

Transitive Existential Paths

by Sven Nilsen, 2017

The concept of a transitive existential path $\exists(f \rightarrow g)$ formalizes what it means to have “information” and “symmetry” stored in some space and performing information-preserving transformations. It does so without referring to the specific data structure used to model the information. In addition, a modular transitive existential path $\exists(f \% g)$ gives solutions of infinite spaces $|\exists(f \% g)| == 1$ and groups $|\exists(f \% g)| == \infty$.

A transitive existential path of f by g with inverse g^{-1} is defined as the following:

$$\exists(f \rightarrow g) := \lambda(x : [\exists g] \text{ true}) = (\exists f)(g^{-1}(x))$$

$$\begin{aligned} g &: A \rightarrow A \\ g^{-1} &\leq=> \text{id}[id \rightarrow g] \end{aligned}$$

The transitive existential path of f by id is equal to the existential path:

$$\exists(f \rightarrow \text{id}) \leq=> \exists f$$

Repeated transformations is written:

$$\exists(f \rightarrow g^n) := \lambda(x : [\exists g^n] \text{ true}) = (\exists f)(g^{-n}(x))$$

$$n : \text{nat}$$

It is easy to see that the transitive existential path can be defined in terms of any “previously defined” transitive existential path:

$$\exists(f \rightarrow g^{n+m}) := \lambda(x : [\exists g^{n+m}] \text{ true}) = (\exists(f \rightarrow g^n))(g^{-m}(x))$$

$$n : \text{nat}$$

$$m : \text{nat}$$

$$g^0 \leq=> \text{id}$$

Some examples:

$$\exists(f \rightarrow g^1) := \lambda(x : [\exists g^1] \text{ true}) = (\exists f)(g^{-1}(x))$$

$$\exists(f \rightarrow g^2) := \lambda(x) = (\exists(f \rightarrow g^1))(g^{-1}(x))$$

$$\exists(f \rightarrow g^3) := \lambda(x) = (\exists(f \rightarrow g^2))(g^{-1}(x))$$

$$\exists(f \rightarrow g^3) := \lambda(x) = (\exists(f \rightarrow g^1))(g^{-2}(x))$$

As a closely related concept, a modular transitive existential path is a function returning `true` for `n` reducing to the existential path.

$$\exists(f \% g) : \text{nat} \rightarrow \text{bool}$$

The function captures a characteristic variable `n` such that the following condition is satisfied:

$$\forall x : \text{nat} \{ \exists(f \rightarrow g^{x \cdot n}) \Leftrightarrow \exists f \}$$

Notice that any natural number `m` multiplied with `n` is also a characteristic variable, so this forms a subset relationship between the two series of modular transitive existential paths:

$$\exists(f \% g^{n \cdot m}) \subseteq \exists(f \% g^n)$$

For infinite spaces, a modular transitive existential path is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists(f \% g) &:= \lambda(x : \text{nat}) = x == 0 \\ \exists(f \% g) &\Leftrightarrow (= 0) \end{aligned}$$

$$|\exists(f \% g)| == 1$$

For groups, a modular transitive existential path is defined as:

$$\exists(f \% g) := \lambda(x : \text{nat}) = (x \% n) == 0$$

$$|\exists(f \% g)| == \infty$$

A group is naturally unbounded, so you can change `nat` to `int`, if you want to.

This can also be done for infinite spaces, if there exists an inverse for all input. Remember that a transitive existential path got a domain constraint on the argument:

$$\exists(f \rightarrow g) := \lambda(x : [\exists g] \text{ true}) = (\exists f)(g^{-1}(x))$$

The domain constraint `[∃g] true` prevents `x` from taking on values that `g⁻¹` does not map to. If you wonder whether `g⁻¹` is a partial function, you are both right and wrong, because `g⁻¹ ⇔ id[id → g]` defines a logical equivalence between the path sets and supports partial functions of `g⁻¹` when this is the case.

For example, for real numbers a function `g` might return all values:

$$\exists g := (_ : \text{real}) = \text{true}$$

This means you can drop the constraint:

$$\exists(f \rightarrow g) := \lambda(x : \text{real}) = (\exists f)(g^{-1}(x))$$

A simple example of an infinite space is the `add(k)` function:

```
add(k) : nat → nat
add := \ (k : nat ∧ (> 0)) = \ (x : nat) = x + k
```

Let us say `f` is `even_sequence` and `g` is `add(k)`, it is just a matter of substitute and solve:

```
∃ (f → g) := \ (x : [∃ g] true) = (∃ f)(g-1(x))
∃ (even_sequence → add(k)) := \ (x : [∃ add(k)] true) = (∃ even_sequence)(add(k)-1(x))
  f <=> even_sequence
  g <=> add(k)
∃ (even_sequence → add(k)) := \ (x : [∃ add(k)] true) = (∃ even_sequence)(x - k)
  add(k)-1(x) = x - k
∃ (even_sequence → add(k)) := \ (x : [∃ add(k)] true) = even(x - k)
  ∃ even_sequence <=> even
```

The modular transitive existential path has only one solution, because if you move even numbers by adding with `k > 0`, you lose `0` from the transitive existential path.

```
(∃ (even_sequence → add(k : (> 0))))(0) = false
(∃ even_sequence)(0) <=> even(0) <=> true
```

```
∃ (even_sequence % add(k)) := \ (x : nat) = x == 0
```

```
|∃ (even_sequence % add(k))| == 1
```

A simple example of a group is one that increments numbers and maps back using modulus:

```
g := \ (x : nat) = (x + 1) % 8
```

Think of this as a rotating pattern where `f := [1, 3, 4, 7]`:

	■		■	■			■
■		■		■	■		
	■		■		■	■	
		■		■		■	■
■			■		■		■
■	■			■		■	
	■	■			■		■
■		■	■			■	
	■		■	■			■

After 8 rounds, we end up with the same pattern as we started with. This is because `g⁸ <=> g`. So, why not use `g`? Why do we have to worry about `f`? The reason is that some patterns repeats themselves more frequently, so to express this precisely we need to write `∃ (f % g)`.