

Materna, Pavel

## Set of methods and set of problems

*Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. B, Řada filozofická.*  
1967, vol. 16, iss. B14, pp. [87]-90

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/106694>

Access Date: 03. 12. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

PAVEL MATERNA

## SET OF METHODS AND SET OF PROBLEMS

The term „method“ may be explicated in two ways: the explication is either dependent on the term “problem” or it is not dependent on it.

We are going to give here independent explication, which will enable us to find some relationships between the set of methods and the set of problems. No proofs are given in this sketch.

**Definition 1:** *Method  $M$*  is a set of instructions determining operations that correlate to each element  $a_i$  of a class  $A_M$  (“input data”) a certain element  $b_i$  of a class  $B_M$  (“output data”).

**Definition 2:** A. *Problem  $P$*  is given by the pair  $\{A_P, B_P\}$  and by the task to correlate to each element  $a_i$  of the class  $A_P$  a certain element  $b_i$  of the class  $B_P$ .

B. a) *Problem  $P$*  is *singular* just when  $A_P$  contains a single element.

b) *Problem  $P$*  is *general* just when  $A_P$  contains more than one element.

c) *Problem  $P$*  is *decision problem* just when  $B_P$  is the set  $\{1, 0\}$  the elements of which we correlate to the elements  $a_i$  according to whether  $F(a_i)$  is valid or not, where  $F$  stands for a predicate constant applicable to objects  $a_i$ .

**Definition 3:** *Method  $M$*  solves problem  $P$  just when  $A_P$  is identical with a subclass  $A'_M$  of the class  $A_M$ ,  $B_P$  is identical with a subclass  $B'_M$  of the class  $B_M$ , and the classes  $A'_M$  and  $B'_M$  determine some method  $M'$  in the sense of Definition 1. (consequently, we have  $A'_M = A_M$ , and  $B'_M = B_M$ ), and each element  $f(a_i)$  generated by the application of  $M'$  to  $a_i^M$ ,  $a_i^M \in A'_M$ , is identical with the element  $b_i$ ,  $b_i \in B'_P$ , which is to be correlated to the element  $a_i^P$ ,  $a_i^P \in A_P$ ,  $a_i^P = a_i^M$ .

**Note:** Method  $M'$ , of course, also solves problem  $P$ , since it contains itself as a subclass.

**Example for Definition 3:** Method  $M$ , which solves problem  $P_1$  of recognizing well formed formulae of the predicate calculus [Church § 30] also solves problem  $P_2$  of recognizing well formed formulae of the propositional calculus:  $A'_M$  will be the class of combinations of propositional variables and signs  $\sim, \supset, [ , ]$ , (which is subclass of  $A_M$ ),  $B'_M$  will be the set  $\{1, 0\}$  (which is improper subclass of  $B_M$ ), and there exists a set of instructions for operations transforming  $A'_M$  into  $B'_M$  according to Def. 1. i. e. method  $M'$  (derivable from [Church § 20]). Problem  $P_2$  is thus solved both by method  $M$  and method  $M'$ .

**Definition 4:** Problem  $P$  is *solvable* just when there exists a method that solves problem  $P$ .

**Agreement:** We exclude from our considerations cases in which transfinite sets would be elements of  $B_M$  and  $B_P$ .

**Statement 1 a)** A decision problem is solvable just when the respective predicate  $F$  is general recursive.

*Argumentation.* If  $F$  is general recursive, then the characteristic function  $f$  of this predicate defined on the class  $A_P$  is general recursive too. Consequently there exists such a method  $M$  that  $A_M = A_P$  and  $M$  satisfies Def. 1.

Conversely: If there exists a method  $M$  satisfying Def. 3, then the application of this method to objects  $a_i$  is equivalent (vide Definition 2 B c) to the computation of the characteristic function  $f$  of predicate  $F$ . On the basis of our Agreement, the existence of such a method warrants the intuitive computability of function  $f$ , and consequently — provided that Church's thesis is valid — its general recursiveness.

**Statement 1 b)** The problem is solvable just when for  $a_i \in A_P$ ,  $x_i \in B_P$  the identity  $f(a_i) = x_i$  is valid, where  $f$  is a general recursive function.

It is obvious that Statement 1 a) follows from Statement 1 b) as a special case.

**Statement 2:** A problem may be correlated to each function.

To each  $n$ -argument function  $f_j^n$ ,  $j, n = 1, 2, \dots$  we correlate a class  $A_{P_j} = \{ \langle z_1, \dots, z_n \rangle_i \}$  of all  $n$ -tuples on the basis of which  $f_j^n$  has been defined, and the class  $B_{P_j} = \{ x_i \}$ , where  $x_i$  is the value of function  $f_j^n$  for the  $i$ -th  $n$ -tuple of arguments.

*Considering the set of all functions.* Let  $\mathcal{F}_{1R}$  be the set of definable general recursive functions,  $\mathcal{F}_{1\bar{R}}$  the set of the other definable functions,  $\mathcal{F}_1$  the set of definable functions, and  $\mathcal{F}_2$  the set of undefinable functions. Consequently the set of all functions  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}_{1R} \cup \mathcal{F}_{1\bar{R}} \cup \mathcal{F}_2$  and not a single one of the mentioned sets is empty.

(The nonemptiness of set  $\mathcal{F}_2$  is the consequence of the existence of undefinable relations — vide e. g. [Grzegorzczuk] —, but thinkable is also such a conception of existence in which this set may be considered to be empty. This circumstance will not influence our further interpretation — vide *Considering the set of all problems*). The nondenumerability of set  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$ , as well as the denumerability of sets  $\mathcal{F}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{1R}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{1\bar{R}}$  is evident.

*Considering the set of all problems.* This consideration is the consequence of the preceding *Consideration* and of Statement 2. Let  $\mathcal{P}_{1S}$  be the set of definable solvable problems (of element 0 of Medvedev's set  $\Omega$  — [Medvedev]),  $\mathcal{P}_{1\bar{S}}$  the set of unsolvable definable problems,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  the set of definable problems, and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  the set of undefinable problems. Consequently the set of all problems  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2 = \mathcal{P}_{1S} \cup \mathcal{P}_{1\bar{S}} \cup \mathcal{P}_2$  and none of the mentioned sets is empty.

(As far as the nonemptiness of set  $\mathcal{P}_2$  is concerned, we shall not take this set into consideration any longer having obtained information from [Wittgenstein §§ 5, 6 and 7].

Theoretically we might further consider some set of "pseudoproblems" for which  $\sim (\exists f) . f(a_i) = x_i$  is valid. We shall not consider this set either (just as Medvedev).

*Relationship between the set of problems  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and the set of methods  $\mathcal{M}$*

Note: By agreement, we have excluded from the concept of the method such sets of instructions as "add a stroke to the given term," the application of which generates (potentially) an infinite series of strokes.

**Statement 3:** Each method solves at least one problem of set  $\mathcal{P}_{1S}$ .

Statement 3 follows from the given definitions.

**Definition 5:** Method  $M_i$  is equivalent to method  $M_j$  ( $M_i \equiv_M M_j$ ), just when  $A_{M_i} = A_{M_j}$  and  $f_{M_i}(a_i) = f_{M_j}(a_i)$ .

Note: The existence of pairs of equivalent methods can be empirically verified.

**Statement 4.** The relation  $\equiv_M$  is reflexive, symmetrical and transitive in set  $M$ .

Statement 4 is evident.

From Statement 4 follows the possibility of defining equivalence classes of methods: let  $|M_i|$  be the class of methods equivalent to method  $M_i$ .

**Statement 5.**  $M_i \equiv_M M_j$  just in that case when the class of problems that are solved by method  $M_i$  is identical with the class of problems that are solved by method  $M_j$ .

Statement 5 follows from Definition 3 and Definition 5.

We are going to write now some results concerning the relationship of set  $M$  and set  $\mathcal{P}_1$  in one of the standard ways of writing expressions of predicate logic (for the sake of brevity).  $S(v, w)$  will stand for the relation "v solves w" in the sense of Definition 3.

**Statement 6.** The following relationships are valid between set  $\mathcal{M}$  and set  $\mathcal{P}_1$ :

- a)  $(\exists x) (y) (x \in \mathcal{P}_1 \ \& \ y \in \mathcal{M} \supset \sim S(y, x))$ ;
- b)  $(x) (x \in \mathcal{M} \supset (\exists y) (y \in \mathcal{P}_{1S} \ \& \ S(x, y)))$ ; (Statement 3)
- c)  $(x) (x \in \mathcal{P}_{1S} \supset (\exists y) (y \in \mathcal{M} \ \& \ S(y, x)))$ ;
- d)  $(x) (x \in \mathcal{P}_{1\bar{S}} \supset \sim (\exists y) (y \in \mathcal{M} \ \& \ S(y, x)))$ ;
- e)  $\sim (x) \{x \in \mathcal{P}_{1S} \supset (\exists y) (y \in \mathcal{M} \ \& \ S(y, x) \ \& \ (z) [z \in \mathcal{M} \ \& \ S(z, x) \supset z = y])]\}$ ; (i. e. we cannot speak about mapping set  $\mathcal{P}_{1S}$  into set  $\mathcal{M}$ ).
- f)  $\sim (x) (x \in \mathcal{M} \supset (\exists y) \{y \in \mathcal{P}_{1S} \ \& \ S(x, y) \ \& \ (z) [z \in \mathcal{P}_{1S} \ \& \ S(x, z) \supset z = y]\})$ ; (i. e. we cannot speak about mapping set  $\mathcal{M}$  into set  $\mathcal{P}_{1S}$ ).
- g)  $\sim (x) (x \in \mathcal{P}_{1S} \supset (\exists i) \{(y) (y \in |M_i| \supset S(y, x)) \ \& \ (j) (j \neq i \supset (z) (z \in |M_j| \supset \sim S(z, x)))\})$ ,

#### REFERENCES

- A. Church: *Introduction to Mathematical Logic I*. Princeton University Press 1956.
- A. Grzegorzczuk: Konsekwencje teoriopoznawcze dwóch twierdzeń metamatematyki. *Studia filozoficzne* 5 (42), 1965, 115—118.
- U. T. Medvedev: Stépni trudnosti massovyh problém. *Papers of the Ac. Sc. of the USSR* 104 (1955), 501—504 (russian).
- L. Wittgenstein: *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus*. London 1955

Translated by Mikoláš Adler

**MNOŽINA METOD A MNOŽINA PROBLÉMŮ**

Článek informuje o některých jednoduchých vztazích mezi množinou metod a množinou problémů. Činí tak na základě definice pojmů: problém, metoda, řešit, a některých tvrzení vyplývajících z teorie rekurzivních funkcí. Za důležité, byť i velice elementární tvrzení pokládá autor zejména větu, že nelze zobrazit množinu řešitelných problémů do množiny metod, ani množinu metod do množiny řešitelných problémů.