

The  
Carus  
Mathematical  
Monographs

**30**

# A TOUR THROUGH MATHEMATICAL LOGIC

Robert S. Wolf



Mathematical  
Association  
of America

0141  
W855

*The Carus Mathematical Monographs*

---

Number Thirty

# A Tour through Mathematical Logic

Robert S. Wolf

*California Polytechnic State University*



E2011000392

*Published and Distributed by*  
THE MATHEMATICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

© 2005 by  
The Mathematical Association of America (Incorporated)  
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 2004113540

Complete Set ISBN 0-88385-000-1  
Vol. 30 ISBN-10: 0-88385-036-2  
Vol. 30 ISBN-13: 978-0-88385-036-7

Printed in the United States of America

Current Printing (last digit):  
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

# A Tour through Mathematical Logic

THE  
CARUS MATHEMATICAL MONOGRAPHS

*Published by*  
THE MATHEMATICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

---

*Council on Publications*  
Roger Nelsen, *Chair*

*Carus Mathematical Monographs Editorial Board*

Kenneth A. Ross, *Editor*

Joseph Auslander

Harold P. Boas

Robert E. Greene

Roger Horn

Jeffrey Lagarias

Barbara Osofsky

The following Monographs have been published:

1. *Calculus of Variations*, by G. A. Bliss (out of print)
2. *Analytic Functions of a Complex Variable*, by D. R. Curtiss (out of print)
3. *Mathematical Statistics*, by H. L. Rietz (out of print)
4. *Projective Geometry*, by J. W. Young (out of print)
5. *A History of Mathematics in America before 1900*, by D. E. Smith and Jekuthiel Ginsburg (out of print)
6. *Fourier Series and Orthogonal Polynomials*, by Dunham Jackson (out of print)
7. *Vectors and Matrices*, by C. C. MacDuffee (out of print)
8. *Rings and Ideals*, by N. H. McCoy (out of print)
9. *The Theory of Algebraic Numbers*, second edition, by Harry Pollard and Harold G. Diamond
10. *The Arithmetic Theory of Quadratic Forms*, by B. W. Jones (out of print)
11. *Irrational Numbers*, by Ivan Niven
12. *Statistical Independence in Probability, Analysis and Number Theory*, by Mark Kac
13. *A Primer of Real Functions*, third edition, by Ralph P. Boas, Jr.
14. *Combinatorial Mathematics*, by Herbert J. Ryser
15. *Noncommutative Rings*, by I. N. Herstein
16. *Dedekind Sums*, by Hans Rademacher and Emil Grosswald
17. *The Schwarz Function and Its Applications*, by Philip J. Davis
18. *Celestial Mechanics*, by Harry Pollard
19. *Field Theory and Its Classical Problems*, by Charles Robert Hadlock
20. *The Generalized Riemann Integral*, by Robert M. McLeod
21. *From Error-Correcting Codes through Sphere Packings to Simple Groups*, by Thomas M. Thompson
22. *Random Walks and Electric Networks*, by Peter G. Doyle and J. Laurie Snell
23. *Complex Analysis: The Geometric Viewpoint*, by Steven G. Krantz
24. *Knot Theory*, by Charles Livingston
25. *Algebra and Tiling: Homomorphisms in the Service of Geometry*, by Sherman Stein and Sándor Szabó
26. *The Sensual (Quadratic) Form*, by John H. Conway assisted by Francis Y. C. Fung
27. *A Panorama of Harmonic Analysis*, by Steven G. Krantz
28. *Inequalities from Complex Analysis*, by John P. D'Angelo
29. *Ergodic Theory of Numbers*, by Karma Dajani and Cor Kraaikamp
30. *A Tour through Mathematical Logic*, by Robert S. Wolf

MAA Service Center  
P. O. Box 91112  
Washington, DC 20090-1112  
800-331-1MAA      FAX: 301-206-9789

## Preface

This book is supposed to be about “mathematical logic,” so it seems appropriate to begin with a definition of that phrase. On the surface, this is an easy task: we can say that mathematical logic is the branch of mathematics that studies the logic and the methods of deduction used in mathematics. Chapter 1 is an introduction to mathematical logic in this narrow sense.

A bit of reflection should convince you that this is not a typical branch of mathematics. Most branches of mathematics study mathematical “objects” or “structures”: numbers, triangles, functions of a real variable, groups, topological spaces, etc. But mathematical logic studies something very different—essentially, mathematical reasoning.

A couple of points come to mind on the basis of this characterization. One is that mathematical logic could be among the most abstract branches of mathematics, since it is particularly difficult to give a concrete description of its subject material. (On the other hand, mathematical logic also studies the symbolic language used in mathematics, which is a concrete object.) Another is that there is something circular, perhaps even paradoxical, in the nature of this field. For its subject matter is mathematical reasoning, but since it is a branch of mathematics its method of inquiry must also consist of mathematical reasoning. The term “metamathematics” was introduced by David Hilbert to describe this unusual situation: a discipline that is mathematical in nature but at the same time beyond or above ordinary mathematics because it treats

mathematics as an object of study. (Another branch of mathematics with a somewhat similar status is category theory.)

However, there are compelling reasons to broaden what we mean by mathematical logic. It turns out to be of limited value to study mathematical reasoning without also addressing the nature of mathematical objects. After all, reasoning is usually *about* something, and if it is, understanding what the reasoning is about may be nearly essential to analyzing the reasoning itself. One of the great achievements of modern mathematics has been the unification of the many types of objects studied in mathematics. This unification began in the seventeenth century, when René Descartes and Pierre de Fermat showed how geometric objects (points, lines, circles, etc.) could be represented numerically or algebraically, and culminated in the twentieth century with the sophisticated use of set theory to represent all the objects normally considered in mathematics. In common parlance (including the title of this book), the term “mathematical logic” is used as a synonym for “foundations of mathematics,” which includes both mathematical logic in the stricter sense defined above, and the study of the fundamental types of mathematical objects and the relationships among them.

Accordingly, this book includes two chapters on set theory, one on the basics of the subject and the other on the explosion of methods and results that have been discovered since the 1960s. It also includes a chapter on model theory, which uses set theory to show that the theorem-proving power of the usual methods of deduction in mathematics corresponds perfectly to what must be true in actual mathematical structures. The remaining chapters describe several other important branches of the foundations of mathematics. Chapter 3 is about the important concepts of “effective procedures” and “computable functions,” and Chapter 4 describes Kurt Gödel’s (and others’) famous incompleteness theorems. Chapter 7 is on the powerful tool known as nonstandard analysis, which uses model theory to justify the use of infinitesimals in mathematical reasoning. The final chapter is about various “constructivist” movements that have attempted to convince mathematicians to give “concrete” reasoning more legitimacy than “abstract” reasoning.



The word “tour” in the title of this book also deserves some explanation. For one thing, I chose this word to emphasize that it is not a textbook in the strict sense. To be sure, it has many of the features of a textbook, including exercises. But it is less structured, more free-flowing, than a standard text. It also lacks many of the details and proofs that one normally expects in a mathematics text. However, in almost all such cases there are references to more detailed treatments and the omitted proofs. Therefore, this book is actually quite suitable for use as a text at the university level (undergraduate or graduate), provided that the instructor is willing to provide supplementary material from time to time.

The most obvious advantage of this omission of detail is that this monograph is able to cover a lot more material than if it were a standard textbook of the same size. This de-emphasis on detail is also intended to help the reader concentrate on the big picture, the essential ideas of the subject, without getting bogged down in minutiae. Could this book have been titled “A Survey of Mathematical Logic”? Perhaps it could have, but my choice of the word “tour” was deliberate. A survey sounds like a rather dry activity, carried out by technicians with instruments. Tours, on the other hand, are what people take on their vacations. They are intended to be fun. On a tour of Europe, you might learn a lot about the cathedrals of Germany or Impressionist art, but you wouldn’t expect to learn about them as thoroughly as if you took a course in the subject. The goal of this book is similar: to provide an introduction to the foundations of mathematics that is substantial and stimulating, and at the same time a pleasure to read.

Here are some suggestions for how to proceed on the tour that this book provides. It is self-contained enough that a reader with no previous knowledge of logic and set theory (but at least a year of mathematics beyond calculus) should be able to read it on his or her own, without referring to outside sources and without getting seriously stuck. This is especially true of the first two chapters, which (except for Section 1.7) consist of basic material that is prerequisite to the later chapters. Before proceeding to the later chapters, it is highly advisable to read and understand at least Sections 1.1 through 1.5 and 2.1 through 2.3.

Several appendices covering some important background material are provided for the reader with limited experience in higher mathematics. The main topics included in these appendices, other than those from foundations, are ordering relations and basic concepts from abstract algebra (groups, rings, and fields). Some topics that are not included are basic concepts from linear algebra (e.g., vector spaces), analysis, and topology. These topics are occasionally mentioned in the book, but the reader who is unfamiliar with them should not be significantly hindered.

The remaining chapters are distinctly more advanced than the first two. Attempting to digest them without first understanding the basics of logic and set theory could prove frustrating, but the savvy reader may be able to read one or more of these later chapters, needing to refer only occasionally to particular material in Chapters 1 and 2. Most of these later chapters depend only slightly on each other. So, for instance, someone who decides to read Chapters 1, 2, and 5 will not be significantly hindered by having skipped Chapters 3 and 4. The most significant exceptions to this are that Chapter 4 is based essentially on Chapter 3, and Chapters 6 and 7 use many concepts from Chapter 5.

Of course, even in the introductory chapters, if you want to learn the material thoroughly, then you must be prepared to reread certain parts, do the exercises, and perhaps fill in some details from outside sources. A book can be made pleasant to read, but it cannot turn abstract mathematics into a walk in the park. As Euclid supposedly said to King Ptolemy, "There is no royal road to geometry."

This book includes about a dozen biographies, in boxes, of people who have made important contributions to mathematical logic and foundations. In order to fend off any bewilderment about whom I chose for these and why, let me clarify two points. First, I decided not to include biographies of any living mathematicians. Second, my choices were motivated only partly by the importance, quality, quantity, brilliance, etc., of the person's contributions. My other main criterion was to what extent the person's life was noteworthy or unusual, perhaps even heroic or tragic. So I have omitted the biographies of some true "giants" in the field whose lives were relatively straightforward.

I sincerely hope that you will find this “tour” interesting, informative, and enjoyable. I welcome any type of feedback, including questions, corrections, and criticisms, sent to [rswolf@calpoly.edu](mailto:rswolf@calpoly.edu).

## Acknowledgments

One of the few pleasurable activities that normally occurs during the frantic process of finalizing a book is thanking the people who helped the author(s) along the way. In the present situation, an unusually large number of people have aided me in one way or another, and I am genuinely grateful to all of them.

First, I want to thank the staff of the Mathematical Association of America, specifically Don Albers, Elaine Pedreira, and Bev Ruedi. They have been consistently helpful and encouraging during the long process of writing this book, and their technical expertise has been extremely valuable.

I also want to sincerely thank the editorial board of the Carus Monograph series for their time and their many constructive comments: Joseph Auslander, Harold P. Boas, Robert E. Greene, Dennis Hejhal, M. Susan Montgomery, Bruce A. Reznick, Ken Ross, Clarence Eugene Wayne, and David Wright.

Space does not allow me to thank all the mathematicians and mathematics students who have read part or all of this manuscript and provided valuable feedback. So, at the risk of omitting some deserving ones (and with apologies in advance, if that occurs), I want to thank the following people who have kindly donated a substantial amount of time to provide comments and guidance: Michael Beeson, Jim Henle, Robert Solovay, Charlie Steinhorn, Todor Todorov, and Dan Velleman.

I am especially indebted to Ken Ross, chair of the Carus Monograph editorial board during the writing of this book. Ken gave an extraordinary amount of his time to reading every chapter of this manuscript, most of them more than once, and providing thoughtful and detailed comments. He also provided much encouragement and helped me deal with more than one thorny issue. Ken, you're swell!

Finally, I want to thank my friends and family for their patience and encouragement during these several years of distraction and A.R.-ness on my part. Special kudos go to my wife, Laurie, for suppressing her impulse to laugh out loud when the number of times I said, "I've just finished my book!" hit double digits.

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>1 Predicate Logic</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction .....	1
Biography: Bertrand Russell .....	6
1.2 Propositional logic .....	7
1.3 Quantifiers .....	14
1.4 First-order languages and theories .....	23
Biography: Euclid .....	27
1.5 Examples of first-order theories .....	32
1.6 Normal forms and complexity .....	38
1.7 Other logics .....	47
<b>2 Axiomatic Set Theory</b>	<b>59</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	59
2.2 “Naive” set theory .....	61
Biography: Georg Ferdinand Cantor .....	62
2.3 Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory .....	68
Biography: John von Neumann .....	72
2.4 Ordinals .....	77
2.5 Cardinals and the cumulative hierarchy .....	84
	<b>xiii</b>

<b>3</b>	<b>Recursion Theory and Computability</b>	<b>95</b>
3.1	Introduction .....	95
	Biography: Emil Post .....	97
3.2	Primitive recursive functions .....	98
3.3	Turing machines and recursive functions .....	108
	Biography: Alan Turing .....	109
3.4	Undecidability and recursive enumerability .....	118
3.5	Complexity theory .....	125
<b>4</b>	<b>Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems</b>	<b>135</b>
4.1	Introduction .....	135
4.2	The arithmetization of formal theories .....	136
	Biography: Kurt Gödel .....	137
4.3	A potpourri of incompleteness theorems .....	146
4.4	Strengths and limitations of PA .....	156
	Biography: Frank Ramsey .....	159
<b>5</b>	<b>Model Theory</b>	<b>165</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	165
5.2	Basic concepts of model theory .....	167
5.3	The main theorems of model theory .....	172
5.4	Preservation theorems .....	181
5.5	Saturation and complete theories .....	191
	Biography: Julia Robinson .....	198
5.6	Quantifier elimination .....	205
5.7	Additional topics in model theory .....	214
<b>6</b>	<b>Contemporary Set Theory</b>	<b>225</b>
6.1	Introduction .....	225
6.2	The relative consistency of AC and GCH .....	228
6.3	Forcing and the independence results .....	234
6.4	Modern set theory and large cardinals .....	242
6.5	Descriptive set theory .....	254

Biography: Nikolai Luzin .....	261
6.6 The axiom of determinacy .....	267
<b>7 Nonstandard Analysis</b>	<b>279</b>
7.1 Introduction .....	279
Biography: Archimedes .....	282
Biography: Leonhard Euler .....	287
7.2 Nonarchimedean fields .....	289
7.3 Standard and nonstandard models .....	293
7.4 Nonstandard methods in mathematics .....	304
<b>8 Constructive Mathematics</b>	<b>317</b>
8.1 Introduction .....	317
8.2 Brouwer's intuitionism .....	325
Biography: L. E. J. Brouwer .....	326
8.3 Bishop's constructive analysis .....	330
<b>A A Deductive System for First-order Logic</b>	<b>347</b>
<b>B Relations and Orderings</b>	<b>349</b>
<b>C Cardinal Arithmetic</b>	<b>355</b>
<b>D Groups, Rings, and Fields</b>	<b>361</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>375</b>
<b>Symbols and Notation</b>	<b>381</b>
<b>Index</b>	<b>387</b>

## CHAPTER 1

# Predicate Logic

## 1.1 Introduction

Why should students of mathematics want to know something about predicate logic? Here is one answer: predicate logic helps one understand the fine points of mathematical language, including the ambiguities that arise from the use of *natural* language (English, French, etc.) in mathematics. For research mathematicians, these ambiguities are usually easy to spot, and their intuition will normally prevent any errors. Yet, occasionally, such ambiguities can be very subtle and present real pitfalls. For instructors of mathematics, awareness of this type of ambiguity is indispensable for analyzing students' mistakes and misconceptions.

Let's illustrate this point with a rather fanciful example: imagine that you are an eminent mathematician with an international reputation. Your life is wonderful in every way except that, after many years, your marriage has become stale. Reluctantly, you decide to have a fling, hoping that a brief one will be enough and your marriage will survive. You approach your friend Lee, whose marriage is also stale, and the two of you agree to have a tryst. (For the record, I would never do such a thing. Remember, it's *you* I'm talking about. If you wouldn't do such a thing either, then I must be thinking of a different reader.)



To be on the safe side, you and Lee decide to go to another state for your tryst. You drive there and go to a nondescript motel. To your surprise, the desk clerk asks, “Are you folks married? We have to ask that, and you’re required by state law to answer truthfully.” Without batting an eyelash, you reply, “Of course we are.” You get the room and have your little fling, but the next morning you are arrested—not for adultery (since nothing can be proved about that), but for perjury!

From your jail cell, you plan your clever defense: you will simply say that you didn’t lie at all. You and Lee are married, but not to each other! Your answer was literally quite correct, so no perjury has occurred.

Will your defense succeed? I doubt it, but that’s not what interests us anyway. Among the many types of ambiguities in the English language, this one is of a particularly interesting sort. Note that the statement “I am married” is not ambiguous. The statement (or **predicate**, since it involves a variable) “ $x$  is married” means that  $x$  is married to *someone*. But the statement “ $x$  and  $y$  are married” somehow becomes ambiguous. It would normally mean that  $x$  and  $y$  are married to each other, but it could mean that  $x$  and  $y$  are, individually, married persons. To analyze the source of this ambiguity, one should realize that the **binary** (two-variable) predicate “ $x$  and  $y$  are married to each other” is really the basic or **atomic** predicate here. If we use  $M(x, y)$  to denote this sentence, then the **unary** (one-variable) predicate “ $x$  is married” actually means “There is a person  $y$  such that  $M(x, y)$ .” It is not atomic because it includes a **quantifier** (“there is”), which is tacit in its usual English rendition. Thus the less common meaning of “ $x$  and  $y$  are married” is in a sense simpler than the usual meaning (because it’s a statement about the individuals  $x$  and  $y$  separately), but in another sense more complicated (because it involves two quantifiers).

We are done with this example, but one could concoct other interesting questions. How would you normally interpret “Fred and Jane and Bill and Mary are married”? How about “Fred, Jane, Bill and Mary are married”? How about “Fred, Jane, and Bill are married”? Of course, we usually rely on context to interpret such statements, but sometimes there is little or no context to rely on.