

334 Could we define the expression $P \text{ value } e$ with the axiom

- (a) $x'=(P \text{ value } e) \equiv P. x'=e$
- (b) $x'=(P \text{ value } e) \implies P. x'=e$
- (c) $P \implies (P \text{ value } e)=e'$
- (d) $x'=(P \text{ value } e) \wedge P \implies x'=e'$

After trying the question, scroll down to the solution.

§ The **value** expression axiom in Subsection 5.5.0 is

$$P. (P \text{ value } e)=e$$

except that $(P \text{ value } e)$ is not subject to double-priming in sequential composition, nor to substitution when using the Substitution Law. In one natural variable x , consider $\top \text{ value } x$, first under the axiom in Subsection 5.5.0, then under each axiom offered in the exercise.

$$\begin{aligned} & \top. (\top \text{ value } x)=x && \text{sequential composition} \\ = & \top \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad & x'=(P \text{ value } e) = P. x'=e \\ \S & (x'=(\top \text{ value } x)) = (\top. x'=x) \\ = & (x'=(\top \text{ value } x)) = \top \\ = & x'=(\top \text{ value } x) \end{aligned}$$

sequential composition
identity

but we should get \top , so (a) is stronger than the Subsection 5.5.0 axiom. It leads to inconsistency, as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & (r'<5 \text{ value } r)=3 && \text{one-point law in reverse} \\ = & \forall x'. x'=(r'<5 \text{ value } r) \Rightarrow x'=3 && \text{use the (a) axiom} \\ = & \forall x'. (r'<5. x'=r) \Rightarrow x'=3 \\ = & \forall x'. x'<5 \Rightarrow x'=3 \\ = & \perp \\ & (r'<5 \text{ value } r)=3 && \text{one-point law in reverse} \\ = & \forall x'. x'=3 \Rightarrow x'=(r'<5 \text{ value } r) && \text{use the (a) axiom} \\ = & \forall x'. x'=3 \Rightarrow (r'<5. x'=r) \\ = & \forall x'. x'=3 \Rightarrow x'<5 \\ = & \top \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(b)} \quad & x'=(P \text{ value } e) \Rightarrow P. x'=e \\ \S & x'=(\top \text{ value } x) \Rightarrow (\top. x'=x) \\ = & x'=(\top \text{ value } x) \Rightarrow \top \\ = & \top \end{aligned}$$

sequential composition
base

so maybe this one is all right.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(c)} \quad & P \Rightarrow (P \text{ value } e)=e' \\ \S & \top \Rightarrow (\top \text{ value } x)=x' \\ = & (\top \text{ value } x)=x' \end{aligned}$$

identity

but we should get \top , so (c) is stronger than the Subsection 5.5.0 axiom. It leads to inconsistency, as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & (r'<5 \text{ value } r)=3 && \text{one-point law in reverse} \\ = & \forall x'. x'=(r'<5 \text{ value } r) \Rightarrow x'=3 && \text{use the (c) axiom} \\ \Rightarrow & \forall x'. r'<5 \Rightarrow x'=3 \\ = & \neg r'<5 \\ & (r'<5 \text{ value } r)=3 && \text{one-point law in reverse} \\ = & \forall x'. x'=3 \Rightarrow x'=(r'<5 \text{ value } r) && \text{use the (c) axiom} \\ \Leftarrow & \forall x'. x'=3 \Rightarrow r'<5 \\ = & r'<5 \end{aligned}$$

Now we have

$$r'<5 \Rightarrow (r'<5 \text{ value } r)=3 \Rightarrow \neg r'<5$$

from which we conclude $\neg r'<5$. By a very similar calculation, we can prove $\neg r' \geq 5$, contradicting trichotomy.

$$\text{(d)} \quad x'=(P \text{ value } e) \wedge P \Rightarrow x'=e'$$

§

$$\begin{aligned} & x' = (\top \text{ value } x) \wedge \top \Rightarrow x' = x \\ = & x' = (\top \text{ value } x) \Rightarrow x' = x \end{aligned}$$

identity

but we should get \top , so (d) is stronger than the Subsection 5.5.0 axiom.