

A true and falsifiable statement Ψ with the predicate \mathcal{K} of the current mathematical knowledge, where Ψ strengthens a non-trivial theorem and does not express what is currently unproved in mathematics

Apoloniusz Tyszk

Abstract

The theorem of Royer and Case states that there exists a limit-computable function $\beta_1 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ which eventually dominates every computable function $\delta_1 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. We present an alternative proof of this theorem. \mathcal{K} denotes both the knowledge predicate satisfied by every currently known theorem and the set of all currently known theorems. The set \mathcal{K} is time-dependent. Any theorem of any mathematician from past or present forever belongs to \mathcal{K} . We prove: (1) there exists a limit-computable function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of unknown computability which eventually dominates every function $\delta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with a single-fold Diophantine representation. We present both constructive and non-constructive proof of (1). Statement (1) claims that there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that (f is computable in the limit) \wedge ($\neg\mathcal{K}(f$ is computable)) \wedge ($\neg\mathcal{K}(f$ is uncomputable)) \wedge (f eventually dominates every function $\delta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with a single-fold Diophantine representation). Since Martin Davis' conjecture on single-fold Diophantine representations disproves statement (1), statement (1) has all properties from the title of the article.

Key words and phrases: eventual domination, limit-computable function, predicate \mathcal{K} of the current mathematical knowledge, single-fold Diophantine representation, time-dependent truth in mathematics with the predicate \mathcal{K} .

\mathcal{K} denotes both the knowledge predicate satisfied by every currently known theorem and the set of all currently known theorems. The set \mathcal{K} is time-dependent. Any theorem of any mathematician from past or present forever belongs to \mathcal{K} .

1 The goal of the article

We formulate a statement Ψ of the form:

there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that
 f satisfies a mathematical condition \mathcal{C} and

it is unknown whether or not f satisfies a mathematical condition \mathcal{D} .

We prove that Ψ has all properties from the title of the article. There is no widely known theorem from which we can draw Ψ . Ignoring the epistemic condition in Ψ , Ψ follows from a known theorem.

2 Statements with the predicate \mathcal{K} which do not have all properties from the title of the article

Let \mathcal{T} denote the set of twin primes.

Proposition 1. *The statement*

$$(\neg\mathcal{K}(\text{card}(\mathcal{T}) = \omega)) \wedge (\neg\mathcal{K}(\text{card}(\mathcal{T}) < \omega))$$

is true, falsifiable, and expresses what is currently unproved in mathematics.

Statement 1. *There exists a non-zero integer n such that*

$$(\neg\mathcal{K}(n < 0)) \wedge (\neg\mathcal{K}(n > 0)) \tag{1}$$

Proof. It holds for

$$n = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if Continuum Hypothesis holds} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

□

Proposition 2. *Statement 1 holds forever.*

Proof. Since *Continuum Hypothesis* is independent from *ZFC*, conjunction (1) holds forever for the above n . □

Proposition 3. *Statement 1 does not express what is currently unproved in mathematics.*


3 Classical computability theory

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$E_n = \{1 = x_k, x_i + x_j = x_k, x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{0, \dots, n\}\}$$

Theorem 1. ([4, p. 118]). *There exists a limit-computable function $\beta_1 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ which eventually dominates every computable function $\delta_1 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.*

We present an alternative proof of Theorem 1. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\beta_1(n)$ as the smallest $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if a system of equations $S \subseteq E_n$ has a solution in \mathbb{N}^{n+1} , then this solution belongs to $\{0, \dots, b\}^{n+1}$. The function $\beta_1 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is computable in the limit and eventually dominates every computable function $\delta_1 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, see [5]. Flowchart 1 describes a semi-algorithm which computes $\beta_1(n)$ in the limit.



Flowchart 1

A semi-algorithm which computes $\beta_1(n)$ in the limit

Conjecture 1. ([1, pp. 341–342], [2, p. 42], [3, p. 745]). Every listable set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$ ($k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$) has a single-fold Diophantine representation.

Let Φ denote the following statement: *the function $\mathbb{N} \ni n \rightarrow 2^n \in \mathbb{N}$ eventually dominates every function $\delta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with a single-fold Diophantine representation.* For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$g(n) = \begin{cases} 2^n, & \text{if } \Phi \text{ holds} \\ \beta_1(n), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The function $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is computable if and only if Φ holds. Currently,

$$(\neg\mathcal{K}(\Phi)) \wedge (\neg\mathcal{K}(\neg\Phi)) \wedge (\neg\mathcal{K}(g \text{ is computable})) \wedge (\neg\mathcal{K}(g \text{ is uncomputable}))$$


Lemma 1. *The function g is computable in the limit and eventually dominates every function $\delta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with a single-fold Diophantine representation.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 1. □

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\beta(n)$ as the smallest $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if a system of equations $S \subseteq E_n$ has a unique solution in \mathbb{N}^{n+1} , then this solution belongs to $\{0, \dots, b\}^{n+1}$.

Theorem 2. *The function $\beta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is computable in the limit and eventually dominates every function $\delta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with a single-fold Diophantine representation.*

Proof. This is proved in [5]. The term "dominated" in the title of [5] means "eventually dominated". Flowchart 2 describes a semi-algorithm which computes $\beta(n)$ in the limit.



Flowchart 2

A semi-algorithm which computes $\beta(n)$ in the limit □

4 A statement described by the title of the article

Statement 2. *There exists a limit-computable function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of unknown computability which eventually dominates every function $\delta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with a single-fold Diophantine representation.*

Proof. Statement 2 follows constructively from Theorem 2 by taking $f = \beta$ and the following conjunction:

$$(\neg\mathcal{K}(\beta \text{ is computable})) \wedge (\neg\mathcal{K}(\beta \text{ is uncomputable}))$$

Statement 2 follows non-constructively from Lemma 1 by taking $f = g$ and the following conjunction:

$$(\neg\mathcal{K}(g \text{ is computable})) \wedge (\neg\mathcal{K}(g \text{ is uncomputable}))$$

□

Proposition 4. *Statement 2 has all properties from the title of the article.*

Proof. Statement 2 claims that there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(f \text{ is computable in the limit}) \wedge (\neg\mathcal{K}(f \text{ is computable})) \wedge (\neg\mathcal{K}(f \text{ is uncomputable})) \wedge$$

(f eventually dominates every function $\delta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with a single-fold Diophantine representation)

Conjecture 1 disproves Statement 2. Statement 2 strengthens Statement 2 without the epistemic condition. The weakened Statement 2 is a theorem which follows from Theorem 1. □

Since the function β_1 in Theorem 1 is not computable, Statement 2 does not follow from Theorem 1.

References

- [1] M. Davis, Yu. Matiyasevich, J. Robinson, *Hilbert's tenth problem, Diophantine equations: positive aspects of a negative solution*; in: Mathematical developments arising from Hilbert problems (ed. F. E. Browder), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 28, Part 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1976, 323–378, <http://doi.org/10.1090/pspum/028.2>; reprinted in: The collected works of Julia Robinson (ed. S. Feferman), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996, 269–324.
- [2] Yu. Matiyasevich, *Hilbert's tenth problem: what was done and what is to be done*, in: Proceedings of the Workshop on Hilbert's tenth problem: relations with arithmetic and algebraic geometry (Ghent, 1999), Contemp. Math. 270, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000, 1–47, <http://doi.org/10.1090/conm/270>.
- [3] Yu. Matiyasevich, *Towards finite-fold Diophantine representations*, J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) vol. 171, no. 6, 2010, 745–752, <http://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs10958-010-0179-4>.
- [4] J. S. Royer and J. Case, *Subrecursive Programming Systems: Complexity and Succinctness*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.
- [5] A. Tyszka, *All functions $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ which have a single-fold Diophantine representation are dominated by a limit-computable function $f : \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ which is implemented in MuPAD and whose computability is an open problem*, in: Computation, cryptography, and network security (eds. N. J. Daras, M. Th. Rassias), Springer, Cham, 2015, 577–590, http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18275-9_24.

Apoloniusz Tyszka
Technical Faculty
Hugo Kołłątaj University
Balicka 116B, 30-149 Kraków, Poland
E-mail: rtyszka@cyf-kr.edu.pl