## A SEMANTICAL PROOF OF THE UNDECIDABILITY OF THE MONADIC INTUITIONISTIC PREDICATE CALCULUS OF THE FIRST ORDER

## JEKERI OKEE

A constructive proof of the undecidability of the monadic intuitionistic predicate calculus of the first order was given in [3]. We shall denote this calculus with "MIP". The aim of this article is to give a proof of the undecidability of the MIP, using Kripke semantics. We shall show that the class of formulae of the MIP which contain only two predicate variables is undecidable. We shall denote this class by  $\mathcal{L}$ . It is well known that in the classical two-valued predicate calculus of the first order, the class of formulae which contain only one binary predicate variable is undecidable. We shall denote this class by M. Let K be the class of all formulae of the intuitionistic predicate calculus of the first order, then we can obtain any formula  $H \in \mathbf{M}$  from K, by simply interpreting classically every propositional functor and every quantifier occurring in H. Since M is undecidable, it follows that the class K' of all formulae of K with only one binary predicate variable is also undecidable. To prove the undecidability of  $\mathcal L$  we shall assign, to every closed formula  $H \in K'$ , a formula  $H^* \in \mathcal{L}$  such that H is valid in K if and only if  $H^*$  is valid in MIP, then since K' is undecidable, it follows that  $\mathcal{L}$  is also undecidable. The details of Kripke semantics will be assumed (see [1]).

The following definitions are given in [1], p. 94, namely:

- (a)  $\phi(A \land B, H) = T$  iff  $\phi(A, H) = (B, H) = T$ , otherwise  $\phi(A \land B, H) = F$ ,
- (b)  $\phi(A \vee B, H) = T$  iff  $\phi(A, H) = T$  or  $\phi(B, H) = T$ , otherwise  $\phi(A \vee B, H) = F$ ,
- (c)  $\phi(A \to B, H) = T$  iff for all  $H' \in K$  such that H R H',  $\phi(A, H) = F$  or  $\phi(B, H) = T$ , otherwise  $\phi(A \to B) = F$ ,
- (d)  $\phi(\sim A, H) = T$  iff for all  $H' \in K$  such that HRH',  $\phi(A, H') = F$ , otherwise,  $\phi(\sim A, H) = F$ .

In addition to the above definitions we shall add the following:

(e)  $\phi(\sim A, H) = T$  iff there exist an  $H' \in K$  such that  $\phi(A, H') = T$ , otherwise,  $\phi(\sim A, H) = F$ .

The definition (e) is clearly consistent with the definitions (a)-(d).