



Using the example of Gödel numbering, we can show that  $\text{Proves}(a, x)$  (the statement that  $a$  is a proof of  $x$ , which will be formally defined below) is  $\Delta_1$ .

First,  $\text{Term}(x)$  should be true if and only if  $x$  is the Gödel number of a term. Thanks to primitive recursion, we can define it by:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Term}(x) \leftrightarrow & \exists i < x [x = \langle 0, i \rangle] \vee \\ & x = \langle 5 \rangle \vee \\ & \exists y < x [x = \langle 6, y \rangle \wedge \text{Term}(y)] \vee \\ & \exists y, z < x [x = \langle 8, y, z \rangle \wedge \text{Term}(y) \wedge \text{Term}(z)] \vee \\ & \exists y, z < x [x = \langle 9, y, z \rangle \wedge \text{Term}(y) \wedge \text{Term}(z)]\end{aligned}$$

Then  $\text{AtForm}(x)$ , which is true when  $x$  is the Gödel number of an atomic formula, is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{AtForm}(x) \leftrightarrow & \exists y, z < x [x = \langle 1, y, z \rangle \wedge \text{Term}(y) \wedge \text{Term}(z)] \vee \\ & \exists y, z < x [x = \langle 7, y, z \rangle \wedge \text{Term}(y) \wedge \text{Term}(z)]\end{aligned}$$

Next,  $\text{Form}(x)$ , which is true only if  $x$  is the Gödel number of a formula, is defined recursively by:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Form}(x) \leftrightarrow & \text{AtForm}(x) \vee \\ & \exists i, y < x [x = \langle 2, i, y \rangle \wedge \text{Form}(y)] \vee \\ & \exists y < x [x = \langle 3, y \rangle \wedge \text{Form}(y)] \vee \\ & \exists y, z < x [x = \langle 4, y, z \rangle \wedge \text{Form}(y) \wedge \text{Form}(z)]\end{aligned}$$

The definition of  $\text{QFForm}(x)$ , which is true when  $x$  is the Gödel number of a quantifier free formula, is defined the same way except without the second clause.

Next we want to show that the set of logical tautologies is  $\Delta_1$ . This will be done by formalizing the concept of truth tables, which will require some development. First we show that  $\text{AtForms}(a)$ , which is a sequence containing the (unique) atomic formulas of  $a$  is  $\Delta_1$ . Define it by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{AtForms}(a, t) \leftrightarrow & (\neg \text{Form}(a) \wedge t = 0) \vee \\
& \text{Form}(a) \wedge ( \\
& \exists x, y < a [a = \langle 1, x, y \rangle t = a] \vee \\
& \exists x, y < a [a = \langle 7, x, y \rangle \wedge t = a] \vee \\
& \exists i, x < a [a = \langle 2, i, x \rangle \wedge t = \text{AtForms}(x)] \vee \\
& \exists x < a [a = \langle 3, x \rangle \wedge t = \text{AtForms}(x)] \vee \\
& \exists x, y < a [a = \langle 4, x, y \rangle \wedge t = \text{AtForms}(x) *_u \text{AtForms}(y)] )
\end{aligned}$$

We say  $v$  is a *truth assignment* if it is a sequence of pairs with the first member of each pair being a atomic formula and the second being either 1 or 0:

$$TA(v) \leftrightarrow \forall i < \text{len}(v) \exists x, y < (v)_i [(v)_i = \langle x, y \rangle \wedge \text{AtForm}(x) \wedge (y = 1 \vee y = 0)]$$

Then  $v$  is a truth assignment for  $a$  if  $v$  is a truth assignment,  $a$  is quantifier free, and every atomic formula in  $a$  is the first member of one of the pairs in  $v$ . That is:

$$TAf(v, a) \leftrightarrow TA(v) \wedge \text{QFForm}(a) \wedge \forall i < \text{len}(\text{AtForms}(a)) \exists j < \text{len}(v) [((v)_j)_0 = (\text{AtForms}(a))_i]$$

Then we can define when  $v$  makes  $a$  true by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{True}(v, a) \leftrightarrow & TAf(v, a) \wedge \\
& \text{AtForm}(a) \wedge \exists i < \text{len}(v) [((v)_i)_0 = a \wedge ((v)_i)_1 = 1] \vee \\
& \exists y < x [x = \langle 3, y \rangle \wedge \text{True}(v, y)] \vee \\
& \exists y, z < x [x = \langle 4, y, z \rangle \wedge \text{True}(v, y) \rightarrow \text{True}(v, z)]
\end{aligned}$$

Then  $a$  is a tautology if every truth assignment makes it true:

$$\text{Taut}(a) \forall v < 2^{2^{\text{AtForms}(a)}} [TAf(v, a) \rightarrow \text{True}(v, a)]$$

We say that a number  $a$  is a *deduction* of  $\phi$  if it encodes a proof of  $\phi$  from a set of axioms  $Ax$ . This means that  $a$  is a sequence where for each  $(a)_i$  either:

- $(a)_i$  is the Gödel number of an axiom

- $(a)_i$  is a logical tautology

or

- there are some  $j, k < i$  such that  $(a)_j = \langle 4, (a)_k, (a)_i \rangle$  (that is,  $(a)_i$  is a conclusion under modus ponens from  $(a)_j$  and  $(a)_k$ ).

and the last element of  $a$  is  $\ulcorner \phi \urcorner$ .

If  $Ax$  is  $\Delta_1$  (almost every system of axioms, including  $PA$ , is  $\Delta_1$ ) then  $\text{Proves}(a, x)$ , which is true if  $a$  is a deduction whose last value is  $x$ , is also  $\Delta_1$ . This is fairly simple to see from the above results (let  $Ax(x)$  be the relation specifying that  $x$  is the Gödel number of an axiom):

$$\text{Proves}(a, x) \leftrightarrow \forall i < \text{len}(a) [Ax((a)_i) \vee \exists j, k < i [(a)_j = \langle 4, (a)_k, (a)_i \rangle] \vee \text{Taut}((a)_i)]$$