

# domain of iterate[x,y]

*Johan G. F. Belinfante*  
2002 July 1

```
<< goedel52.o85; << tools.m
:Package Title: goedel52.o85          2002 June 30 at 9:55 p.m.

It is now: 2002 Jul 1 at 11:26

Loading Simplification Rules

TOOLS.M                      Revised 2002 June 12

weightlimit = 40
```

## ■ Remark

This notebook improves upon a result in the notebook **ITER-DO.NB** dated 2002 May 14, and derives a useful corollary. The result obtained in May is this:

```
implies[equal[V, domain[x]], or[equal[0, y], equal[omega, domain[iterate[x, y]]]]]
True
```

The goal is to weaken the hypothesis **equal[V, domain[x]]** in this result.

## ■ Introduction

The requirement that **y** be nonempty is needed to assure that **0** belongs to the domain of **iterate[x,y]**. The induction step depends on the following observation.

```
Map[subclass[image[SUCC, #], domain[iterate[x, y]]] &, IminComp[iterate[x, y], SUCC, V]]
subclass[image[SUCC, image[inverse[iterate[x, y], domain[x]]],
domain[iterate[x, y]]] == True

subclass[image[SUCC, image[inverse[iterate[x_, y_], domain[x_]]],
domain[iterate[x_, y_]]] := True
```

Observe that if **domain[x]** were **V**, then this would say that **domain[iterate[x,y]]** is inductive, and we get back our old result. But clearly it is not required that **domain[x]** be quite this large. The following temporary rule is useful:

```
SubstTest[implies, subclass[u, v], subclass[image[w, u], image[w, v]],
{u -> range[x], v -> y, w -> inverse[x]}]

or[not[subclass[range[x], y]], subclass[domain[x], image[inverse[x], y]]] == True

or[not[subclass[range[x_], y_]], subclass[domain[x_], image[inverse[x_], y_]]] := True
```

We can actually do better:

```
Map[implies[subclass[range[x], y], #] &, SubstTest[and, subclass[u, v], subclass[v, u],
  {u -> image[inverse[x], y], v -> domain[x]}] // Reverse

or[equal[domain[x], image[inverse[x], y]], not[subclass[range[x], y]]] == True

or[equal[domain[x_], image[inverse[x_], y_]], not[subclass[range[x_], y_]]] := True
```

## ■ the old derivation revisited

We now continue along the same path that we took in May, but generalize a bit, where we can.

```
SubstTest[implies, and[equal[u, v], subclass[v, w]], subclass[u, w],
  {v -> image[SUCC, image[inverse[iterate[x, y], domain[x]]],
  w -> domain[iterate[x, y]]}]

or[not[equal[u, image[SUCC, image[inverse[iterate[x, y], domain[x]]]]],
  subclass[u, domain[iterate[x, y]]] == True

or[not[equal[u_, image[SUCC, image[inverse[iterate[x_, y_], domain[x_]]]]],
  subclass[u_, domain[iterate[x_, y_]]] := True

Map[not, SubstTest[and, implies[p1, p2], implies[p2, p3], implies[p3, p4],
  not[implies[p1, p4]], {p1 -> subclass[range[iterate[x, y], domain[x]],
  p2 -> equal[image[inverse[iterate[x, y], domain[x]], domain[iterate[x, y]]],
  p3 -> equal[image[SUCC, image[inverse[iterate[x, y], domain[x]]],
  image[SUCC, domain[iterate[x, y]]]],
  p4 -> subclass[image[SUCC, domain[iterate[x, y]]], domain[iterate[x, y]]}]]]

or[not[subclass[range[iterate[x, y], domain[x]]],
  subclass[image[SUCC, domain[iterate[x, y]]], domain[iterate[x, y]]] == True

or[not[subclass[range[iterate[x_, y_], domain[x_]]],
  subclass[image[SUCC, domain[iterate[x_, y_]]], domain[iterate[x_, y_]]] := True

SubstTest[implies, and[member[0, w], subclass[image[SUCC, w], w]], subclass[omega, w],
  w -> domain[iterate[x, y]]]

or[equal[0, y],
  not[subclass[image[SUCC, domain[iterate[x, y]]], domain[iterate[x, y]]],
  subclass[omega, domain[iterate[x, y]]] == True

or[equal[0, y_],
  not[subclass[image[SUCC, domain[iterate[x_, y_]]], domain[iterate[x_, y_]]],
  subclass[omega, domain[iterate[x_, y_]]] := True

Map[implies[subclass[omega, domain[iterate[x, y]]], #] &, SubstTest[and, subclass[u, v],
  subclass[v, u], {u -> domain[iterate[x, y]], v -> omega}] // Reverse

or[equal[omega, domain[iterate[x, y]]],
  not[subclass[omega, domain[iterate[x, y]]]] == True

or[equal[omega, domain[iterate[x_, y_]]],
  not[subclass[omega, domain[iterate[x_, y_]]]] := True
```

The following result is a slight improvement over what was found in May.

```

Map[not, SubstTest[and, implies[p1, p3], implies[and[p2, p3], p4], implies[p4, p5],
  not[implies[and[p1, p2], p5]],
  {p1 -> subclass[range[iterate[x, y]], domain[x]], p2 -> not[empty[y]],
  p3 -> subclass[image[SUCC, domain[iterate[x, y]]], domain[iterate[x, y]]],
  p4 -> subclass[omega, domain[iterate[x, y]]],
  p5 -> equal[omega, domain[iterate[x, y]]]}]]

or[equal[0, y], equal[omega, domain[iterate[x, y]]],
  not[subclass[range[iterate[x, y]], domain[x]]] == True

or[equal[0, y_], equal[omega, domain[iterate[x_, y_]]],
  not[subclass[range[iterate[x_, y_]], domain[x_]]] := True

```

## ■ a new result

The key to continuing is this result:

```

implies[subclass[image[x, y], y], equal[range[iterate[x, y]], y]]

True

```

This is not surprising; if  $y$  is invariant under  $x$  then the successive generations in the iteration get progressively smaller, and so the union of all the generations is just the starting generation  $y$ . Thus, if the starting generation is contained in  $\text{domain}[x]$ , then the weakened hypothesis about the domain of  $x$  in our improved theorem will hold, and we wind up with the following corollary.

```

Map[not,
  SubstTest[and, implies[p1, p2], implies[and[p2, p3], p4], implies[and[p4, p5], p6],
    not[implies[and[p1, p3, p5], p6]],
    {p1 -> subclass[image[x, y], y],
    p2 -> equal[range[iterate[x, y]], y],
    p3 -> subclass[y, domain[x]],
    p4 -> subclass[range[iterate[x, y]], domain[x]],
    p5 -> not[equal[0, y]],
    p6 -> equal[omega, domain[iterate[x, y]]]}]]

or[equal[0, y], equal[omega, domain[iterate[x, y]]],
  not[subclass[y, domain[x]]], not[subclass[image[x, y], y]] == True

```

This says that if  $y$  is a nonempty invariant subclass of the domain of  $x$ , then the iteration process never ends.

```

or[equal[0, y_], equal[omega, domain[iterate[x_, y_]]],
  not[subclass[y_, domain[x_]]], not[subclass[image[x_, y_], y_]] := True

```