computational processes might operate on continuous domains. However, even in those contexts, the fundamental limitations of what is computable and the distinctions between countable and uncountable sets play a major role. To our knowledge, no published work claims a method to encode the syntax of arithmetic into an uncountable domain in a way that preserves all the desirable properties of Gödel's original numbering. This absence reinforces the intuition that the idea is fraught with fundamental difficulties.

VII. Relevant Theorems and Concepts

VII.A. Countability and Cardinality

The concept of *countability*, particularly the distinction between countable and uncountable sets, is fundamental to understanding the challenges of adapting Gödel's encoding. Gödel's original construction relies on a bijection between the countable set of formulas (and proofs) and a subset of the natural numbers (which are themselves countable). The fact that the set of real numbers is uncountable (as proven by Cantor's diagonalization argument) means that no such bijection can exist between the formulas/proofs and the real numbers. This difference in cardinality is a primary reason why a direct and straightforward adaptation of Gödel's encoding to real, transcendental, or irrational numbers faces significant theoretical obstacles. In simpler terms, there are strictly more real numbers than there are formulas, which breaks the one-to-one correspondence needed for a Gödel-style encoding.

VII.B. Computability Theory

Concepts from computability theory—such as *computable functions*, *Turing machines*, and the *Church-Turing thesis*—are essential when considering the feasibility of encoding and decoding processes. Gödel's original encoding is effective in large part because the mapping between formulas and natural numbers (and vice versa) can be carried out by a Turing machine or any equivalent model of computation. Each step of forming or factoring a Gödel number is algorithmically doable. If the encoding were to involve real numbers with their potentially infinite and non-repeating decimal expansions, it becomes significantly more complex to determine whether the encoding and decoding processes could remain within the realm of computability【46】. The limitations of representing and manipulating real numbers in computational models (for example, one can only approximate most reals on a digital computer) would need to be carefully considered. Without a guarantee that there's an effective procedure to go from formulas to their encoded real numbers and back, the whole purpose of Gödel numbering—namely to carry out meta-mathematical reasoning within the formal system—would be undermined.

VII.C. Fixed-Point Theorem

Gödel's construction of a self-referential undecidable statement relies on what is now often called the *fixed-point theorem* or *diagonalization lemma* in logic. This theorem guarantees the existence of a formula that is equivalent to a statement about its own provability (or unprovability) within the system. This crucial self-referential property is enabled by the ability to represent formulas and their properties (like “formula X is not provable”) within the formal system through Gödel numbering. If an alternative encoding system were used, an analogous fixed-point theorem would be required to construct a similar self-referential statement. It is not immediately obvious whether such a theorem would hold, or how it would be formulated, for encoding systems based on real, transcendental, or irrational numbers. The usual proofs of the fixed-point theorem explicitly use the effective enumeration of all formulas (via Gödel numbers) and the ability to algorithmically manipulate those codes (e.g. to produce the code of a formula that asserts “I have property P”). In an uncountable setting, the notion of enumerating or algorithmically finding such a fixed-point formula is problematic. Therefore, replicating Gödel’s self-referential trick would likely require developing a new theoretical framework, if it’s possible at all, under an alternative encoding.

VII.D. Set Theory

Basic concepts from set theory—such as *bijections* (one-to-one and onto mappings), *injections* (one-to-one mappings), and *surjections* (onto mappings)—provide the formal language for discussing correspondences between sets. The success of Gödel's encoding relies on the existence of a bijection between the syntactic elements of the formal system (a countable set) and a subset of the natural numbers (also countable). The challenge of using uncountable sets like the real numbers for encoding stems directly from the fact that **no bijection can exist** between a countable set (e.g. the set of all formulas) and an uncountable set (e.g. the reals). This set-theoretic barrier is absolute: it doesn’t depend on any particular construction or cleverness—we simply cannot pair off elements of a countable and an uncountable set one-to-one. Any approach to encode formulas into an uncountable domain would have to contend with this fact, likely by either restricting to a countable subset of that domain (thus forfeiting the full continuum) or by accepting a many-to-one mapping (thus forfeiting uniqueness of encoding), both of which undermine the goal of Gödel numbering.

VIII. Potential Applications and Theoretical Consequences

VIII.A. Advanced Computability Models

While a direct adaptation of Gödel's encoding to real numbers faces the fundamental issues discussed, the idea of encoding mathematical concepts using real numbers could potentially have implications for advanced models of computation that go beyond the standard Turing machine model. For example, in the field of analog computation or *real number computation*, where computational models operate on continuous quantities, an encoding of logical formulas into real numbers might offer a different perspective on the limits and capabilities of such models. This is a speculative connection: one might wonder if an analog computer (idealized with infinite precision) could manipulate encoded logical statements as continuous values. Such an investigation would relate to questions about the Church-Turing thesis and whether allowing real-number operations extends computational power in a way relevant to logic. However, even in these models, the fundamental issues of uniqueness, precision, and effective *reversibility* of the encoding/decoding process would still need to be addressed.

The continuous nature of analog models introduces issues of noise and stability, which parallel the ambiguity concerns we noted earlier for dense encodings.

VIII.B. Non-Standard Analysis

Non-standard analysis provides an alternative foundation for calculus and analysis by introducing infinitesimals and hyperreal numbers. It is conceivable that within the framework of non-standard analysis—where the number system is extended to include infinitesimal and infinite quantities—there might be novel ways to approach the encoding of mathematical concepts. The hyperreal number system, for instance, is a proper extension of the reals that is still rich in structure (though not countable). One could ask whether encoding formulas into hyperreals (or some related structure) could circumvent some issues (perhaps by using the additional elements to encode "extra information"). However, exploring this connection would require a deep understanding of the model theory of non-standard arithmetic. In essence, we would be investigating encoding in a *non-standard model* of arithmetic rather than the standard one. While an intriguing idea, it's unclear what advantage that would bring to incompleteness questions—Gödel's theorems themselves apply to any effectively axiomatized theory of a certain strength, regardless of whether one considers standard or non-standard models.

VIII.C. Alternative Foundational Systems

The choice of the underlying number system for encoding could potentially align with or challenge alternative foundational systems for mathematics that differ from the usual Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory with Choice (ZFC) which underpins most of classical mathematics. For instance, in **constructive mathematics** (which avoids non-constructive existence proofs and often works with intuitionistic logic), the use of uncountable sets and actual infinities is viewed differently. If one were working in a constructive or computational foundation, one might prefer to avoid uncountable encodings simply because they are not constructively given. Conversely, one could imagine a perspective from a more philosophical or speculative foundation: could using, say, the real numbers as an encoding domain relate to a viewpoint where formulas are seen as points in a continuum of meanings? Such ideas veer more into philosophical interpretations than concrete mathematical results. In practice, any encoding scheme has to live within a formal system itself, and any alternative foundation robust enough to carry arithmetic will likely allow Gödel's proof to go through as usual. Thus, while we can consider alternative foundational viewpoints (like category theory foundations, homotopy type theory, etc.), none of these seem to offer a loophole to avoid incompleteness via changing the encoding method.

VIII.D. Speculative Ideas and Research Directions

It is worth mentioning a few speculative ideas that could be topics for further thought, even if they seem impractical. **One idea** could involve exploring encodings that map formulas not to individual real numbers, but to *specific types or sets of real numbers* with particular properties (for example, encoding a formula as a *set* of reals or as an interval, rather than a single real number). If these sets or intervals have some structure (like a certain measure or topological property), one might attempt to recover uniqueness or avoid ambiguity. This approach might address some of the uniqueness issues by providing each formula with a "region" of values rather than a single value, though it introduces new complexities in decoding (since any real in that region would then need to be identified as representing the formula). **Another direction** could involve investigating *probabilistic or approximate encoding schemes* using real numbers, where the decoding process might yield a formula with a certain probability or within a certain margin of error. Such an approach would deviate significantly from the exact and deterministic nature of Gödel's original encoding, but might be relevant in contexts like randomized algorithms or fuzzy logic interpretations. It might ask: can we encode statements in such a way that we can *probably* decode them correctly from a real number, and what would that mean for incompleteness? This is far afield from Gödel's original thrust, but it touches on whether "approximate self-reference" could be meaningful.

Ultimately, any such unconventional encoding would raise as many questions as it answers. Further research along these lines could explore the implications of using number systems with different cardinalities or topological properties for encoding in other areas of logic or computer science. For example, in theoretical computer science one might ask if there's a use in complexity theory or cryptography for encoding something (not necessarily Gödel sentences, but maybe other combinatorial structures) into real numbers in a clever way. These ideas, while intriguing, remain largely speculative and outside the scope of classical incompleteness theorems.

IX. Examples of Alternative Encoding in Other Fields

To gain perspective, it is useful to look at domains outside of pure logic where information encoding takes place into systems that are not purely discrete, and see why discrete encodings are often preferred.

IX.A. Real Numbers in Computer Graphics and Signal Processing

In computer graphics and signal processing, real numbers are extensively used to represent continuous quantities such as colors, geometric coordinates, and signal amplitudes. However, due to the finite precision of digital computers, these real-valued quantities are always *approximated* using floating-point representations (a finite binary or decimal approximation). The use of floating-point numbers introduces small rounding errors, and there is a finite limit to the range and precision of representable values. This practical limitation highlights the challenges of working with real numbers in a computational setting and the potential for loss of information due to discretization. When designing systems that rely on encoding and decoding information (like image formats or audio codecs), engineers have to carefully manage precision to ensure that the original data can be recovered within acceptable error margins. The key takeaway is that even when the underlying model is continuous (real-valued), effective encoding for processing on actual computers requires discrete approximations. This resonates with the Gödel encoding scenario: an exact, lossless encoding into an uncountable domain would be analogous to having infinitely precise analog storage, which is not achievable in practice (and even in theory comes with the issues discussed). The success of real numbers in graphics and signal processing is predicated on tolerating a small amount of error—something we cannot do in logic if we require absolute certainty and correctness of decoding.

IX.B. Encoding Information in DNA or Other Biological Systems

Biological systems, such as DNA, encode vast amounts of information using a discrete alphabet of four nucleotide bases (usually labeled A, C, G, T). Sequences of these bases (genes) carry the instructions to build proteins and ultimately determine the characteristics of an organism. This highly successful example of a natural encoding relies on a *discrete* system—DNA is essentially a long string over a finite alphabet. The information is stored reliably and can be copied and read with high fidelity (though not perfect, as mutations occur). This contrasts with the idea of using a continuous number system like the reals for encoding. The discreteness in DNA likely offers advantages in terms of error correction and robustness: small changes (mutations) often have localized effects and there are cellular mechanisms to repair or tolerate certain errors. If genetic information were somehow stored in analog form (imagine encoding genes as continuous quantities like concentrations of some chemicals in a precise ratio), it might be much harder for organisms to reproduce reliably due to noise and environmental fluctuations. The analogy to Gödel encoding is that using natural numbers (discrete) gave Gödel a stable, unambiguous way to encode statements, whereas a continuous encoding could make the "genetics" of formal proofs unstable.

IX.C. Analogical Representations

Analogical representations involve using continuous physical properties (e.g., voltage, length, angle) to represent information. In the history of computing and measurement, analog devices were common (consider old thermometers, voltmeters, or analog computers that use electrical currents to represent values). While sometimes intuitive and useful for specific tasks, analog representations generally suffer from limitations in precision and are more susceptible to noise and interference compared to digital (discrete) representations. For example, the position of a needle on a dial might represent a certain value, but the precision is limited by the fineness of the scale and the observer's ability to read it accurately, and it may drift with temperature or wear. These limitations underscore the potential difficulties of using continuous number systems for encoding *discrete and precise* mathematical information. In a Gödel-like scenario, even a minute uncertainty in a continuous representation could lead to a different interpretation of a formula or a proof. Digital (discrete) systems have the advantage that they can, in principle, be made arbitrarily reliable by increasing the separation between representable states and employing error-correcting schemes, something much harder to do in analog systems without effectively digitizing them at some level.

In summary, lessons from other fields consistently highlight that discrete encodings are favored when exactness and reliability are required. This aligns with the intuition that Gödel's use of natural numbers was not an incidental choice but rather a necessity for achieving a clear, unambiguous encoding that a formal system can reason about.

X. Conclusion

The exploration of using real, transcendental, or irrational numbers as the basis for a Gödel-like encoding system reveals significant challenges, stemming primarily from the fundamental differences in cardinality and computability between these number systems and the natural numbers used in Gödel's original work. The uncountability of real, transcendental, and irrational numbers poses a major obstacle to establishing a bijective mapping with the countable set of formulas and proofs in a formal system. Furthermore, the density of these number systems, and the complexities associated with their computational representation and manipulation, raise serious concerns about the feasibility of creating effective and reversible encoding and decoding processes. While one could conceive of alternative encoding schemes based on these number systems that might offer new theoretical perspectives or have niche applications in specialized areas (such as advanced computability models or exploring non-standard analysis), a direct and straightforward adaptation that preserves the key features and effectiveness of Gödel's original encoding appears unlikely.

In essence, the inherent limitations exposed by Gödel's incompleteness theorems seem to be deeply rooted in the structure of formal systems and the phenomenon of self-reference, rather than being an artifact of having chosen the natural numbers as the encoding medium. Switching to an uncountable domain does not eliminate the possibility of constructing undecidable statements; if anything, it introduces new difficulties without addressing the core source of incompleteness. Future research could explore more nuanced approaches to encoding mathematical concepts using alternative number systems—perhaps focusing on specific classes of numbers or investigating probabilistic/approximate methods as discussed—but the fundamental challenges related to countability, uniqueness, and computability remain significant hurdles to overcome. Our investigation thereby reinforces the insight that Gödel's choice of encoding into the natural numbers was not just a convenient trick, but in many ways a *necessary* condition for the precision and success of the incompleteness proofs.

References

[1] K. Gödel. *Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I*. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, **38**(1):173–198, 1931. (English translation: “On formally undecidable propositions of Principia Mathematica and related systems I,” in *Kurt Gödel: Collected Works, Vol. I*, Oxford University Press, 1986, pp. 144–195. Also available via University of Cincinnati archives.)

[2] R. Zach. “Kurt Gödel, paper on the incompleteness theorems (1931).” In I. Grattan-Guinness (ed.), *Landmark Writings in Mathematics*, North-Holland (Elsevier), Amsterdam, 2004, pp. 917–925.

[3] J. Kennedy. *Gödel’s Incompleteness Theorems*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.

[4] J. W. Steinmetz. “An intuitively complete analysis of Gödel’s incompleteness.” arXiv:1512.03667 [math.LO], preprint, 2015. (A detailed analysis and commentary on Gödel’s first incompleteness theorem.)

[5] **Wikipedia**. “Gödel numbering.” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Available: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/G%C3%B6del_numbering (accessed Mar. 2025).

[6] J. R. Meyer. “A Simplified Explanation of Gödel’s Incompleteness Proof: Part 3.” *Logic and Language* series, 2021. Available: https://jamesrmeyer.com/ffgit/GodelSimplified3.

[7] **Reddit (r/explainlikeimfive)**. “ELI5: How does Gödel numbering work and what are the implications of it?” Online discussion thread, Reddit, 2018. Available: https://www.reddit.com/r/explainlikeimfive/comments/a7z9dk/eli5_how_does_godel_numbering_work_and_what_are/.

[8] **Mathematics StackExchange**. “Understanding Gödel’s 1931 paper – Gödel numbers.” Question post by user *Joseph M’Bimbi-Bene*, Oct. 17, 2015. Available: https://math.stackexchange.com/q/1484834.

[9] J. R. Meyer. “A Simplified Explanation of Gödel’s Incompleteness Proof: Part 4.” *Logic and Language* series, 2021. Available: https://www.jamesrmeyer.com/ffgit/GodelSimplified4.

[10] **Encyclopædia Britannica**. “Incompleteness theorem.” *Britannica Online*. Available: https://www.britannica.com/topic/incompleteness-theorem.

[11] **Byju’s Learning**. “Real Numbers – Definition and Properties.” Byju’s online math resource. Available: https://byjus.com/maths/real-numbers/ (accessed Mar. 2025).

[12] **Lumen Learning**. “Properties of Real Numbers.” *College Algebra* course material, Lumen Learning. Available: https://courses.lumenlearning.com/waymakercollegealgebra/chapter/properties-of-real-numbers/ (accessed Mar. 2025).

[13] **Lumen Learning**. “Properties of Real Numbers (Supplemental).” *College Algebra Corequisite* material, Lumen Learning. Available: https://courses.lumenlearning.com/waymakercollegealgebracorequisite/chapter/properties-of-real-numbers-2/ (accessed Mar. 2025).

[14] **GeeksforGeeks**. “Properties of Real Numbers.” GeeksforGeeks, Dec. 2020. Available: https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/properties-of-real-numbers/.

[15] **MathBitsNotebook**. “Properties of Real Numbers.” Algebra 1 Notes, MathBits Notebook, 2018. Available: https://www.mathbitsnotebook.com/Algebra1/RealNumbers/RNProp.html.

[16] **Wikipedia**. “Transcendental number.” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Available: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transcendental_number.

[17] **MathWorld**. “Transcendental Number.” From *Wolfram MathWorld*. Available: https://mathworld.wolfram.com/TranscendentalNumber.html.

[18] **Mathematics StackExchange**. “What’s the importance of the transcendental numbers in calculus?” Question post, Nov. 2017. Available: https://math.stackexchange.com/q/2535997.

[19] E. Evstafev. “The Hidden Depths of Transcendental Numbers: A Mathematical Adventure.” *Medium*, Apr. 2024. Available:

https://medium.com/@chigwel/the-hidden-depths-of-transcendental-numbers-a-mathematical-adventure-a3e183b58688.

[20] **Brilliant.org**. “Transcendental Number.” Brilliant Math & Science Wiki. Available: https://brilliant.org/wiki/transcendental-number/.

[21] **Testbook.com**. “Irrational Numbers – Definition, Properties and Examples.” Testbook, 2021. Available: https://testbook.com/maths/irrational-numbers.

[22] **Byju’s Learning**. “Irrational Numbers – Definition and Examples.” Byju’s online math resource. Available: https://byjus.com/maths/irrational-numbers/ (accessed Mar. 2025).

[23] **Brilliant.org**. “Irrational Numbers.” Brilliant Math & Science Wiki. Available: https://brilliant.org/wiki/irrational-numbers/.

[24] **CK-12 Foundation**. “What are the characteristics of irrational numbers?” CK-12 FlexBook, Algebra. Available: https://www.ck12.org/algebra/irrational-numbers/lesson/What-are-the-Characteristics-of-Irrational-Numbers-ALG1/.

[25] **Cuemath**. “Irrational Numbers – Definition, List, Properties.” Cuemath learning resource. Available: https://www.cuemath.com/numbers/irrational-numbers/.

[26] **Unacademy**. “Natural Numbers and Real Numbers – Study Notes.” Unacademy Mathematics (SSC) content. Available: https://unacademy.com/content/ssc/study-material/mathematics/natural-numbers-and-real-numbers/.

[27] **Khan Academy**. “Categorizing numbers.” Khan Academy Video Tutorial. Available: https://www.khanacademy.org/v/categorizing-numbers.

[28] J. Gietzen. “What is a real number (also rational, decimal, integer, natural, cardinal, ordinal...)?”. *Mathematics StackExchange*, Jul. 20, 2010. Available: https://math.stackexchange.com/q/20.

[29] **Virtual Nerd**. “What’s an Irrational Number?” Virtual Nerd tutorial (Pre-Algebra). Available: https://virtualnerd.com/worksheetHelper.php?tutID=Alg1_1ag.