Recursion Theory

Joost J. Joosten

Institute for Logic Language and Computation University of Amsterdam Plantage Muidergracht 24 1018 TV Amsterdam Room P 3.26, +31 20 5256095 jjoosten@phil.uu.nl www.phil.uu.nl/~jjoosten

Enrollment

 de studenten zonder coll.krt.nr kunnen alleen ingeschreven worden als ze daadwerkelijk ingeschreven staan;

- Scorelle: onduidelijk welke opleiding
- Dorrestijn: idem
- Tom, wsch Kemper: idem
- Bashan Michel: idem
- Nina: idem
- Neutel: idem
- Tsai: idem

Extra announcements

Next friday, lecture by Sebastiaan Terwijn on the Medvedev Lattice See http://www.math.uu.nl/people/jvoosten/seminar.html

Extra announcements

- Next friday, lecture by Sebastiaan Terwijn on the Medvedev Lattice See http://www.math.uu.nl/people/jvoosten/seminar.html
- 16:00 sharp at Wiskundegebouw, Room K11 (take stairs down)

Confusion about exercise 2.2.11

- Confusion about exercise 2.2.11
- There is NO need to work within a formal system

- Confusion about exercise 2.2.11
- There is NO need to work within a formal system
- **•** Confusion: $\exists \varphi \; \forall n \text{ versus } \forall n \; \exists \varphi$

- Confusion about exercise 2.2.11
- There is NO need to work within a formal system
- **•** Confusion: $\exists \varphi \forall n \text{ versus } \forall n \exists \varphi$
- Bounded quantification up to p can not be done using p many disjunctions!

- Confusion about exercise 2.2.11
- There is NO need to work within a formal system
- **•** Confusion: $\exists \varphi \forall n \text{ versus } \forall n \exists \varphi$
- Bounded quantification up to p can not be done using p many disjunctions!
- Students can go back to Daisuke with their homework to get a higher mark

Other computational models need to be introduced

- Other computational models need to be introduced
- For sake of later applications

- Other computational models need to be introduced
- For sake of later applications (and general education)

- Other computational models need to be introduced
- For sake of later applications (and general education)
- URMs are also/better known as RAM: Random Access Machines

- Other computational models need to be introduced
- For sake of later applications (and general education)
- URMs are also/better known as RAM: Random Access Machines
- Hardware: unbounded array of registers of unbounded capacity (starting at R_1)

- Other computational models need to be introduced
- For sake of later applications (and general education)
- URMs are also/better known as RAM: Random Access Machines
- Hardware: unbounded array of registers of unbounded capacity (starting at R_1)
- Software: Four types of instructions



Software: Four types of instructions

- Software: Four types of instructions
- **Jero:** Z(n)

- Software: Four types of instructions
- **Jero:** Z(n)
- **Successor:** S(n)

- Software: Four types of instructions
- **Jero:** Z(n)
- **Successor:** S(n)
- **•** Transfer: T(m, n): r_n becomes r_m

- Software: Four types of instructions
- **Jero:** Z(n)
- **Successor:** S(n)
- **•** Transfer: T(m, n): r_n becomes r_m
- **Jump:** J(m, n, q) (If, then, else)

- Software: Four types of instructions
- **Jero:** Z(n)
- **Successor:** S(n)
- **•** Transfer: T(m, n): r_n becomes r_m
- Jump: J(m, n, q) (If, then, else)
- Programs are numbered lists of instructions always executing the next instruction unless told otherwise by a Jump operation

- Software: Four types of instructions
- **Jero:** Z(n)
- **Successor:** S(n)
- **•** Transfer: T(m, n): r_n becomes r_m
- Jump: J(m, n, q) (If, then, else)
- Programs are numbered lists of instructions always executing the next instruction unless told otherwise by a Jump operation
- A program stops if it enters a line with no program line on it

Input output convention

- Input output convention
- Definition 2.3.2

- Input output convention
- Definition 2.3.2
- URM Program P computes a function f

- Input output convention
- Definition 2.3.2
- URM Program P computes a function f
- **•** Function *f* is URM computable

- Input output convention
- Definition 2.3.2 (totality can be relaxed)
- URM Program P computes a function f
- **•** Function *f* is URM **computable**

- Input output convention
- Definition 2.3.2 (totality can be relaxed)
- URM Program P computes a function f
- **•** Function *f* is URM **computable**
- What is the class of URM computable functions?

- Input output convention
- Definition 2.3.2 (totality can be relaxed)
- URM Program P computes a function f
- **•** Function *f* is URM **computable**
- What is the class of URM computable functions?
- That is, find another equivalent characterization

Conjecture: URM Computable = Recursive

- Conjecture: URM Computable = Recursive
- How to prove this?

- Conjecture: URM Computable = Recursive
- How to prove this?
- Two parts!

- Conjecture: URM Computable = Recursive
- How to prove this?
- Two parts!
- One part: By induction!

- Conjecture: URM Computable = Recursive
- How to prove this?
- Two parts!
- One part: By induction!
- Basic case

- Conjecture: URM Computable = Recursive
- How to prove this?
- Two parts!
- One part: By induction!
- Basic case
- and constructions

Closure under composition

- Closure under composition
- Example: for one variable

- Closure under composition
- Example: for one variable
- Intuitive idea: concatenate programs

- Closure under composition
- Example: for one variable
- Intuitive idea: concatenate programs
- Three problems:

- Closure under composition
- Example: for one variable
- Intuitive idea: concatenate programs
- Three problems:
- P_g may halt somewhere in the middle of P_f

- Closure under composition
- Example: for one variable
- Intuitive idea: concatenate programs
- Three problems:
- P_g may halt somewhere in the middle of P_f
- Solution: assume programs are in standard form

- Closure under composition
- Example: for one variable
- Intuitive idea: concatenate programs
- Three problems:
- P_g may halt somewhere in the middle of P_f
- Solution: assume programs are in standard form
- Problem/solution 2: renumber

- Closure under composition
- Example: for one variable
- Intuitive idea: concatenate programs
- Three problems:
- P_g may halt somewhere in the middle of P_f
- Solution: assume programs are in standard form
- Problem/solution 2: renumber
- Problem 3: Input/Output convention: how many registers are used?

Proof by intimidation

- Proof by intimidation
- Proof by hand waving

- Proof by intimidation
- Proof by hand waving
- Thm: f is URM computable iff f is Recursive

- Proof by intimidation
- Proof by hand waving
- Thm: f is URM computable iff f is Recursive
- By relaxing Definition 2.3.2 you can describe Partial Recursive

Hardware: two sided infinite tape with reading/writing head

- Hardware: two sided infinite tape with reading/writing head
- Language: tape symbols, set of internal states, action symbols

- Hardware: two sided infinite tape with reading/writing head
- Language: tape symbols, set of internal states, action symbols
- Instructions are quadruples

- Hardware: two sided infinite tape with reading/writing head
- Language: tape symbols, set of internal states, action symbols
- Instructions are quadruples

$$Q = \langle q_i S A q_j \rangle$$

- Hardware: two sided infinite tape with reading/writing head
- Language: tape symbols, set of internal states, action symbols
- Instructions are quadruples
- $Q = \langle q_i S A q_j \rangle$
- A program is a consistent set of instructions

- Hardware: two sided infinite tape with reading/writing head
- Language: tape symbols, set of internal states, action symbols
- Instructions are quadruples
- $Q = \langle q_i S A q_j \rangle$
- A program is a consistent set of instructions
- better name would have been "deterministic"

- Hardware: two sided infinite tape with reading/writing head
- Language: tape symbols, set of internal states, action symbols
- Instructions are quadruples
- $Q = \langle q_i S A q_j \rangle$
- A program is a consistent set of instructions
- better name would have been "deterministic"
- A program Halts if it runs out of instructions

How to compute a function

- How to compute a function
- Input/output conventions

- How to compute a function
- Input/output conventions
- Input is unary (which is not a good choice)

- How to compute a function
- Input/output conventions
- Input is unary (which is not a good choice)
- Input: n is represented by n + 1 consecutive 1's

- How to compute a function
- Input/output conventions
- Input is unary (which is not a good choice)
- Input: n is represented by n + 1 consecutive 1's
- Output: number of 1's on the tape

- How to compute a function
- Input/output conventions
- Input is unary (which is not a good choice)
- Input: n is represented by n + 1 consecutive 1's
- Output: number of 1's on the tape
- Again, define M computing a function, and a function being computable

- How to compute a function
- Input/output conventions
- Input is unary (which is not a good choice)
- Input: n is represented by n + 1 consecutive 1's
- Output: number of 1's on the tape
- Again, define M computing a function, and a function being computable
- Successor function becomes very easy!

Very true statement in Cooper:

- Very true statement in Cooper:
- Composing Turing Programs is much more rewarding than reading them!

- Very true statement in Cooper:
- Composing Turing Programs is much more rewarding than reading them!
- No Concrete Machines here

- Very true statement in Cooper:
- Composing Turing Programs is much more rewarding than reading them!
- No Concrete Machines here
- How to deal with composition?

- Very true statement in Cooper:
- Composing Turing Programs is much more rewarding than reading them!
- No Concrete Machines here
- How to deal with composition?
- Hard problem (?): Output becomes Input

- Very true statement in Cooper:
- Composing Turing Programs is much more rewarding than reading them!
- No Concrete Machines here
- How to deal with composition?
- Hard problem (?): Output becomes Input
- Thm: Turing computable = Partial Recursive

Computations and theories

We shall now make a link between computations and formal theories

Computations and theories

- We shall now make a link between computations and formal theories
- This yields: yet another characterization of the recursive functions

Computations and theories

- We shall now make a link between computations and formal theories
- This yields: yet another characterization of the recursive functions
- Plus the precursor to Gödel's first incompleteness theorem

Formal theories

Specify three ingredients

Formal theories

- Specify three ingredients
- Language

Formal theories

- Specify three ingredients
- Language
- Axioms

Formal theories

- Specify three ingredients
- Language
- Axioms
- Rules

Formal theories

- Specify three ingredients
- Language
- Axioms
- Rules
- Model for idealized science

Well known arithmetical first order system

- Well known arithmetical first order system
- Chapter 3

- Well known arithmetical first order system
- Chapter 3 (please send me corrections)

- Well known arithmetical first order system
- Chapter 3 (please send me corrections)
- Language consists of $\{+, ', \times, 0, =\}$

- Well known arithmetical first order system
- Chapter 3 (please send me corrections)
- Language consists of $\{+, ', \times, 0, =\}$
- Axioms, come in two groups

- Well known arithmetical first order system
- Chapter 3 (please send me corrections)
- Language consists of $\{+, ', \times, 0, =\}$
- Axioms, come in two groups
- The Logical axioms

- Well known arithmetical first order system
- Chapter 3 (please send me corrections)
- Language consists of $\{+, ', \times, 0, =\}$
- Axioms, come in two groups
- The Logical axioms
- The non-logical axioms

- Well known arithmetical first order system
- Chapter 3 (please send me corrections)
- Language consists of $\{+, ', \times, 0, =\}$
- Axioms, come in two groups
- The Logical axioms
- The non-logical axioms
- The rules: (MP) and (GEN)

Note: there are infinitely many induction axioms (it is proved that finitely many can never be enough)

- Note: there are infinitely many induction axioms (it is proved that finitely many can never be enough)
- What do models of PA look like

- Note: there are infinitely many induction axioms (it is proved that finitely many can never be enough)
- What do models of PA look like
- Of course: standard model

- Note: there are infinitely many induction axioms (it is proved that finitely many can never be enough)
- What do models of PA look like
- Of course: standard model
- Many more models

 Gödel's completeness theorem: Any consistent first order theory has a model

- Gödel's completeness theorem: Any consistent first order theory has a model
- The Compactness Theorem

- Gödel's completeness theorem: Any consistent first order theory has a model
- The Compactness Theorem
- The (downwards) Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem

- Gödel's completeness theorem: Any consistent first order theory has a model
- The Compactness Theorem
- The (downwards) Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem
- What is countable?

Countable: there is a surjection from the natural numbers

- Countable: there is a surjection from the natural numbers
- Examples: pairs

- Countable: there is a surjection from the natural numbers
- Examples: pairs
- Rationals

- Countable: there is a surjection from the natural numbers
- Examples: pairs
- Rationals
- Finite sequences of natural numbers

- Countable: there is a surjection from the natural numbers
- Examples: pairs
- Rationals
- Finite sequences of natural numbers
- Are there uncountable sets?

- Countable: there is a surjection from the natural numbers
- Examples: pairs
- Rationals
- Finite sequences of natural numbers
- Are there uncountable sets?
- \checkmark Cantor: Yes, eg [0,1]

There exists a non-standard model of PA

- There exists a non-standard model of PA
- What do these non-standard models look like?

- There exists a non-standard model of PA
- What do these non-standard models look like?
- Order structure is unique

- There exists a non-standard model of PA
- What do these non-standard models look like?
- Order structure is unique
- However (Friedman) uncountably (continuous) many

What does it mean to represent a function in PA?

- What does it mean to represent a function in PA?
- Reduce it to relations

- What does it mean to represent a function in PA?
- Reduce it to relations
- Which functions are representable in PA?

- What does it mean to represent a function in PA?
- Reduce it to relations
- Which functions are representable in PA?
- Theorem: all recursive functions are representable in PA

- What does it mean to represent a function in PA?
- Reduce it to relations
- Which functions are representable in PA?
- Theorem: all recursive functions are representable in PA
- Later we shall prove the reverse

- What does it mean to represent a function in PA?
- Reduce it to relations
- Which functions are representable in PA?
- Theorem: all recursive functions are representable in PA
- Later we shall prove the reverse
- Thus, we have yet another characterization of the recursive functions