

## udf Induction

### ind.1 Introduction

math:ind:int:  
sec

Induction is an important proof technique which is used, in different forms, in almost all areas of logic, theoretical computer science, and mathematics. It is needed to prove many of the results in logic.

Induction is often contrasted with deduction, and characterized as the inference from the particular to the general. For instance, if we observe many green emeralds, and nothing that we would call an emerald that's not green, we might conclude that all emeralds are green. This is an inductive inference, in that it proceeds from many particular cases (this emerald is green, that emerald is green, etc.) to a general claim (all emeralds are green). *Mathematical induction* is also an inference that concludes a general claim, but it is of a very different kind that this “simple induction.”

Very roughly, an inductive proof in mathematics concludes that all mathematical objects of a certain sort have a certain property. In the simplest case, the mathematical objects an inductive proof is concerned with are natural numbers. In that case an inductive proof is used to establish that all natural numbers have some property, and it does this by showing that (1) 0 has the property, and (2) whenever a number  $n$  has the property, so does  $n + 1$ . Induction on natural numbers can then also often be used to prove general about mathematical objects that can be assigned numbers. For instance, finite sets each have a finite number  $n$  of elements, and if we can use induction to show that every number  $n$  has the property “all finite sets of size  $n$  are ...” then we will have shown something about all finite sets.

Induction can also be generalized to mathematical objects that are *inductively defined*. For instance, expressions of a formal language such as those of first-order logic are defined inductively. *Structural induction* is a way to prove results about all such expressions. Structural induction, in particular, is very useful—and widely used—in logic.

### ind.2 Induction on $\mathbb{N}$

math:ind:inN:  
sec

In its simplest form, induction is a technique used to prove results for all natural numbers. It uses the fact that by starting from 0 and repeatedly adding 1 we eventually reach every natural number. So to prove that something is true for every number, we can (1) establish that it is true for 0 and (2) show that whenever a number has it, the next number has it too. If we abbreviate “number  $n$  has property  $P$ ” by  $P(n)$ , then a proof by induction that  $P(n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  consists of:

1. a proof of  $P(0)$ , and
2. a proof that, for any  $n$ , if  $P(n)$  then  $P(n + 1)$ .

To make this crystal clear, suppose we have both (1) and (2). Then (1) tells us that  $P(0)$  is true. If we also have (2), we know in particular that if  $P(0)$  then  $P(0 + 1)$ , i.e.,  $P(1)$ . (This follows from the general statement “for any  $n$ , if  $P(n)$  then  $P(n + 1)$ ” by putting 0 for  $n$ . So by modus ponens, we have that  $P(1)$ . From (2) again, now taking 1 for  $n$ , we have: if  $P(1)$  then  $P(2)$ . Since we’ve just established  $P(1)$ , by modus ponens, we have  $P(2)$ . And so on. For any number  $k$ , after doing this  $k$  steps, we eventually arrive at  $P(k)$ . So (1) and (2) together established  $P(k)$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let’s look at an example. Suppose we want to find out how many different sums we can throw with  $n$  dice. Although it might seem silly, let’s start with 0 dice. If you have no dice there’s only one possible sum you can “throw”: no dots at all, which sums to 0. So the number of different possible throws is 1. If you have only one die, i.e.,  $n = 1$ , there are six possible values, 1 through 6. With two dice, we can throw any sum from 2 through 12, that’s 11 possibilities. With three dice, we can throw any number from 3 to 18, i.e., 16 different possibilities. 1, 6, 11, 16: looks like a pattern: maybe the answer is  $5n + 1$ ? Of course,  $5n + 1$  is the maximum possible, because there are only  $5n + 1$  numbers between  $n$ , the lowest value you can throw with  $n$  dice (all 1’s) and  $6n$ , the highest you can throw (all 6’s).

**Theorem ind.1.** *With  $n$  dice one can throw all  $5n + 1$  possible values between  $n$  and  $6n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $P(n)$  be the claim: “It is possible to throw any number between  $n$  and  $6n$  using  $n$  dice.” To use induction, we prove:

1. The *induction basis*  $P(1)$ , i.e., with just one die, you can throw any number between 1 and 6.
2. The *induction step*, for all  $k$ , if  $P(k)$  then  $P(k + 1)$ .

(1) Is proved by inspecting a 6-sided die. It has all 6 sides, and every number between 1 and 6 shows up one on of the sides. So it is possible to throw any number between 1 and 6 using a single die.

To prove (2), we assume the antecedent of the conditional, i.e.,  $P(k)$ . This assumption is called the *inductive hypothesis*. We use it to prove  $P(k + 1)$ . The hard part is to find a way of thinking about the possible values of a throw of  $k + 1$  dice in terms of the possible values of throws of  $k$  dice plus of throws of the extra  $k + 1$ -st die—this is what we have to do, though, if we want to use the inductive hypothesis.

The inductive hypothesis says we can get any number between  $k$  and  $6k$  using  $k$  dice. If we throw a 1 with our  $(k + 1)$ -st die, this adds 1 to the total. So we can throw any value between  $k + 1$  and  $6k + 1$  by throwing  $k$  dice and then rolling a 1 with the  $(k + 1)$ -st die. What’s left? The values  $6k + 2$  through  $6k + 6$ . We can get these by rolling  $k$  6s and then a number between 2 and 6 with our  $(k + 1)$ -st die. Together, this means that with  $k + 1$  dice we can throw any of the numbers between  $k + 1$  and  $6(k + 1)$ , i.e., we’ve proved  $P(k + 1)$  using the assumption  $P(k)$ , the inductive hypothesis.  $\square$

Very often we use induction when we want to prove something about a series of objects (numbers, sets, etc.) that is itself defined “inductively,” i.e., by defining the  $(n + 1)$ -st object in terms of the  $n$ -th. For instance, we can define the sum  $s_n$  of the natural numbers up to  $n$  by

$$\begin{aligned}s_0 &= 0 \\ s_{n+1} &= s_n + (n + 1)\end{aligned}$$

This definition gives:

$$\begin{aligned}s_0 &= 0, \\ s_1 &= s_0 + 1 &&= 1, \\ s_2 &= s_1 + 2 &&= 1 + 2 = 3 \\ s_3 &= s_2 + 3 &&= 1 + 2 + 3 = 6, \text{ etc.}\end{aligned}$$

Now we can prove, by induction, that  $s_n = n(n + 1)/2$ .

**Proposition ind.2.**  $s_n = n(n + 1)/2$ .

*Proof.* We have to prove (1) that  $s_0 = 0 \cdot (0 + 1)/2$  and (2) if  $s_n = n(n + 1)/2$  then  $s_{n+1} = (n + 1)(n + 2)/2$ . (1) is obvious. To prove (2), we assume the inductive hypothesis:  $s_n = n(n + 1)/2$ . Using it, we have to show that  $s_{n+1} = (n + 1)(n + 2)/2$ .

What is  $s_{n+1}$ ? By the definition,  $s_{n+1} = s_n + (n + 1)$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $s_n = n(n + 1)/2$ . We can substitute this into the previous equation, and then just need a bit of arithmetic of fractions:

$$\begin{aligned}s_{n+1} &= \frac{n(n + 1)}{2} + (n + 1) = \\ &= \frac{n(n + 1)}{2} + \frac{2(n + 1)}{2} = \\ &= \frac{n(n + 1) + 2(n + 1)}{2} = \\ &= \frac{(n + 2)(n + 1)}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

□

The important lesson here is that if you’re proving something about some inductively defined sequence  $a_n$ , induction is the obvious way to go. And even if it isn’t (as in the case of the possibilities of dice throws), you can use induction if you can somehow relate the case for  $n + 1$  to the case for  $n$ .

### ind.3 Strong Induction

math.ind.str:  
sec In the principle of induction discussed above, we prove  $P(0)$  and also if  $P(n)$ , then  $P(n + 1)$ . In the second part, we assume that  $P(n)$  is true and use

this assumption to prove  $P(n + 1)$ . Equivalently, of course, we could assume  $P(n - 1)$  and use it to prove  $P(n)$ —the important part is that we be able to carry out the inference from any number to its successor; that we can prove the claim in question for any number under the assumption it holds for its predecessor.

There is a variant of the principle of induction in which we don't just assume that the claim holds for the predecessor  $n - 1$  of  $n$ , but for all numbers smaller than  $n$ , and use this assumption to establish the claim for  $n$ . This also gives us the claim  $P(k)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . For once we have established  $P(0)$ , we have thereby established that  $P$  holds for all numbers less than 1. And if we know that if  $P(l)$  for all  $l < n$  then  $P(n)$ , we know this in particular for  $n = 1$ . So we can conclude  $P(2)$ . With this we have proved  $P(0)$ ,  $P(1)$ ,  $P(2)$ , i.e.,  $P(l)$  for all  $l < 3$ , and since we have also the conditional, if  $P(l)$  for all  $l < 3$ , then  $P(3)$ , we can conclude  $P(3)$ , and so on.

In fact, if we can establish the general conditional “for all  $n$ , if  $P(l)$  for all  $l < n$ , then  $P(n)$ ,” we do not have to establish  $P(0)$  anymore, since it follows from it. For remember that a general claim like “for all  $l < n$ ,  $P(l)$ ” is true if there are no  $l < n$ . This is a case of vacuous quantification: “all  $A$ s are  $B$ s” is true if there are no  $A$ s,  $\forall x (\varphi(x) \rightarrow \psi(x))$  is true if no  $x$  satisfies  $\varphi(x)$ . In this case, the formalized version would be “ $\forall l (l < n \rightarrow P(l))$ ”—and that is true if there are no  $l < n$ . And if  $n = 0$  that's exactly the case: no  $l < 0$ , hence “for all  $l < 0$ ,  $P(0)$ ” is true, whatever  $P$  is. A proof of “if  $P(l)$  for all  $l < n$ , then  $P(n)$ ” thus automatically establishes  $P(0)$ .

This variant is useful if establishing the claim for  $n$  can't be made to just rely on the claim for  $n - 1$  but may require the assumption that it is true for one or more  $l < n$ .

## ind.4 Inductive Definitions

In logic we very often define kinds of objects *inductively*, i.e., by specifying rules for what counts as an object of the kind to be defined which explain how to get new objects of that kind from old objects of that kind. For instance, we often define special kinds of sequences of symbols, such as the terms and **formulas** of a language, by induction. For a simpler example, consider strings of parentheses, such as “ $((())$ ” or “ $(())(())$ ”. In the second string, the parentheses “balance,” in the first one, they don't. The shortest such expression is “ $()$ ”. Actually, the very shortest string of parentheses in which every opening parenthesis has a matching closing parenthesis is “”, i.e., the empty sequence  $\emptyset$ . If we already have a parenthesis expression  $p$ , then putting matching parentheses around it makes another balanced parenthesis expression. And if  $p$  and  $p'$  are two balanced parentheses expressions, writing one after the other, “ $pp'$ ” is also a balanced parenthesis expression. In fact, any sequence of balanced parentheses can be generated in this way, and we might use these operations to *define* the set of such expressions. This is an *inductive definition*.

[mth:ind:idf:sec](#)

**Definition ind.3** (Paraexpressions). The set of *parexpressions* is inductively defined as follows:

1.  $\emptyset$  is a parexpression.
2. If  $p$  is a parexpression, then so is  $(p)$ .
3. If  $p$  and  $p'$  are parexpressions  $\neq \emptyset$ , then so is  $pp'$ .
4. Nothing else is a parexpression.

(Note that we have not yet proved that every balanced parenthesis expression is a parexpression, although it is quite clear that every parexpression is a balanced parenthesis expression.)

The key feature of inductive definitions is that if you want to prove something about all parexpressions, the definition tells you which cases you must consider. For instance, if you are told that  $q$  is a parexpression, the inductive definition tells you what  $q$  can look like:  $q$  can be  $\emptyset$ , it can be  $(p)$  for some other parexpression  $p$ , or it can be  $pp'$  for two parexpressions  $p$  and  $p' \neq \emptyset$ . Because of clause (4), those are all the possibilities.

When proving claims about all of an inductively defined set, the strong form of induction becomes particularly important. For instance, suppose we want to prove that for every parexpression of length  $n$ , the number of ( in it is  $n/2$ . This can be seen as a claim about all  $n$ : for every  $n$ , the number of ( in any parexpression of length  $n$  is  $n/2$ .

**Proposition ind.4.** *For any  $n$ , the number of ( in a parexpression of length  $n$  is  $n/2$ .*

*Proof.* To prove this result by (strong) induction, we have to show that the following conditional claim is true:

If for every  $k < n$ , any parexpression of length  $k$  has  $k/2$  (’s, then any parexpression of length  $n$  has  $n/2$  (’s.

To show this conditional, assume that its antecedent is true, i.e., assume that for any  $k < n$ , parexpressions of length  $k$  contain  $k/2$  (’s. We call this assumption the inductive hypothesis. We want to show the same is true for parexpressions of length  $n$ .

So suppose  $q$  is a parexpression of length  $n$ . Because parexpressions are inductively defined, we have three cases: (1)  $q$  is  $\emptyset$ , (2)  $q$  is  $(p)$  for some parexpression  $p$ , or (3)  $q$  is  $pp'$  for some parexpressions  $p$  and  $p' \neq \emptyset$ .

1.  $q$  is  $\emptyset$ . Then  $n = 0$ , and the number of ( in  $q$  is also 0. Since  $0 = 0/2$ , the claim holds.
2.  $q$  is  $(p)$  for some parexpression  $p$ . Since  $q$  contains two more symbols than  $p$ ,  $\text{len}(p) = n - 2$ , in particular,  $\text{len}(p) < n$ , so the inductive hypothesis applies: the number of ( in  $p$  is  $\text{len}(p)/2$ . The number of ( in  $q$  is 1 + the number of ( in  $p$ , so  $= 1 + \text{len}(p)/2$ , and since  $\text{len}(p) = n - 2$ , this gives  $1 + (n - 2)/2 = n/2$ .

3.  $q$  is  $pp'$  for some parexpression  $p$  and  $p' \neq \emptyset$ . Since neither  $p$  nor  $p' = \emptyset$ , both  $\text{len}(p)$  and  $\text{len}(p') < n$ . Thus the inductive hypothesis applies in each case: The number of  $($  in  $p$  is  $\text{len}(p)/2$ , and the number of  $($  in  $p'$  is  $\text{len}(p')/2$ . On the other hand, the number of  $($  in  $q$  is obviously the sum of the numbers of  $($  in  $p$  and  $p'$ , since  $q = pp'$ . Hence, the number of  $($  in  $q$  is  $\text{len}(p)/2 + \text{len}(p')/2 = (\text{len}(p) + \text{len}(p'))/2 = \text{len}(pp')/2 = n/2$ .

In each case, we've shown that the number of  $($  in  $q$  is  $n/2$  (on the basis of the inductive hypothesis). By strong induction, the proposition follows.  $\square$

## ind.5 Structural Induction

So far we have used induction to establish results about all natural numbers. But a corresponding principle can be used directly to prove results about all **elements** of an inductively defined set. This is often called *structural induction*, because it depends on the structure of the inductively defined objects.

[math:ind:sti:sec](#)

Generally, an inductive definition is given by (a) a list of “initial” **elements** of the set and (b) a list of operations which produce new **elements** of the set from old ones. In the case of parexpressions, for instance, the initial object is  $\emptyset$  and the operations are

$$\begin{aligned} o_1(p) &= (p) \\ o_2(q, q') &= qq' \end{aligned}$$

You can even think of the natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}$  themselves as being given by an inductive definition: the initial object is 0, and the operation is the successor function  $x + 1$ .

In order to prove something about all elements of an inductively defined set, i.e., that every **element** of the set has a property  $P$ , we must:

1. Prove that the initial objects have  $P$
2. Prove that for each operation  $o$ , if the arguments have  $P$ , so does the result.

For instance, in order to prove something about all parexpressions, we would prove that it is true about  $\emptyset$ , that it is true of  $(p)$  provided it is true of  $p$ , and that it is true about  $qq'$  provided it is true of  $q$  and  $q'$  individually.

**Proposition ind.5.** *The number of  $($  equals the number of  $)$  in any parexpression  $p$ .*

*Proof.* We use structural induction. Parexpressions are inductively defined, with initial object  $\emptyset$  and the operations  $o_1$  and  $o_2$ .

1. The claim is true for  $\emptyset$ , since the number of  $($  in  $\emptyset = 0$  and the number of  $)$  in  $\emptyset$  also  $= 0$ .

2. Suppose the number of  $($  in  $p$  equals the number of  $)$  in  $p$ . We have to show that this is also true for  $(p)$ , i.e.,  $o_1(p)$ . But the number of  $($  in  $(p)$  is  $1 +$  the number of  $($  in  $p$ . And the number of  $)$  in  $(p)$  is  $1 +$  the number of  $)$  in  $p$ , so the claim also holds for  $(p)$ .
3. Suppose the number of  $($  in  $q$  equals the number of  $)$ , and the same is true for  $q'$ . The number of  $($  in  $o_2(p, p')$ , i.e., in  $pp'$ , is the sum of the number  $($  in  $p$  and  $p'$ . The number of  $)$  in  $o_2(p, p')$ , i.e., in  $pp'$ , is the sum of the number of  $)$  in  $p$  and  $p'$ . The number of  $($  in  $o_2(p, p')$  equals the number of  $)$  in  $o_2(p, p')$ .

The result follows by structural induction. □

## Photo Credits

## Bibliography