

# A DECIDABILITY THEOREM

Vitaly A. Filippovski

Samara State Aerospace University named after academician S.P. Korolyov (SSAU)  
miomache@gmail.com

**Abstract.** The aim of this investigation is to show that supposed assumptions in the original proof of Gödel's First incompleteness theorem allow to infer a decidability of formulas that were asserted as undecidable in the theorem; moreover, we will prove that these decidable formulas are provable.

Gödel's First incompleteness theorem reads as follows [Gödel 1931b (engl.), p. 98]:

**Theorem 1.** (*Incompleteness theorem*). *For every  $\omega$ -consistent recursive class  $\varkappa$  of formulas there are recursive class sings  $r$ , such that neither  $v \text{ Gen } r$  nor  $\text{Neg}(v \text{ Gen } r)$  belongs to  $\text{Flg}(\varkappa)$  (where  $v$  is the free variable of  $r$ ).*

Let us express the theorem by means of the logical symbolization:

$$\forall \varkappa \left[ \overbrace{\text{recursive}(\varkappa) \ \& \ \omega\text{consist}(\varkappa)} \ \& \ \exists r \left( \overbrace{r \in \varkappa \ \& \ \text{recursive}(r)} \right) \supset \overbrace{v \text{ Gen } r \in \text{Flg}(\varkappa) \ \& \ (\text{Neg}(v \text{ Gen } r)) \in \text{Flg}(\varkappa)} \right].$$

Because  $r$  does not occur as free in  $\text{recursive}(\varkappa)$  and  $\omega\text{consist}(\varkappa)$ , given above formal expression of the theorem may be rewritten as:

$$\forall \varkappa, \exists r \left[ \overbrace{\text{recursive}(\varkappa) \ \& \ \omega\text{consist}(\varkappa) \ \& \ r \in \varkappa \ \& \ \text{recursive}(r)} \supset \overbrace{v \text{ Gen } r \in \text{Flg}(\varkappa) \ \& \ (\text{Neg}(v \text{ Gen } r)) \in \text{Flg}(\varkappa)} \right].$$

Four members of conjunction in the antecedent of implication in last are assumptions<sup>1</sup>:

- |  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1) $\text{recursive}(\varkappa)$ ;     | 3) $r \in \varkappa$ ;     |
| 2) $\omega\text{consist}(\varkappa)$ ; | 4) $\text{recursive}(r)$ . |

These assumptions allow to derive a decidability of undecidable formulas; furthermore, we will prove that these formulas are provable. Before we propose the proof of this result, let us turn to five supplementary lemmas<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> It is obviously from the original proof of Gödel's First incompleteness theorem [Gödel 1931b (engl.), pp. 98-100] and also from the reconstruction of it that was made recently by author (the reconstruction will be published soon in *Philosophy of Science*, the journal of SB RAS).

<sup>2</sup> The proofs of *lemmas* and *the decidability theorem* are given with the help of the symbolization technique of metamathematical predicates that was suggested by Gödel

**Lemma 1.** *If a class  $\varkappa$  of formulas is recursive, then for the given class sign  $r$  can be defined whether it belongs to the class  $\varkappa$  or not.*

*Proof.*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. $recursive(\varkappa) \equiv \forall r(r \varepsilon \varkappa \vee \overline{r \varepsilon \varkappa})$  | definition  |
| 2. $\forall r(A(r)) \equiv A(r)$   | logic rule  |
| 3. $\forall r(r \varepsilon \varkappa \vee \overline{r \varepsilon \varkappa}) \equiv r \varepsilon \varkappa \vee \overline{r \varepsilon \varkappa}$ | 2 by $A(r) = r \varepsilon \varkappa \vee \overline{r \varepsilon \varkappa}$ |
| 4. $recursive(\varkappa) \equiv r \varepsilon \varkappa \vee \overline{r \varepsilon \varkappa}$   | transitivity of $\equiv$ , 1, 3   |
| 5. $recursive(\varkappa) \supset r \varepsilon \varkappa \vee \overline{r \varepsilon \varkappa}$  | $\equiv$ -elim., 4  |

□

**Lemma 2.** *If the given class sign  $r$  belongs to a class  $\varkappa$ , then  $v Gen r$  belongs to a class  $Flg(\varkappa)$ .*

*Proof.*

- |  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. $r \varepsilon \varkappa$   | assumption         |
| 2. $r \varepsilon \varkappa \supset r \varepsilon \varkappa \vee Ax(r) \vee (y, z \varepsilon Flg(\varkappa) \& Fl(r, y, z))$      | logic rule         |
| 3. $r \varepsilon \varkappa \vee Ax(r) \vee (y, z \varepsilon Flg(\varkappa) \& Fl(r, y, z))$                                      | <i>m.p.</i> , 2, 1 |
| 4. $r \varepsilon Flg(\varkappa) \equiv r \varepsilon \varkappa \vee Ax(r) \vee (y, z \varepsilon Flg(\varkappa) \& Fl(r, y, z))$  | definition         |
| 5. $r \varepsilon \varkappa \vee Ax(r) \vee (y, z \varepsilon Flg(\varkappa) \& Fl(r, y, z)) \supset r \varepsilon Flg(\varkappa)$ | $\equiv$ -elim., 4 |

in his system  $P$ . It is assumed that this system and definitions of following notions and relations are known by readers (see Gödel 1931b (engl.)):

- 1)  $recursive(\varkappa) \equiv \forall x(x \varepsilon \varkappa \vee \overline{x \varepsilon \varkappa})$ ;
- 2) a class sign is a formula (a combination of signs) that has the form  $a(b)$ , where  $b$  is a sign of type 1 (i.e. a variable of the natural numbers) and  $a$  a sign of type 2 (i.e. a class of numbers); or has one of forms  $\sim(a)$ ,  $(a) \vee (b)$ ,  $x\Pi(a)$ , where  $x$  may be any variable;
- 3)  $x \varepsilon Flg(\varkappa) \equiv x \varepsilon \varkappa \vee Ax(x) \vee (y, z \varepsilon Flg(\varkappa) \& Fl(x, y, z))$ ;
- 4)  $x Gen y \equiv x\Pi(y)$ ;
- 5)  $Sb(x_y^v) \equiv Subst a_b^v$ ;
- 6)  $\omega consist(\varkappa) \equiv \exists a \left( \forall n [Sb(a_{Z(n)}^v) \varepsilon Flg(\varkappa)] \& [Neg(v Gen a)] \varepsilon Flg(\varkappa) \right)$ ;
- 7)  $\forall R(recursive(R) \equiv decid(R))$ ;
- 8)  $recursive(r) \equiv recursive(R) \& R \simeq r$  (where the sign ' $\simeq$ ' means a relation of one-to-one correspondence between an arbitrary relation (class)  $R$  and its isomorphic relation sign (class sign)  $r$ );
- 9)  $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \equiv r(Z(n))$ ;
- 10)  $decid(R) \equiv \exists r(R \rightarrow Bew(r) \& \overline{R} \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r)))$ ,

and also it is known that with the help of 5<sup>th</sup> definition and some substitutions from the scheme of axiom III.1 of the system  $P$ , — i.e.,  $v\Pi(a) \supset Subst a_c^v$ , — the axiom  $v\Pi(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)$  turns out.

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 6. $r \in Flg(\mathcal{X})$                                 | <i>m.p.</i> , 5, 3                  |
| 7. $v Gen r \equiv r$                                       | logic rule                          |
| 8. $v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{X})$                           | change rule,<br>7, 6                |
| 9. $r \in \mathcal{X} \supset v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{X})$ | $\supset$ -enter.,<br>ass. elim., 1 |

□

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose  $v Gen r$  belongs to a class  $Flg(\mathcal{X})$ . Let  $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)$  be a formula that results from a class sign  $r$  by a substitution for its free variable  $v$  by a numeral of the number  $n$ ; then does not exist a number  $n$ , such that  $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)$  does not belong to the class  $Flg(\mathcal{X})$ .*

*Proof.*

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. $v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{X})$  | assumption           |
| 2. $v Gen r \equiv vII(r)$   | definition           |
| 3. $vII(r) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})$   | change rule,<br>2, 1 |
| 4. $vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)$   | axiom                |
| 5. $Ax(vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v))$   | Def. №42, 38         |
| 6. $Ax(vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \supset$<br>$Ax(vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \vee (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in \mathcal{X} \vee$<br>$(y, z \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \& Fl((vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), y, z))$                    | logic rule           |
| 7. $Ax(vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \vee (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in \mathcal{X} \vee$<br>$(y, z \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \& Fl((vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), y, z))$   | <i>m.p.</i> , 6, 5   |
| 8. $(vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \equiv$<br>$Ax(vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \vee (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in \mathcal{X} \vee$<br>$(y, z \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \& Fl((vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), y, z))$  | definition           |
| 9. $Ax(vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \vee (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in \mathcal{X} \vee$<br>$(y, z \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \& Fl((vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), y, z)) \supset$<br>$(vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})$ | $\equiv$ -elim., 8   |
| 10. $(vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})$   | <i>m.p.</i> , 9, 7   |
| 11. $Fl(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v), (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), vII(r))$  | Def. №43             |

12.  $vII(r) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \& \ (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \&$  &-enter., 3,  
 $Fl(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v), (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), vII(r))$  10, 11
13.  $vII(r) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \& \ (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \&$  logic rule  
 $Fl(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v), (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), vII(r)) \supset$   
 $\left\{ vII(r) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \& \ (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \&$   
 $Fl(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v), (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), vII(r)) \right\} \vee$   
 $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in \varkappa \ \vee \ Ax(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v))$
14.  $\left\{ vII(r) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \& \ (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \&$  *m.p.*, 13, 12  
 $Fl(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v), (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), vII(r)) \right\} \vee$   
 $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in \varkappa \ \vee \ Ax(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v))$
15.  $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\varkappa) \equiv$  definition  
 $\left\{ vII(r) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \& \ (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \&$   
 $Fl(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v), (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), vII(r)) \right\} \vee$   
 $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in \varkappa \ \vee \ Ax(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v))$
16.  $\left\{ vII(r) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \& \ (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \in Flg(\varkappa) \ \&$   $\equiv$ -elim., 15  
 $Fl(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v), (vII(r) \supset Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)), vII(r)) \right\} \vee$   
 $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in \varkappa \ \vee \ Ax(Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)) \supset$   
 $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\varkappa)$
17.  $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\varkappa)$  *m.p.*, 16, 14
18.  $\forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\varkappa)]$   $\forall$ -enter., 17
19.  $\forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\varkappa)] \equiv \overline{\overline{\exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\varkappa)]}}$  logic rule
20.  $\forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\varkappa)] \supset \overline{\overline{\exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\varkappa)]}}$   $\equiv$ -elim., 19
21.  $\overline{\overline{\exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\varkappa)]}}$  *m.p.*, 20, 18
22.  $v \ Gen \ r \in Flg(\varkappa) \supset \overline{\overline{\exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\varkappa)]}}$   $\supset$ -enter.,  
 ass. elim., 1

□

**Lemma 4.** *Suppose a class  $\mathcal{X}$  of formulas is  $\omega$ -consistent. Let  $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)$  be a formula that results from a class sign  $r$  by a substitution for its free variable  $v$  by a numeral of the number  $n$ ; then either  $Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)$  does not belong to a class  $Flg(\mathcal{X})$  or exists a number  $n$ , such that  $Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v)$  does not belong to the class  $Flg(\mathcal{X})$ .*

*Proof.*

- |     |   |                     |
|-----|---|---------------------|
| 1.  | $\omega\text{consist}(\mathcal{X})$   | assumption          |
| 2.  | $\omega\text{consist}(\mathcal{X}) \equiv$  | definition          |
|     | $\overline{\exists r \left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right)}$ |                     |
| 3.  | $\omega\text{consist}(\mathcal{X}) \supset$   | $\equiv$ -elim., 2  |
|     | $\overline{\exists r \left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right)}$ |                     |
| 4.  | $\exists r \left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right)$            | <i>m.p.</i> , 3, 1  |
|     | $\overline{\exists r \left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right)}$ |                     |
| 5.  | $\exists r \left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right) \equiv$     | logic rule          |
|     | $\overline{\forall r \left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right)}$ |                     |
| 6.  | $\exists r \left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right) \supset$    | $\equiv$ -elim., 5  |
|     | $\overline{\forall r \left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right)}$ |                     |
| 7.  | $\forall r \left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right)$            | <i>m.p.</i> , 6, 4  |
|     | $\overline{\left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right)}$           |                     |
| 8.  | $\left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right)$                      | $\forall$ -elim., 7 |
|     | $\overline{\left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right)}$           |                     |
| 9.  | $\left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right) \equiv$               | A. de Morgan        |
|     | $\overline{\forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \vee \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X})}$                        | rule                |
| 10. | $\left( \forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \& \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X}) \right) \supset$              | $\equiv$ -elim., 9  |
|     | $\overline{\forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \vee \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X})}$                        |                     |
| 11. | $\forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \vee \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X})$                                   | <i>m.p.</i> , 10, 8 |
|     | $\overline{\forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \vee \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X})}$                        |                     |
| 12. | $\forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \equiv \exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})]$                                  | logic rule          |
|     | $\overline{\forall n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \vee \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X})}$                        |                     |
| 13. | $\exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \in Flg(\mathcal{X})] \ \vee \ [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r)] \in Flg(\mathcal{X})$                                   | change rule,        |
|     |   | 12, 11              |

$$14. \frac{\omega \text{consist}(\mathcal{X}) \supset \exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \varepsilon Flg(\mathcal{X})] \vee [Neg(v \text{Gen } r)] \varepsilon Flg(\mathcal{X})}{\supset\text{-enter.}, \text{ ass. elim.}, 1}$$

□

**Lemma 5.** *Suppose a class sign  $r$  is recursive; then either  $v \text{Gen } r$  or  $Neg(v \text{Gen } r)$  belongs to a class  $Flg(\mathcal{X})$ .*

*Proof.*

- |  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1. $recursive(r)$  | assumption                    |
| 2. $recursive(r) \equiv recursive(R) \ \& \ R \rightleftharpoons r$  | definition                    |
| 3. $recursive(r) \supset recursive(R) \ \& \ R \rightleftharpoons r$   | $\equiv$ -elim., 2            |
| 4. $recursive(R) \ \& \ R \rightleftharpoons r$  | <i>m.p.</i> , 3, 1            |
| 5. $recursive(R) \ \& \ R \rightleftharpoons r \supset recursive(R)$   | logic rule                    |
| 6. $recursive(R) \ \& \ R \rightleftharpoons r \supset R \rightleftharpoons r$   | logic rule                    |
| 7. $recursive(R)$  | <i>m.p.</i> , 5, 4            |
| 8. $R \rightleftharpoons r$  | <i>m.p.</i> , 6, 4            |
| 9. $\forall R (recursive(R) \equiv decid(R))$  | definition <sup>3</sup>       |
| 10. $recursive(R) \equiv decid(R)$   | $\forall$ -elim., 9           |
| 11. $recursive(R) \supset decid(R)$  | $\equiv$ -elim., 10           |
| 12. $decid(R)$   | <i>m.p.</i> , 11, 7           |
| 13. $decid(R) \equiv \exists r (R \rightarrow Bew(r) \ \& \ \bar{R} \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r)))$  | definition                    |
| 14. $decid(R) \supset \exists r (R \rightarrow Bew(r) \ \& \ \bar{R} \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r)))$   | $\equiv$ -elim., 13           |
| 15. $\exists r (R \rightarrow Bew(r) \ \& \ \bar{R} \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r)))$  | <i>m.p.</i> , 14, 12          |
| 16. $R \rightarrow Bew(r) \ \& \ \bar{R} \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r))$  | $\exists$ -elim., 15, 8       |
| 17. $Neg(R) \equiv \bar{R}$  | definition                    |
| 18. $R \rightarrow Bew(r) \ \& \ Neg(R) \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r))$   | change rule,<br>17, 16        |
| 19. $Neg(Bew(r)) \rightarrow Neg(R) \ \& \ Neg(Bew(Neg(r))) \rightarrow Neg(Neg(R))$   | twice contra-<br>position, 18 |
| 20. $R \rightarrow Bew(r) \ \& \ Neg(R) \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r)) \ \& \ Neg(Bew(r)) \rightarrow Neg(R) \ \& \ Neg(Bew(Neg(r))) \rightarrow Neg(Neg(R))$ | $\&$ -enter.,<br>18, 19       |

<sup>3</sup> The corollary of Gödel's Theorem V. See Gödel 1931b (engl.), p. 100.

21.  $Neg(Bew(Neg(r))) \rightarrow Neg(Neg(R)) \ \& \ R \rightarrow Bew(r) \ \& \ Neg(Bew(r)) \rightarrow Neg(R) \ \& \ Neg(R) \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r))$  commutativity of  $\&$ , 20
22.  $(Neg(Bew(Neg(r))) \rightarrow Neg(Neg(R)) \ \& \ R \rightarrow Bew(r)) \ \& \ (Neg(Bew(r)) \rightarrow Neg(R) \ \& \ Neg(R) \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r)))$  associativity of  $\&$ , 21
23.  $Neg(Neg(R)) \equiv R$  logic rule
24.  $(Neg(Bew(Neg(r))) \rightarrow R \ \& \ R \rightarrow Bew(r)) \ \& \ (Neg(Bew(r)) \rightarrow Neg(R) \ \& \ Neg(R) \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r)))$  change rule, 23, 22
25.  $(Neg(Bew(Neg(r))) \rightarrow Bew(r)) \ \& \ (Neg(Bew(r)) \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r)))$  twice transitivity of  $\rightarrow$ , 24
26.  $Neg(A) \rightarrow B \equiv A \vee B$  logic rule
27.  $Neg(Bew(Neg(r))) \rightarrow Bew(r) \equiv Bew(Neg(r)) \vee Bew(r)$  26 by  $A = Bew(Neg(r))$ ,  $B = Bew(r)$
28.  $Neg(Bew(r)) \rightarrow Bew(Neg(r)) \equiv Bew(r) \vee Bew(Neg(r))$  26 by  $B = Bew(Neg(r))$ ,  $A = Bew(r)$
29.  $(Bew(Neg(r)) \vee Bew(r)) \ \& \ (Bew(r) \vee Bew(Neg(r)))$  twice change rule, 27-28, 25
30.  $(Bew(Neg(r)) \vee Bew(r)) \ \& \ (Bew(r) \vee Bew(Neg(r))) \supset Bew(Neg(r)) \vee Bew(r)$  logic rule
31.  $Bew(Neg(r)) \vee Bew(r)$  *m.p.*, 30, 29
32.  $v \ Gen \ r \equiv r$  logic rule
33.  $Bew(Neg(v \ Gen \ r)) \vee Bew(v \ Gen \ r)$  change rule, 32, 31
34.  $\forall x[Bew(x) \rightarrow Bew_{\varkappa}(x)]$  statement (8)<sup>4</sup>
35.  $Bew(Neg(v \ Gen \ r)) \supset Bew_{\varkappa}(Neg(v \ Gen \ r))$   $\forall$ -elim., 34
36.  $Bew(v \ Gen \ r) \supset Bew_{\varkappa}(v \ Gen \ r)$   $\forall$ -elim., 34
37.  $\forall x[Bew_{\varkappa}(x) \equiv x \ \varepsilon \ Flg(\varkappa)]$  statement (7)<sup>5</sup>
38.  $Bew_{\varkappa}(Neg(v \ Gen \ r)) \equiv Neg(v \ Gen \ r) \ \varepsilon \ Flg(\varkappa)$   $\forall$ -elim., 37
39.  $Bew_{\varkappa}(Neg(v \ Gen \ r)) \supset Neg(v \ Gen \ r) \ \varepsilon \ Flg(\varkappa)$   $\equiv$ -elim., 38
40.  $Bew_{\varkappa}(v \ Gen \ r) \equiv v \ Gen \ r \ \varepsilon \ Flg(\varkappa)$   $\forall$ -elim., 37
41.  $Bew_{\varkappa}(v \ Gen \ r) \supset v \ Gen \ r \ \varepsilon \ Flg(\varkappa)$   $\equiv$ -elim., 40

<sup>4</sup> Gödel 1931b (engl.), p. 99

<sup>5</sup> Ibidem.

42. $Bew(Neg(v Gen r)) \supset Neg(v Gen r) \in Flg(\mathcal{K})$	transitivity of $\supset$ , 35, 39
43. $Bew(v Gen r) \supset v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{K})$	transitivity of $\supset$ , 36, 41
44. $Bew(Neg(v Gen r)) \vee Bew(v Gen r) \&$ $Bew(Neg(v Gen r)) \supset Neg(v Gen r) \in Flg(\mathcal{K}) \&$ $Bew(v Gen r) \supset v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{K})$	$\&$ -enter., 33, 42-43
45. $(A \vee B \& A \supset C \& B \supset D) \supset C \vee D$	logic rule
46. $(Bew(Neg(v Gen r)) \vee Bew(v Gen r) \&$ $Bew(Neg(v Gen r)) \supset Neg(v Gen r) \in Flg(\mathcal{K}) \&$ $Bew(v Gen r) \supset v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{K})) \supset$ $Neg(v Gen r) \in Flg(\mathcal{K}) \vee v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{K})$	45 by $A =$ $Bew(Neg(v Gen r))$ , $B = Bew(v Gen r)$ , $C = Neg(v Gen r) \in$ $\in Flg(\mathcal{K})$ , $D =$ $v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{K})$ <i>m.p.</i> , 46, 44
47. $Neg(v Gen r) \in Flg(\mathcal{K}) \vee v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{K})$	<i>m.p.</i> , 46, 44
48. $recursive(r) \supset$ $Neg(v Gen r) \in Flg(\mathcal{K}) \vee v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{K})$	$\supset$ -enter., ass. elim., 1

□

We now had been approaching to the main goal of present paper. The main result about the decidability of undecidable propositions consists in following:

**Theorem 2.** (*Decidability theorem*). *For every  $\omega$ -consistent recursive class  $\mathcal{K}$  of formulas, for all recursive class sings  $r$   $v Gen r$  belongs to  $Flg(\mathcal{K})$  whereas  $Neg(v Gen r)$  does not belong to  $Flg(\mathcal{K})$  (where  $v$  is the free variable of  $r$ ).*

Let us express the theorem symbolically:

$$\forall \mathcal{K}, \forall r \left[ (recursive(\mathcal{K}) \& \omega consist(\mathcal{K}) \& r \in \mathcal{K} \& recursive(r)) \supset \right. \\ \left. v Gen r \in Flg(\mathcal{K}) \& \overline{(Neg(v Gen r)) \in Flg(\mathcal{K})} \right].$$

*Proof.*

1.  $recursive(\mathcal{K})$  assumption 1
  2.  $recursive(\mathcal{K}) \supset r \in \mathcal{K} \vee \overline{r \in \mathcal{K}}$  Lemma 1
  3.  $r \in \mathcal{K} \vee \overline{r \in \mathcal{K}}$  *m.p.*, 2, 1
  4.  $r \in \mathcal{K}$  assumption 2
-

5.	$r \varepsilon \mathcal{X} \& (r \varepsilon \mathcal{X} \vee \overline{r \varepsilon \mathcal{X}})$	&-enter., 4, 3
6.	$r \varepsilon \mathcal{X} \& (r \varepsilon \mathcal{X} \vee \overline{r \varepsilon \mathcal{X}}) \equiv r \varepsilon \mathcal{X}$	elimination rule
7.	$r \varepsilon \mathcal{X} \& (r \varepsilon \mathcal{X} \vee \overline{r \varepsilon \mathcal{X}}) \supset r \varepsilon \mathcal{X}$	$\equiv$ -elim., 6
8.	$r \varepsilon \mathcal{X}$	<i>m.p.</i> , 7, 5
9.	$r \varepsilon \mathcal{X} \supset v \text{ Gen } r \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})$	Lemma 2
10.	$v \text{ Gen } r \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})$	<i>m.p.</i> , 9, 8
11.	$v \text{ Gen } r \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X}) \supset \overline{\exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})]}$	Lemma 3
12.	$\overline{\exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})]}$	<i>m.p.</i> , 11, 10
13.	$\omega \text{ consist}(\mathcal{X})$	assumption 3
14.	$\omega \text{ consist}(\mathcal{X}) \supset$ $\overline{\exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})] \vee [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})]}$	Lemma 4
15.	$\overline{\exists n [Sb(r_{Z(n)}^v) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})] \vee [Neg(v \text{ Gen } r) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})]}$	<i>m.p.</i> , 14, 13
16.	$\overline{[Neg(v \text{ Gen } r) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})]}$	resolution, 15, 12
17.	$\text{recursive}(r)$	assumption 4
18.	$\text{recursive}(r) \supset$ $Neg(v \text{ Gen } r) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X}) \vee v \text{ Gen } r \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})$	Lemma 5
19.	$Neg(v \text{ Gen } r) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X}) \vee v \text{ Gen } r \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})$	<i>m.p.</i> , 18, 17
20.	$v \text{ Gen } r \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})$	resolution, 19, 16
21.	$v \text{ Gen } r \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X}) \& \overline{[Neg(v \text{ Gen } r) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})]}$	&-enter., 20, 16
22.	$\text{recursive}(\mathcal{X}) \& \omega \text{ consist}(\mathcal{X}) \& r \varepsilon \mathcal{X} \& \text{recursive}(r)$	&-enter., 1, 4, 13, 17
23.	$(\text{recursive}(\mathcal{X}) \& \omega \text{ consist}(\mathcal{X}) \& r \varepsilon \mathcal{X} \& \text{recursive}(r)) \supset$ $v \text{ Gen } r \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X}) \& \overline{[Neg(v \text{ Gen } r) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})]}$	$\supset$ -enter., ass.-s elim., 1–4, 22, 21
24.	$\forall \mathcal{X}, \forall r \left[ (\text{recursive}(\mathcal{X}) \& \omega \text{ consist}(\mathcal{X}) \& \right.$ $\left. \& r \varepsilon \mathcal{X} \& \text{recursive}(r)) \supset \right.$ $\left. v \text{ Gen } r \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X}) \& \overline{[Neg(v \text{ Gen } r) \varepsilon \text{ Flg}(\mathcal{X})]} \right]$	twice $\forall$ -enter., 23

□

Q. E. D.

## References

- Bessonov A.V. Myths about the Gödel's theorems. In: Science. Philosophy. Society. The Materials of 5th Russian Congress of Philosophy. Vol. I. 127. Novosibirsk. (in russian) (2009)
- Carnap R. The logical syntax of language. London (2002)
- Church A. An unsolvable problem of elementary number theory. The American Journal of Mathematics. Vol. 58. 345-363 (1936a)
- Church A. A note on the Entscheidungsproblem. The Journal of Symbolic Logic. Vol. 1. 40-41 (1936b)
- Church A. Correction to a Note on the Entscheidungsproblem. The Journal of Symbolic Logic. Vol. 1(3). 101-102 (1936c)
- Damböck C. The philosophical (ir)relevance of Gödel's proof. URL: <http://homepage.univie.ac.at/christian.damboeck/texte/goedel060509.pdf>
- Davis M. (ed.) The undecidable. Basic papers on undecidable propositions, unsolvable problems and computable functions. Hewlett, N.Y. (1965)
- Filippovski V.A. An incorrectness of the original proof of the First Gödel's incompleteness theorem. In: Science. Philosophy. Society. The Materials of 5th Russian Congress of Philosophy. Vol. I. 136-137. Novosibirsk. (in russian) (2009)
- Franzén T. Gödel's theorem: an incomplete guide to its use and abuse. Wellesley, Massachusetts (2005)
- Franzén T. The popular impact of Gödel's incompleteness theorem. Notices of the AMS. Vol. 53, april. 440-444. URL: <http://www.ams.org/notices/200604/fea-franzen.pdf> (2006)
- Gödel K. Einige metamathematische Resultate über Entscheidungsdefinitheit und Widerspruchsfreiheit. Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Klasse, 19, 1930. 214-215; English translation: Gödel K. Some metamathematical results on completeness and consistency. In: van Heijenoort 1970, 86-87 (1930)
- Gödel K. Über Vollständigkeit und Widerspruchsfreiheit. Ergebnisse eines mathematischen Kolloquiums, 3, 1932. 12-13; English translation: Gödel K. On completeness and consistency. In: van Heijenoort 1970, 107-108 (1931a)
- Gödel K. Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der *Principia Mathematica* und verwandter System I. Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik, 38. 173-198; English translation: Gödel K. On formally undecidable propositions of *Principia Mathematica* and related systems I. In: van Heijenoort 1970, 87-108 (1931b)
- Gödel K. On undecidable propositions of formal mathematical systems. In: Davis 1965, 39-74 (1934)
- Guidi Fr. La proposizione di Gödel. California (2007)
- van Heijenoort J. (ed.) From Frege to Gödel: A source book in mathematical logic, 1879-1931. Cambridge, Massachusetts (1967)
- van Heijenoort J. (ed.) Frege and Gödel: Two fundamental texts in mathematical logic. Cambridge, Massachusetts (1970)
- Kleene St.C. Introduction to metamathematics. Moscow (in russian translation) (1957)
- Kleene St.C. Mathematical logic. Moscow (in russian translation) (2005)
- Kotlarski H. A model-theoretic approach to proof theory for arithmetic. In: Ehrenfeucht A., Marek V.W., Srebrny M. (ed.) Andrzej Mostowski and Foundational Studies. Amsterdam, Berlin, Oxford, Tokyo, Washington. 198-234 (2008)
- Lucas J.R. Minds, machines and Goedel. URL: <http://cogprints.org/356/0/lucas.html> (1961)

- Markov A.A. Elements of mathematical logic. In: Markov A.A. Selected papers. Vol. II. Moscow. 429-485 (in russian) (2003)
- Nagel Ern., Newman J.R. Gödel's proof. Moscow (in russian translation) (1970)
- Podnieks K.M. What is mathematics: Gödel's theorem and around. URL: <http://www.ltn.lv/~podnieks/gt.html> (1992, 2007)
- Rosser J.B. Extensions of some theorems of Gödel and Church. The Journal of Symbolic Logic. Vol. 1(3). 87-91 (1936)
- Rosser J.B. An informal exposition of proofs of Gödel's theorem and Church's theorem. The Journal of Symbolic Logic. Vol. 4. 53-60 (1939)
- Sieg W. Only two letters: the correspondence between Herbrand and Gödel. The bulletin of symbolic logic. Nov.21 (2004)
- Smirnov V.A. The theory of logical inference. Moscow (in russian) (1999)
- Smith P. An introduction to Gödel's theorems. Cambridge (2006)
- Smorynski Cr. The incompleteness theorems. In: Barwise J. (ed.). Handbook of mathematical logic. Amsterdam. 81-95 (1991)
- Smullyan R.M. Gödel's incompleteness theorems. N.Y., Oxford (1992)
- Takeuti G., Yasugi M., Passell N. Memoirs of a proof theorist: Gödel and other logicians. N.J., London (2003)
- Tselishchev V.V. A thinking algorithmization. The Gödel's argument. Novosibirsk (in russian) (2005)
- Uspenskij V.A. Gödel's incompleteness theorem. Moscow (in russian) (1982)