

ON THE EXTREME POWER OF NONSTANDARD PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES

TAKUMA IMAMURA

ABSTRACT. Suenaga and Hasuo introduced a nonstandard programming language **While**^{dt} which models hybrid systems. We demonstrate why **While**^{dt} is not suitable for modeling actual computations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Suenaga and Hasuo [9] introduced an imperative programming language **While**^{dt}, which is the usual **While** programming language equipped with a positive infinitesimal **dt**. This language is intended to *hyperdiscretise* hybrid systems and enable them to be formally verified by Hoare logic [3]. On the other hand, this language is not intended to be a model of *actual* computation. We demonstrate why **While**^{dt} is not suitable for modeling actual computations. The main reason is that **While**^{dt} has too strong computational power *caused by physically impossible settings*. We clarify the causes of the power.

We refer to Suenaga and Hasuo [9] for the definition of **While**^{dt}; Robinson [7] for nonstandard analysis; Shen and Vereshchagin [8] for computability theory.

2. COMPUTATION BEYOND TURING MACHINE MODEL

2.1. The first cause: unrestricted use of reals. The first cause of the power is that **While**^{dt} is furnished with the constant symbols c_r for *all* real numbers $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and the exact comparison operator $<$. They bring much strong computational power to this language as we will see below.

Lemma 1. **While**^{dt} computes the floor function on ${}^*\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. The following (pseudo) **While**^{dt}-program computes the floor function.

```
Input :  $x$ 
Output :  $y$ 
 $n := 0$ ;
while  $\neg(n \leq x < n + 1 \vee -n \leq x < -n + 1)$  do
   $n := n + 1$ ;
if  $x \geq 0$ 
then  $y := n$ 
else  $y := -n$ 
```

□

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 34A38; 68Q10; 03H10.

Key words and phrases. hybrid systems; hypercomputation; nonstandard analysis.

Remark 2. The floor function is a typical example of a uncomputable real function (see Weihrauch [12] p. 6).

Proposition 3. **While^{dt}** computes every standard decision problem on ${}^*\mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. The constant $r = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 3^{-i} \chi_A(i)$, where χ_A is the characteristic function of A , has complete information deciding the membership of A . Consider the following program.

```

Input :  $x$ 
Output :  $y$ 
 $a := r$ ;
while  $x \neq 0$  do
   $a := 3 \cdot a$ ;
   $x := x - 1$ ;
if  $a - 3 \cdot \lfloor (1/3) \cdot a \rfloor \geq 1$ 
then  $y := 1$ 
else  $y := 0$ 

```

This computes the characteristic function χ_{*A} of $*A$ for all (standard and nonstandard) inputs. \square

Corollary 4. **While^{dt}** computes every standard function on ${}^*\mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Consider the set $A = \{J(x, f(x)) \mid x \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $J: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a computable bijection. **While^{dt}** decides $*A$ by Proposition 3. The following program computes $*f$ for all inputs.

```

Input :  $x$ 
Output :  $y$ 
 $y := 0$ ;
 $a := 1$ ;
while  $J(x, y) \notin *A$  do
   $y := y + 1$ 

```

\square

Remark 5. Here the source of the computational power is not the use of infinitesimals. The foregoing argument can be applied to any other models of hybrid systems in which there is no restriction of discrete-continuous interaction.

2.2. The second cause: supertasks. The second cause is that **While^{dt}** can execute infinitely many steps of computation whose computational resource consumption (such as time, space and electricity usage and heat generation) is $\gg 0$.

While the following result is a special case of Corollary 4, the proof is based on an essentially different idea.

Proposition 6. **While^{dt}** computes every $\mathbf{0}'$ -computable function on \mathbb{N} .

Proof. Let $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be $\mathbf{0}'$ -computable. By Schoenfield's limit lemma (see Theorem 48 of [8]), there is a computable function $F: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $f = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} F(s, -)$. Obviously **While^{dt}** computes F for all inputs (with no use of uncomputable real numbers). Consider the following program:

```

Input :  $x$ 
Output :  $y$ 
 $y := F(\infty, x)$ 

```

This computes the limit function f for all standard inputs. □

Remark 7. The infinity constant ∞ can be eliminated as follows.

```

t := 0;
u := 0;
while t < 1 do
  t := t + dt;
  u := u + 1

```

The variable u is infinite after executing this program. The while loop is repeated an infinite number of times. The instruction $u := u + 1$ in the loop consumes computational resource $\gg 0$ in each execution.

If **While**^{dt} can finish such an infinite sequence of operations *only within infinite time*, there is no problem involving the computational power, because the computation by **While**^{dt}-programs is not considered to be actual one. On the other hand, if we want to consider **While**^{dt} to be a model of computation in the real world, **While**^{dt} must be able to finish such an infinite sequence of operations *within finite time*, or, in other words, must admit *supertasks*.

Thomson [11] did an insightful thought experiment to analyse the (im)possibility of supertasks. There is a lamp with a switch. The initial state of the switch is off. Consider the following supertask: in the first 1/2 sec, turn on the switch; in the next 1/4 sec, turn off the switch; in the next 1/8 sec, turn on the switch; and so on. After this supertask, is the lamp on or off? A similar circumstance occurs in **While**^{dt}. We identify ‘on’ with 1 and ‘off’ with 0. Consider the following **While**^{dt}-program.

```

time := 0;
lamp := 0;
while time < 1 do
  time := time + dt;
  lamp := 1 - lamp

```

This program eventually halts. The same question then arises: after execution, is the value of *lamp* on or off? The answer depends on the interpretation of the infinitesimal constant dt .

Remark 8. The same phenomena occur in other models of hypercomputation which admit supertasks, such as the accelerated Turing machines (Copeland [2]; Calude and Staiger [1]).

3. CONCLUSION

The nonstandard programming language **While**^{dt} has too strong computational power. However, this computational power *per se* is not an essential reason why this model is inappropriate, because the Church–Turing thesis may be false (i.e. hypercomputation may be physically realisable). The excessive power is a consequence of the following causes: the unrestricted use of reals, the exact comparison of reals, and the possibility of supertasks consuming infinite resources. These are physically impossible. Because of this impossibility, while actual hybrid systems can be modeled by **While**^{dt}-programs, some **While**^{dt}-programs do not represent any actual hybrid system. The same applies to other nonstandard “models of computation” such as **Sproc**^{dt} (Suenaga *et.al.* [10]), **NSF** (Nakamura *et.al.* [6, 5]) and the internal Turing machines (Loo [4]).




FIGURE 3.1. The rubber ball loses some kinetic energy in each inelastic collision. The kinetic energy lost is converted into other forms such as thermal energy. Then the interval of collision becomes shorter. Thus the ball bounces infinitely many times within finite time.

Some restrictions are needed to metamorphose **While^{dt}** into a model of actual hybrid computation. For instance, restricting the electricity usage and/or the heat generation to finite, one can avoid “Thomson-type” problems. In the Thomson’s lamp experiment, one needs infinite energy to switch the lamp infinitely many times. This is an example of a *bad* supertask. On the other hand, a rubber ball uses only finite energy (the initial mechanical energy) to bounce infinitely many times (Figure 3.1 on page 4). This is an example of a *good* supertask.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cristian S. Calude and Ludwig Staiger. A note on accelerated turing machines. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 20(6):1011–1017, 2010.
- [2] B. Jack Copeland. Accelerating Turing Machines. *Minds and Machines*, 12(2):281–300, 2002.
- [3] C. A. R. Hoare. An Axiomatic Basis for Computer Programming. *Communications of the ACM*, 12(10):576–580, 583, 1969.
- [4] Ken Loo. Internal Turing Machines, 2004. arXiv:0407056.
- [5] Hirofumi Nakamura. A functional programming language with infinitely small numbers. Master’s thesis, Kyoto University, 2018.
- [6] Hirofumi Nakamura, Kensuke Kojima, Kohei Suenaga, and Atsushi Igarashi. A Nonstandard Functional Programming Language. In *APLAS 2017*, pages 514–533, 2017.
- [7] Abraham Robinson. *Non-standard Analysis*. North-Holland, 1966.
- [8] A. Shen and N. K. Vereshchagin. *Computable Functions*. American Mathematical Society, 2003.
- [9] Kohei Suenaga and Ichiro Hasuo. Programming with Infinitesimals: A While-Language for Hybrid System Modeling. In *ICALC 2011*, pages 392–403, 2011.
- [10] Kohei Suenaga, Hiroyoshi Sekine, and Ichiro Hasuo. Hyperstream Processing Systems: Non-standard Modeling of Continuous-Time Signals. In *POPL 2013*, pages 417–430, 2013.
- [11] J. F. Thomson. Tasks and super-tasks. *Analysis*, 15(1):1–13, 1954.
- [12] Klaus Weihrauch. *Computable Analysis*. Springer, 2000.

RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KITASHIRAKAWA
OIWAKE-CHO, SAKYO-KU, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN
E-mail address: timamura@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp