

## A methodological remark on mathematical induction

This note is for the record: I know that I have shown the following during several lectures, but cannot remember that I ever wrote it down.

In the following,  $x$  and  $y$  range over the elements of a well-founded set  $(C, <)$ ;  $(C, <)$  being well-founded means that for any predicate  $P$  on  $C$

$$(0) \quad (\underline{\forall} x :: P.x) \equiv (\underline{\forall} x :: P'.x) ,$$

where  $P'$  is given in terms of  $P$  by

$$(1) \quad (\underline{\forall} x :: P'.x \equiv P.x \vee (\underline{\exists} y: y < x: \neg P.y)) .$$

This is what mathematical induction is about: instead of computing the left-hand side of (0), we can compute its right-hand side, and, if the value is true, the latter computation is "easier" because - see (1) -  $P'$  is formally weaker than  $P$ . Indeed, we deduce from (1) immediately

$$(2) \quad (\underline{\forall} x :: P.x \Rightarrow P'.x) .$$

\* \* \*

The right-hand side of (0) is of the same form as its left-hand side, so, why don't we make life still easier by repeating the trick, since

$$(\underline{\forall} x :: P'.x) \equiv (\underline{\forall} x :: P''.x)$$

where according to (1) - with  $P := P'$  -

$$(3) \quad (\underline{\forall} x :: P''.x \equiv P'.x \vee (\underline{\exists} y: y < x: \neg P.y)) .$$

Should we continue, and derive  $P'''$  to make life even easier? No, we can stop at  $P'$ , for we observe

For any  $x$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & P''_x \\
 = & \{(3)\} \\
 = & P'_x \vee (\exists y: y \ll x: \neg P'_y) \\
 = & \{(1)\} \\
 = & P_x \vee (\exists y: y \ll x: \neg P_y) \vee (\exists y: y \ll x: \neg P'_y) \\
 = & \{\text{predicate calculus}\} \\
 = & P_x \vee (\exists y: y \ll x: \neg P_y \vee \neg P'_y) \\
 = & \{(2) \text{ and predicate calculus}\} \\
 = & P_x \vee (\exists y: y \ll x: \neg P_y) \\
 = & \{(1)\} \\
 = & P'_x
 \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the decision to demonstrate the truth of  $(\forall x: P_x)$  by mathematical induction is idempotent: it can be taken once, but then the proof obligation has reached a fixpoint.

Austin, 22 March 1987

prof. dr. Edsger W. Dijkstra  
 Department of Computer Sciences  
 The University of Texas at Austin  
 Austin, TX 78712 - 1188  
 USA