

5. Some Techniques for Defining PR Functions

5.1 Explicit Definability

This is a convenient method for showing that certain functions are PR.

Given a sequence $\vec{g} \equiv g_1, \dots, g_m$ of functions of arity r_1, \dots, r_m , and a sequence $\vec{x} \equiv x_1, \dots, x_n$ of *indeterminates* or *variables*, the class ***Expr***(\vec{g}, \vec{x}) of ***expressions in*** \vec{g}, \vec{x} is defined inductively by:

1. $x_i \in \mathbf{Expr}(\vec{g}, \vec{x})$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$),
2. $\bar{0} \in \mathbf{Expr}(\vec{g}, \vec{x})$, where $\bar{0}$ a symbol for the number 0,
3. If $E \in \mathbf{Expr}(\vec{g}, \vec{x})$, then so is $\bar{S}(E)$,
where \bar{S} is a symbol for the successor function S ,
4. If $E_1, \dots, E_{r_i} \in \mathbf{Expr}(\vec{g}, \vec{x})$, so is $\bar{g}_i(E_1, \dots, E_{r_i})$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$),
where \bar{g}_i is a symbol for the function g_i .

(More on inductive definitions can be found in [Kle52], §55.)

Since each expression in \vec{g}, \vec{x} represents an *explicit definition* of an n -ary function, we say that f is ***explicitly definable from*** \vec{g} iff $f = \lambda \vec{x} \cdot E$ for some $E \in \mathbf{Expr}(\vec{g}, \vec{x})$.

Examples. (1) $E \equiv \mathbf{exp}(y, 2) \dot{-} \mathbf{sqrt}(x + y)$.

Then $E \in \mathbf{Expr}(\mathbf{exp}, \mathbf{sqrt}, +, \dot{-}, x, y)$.

Note that E ***defines a function relative to a list of variables*** \vec{x} , where $\mathbf{var}(E) \subseteq \vec{x}$.

In this case, take $\vec{x} \equiv (x, y)$.

Then $f = \lambda x, y \cdot E = \lambda x, y \cdot (\mathbf{exp}(y, 2) \dot{-} \mathbf{sqrt}(x + y))$,

i.e., $f(x, y) = \mathbf{exp}(y, 2) \dot{-} \mathbf{sqrt}(x + y)$,

(2) The constant function $C_k^n = \lambda \vec{x} \cdot k$ is explicitly defined from $\langle \rangle$ by the numeral $\bar{k} =_{df} \underbrace{\bar{S}(\dots \bar{S}(\bar{0}) \dots)}_{k \text{ times}}$.

Note. In general we will not distinguish between functions and their symbols, or between numbers and their numerals.

Definition. $\text{ED}(\vec{g})$ is the class of functions explicitly definable from \vec{g} .

Theorem 5.1. $\text{ED}(\vec{g}) \subseteq \text{PR}(\vec{g})$.

Hence if $\vec{g} \in \text{PR}$, then $\text{ED}(\vec{g}) \subseteq \text{PR}$.

Proof: We must show:

$$f \text{ expl. def. by } E \text{ from } \vec{g} \implies f \in \text{PR}(\vec{g})$$

by

- *structural induction* on E , or
- *CVI* on $\text{compl}(E)$.

(Details in class.) \square

Corollary 5.2. In particular, we can define new PR functions from old by:

- (a) *permuting arguments*, e.g. $f(x, y) = g(y, x)$
- (b) *using dummy arguments*, e.g. $f(x, y, z) = g(x, y)$
- (c) *identifying arguments*, e.g. $f(x) = g(x, x)$
- (d) *substituting numerals for arguments*, e.g. $f(x) = g(\bar{2}, x)$
- (e) *any combination of the above*.

Proof: (a) $f \in \text{PR}(\vec{g})$ since

$$f(x, y) = g(U_2^2(x, y), U_1^2(x, y)).$$

(b)-(e) Similarly. \square

EXAMPLE:

If $f(x, y, z) = g(x, h(z, k(x)), \bar{2})$, then f is explicitly definable from g, h, k .
Putting $\vec{x} \equiv (x_1, x_2, x_3)$,

$$f(\vec{x}) = g(U_1^3(\vec{x}), h(U_3^3(\vec{x}), k(U_1^3(\vec{x})), C_2^3(\vec{x}))),$$

which suggests a PR-derivation of f from g, h, k .

- So from now on, we will freely use *explicit definitions*, as well as *infix* and *postfix* notation, to show that functions are PR.

More examples of PR functions:

- **Exponential** $\exp(x, y) = x^y$

Defined by *primitive recursion on the second argument*:

$$\begin{cases} \exp(x, 0) = 1 \\ \exp(x, y + 1) = \exp(x, y) * x. \end{cases}$$

- **Predecessor** $pd(x) = \begin{cases} x - 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \end{cases}$

By primitive recursion:

$$\begin{cases} pd(0) = 0 \\ pd(x + 1) = x. \end{cases}$$

- **Monus** $x \dot{-} y = \begin{cases} x - y & \text{if } x \geq y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

By primitive recursion on the second argument:

$$\begin{cases} x \dot{-} 0 = x \\ x \dot{-} (y + 1) = pd(x \dot{-} y). \end{cases}$$

- **Absolute difference** $\lambda x, y. |x - y|$

By *explicit definition* from **monus** and **sum** which are both PR:

$$|x - y| = (x \dot{-} y) + (y \dot{-} x).$$

- **Zero predicate (characteristic function of 0)**

$$\mathbf{zero}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

By primitive recursion:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{zero}(0) = 1 \\ \mathbf{zero}(x + 1) = 0 \end{cases}$$

or by explicit definition from *monus*: $\mathbf{zero}(x) = 1 \dot{-} x$.

- **Characteristic function of positive integers**

$$\mathbf{pos}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

By primitive recursion:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{pos}(0) = 0 \\ \mathbf{pos}(x + 1) = 1. \end{cases}$$

- **Equality predicate (char. fn. of equality)**

$$\mathbf{eq}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

By explicit definition:

$$\mathbf{eq}(x, y) = \mathbf{zero}(|x - y|).$$

- **Less-than-or-equal predicate**

$$\mathbf{leq}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

By explicit definition:

$$\mathbf{leq}(x, y) = \mathbf{zero}(x \dot{-} y)$$

Theorem 5.3. *Let P and Q be n -ary predicates. Define the predicates*

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(\vec{x}) &\Leftrightarrow \neg P(\vec{x}), \\ R_2(\vec{x}) &\Leftrightarrow P(\vec{x}) \wedge Q(\vec{x}), \text{ and} \\ R_3(\vec{x}) &\Leftrightarrow P(\vec{x}) \vee Q(\vec{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Then $R_1 \in \text{PR}(P)$ and $R_2, R_3 \in \text{PR}(P, Q)$. More informally, the predicate $\neg P$ is PR in P , and the predicates $P \wedge Q$, and $P \vee Q$ are PR in P, Q . Hence if $P, Q \in \text{PR}$, then so are $\neg P, P \wedge Q, P \vee Q$.

Proof: By explicit definition:

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(\vec{x}) &= \mathbf{zero}(P(\vec{x})), \\ R_2(\vec{x}) &= P(\vec{x}) * Q(\vec{x}), \text{ and} \\ R_3(\vec{x}) &= \mathbf{pos}(P(\vec{x}) + Q(\vec{x})). \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively for R_3 , by De Morgan's law, $P \vee Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$. \square

Hence

- **Less predicate** $\lambda x, y. x < y$

is PR, since $x < y \Leftrightarrow \neg(y \leq x)$.

Lemma 5.4 (Definition by cases). *Define f by*

$$f(\vec{x}) \simeq \begin{cases} g(\vec{x}) & \text{if } P(\vec{x}) \\ h(\vec{x}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $f \in \text{PR}(g, h, P)$. Hence if $g, h, P \in \text{PR}$, then so is f .

Proof: $f(\vec{x}) \simeq g(\vec{x}) * P(\vec{x}) + h(\vec{x}) * \mathbf{zero}(P(\vec{x}))$. \square

Lemma 5.5. Let P be an n -ary predicate, and f_1, \dots, f_n m -ary functions. Define the predicate

$$Q(\vec{x}) = P(f_1(\vec{x}), \dots, f_n(\vec{x})).$$

Then $Q \in \text{PR}(P, f_1, \dots, f_n)$. Hence if $P, f_1, \dots, f_n \in \text{PR}$, then so is Q .

Proof: By composition. \square

Corollary 5.6. Given m -ary functions f_1, f_2 , define the predicate

$$Q(\vec{x}) = (f_1(\vec{x}) = f_2(\vec{x})).$$

Then $Q \in \text{PR}(f_1, f_2)$. Hence if $f_1, f_2 \in \text{PR}$, then so is Q .

Note: In Lemma 5.5 and Cor. 5.6, if the f 's are total, then Q is a predicate.

EXERCISES:

1. Does the converse of Theorem 5.1 hold, i.e., $\text{PR}(\vec{g}) \subseteq \text{ED}(\vec{g})$? If so, prove it. If not, state a modified result which *is* true, and prove it.
2. (**Generalised definition by cases**) Let, for some $n \geq 2$, g_1, \dots, g_n be functions and P_1, \dots, P_{n-1} predicates. For the function f , as defined below, show that $f \in \text{PR}(g_1, \dots, g_n, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$. Hence if $\vec{g}, \vec{P} \in \text{PR}$, then so is f . (*Hint:* Induction on n with basis $n = 2$).

$$f(\vec{x}) \simeq \begin{cases} g_1(\vec{x}) & \text{if } P_1(\vec{x}) \\ g_2(\vec{x}) & \text{if } \neg P_1(\vec{x}) \wedge P_2(\vec{x}) \\ g_3(\vec{x}) & \text{if } \neg P_1(\vec{x}) \wedge \neg P_2(\vec{x}) \wedge P_3(\vec{x}) \\ \vdots & \\ g_{n-1}(\vec{x}) & \text{if } \neg P_1(\vec{x}) \wedge \dots \wedge \neg P_{n-2}(\vec{x}) \wedge P_{n-1}(\vec{x}) \\ g_n(\vec{x}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

5.2 Finite sums and products.

Theorem 5.7. *Let f be an $(n+1)$ -ary function. Let*

$$g(y, \vec{x}) = \sum_{z < y} f(z, \vec{x}), \quad h(y, \vec{x}) = \prod_{z < y} f(z, \vec{x}).$$

Then $g, h \in \text{PR}(f)$. Hence if $f \in \text{PR}$, then so are g, h .

Proof: Define g, h by *primitive recursion* on y :

$$\begin{cases} g(0, \vec{x}) = 0 \\ g(y+1, \vec{x}) = g(y, \vec{x}) + f(y, \vec{x}), \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} h(0, \vec{x}) = 1 \\ h(y+1, \vec{x}) = h(y, \vec{x}) * f(y, \vec{x}). \end{cases} \quad \square$$

Corollary 5.8. *Let*

$$g'(y, \vec{x}) = \sum_{z=0}^y f(z, \vec{x}), \quad h'(y, \vec{x}) = \prod_{z=0}^y f(z, \vec{x}).$$

Then $g', h' \in \text{PR}(f)$.

Proof: $g'(y, \vec{x}) = g(y+1, \vec{x})$, and $h'(y, \vec{x}) = h(y+1, \vec{x})$. \square

Corollary 5.9. *Let*

$$g''(y, \vec{x}) = \sum_{z=1}^y f(z, \vec{x}), \quad h''(y, \vec{x}) = \prod_{z=1}^y f(z, \vec{x}).$$

Then $g'', h'' \in \text{PR}(f)$.

EXERCISE: Prove Corollary 5.9.

5.3 Bounded quantification.

Theorem 5.10. *Let P be an $(n+1)$ -ary predicate. Let*

$$Q(y, \vec{x}) = (\exists z < y)P(z, \vec{x})$$

$$\text{and } R(y, \vec{x}) = (\forall z < y)P(z, \vec{x}).$$

Then $Q, R \in \text{PR}(P)$. Hence if $P \in \text{PR}$, then so are Q and R .

Proof:

$$R(y, \vec{x}) = \prod_{z < y} P(z, \vec{x})$$

$$\text{and } Q(y, \vec{x}) = \text{pos}(\sum_{z < y} P(z, \vec{x})),$$

or alternatively, $Q(y, \vec{x}) \Leftrightarrow \neg((\forall z < y) \neg P(z, \vec{x})). \quad \square$

Corollary 5.11. *Let*

$$Q'(y, \vec{x}) = (\exists z \leq y)P(z, \vec{x})$$

$$\text{and } R'(y, \vec{x}) = (\forall z \leq y)P(z, \vec{x}).$$

Then $Q', R' \in \text{PR}(P)$. Hence if $P \in \text{PR}$, then so are Q' and R' .

Corollary 5.12. *Let*

$$Q''(y, \vec{x}) \simeq (\exists z < f(y, \vec{x}))P(z, \vec{x})$$

$$\text{and } R''(y, \vec{x}) \simeq (\forall z < f(y, \vec{x}))P(z, \vec{x}).$$

Then $Q'', R'' \in \text{PR}(f, P)$. Hence if $f, P \in \text{PR}$, then so are Q'' and R'' .

Intuitively, **bounded quantification** is **effective** in P since there are only finitely many cases to check, whereas **unbounded quantification** is **not** (in general).

EXERCISE: Prove Corollaries 5.11 and 5.12.

5.4 Bounded minimalisation (μ).

Theorem 5.13. *Let P be an $(n+1)$ -ary predicate. Let*

$$f(y, \vec{x}) = (\mu z < y)P(z, \vec{x}),$$

i.e., “the least $z < y$ such that $P(z, \vec{x})$ holds, if such z exists; y otherwise.” Then $f \in \text{PR}(P)$. Hence if $P \in \text{PR}$, then so is f .

Proof: Put

$$g(y, \vec{x}) = \sum_{z < y} \prod_{t < z} \mathbf{zero}(P(t, \vec{x})). \quad (1)$$

Clearly, $g \in \text{PR}(P)$. We will show that $f = g$. There are two cases:

- Case 1: There exists $t < y$ such that $P(t, \vec{x})$ is true, i.e. $P(t, \vec{x}) = 1$. Let t_0 be the least such t . Then, for any $t < t_0$, $P(t, \vec{x}) = 0$ so that $\mathbf{zero}(P(t, \vec{x})) = 1$, and $\mathbf{zero}(P(t_0, \vec{x})) = 0$. So for all z ,

$$\prod_{t < z} \mathbf{zero}(P(t, \vec{x})) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } z < t_0 \\ 0 & \text{if } z \geq t_0 \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{z < y} \prod_{t < z} \mathbf{zero}(P(t, \vec{x})) = \underbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}_{t_0 \text{ times}} + 0 + 0 + \cdots = t_0 \quad (2)$$

- Case 2: For all $t < y$, $P(t, \vec{x})$ is false, i.e. $P(t, \vec{x}) = 0$. Clearly, $\mathbf{zero}(P(t, \vec{x})) = 1$. So for all $z < y$,

$$\prod_{t < z} \mathbf{zero}(P(t, \vec{x})) = 1.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{z < y} \prod_{t < z} \mathbf{zero}(P(t, \vec{x})) = \underbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}_y = y. \quad (3)$$

From (1), (2) and (3):

$$g(y, \vec{x}) = \begin{cases} \text{“least } z < y \text{ such that } P(z, \vec{x}) \\ \text{if such } z \text{ exists” (Case 1)} \\ y & \text{otherwise (Case 2).} \end{cases}$$

Hence $f = g \in \text{PR}(P)$. \square

NOTE:

The condition that there is no $z < y$ s.t. $P(z, \vec{x})$ holds is an “*error case*” for $f(y, \vec{x})$. In this case, we set $f(\vec{x}) = y$ to indicate *without ambiguity* that no such z was found.

Corollary 5.14. *If $f(y, \vec{x}) = (\mu z \leq y)P(z, \vec{x})$, then $f \in \text{PR}(P)$.*

Corollary 5.15. *If $f(y, \vec{x}) \simeq (\mu z < g(y, \vec{x}))P(z, \vec{x})$, then $f \in \text{PR}(g, P)$.*

Proofs: Like Cors 5.11, 5.12 (p. 5-8). \square

5.5 A note on unbounded minimalisation

Let P be an $(n+1)$ -ary predicate, and f an n -ary function defined by

$$f(\vec{x}) \simeq \mu y P(\vec{x}, y) \simeq \begin{cases} \text{the least } y \text{ s.t. } P(\vec{x}, y) \text{ holds, if such } y \text{ exists} \\ \uparrow \\ \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Intuitively, $f \in \text{EFF}(P)$ since the following algorithm, which uses an oracle for P , computes f :

“Test $P(\vec{x}, 0), P(\vec{x}, 1), P(\vec{x}, 2), \dots$
until y is found such that $P(\vec{x}, y)$.
Then halt, with output y .”

EXERCISE. Is f as defined in (1) in $\text{PR}(P)$?

NOTES:

1. The n -ary function

$$g(\vec{x}) = \begin{cases} \mu y P(\vec{x}, y) & \text{if } \exists y P(\vec{x}, y) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is total, but *not* (in general) effective in P .

2. In (1), $f \in \mathcal{G}\text{-COMP}(P)$. Hence if $P \in \mathcal{G}\text{-COMP}$, then so is f .
You may try to prove this now, or wait for Lemma 11.1.

5.7 More examples of PR functions and predicates

- Integer division

$$\begin{aligned} x \text{ \textit{div} } y &= \lfloor x/y \rfloor \\ &= \mu z [z * y \leq x \wedge (z + 1) * y > x] \\ &= (\mu z \leq x) [(z + 1) * y > x]. \end{aligned}$$

- Remainder

$$x \text{ \textit{mod} } y = x \dot{-} (x \text{ \textit{div} } y) * y.$$

- Divisibility predicate

$$y|x \iff x \text{ \textit{mod} } y = 0,$$

or alternatively,

$$y|x \iff \exists z (x = y * z) \iff (\exists z \leq x) (x = y * z).$$

- Primality predicate

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{prime}(x) &\iff x > 1 \wedge \neg \exists y [1 < y \wedge y < x \wedge y|x] \\ &\iff x > 1 \wedge \neg (\exists y < x) [1 < y \wedge y|x]. \end{aligned}$$

- **Prime number sequence**

Let p_n denote the n -th prime, with $p_0 = 0$. Is $\lambda n \cdot p_n \in \text{PR}$?

The PR definition

$$\begin{cases} p_0 = 0 \\ p_{n+1} = \mu y [\mathbf{prime}(y) \wedge y > p_n] \end{cases}$$

is problematic as it stands, since (i) μ is unbounded, and (ii) it assumes the existence of a prime $> p_n$, or equivalently, the existence of infinitely many primes. Euclid comes to the rescue!

Theorem 5.16 (Euclid). *There are infinitely many primes.*
More precisely,

$$\forall x \exists p [\mathbf{prime}(p) \wedge x < p \leq (x! + 1)].$$

Proof: Let $y = x! + 1$.

For $2 \leq k \leq x$, $k|x!$, and so $y \bmod k = 1$, and so $k \nmid y$.

But y has at least one prime factor p . So $x < p \leq y$. \square

We can now re-define the prime number sequence as:

$$\begin{cases} p_0 = 0 \\ p_{n+1} = (\mu y \leq (p_n! + 1))[\mathbf{prime}(y) \wedge y > p_n] \end{cases}$$

which is PR, by Corollary 5.15.

EXERCISES:

1. Show that the following functions and predicates are PR:

- (a) $\mathbf{even}(x)$ (x is even)
- (b) $\mathbf{max}(x, y)$
- (c) $\mathbf{perfsq}(x)$ (x is a perfect square)
- (d) $\mathbf{sqrt}(x)$ (integral square root of x)
- (e) $\mathbf{gcd}(x, y)$.

2. For any unary function f , define

$$g(n, x) \simeq f^n(x)$$

(the n -th iterated composition of f). Is $g \in \text{PR}(f)$?

3. (a) Show that every finite subset of \mathbb{N} is PR.
(A set or relation is said to be PR if its char. pred. is PR.)
- (b) Is every co-finite subset of \mathbb{N} PR?
(A set is co-finite if its complement is finite.)

4. Prove the following function is PR:

$$\mathbf{d}(n, k) = (k + 1)\text{st digit in decimal expansion of } 1/n,$$

e.g., $1/7 = 0.142\dots$, so $\mathbf{d}(7, 0) = 1$, $\mathbf{d}(7, 1) = 4$, $\mathbf{d}(7, 2) = 2$.