

Tue Oct 25, 2011

Recall the issue we faced last time;

What is the realizing computational evidence for

induction: $(A(0) \wedge \forall x. A(x) \Rightarrow A(Sx)) \Rightarrow \forall x. A(x)$?

How do we use $A(0)$ and the function witnessing

$\forall x. (A(x) \Rightarrow A(Sx))$ to produce the function for $\forall x. A(x)$?

We need $\lambda(h. \text{spread}(h; b, f. \underline{\quad}))$ and ?

must provide a realizer for $\forall x. A(x)$.

We saw that

$A(0)$	$A(1)$	$A(2)$...
by	by	by	
a_0	$f(0)(a_0)$	$f(1)(f(0)(a_0))$	
	a_1	a_2	

But \dots can't be \dots . It must be a computation expression,

a program. Something like `let rec ind(x) = f(x-1)(ind(x-1))`

might work. In this case we need $x > 0$ to allow $f(x-1)$.

What about the 0 case? Then we use the base, b . Thus

$$\text{ind}(x) = \underline{\text{if}} \ x=0 \ \underline{\text{then}} \ b \\ \underline{\text{else}} \ f(x-1, \text{ind}(x-1))$$

In the Nuprl style proof rules we use

$\text{ind}(x; b; u, i. f(u, i))$ with these computation rules.

$\text{ind}(0; b; _ \downarrow b$ $\text{ind}(Sx; b; u, i. f(u, i)) \downarrow f(x, \text{ind}(x; b; u, i. f(u, i)))$

Tue Oct 25, 2011

We use the induction form for all computation on numbers.

For example, to decide whether a number is zero, we compute with $\text{ind}(x; *, \mu, i. _)$ where $_$ is any computation form that "aborts" like $\text{ap}(0; 0)$.

We can use ind to prove statements such as

1. $\forall x. (Z(x) \vee \sim Z(x))$
2. $\forall x, y. (E_q(x, y) \vee \sim E_q(x, y))$
3. $\forall x (\sim Z(x) \Rightarrow \exists y. \text{Suc}(y, x))$

We can use induction to prove

4. $\forall x, y. \exists z. \text{Add}(x, y, z)$
5. $\forall x, y. \exists z. \text{Mult}(x, y, z)$

We will prove 4 below. You should try 1, 2, 3, 5 as exercises. Also try 6 below.

6. Define $x < y$ iff $\exists z. (x + z = y \wedge z \neq 0)$. Show:
 - (a) $x < \text{S}(x)$
 - (b) $(x < y \wedge y < z) \Rightarrow x < z$
 - (c) $\sim(x < x)$

CS 5860

Using Induction

Tue Oct 25, 2011

Recall 1. $\forall y. \text{Add}(0, y, y)$ Kleene Ax 18 $\text{add}(0, y) = y$

2. $\forall x, y, z. (\text{Add}(x, y, z) \Rightarrow \text{Add}(s(x), y, s(z)))$

Kleene Ax 19 $\text{add}(s(x), y) = s(\text{add}(x, y))$

We show Theorem $\forall x, y. \exists z. \text{Add}(x, y, z)$ by induction (Kleene Ax 13)

$\vdash \forall x. \forall y. \exists z. \text{Add}(x, y, z)$ by $\lambda(x. _)$

$x:0 \vdash \forall y. \exists z. \text{Add}(x, y, z)$ by $\lambda(y. _)$

$x:0, y:0 \vdash \exists z. \text{Add}(x, y, z)$ by $\text{ind}(x; _ ; u; i)$

$\vdash \exists z. \text{Add}(0, y, z)$ by $\langle y, _ \rangle$

$\vdash 0$ by y

$\vdash \text{Add}(0, y, y)$ by $\text{ap}(\text{ax18}; y)$

$x:0, y:0, \underline{u}:0, \underline{i}:\exists z. \text{Add}(u, y, z) \vdash \exists z. \text{Add}(s(u), y, z)$ by $\text{spread}(i; z_0, a. _)$

$z_0:0, a:\text{Add}(u, y, z_0) \vdash \exists z. \text{Add}(s(u), y, z)$ by $\langle s(z_0), _ \rangle$

$\vdash 0$ $s(z_0)$

$\vdash \text{Add}(s(u), y, s(z_0))$

$\text{ax19}(): \text{Add}(_ , y, z) \Rightarrow \text{Add}(s(_), y, s(z))$

by $\text{ap}(\text{ax19}(s(u), y, s(z_0)))$

$\lambda(x. \lambda(y. \text{ind}(\langle y, \text{ap}(\text{ax18}; y) \rangle ;$

$u, i. \text{spread}(i; z_0, a. \langle s(z_0), \text{ap}(\text{ax19}(s(u), y, s(z_0)) \rangle) \rangle))$

Tue Oct 25, 2011

The computation form $\text{ind}(x; b; u, i.f)$ is recursive. You might know that recursion is more expensive than iteration. Can we use computational forms such as

$$\underline{\text{for}} \ i = 0 \text{ to } n \ \underline{\text{do}} \ x := f(i, x) \ \underline{\text{od}}$$

as forms of induction? We'd be computing

$$f(0, x_0), f(1, f(0, x_0)), f(2, f(1, f(0, x_0))), \dots$$

If we set $x = b$, this would be a version of induction. Here is another version.

$$\begin{aligned} &x := b ; i := 0 \\ &\underline{\text{while}} \ i < x \ \underline{\text{do}} \\ &\quad x := f(i, x) \\ &\underline{\text{od}} \end{aligned}$$

It would be interesting to see if we can treat

$$\begin{aligned} &\underline{\text{while}} \ b(x) \ \underline{\text{do}} \\ &\quad x := f(x) \\ &\underline{\text{od}} \end{aligned}$$

as a realizer in pure first-order logic. We will consider this further on Thursday.

Tue Oct 25, 2011

We can have a more efficient form of induction if we used a "tail recursive" or iterative form. For example, we can define an iterative add that uses only a constant amount of space vs a linear amount.

$\text{add}(x, y) = \text{it-add}(x, y, 1)$ where

$\text{it-add}(x, y, z) =$

if $x = 0$ then z

else $\text{it-add}(x-1, y, z+1)$

What is the iterative form of induction?