

## Preface

ROSENCRANTZ: *Shouldn't we be doing something... constructive?* GULDENSTERN: *What did you have in mind?*

—Tom Stoppard, *Rosencratz and Guildenstern Are Dead*

We have written this book in order to provide an introduction to constructive analysis, emphasising techniques and results that have been obtained in the last twenty years. The intended readership comprises senior undergraduates, postgraduates, and professional researchers in mathematics and theoretical computer science. We hope that our work will help spread the message that doing mathematics constructively is interesting (it can even be fun!) and challenging, and produces new, deep computational information.

An appreciation of the distinction between constructive and nonconstructive has become more widespread in this era of computers. Nevertheless, there are few books devoted to the development of mathematics in a rigorously constructive/computable fashion, although there are some, primarily concentrating on logic and foundations, in which the odd chapter deals with constructive mathematics proper as distinct from its underlying logic or set theory. It is now almost forty years since the publication of Errett Bishop's seminal monograph *Foundations of Constructive Analysis* [9], which in our view is one of the most remarkable intellectual documents of the twentieth century, and more than twenty since the appearance of its outgrowth [12]. In the intervening years there has been considerable activity in constructive analysis, algebra, and topology; in related foundational areas such as type theory [69]; and in the relation between constructive mathematics and computer science (for example, program extraction from proofs [42, 70, 51]). Believing that a new introduction to the mathematical, as distinct from the foundational, side of the subject is overdue, we embarked upon this monograph.

Our book is intended not to replace, but to supplement, Bishop's original classic [9] and the later volume [12] based thereon. Both of those two monographs cover aspects of analysis, such as Haar measure and commutative Banach algebras, that we do not mention. We cover some topics that are found in [9] and [12] (it would be almost inconceivable to produce a book like ours, dealing with constructive mathematics for nonexperts, without proving, for example, basic results about locatedness and total boundedness); but we have tried to provide improved proofs whenever possible. However, much of the material we present was simply not around at the time of writing of [9] or [12].

Instead of systematically developing analysis, beginning with the real line and continuing through metric, normed, and Hilbert spaces to its higher reaches, we have chosen to write the chapters around certain themes or techniques (hence our title). For example, Chapter 3 is devoted to the  $\lambda$ -technique, which, since its first use in the proof of Lemma 7 on page 177 of [9], has become a surprisingly powerful tool with applications in many areas of constructive analysis. A major influence in the application of the  $\lambda$ -technique was Ishihara's remarkable paper

[60], which showed that a subtle use of the technique could enable us to prove disjunctions whose proof, although trivial with classical logic, appears at first sight to be constructively out of the question. This paper opened up many new pathways in constructive analysis.

Chapter 1 introduces constructive mathematics and lays the foundations for the later chapters. In Chapter 2 we first present a new construction of the real numbers, motivated by ideas in [2]. After deriving standard properties such as the completeness of  $\mathbb{R}$ , we introduce metric spaces, with the major theme of locatedness, and normed linear spaces. When we discuss metric, normed, and Hilbert spaces, we assume some familiarity with the standard classical definitions of those concepts and with those elementary classical properties that pass over unchanged to the constructive setting.

Chapter 3 we have already referred to. The main theme of Chapter 4 is finite-dimensionality, but the chapter concludes with an introduction to Hilbert spaces.

Chapter 5 deals with convexity in normed spaces. Starting with some elementary convex geometry in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the chapter goes on to handle separation and Hahn–Banach theorems, locally convex spaces, and duality. Following Bishop, we describe those linear functionals that are weak\*-uniformly continuous on the unit ball of the dual space. We then give a new application of the technique used to prove that result, thereby characterising certain continuous linear functionals on the space of bounded operators on a Hilbert space.

In Chapter 6 we derive a range of results associated with the theme of locatedness and with the  $\lambda$ -technique introduced in Chapter 3. We pay particular attention to necessary and sufficient conditions for convex subsets of a normed space to be located, and to connections between properties of an operator on a Hilbert space and those of its adjoint—when that adjoint exists: it may not always do so constructively. The final section of the book deals with a relatively recent version of Baire’s theorem and its applications, and culminates in constructive versions of three of the big guns in functional analysis: the open mapping, inverse mapping, and closed graph theorems.

Which parts of the book deal with new material, compared with what appeared in [12]? We have already mentioned the new construction of the real numbers, in Chapter 2. Notable novelties in the later chapters include all but one result in Chapter 3 on the  $\lambda$ -technique; the section on convexity, Ishihara’s results on exact Hahn–Banach extensions, and our characterisation theorem for certain continuous linear functionals, all in Chapter 5; and virtually all of Chapter 6. Throughout the book there are what we hope will be seen as improvements and simplifications of proofs of many results that were given in [9] or [12].

What do we mean by “constructive analysis” in the title of this book? We do *not* mean analysis carried out with the usual “classical” logic within a framework, such as recursive function theory, designed to capture the concept of computability. In our view, such a notion of constructive has at least two drawbacks. First, by working within, say, the recursive setting, it can make the mathematics look less like normal mathematics and much harder to read. Sec-

only, the recursive constraint removes the possibility of other interpretations of the mathematics, such as Brouwer’s intuitionistic one [48]. Our approach, on the other hand, has neither of these features: the mathematics looks and reads just like the mathematics one is used to from undergraduate days, and all our proofs and results are valid in several models. They are valid in the recursive model, in intuitionistic mathematics, and, we believe, in any of the models for “computable mathematics” (including Weihrauch’s Type Two Effectivity Theory [91], within which Andrej Bauer has recently found a realisability interpretation of constructive mathematics within Weihrauch’s theory [5]). *They are also valid proofs in standard mathematics with classical logic.* For example, our proof of the Hahn–Banach theorem (Theorem ??) is, as it stands, a valid algorithmic proof of the classical Hahn–Banach theorem. Moreover—and this is one advantage of a constructive proof in general—our proof embodies an algorithm for the construction of the functional whose existence is stated in the theorem. This algorithm can be extracted from the proof, and, as an undeserved bonus, the proof itself demonstrates that the algorithm is correct or, in computer science parlance, “meets its specifications”.<sup>1</sup>

So how do we achieve all this? Simply by changing the logic with which we do our mathematics! Instead of using classical logic, we systematically use intuitionistic logic, which was abstracted by Heyting [52] from the practice of Brouwer’s intuitionistic mathematics. The remarkable fact is that every proof carried out with intuitionistic logic is fully constructive/algorithmic. (Is this the “secret on the point of being blabbed” that appears in the epigraph to Bishop’s book?) Unfortunately, too few mathematicians outside the mathematical logic community are aware of this serendipity and dismiss both intuitionistic logic and constructive mathematics as at best a marginal curiosity. This contrasts sharply with the theoretical computer science community, in which there is considerable knowledge of, and interest in, the computational power of intuitionistic logic.

Reading constructive mathematics demands careful interpretation. A theorem in this book might look like a familiar one from classical analysis, but with more complicated hypotheses and proof. However, the statement of the theorem will be phrased so that the explicit algorithmic interpretation is left to the reader; and the additional hypotheses will be necessary for a constructive proof, which will contain algorithmic information that is excluded from the classical proof by the latter’s use of principles outside intuitionistic logic. Consider, for example, the following statement:

(\*) *Let  $C$  be an open convex subset of a normed space  $X$ , let  $\xi \in C$ , and let  $z \in X$  be bounded away from  $C$ . Then the boundary of  $C$  intersects the segment  $[\xi, z]$  joining  $\xi$  and  $z$ .*

This is trivial to prove classically; but to find/construct the (necessarily unique) point in which the boundary of  $C$  intersects  $[\xi, z]$  is a totally different matter. The constructive theorem (Proposition 5.1.5 below) requires us to postulate

---

<sup>1</sup>We do not carry out program-extraction from proofs in our book. For more on this topic see [42, 51, 70].

that the union of  $C$  and its metric complement  $-C$  (the set of points bounded away from  $C$ ) be dense in  $X$ , and that  $X$  itself be a complete normed space. The constructive proof, though elementary, requires some careful geometrical estimation that would be supererogatory in the natural classical proof by contradiction. The benefit of that estimation and of the use of intuitionistic logic is that we could extract from the constructive proof an implementable algorithm for finding the point where the segment crosses the boundary. In turn, this would enable us to produce an algorithm for constructing separating hyperplanes and Hahn–Banach extensions of linear functionals, under appropriate hypotheses.

We could have made the algorithmic interpretation of the constructive version of (\*) explicit by stating the proposition in this way:

*There is a “boundary crossing algorithm” that, applied to the data consisting of (i) an open convex set  $C$  in a Banach space  $X$  such that  $C \cup -C$  is dense in  $X$ , (ii) a point  $\xi$  of  $C$ , and (iii) a point  $z$  of  $-C$ , constructs the point where the boundary of  $C$  intersects the segment  $[\xi, z]$ .*

Even this is not really explicit enough. A full description of the data to which the boundary crossing algorithm applies would require explicit information about the algorithms for such things as these: membership of  $C$ ; the convergence of Cauchy sequences in  $X$ ; the computation, for given  $x$  in  $X$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , of a point  $y$  of  $C \cup -C$  such that  $\|x - y\| < \varepsilon$  (and even the decision between the cases “ $y \in C$ ” and “ $y \in -C$ ”); and so on. Such explicit description of algorithmic hypotheses would become an ever greater burden on writer and reader alike as the book probed deeper and deeper into abstract analysis. It is a matter of sound sense, even sanity, to unburden ourselves from the outset, relying on the reader’s native wit in the interpretation of the statements of our constructive lemmas, propositions, and theorems.

We should make it clear that we are not advocating the exclusive use of intuitionistic logic in mathematics. That logic is, we believe, the natural and right one to use when dealing with the constructive content of mathematics. To abandon classical logic in those fields (such as the higher reaches of set theory) where constructivity is of little or no significance makes no sense whatsoever. Nevertheless, it is remarkable how much mathematics actually has what Bishop called “a deep underpinning of constructive truth”.

Christchurch, New Zealand  
January 2006

*Douglas Bridges*  
*Luminița Simona Viță*

## References

- [1] O. Aberth, *Computable Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980.
- [2] O. Aberth, *Computable Calculus*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, 2001.
- [3] P. Aczel and M. Rathjen, *Notes on Constructive Set Theory*, Report No. 40, Institut Mittag-Leffler, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, 2001.
- [4] G. Bachman and L. Narici, *Functional Analysis*, Academic Press, New York, 1966.
- [5] A. Bauer, Realizability as the connection between computable and constructive mathematics, Proceedings of CCA 2005, Kyoto, Japan, 25–29 August 2005; to appear.
- [6] M.J. Beeson, *Foundations of Constructive Mathematics*, *Ergeb. Math. und ihrer Grenzgebiete, 3. Folge*, **6**, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1985.
- [7] J. Berger and D.S. Bridges, A bizarre property equivalent to the  $\Pi_1^0$ -fan theorem, *Logic J. of the IGPL*, to appear.
- [8] J. Berger and P.M. Schuster, Classifying Dinis theorem, to appear in *Notre Dame J. Formal Logic*.
- [9] E.A. Bishop, *Foundations of Constructive Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967.
- [10] E.A. Bishop, Mathematics as a numerical language, in: *Intuitionism and Proof Theory* (J. Myhill, A. Kino, and R.E. Vesley, eds.), 53–71, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1970.
- [11] E.A. Bishop, Schizophrenia in contemporary mathematics, in: *Errett Bishop: Reflections on Him and His Research* (M. Rosenblatt, ed.), 1–32, *Contemporary Math.* **39**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1985.
- [12] E.A. Bishop and D.S. Bridges, *Constructive Analysis*, *Grundlehren der math. Wissenschaften* **279**, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1985.
- [13] E.A. Bishop and H. Cheng, *Constructive Measure Theory*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **116**, 1972.
- [14] D.S. Bridges, On weak operator compactness of the unit ball of  $\mathcal{L}(H)$ , *Zeit. math. Logik Grundlagen Math.* **24**, 493–494, 1978.
- [15] D.S. Bridges, Recent progress in constructive approximation theory, in *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium* (A.S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen, eds.), 41–50, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.
- [16] D.S. Bridges, A constructive Morse theory of sets, in *Mathematical Logic and Its Applications* (D. Skordev, ed.), 61–79, Plenum Publishing Corp., New York, 1987.

- [17] D.S. Bridges, Locatedness, convexity, and Lebesgue measurability, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford (2)* **39**, 411–421, 1988.
- [18] D.S. Bridges, A constructive look at the real number line, in: *Real Numbers, Generalizations of the Reals, and Theories of Continua* (P. Ehrlich, ed.), 29–92, Synthese Library **242**, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1994.
- [19] D.S. Bridges, Constructive mathematics: a foundation for computable analysis, *Theoretical Computer Science* **219**(1–2), 95–109, 1999.
- [20] D.S. Bridges, Constructive methods in mathematical economics, in *Mathematical Utility Theory*, *J. Econ. (Zeitschrift für Nationalökonomie)*, Suppl. **8**, 1–21, 1999.
- [21] D.S. Bridges, Dinis Theorem: a constructive case study, in: *Combinatorics, Computability and Logic* (Proceedings of DMTCS01, Constanța, Romania, 2–6 July 2001; C.S. Calude, M.J. Dinneen, S. Sburlan, eds.), 69–80, DMTCS Series **17**, Springer-Verlag, London, 2001.
- [22] D.S. Bridges, A weak constructive sequential compactness property and the fan theorem, *Logic J. of the IGPL* **13**(2), 151–158, 2005.
- [23] D.S. Bridges and N.F. Dudley Ward, Constructing ultraweakly continuous linear functionals on  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ , *Proc. American Math. Soc.* **126**(11), 3347–3353, 1998.
- [24] D.S. Bridges and H. Ishihara, Linear mappings are fairly well-behaved, *Arch. Math.* **54**, 558–562, 1990.
- [25] D.S. Bridges and H. Ishihara, A definitive constructive open mapping theorem?, *Math. Logic Quarterly* **44**, 545–552, 1998.
- [26] D.S. Bridges and H. Ishihara, Constructive unbounded operators, in: *Reuniting the Antipodes—Constructive and Nonstandard Views of the Continuum* (Proceedings of the Symposium in San Servolo/Venice, Italy, May 17–22, 1999; U. Berger, H. Osswald, and P.M. Schuster, eds.), 25–37, Synthese Library, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, December 2001.
- [27] D.S. Bridges, H. Ishihara, and P.M. Schuster, Sequential Compactness in Constructive Analysis, *Österr. Akad. Wiss. Math.–Natur. Kl. Sitzungsber. II.* **208**, 159–163, 1999.
- [28] D.S. Bridges, H. Ishihara, and L.S. Viță, Computing infima on convex sets, with applications in Hilbert spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **132**(9)2723–2732, 2004.
- [29] D.S. Bridges, W.H. Julian, and R. Mines, A constructive treatment of open and unopen mapping theorems, *Zeit. math. Logik Grundlagen Math.* **35**, 29–43, 1989.

- [30] D.S. Bridges and A. Mahalanobis, Bounded variation implies regulated: a constructive proof, *J. Symb. Logic* **66**(4), 1695–1700, 2001.
- [31] D.S. Bridges and R. Mines, Sequentially continuous linear mappings in constructive analysis, *J. Symb. Logic* **63**(2), 579–583, 1998.
- [32] D.S. Bridges and G. Popa, Exact, continuous boundary crossings out of convex sets in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , *Quart. J. Math.* **54**, 391–398, 2003.
- [33] D.S. Bridges and S. Reeves, Constructive mathematics, in theory and programming practice, *Philosophia Mathematica* **7**(1), 65–104, 1999.
- [34] D.S. Bridges and F. Richman, *Varieties of Constructive Mathematics*, London Math. Soc, Lecture Notes **97**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987.
- [35] D.S. Bridges, F. Richman, and P.M. Schuster, Adjoints, absolute values, and polar decompositions, *J. Operator Theory* **44**, 243–254, 2000.
- [36] D.S. Bridges, F. Richman, and Y. Wang, Sets, complements and boundaries, *Proc. Koninklijke Nederlandse Akad. Wetenschappen (Indag. Math. N.S.)* **7**(4), 425–445, 1996.
- [37] D.S. Bridges and L.S. Viță, Weak continuity properties in constructive analysis, *Logic J. of the IGPL* **7**(3), 277–281, 1999.
- [38] D.S. Bridges and L.S. Viță, Apartness spaces as a framework for constructive topology, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **119** (1–3), 61–83, 2003.
- [39] D.S. Bridges and L.S. Viță, The constructive uniqueness of the locally convex topology on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , in: *From Sets and Types to Topology and Analysis* (L. Crosilla and P.M. Schuster, eds.), 304–315, Oxford Logic Guides **32**, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2005.
- [40] D.S. Bridges and L.S. Viță, *Apartness Spaces*, book, in preparation.
- [41] L.E.J. Brouwer, *Over de Grondslagen der Wiskunde*, doctoral thesis, University of Amsterdam, 1907. Reprinted with additional material (D. van Dalen, ed.) by *Matematisch Centrum*, Amsterdam, 1981.
- [42] R.L. Constable et al., *Implementing Mathematics with the Nuprl Proof Development System*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1986.
- [43] L. Crosilla and P.M. Schuster (eds.), *From Sets and Types to Topology and Analysis*, Oxford Logic Guides **32**, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2005.
- [44] D. van Dalen (ed.), *Brouwers Cambridge Lectures on Intuitionism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981.
- [45] D. van Dalen, *Mystic, Geometer, and Intuitionist*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1999 (Vol. 1) and 2005 (Vol. 2).

- [46] R. Diaconescu, Axiom of choice and complementation, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **51**, 176–178, 1975.
- [47] J. Dieudonné, *Foundations of Modern Analysis*, Academic Press, New York, 1960.
- [48] M.A.E. Dummett, *Elements of Intuitionism* (2nd edition), Oxford Logic Guides **39**, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2000.
- [49] H.M. Edwards, *Essays in Constructive Mathematics*, Springer Science + Business Media, Inc., New York, 2005.
- [50] N. D. Goodman and J. Myhill, Choice implies excluded middle, Zeit. math. Logik und Grundlagen Math. **24**, 461.
- [51] S. Hayashi and H. Nakano, *PX: A Computational Logic*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1988.
- [52] A. Heyting, Die formalen Regeln der intuitionistischen Logik, Sitzungsber. preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, 42–56, 1930.
- [53] D. Hilbert, Über das Unendliche, Mathematische Annalen **95**, 161–190, 1926; translated in *Philosophy of Mathematics* (P. Benacerraf and H. Putnam, eds.), 183–201, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1964.
- [54] D. Hilbert, Die Grundlagen der Mathematik, Abhandlungen Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg **V**, 65–85, 1927.
- [55] H. Ishihara, On the constructive Hahn–Banach theorem, Bull. London Math. Soc. **21**, 79–81, 1989.
- [56] H. Ishihara, *Boundedness, normability and compactness of constructive linear mappings*, Ph.D. dissertation, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, 1990.
- [57] H. Ishihara, Continuity and nondiscontinuity in constructive analysis, J. Symb. Logic **56**(4), 1349–1354, 1991.
- [58] H. Ishihara, Constructive compact operators on a Hilbert space, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **52**, 31–37, 1991.
- [59] H. Ishihara, Continuity properties in constructive analysis, J. Symb. Logic **57**, 557–565, 1992.
- [60] H. Ishihara, A constructive version of Banach's inverse mapping theorem, New Zealand J. Math **23**, 71–75, 1994.
- [61] H. Ishihara, Locating subsets of a Hilbert space, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **129**(5), 1385–1390, 2001.

- [62] H. Ishihara, Constructive reverse mathematics: compactness properties, in: *From Sets and Types to Topology and Analysis* (L. Crosilla and P.M. Schuster, eds.), 245–267, Oxford Logic Guides **32**, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2005.
- [63] H. Ishihara and L.S. Viță, Locating subsets of a normed space, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **131**(10), 3231–3239, 2003.
- [64] H. Ishihara and L.S. Viță, A constructive Banach inverse mapping theorem in  $\mathcal{F}$ -spaces, New Zealand J. Math., to appear.
- [65] R.V. Kadison and J.R. Ringrose, *Fundamentals of the Theory of Operator Algebras* (Vol. 1), Academic Press, New York, 1988.
- [66] B.A. Kushner, *Lectures on Constructive Mathematical Analysis*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence RI, 1985.
- [67] A.A. Markov, *Theory of Algorithms* (Russian), Trudy Mat. Istituta imeni V.A. Steklova **42** (Izdatelstvo Akademi Nauk SSSR, Moskva), 1954; English translation by J.J. Schoor-Kan and PST staff, Israel Program for Scientific Translations, Jerusalem, 1961.
- [68] P. Martin-Löf, *Notes on Constructive Mathematics*, Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm, 1970.
- [69] P. Martin-Löf, An Intuitionistic Theory of Types: Predicative Part, in: *Logic Colloquium 1973* (H.E. Rose and J.C. Shepherdson, eds.), 73–118, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1975.
- [70] P. Martin-Löf, Constructive mathematics and computer programming, in *Proc. 6th. Int. Congress for Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science* (L. Jonathan Cohen, ed.), 153–179, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980.
- [71] G. Metakides, A. Nerode, and R. Shore, Recursive limits on the Hahn–Banach theorem, in: *Errett Bishop: Reflections on Him and His Research* (M. Rosenblatt, ed.), 85–91, Contemporary Math. **39**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1985.
- [72] R. Mines, F. Richman, and W. Ruitenburg, *A Course in Constructive Algebra*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1988.
- [73] J.R. Moschovakis, The effect of Markov's principle on the intuitionistic continuum, preprint, UCLA, April 2005.
- [74] J. Myhill, Constructive set theory, J. Symb. Logic **40**, 347–382, 1975.
- [75] F. Richman (ed.), *Constructive Mathematics* (Proceedings of the Conference at Las Cruces, New Mexico, August 1980), Lecture Notes in Mathematics **873**, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1981.

- [76] F. Richman, The fundamental theorem of algebra: a constructive development without choice, *Pacific J. Math.* **196**, 213–230, 2000.
- [77] F. Richman, Adjointness and the image of the unit ball, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **129**, 1189–1193, 2001.
- [78] H.L. Royden, Aspects of constructive analysis, in: *Errett Bishop: Reflections on Him and His Research* (M. Rosenblatt, ed.), 57–64, *Contemporary Mathematics* **39**, American Math. Soc., 1985.
- [79] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970.
- [80] E. Schechter, *Handbook of Analysis and Its Foundations*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1997.
- [81] P.M. Schuster, What is continuity, constructively?, *J.UCS* **11**(12), 2076–2085, 2005.
- [82] P.M. Schuster, L.S. Viță, and D.S. Bridges, Apartness as a relation between subsets, in: *Combinatorics, Computability and Logic* (Proceedings of DMTCS01, Constanța, Romania, 2–6 July 2001; C.S. Calude, M.J. Dinneen, S. Sburlan, eds.), 203–214, *DMTCS Series* **17**, Springer-Verlag, London, 2001.
- [83] B. Spitters, Located operators, *Math. Logic Quarterly* **48**(Suppl. 1), 107–122, 2002.
- [84] W.P. van Stigt, *Brouwers Intuitionism*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990.
- [85] G. Stolzenberg, *Review of* [9], *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **76**, 301–323, 1970.
- [86] W. Takahashi, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Yokohama Publishers, 2000.
- [87] A. Takayama, *Mathematical Economics*, The Dryden Press, Hinsdale, IL, 1973.
- [88] A.S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen, *Constructivism in Mathematics: An Introduction* (two volumes), North Holland, Amsterdam, 1988.
- [89] F. Waaldijk, On the foundations of constructive mathematics, *Foundations of Science* **10**(3), 249–324, 2005.
- [90] H. Weber, Leopold Kronecker, *Jahresber. der Deutschen Math. Verein* **2**, 5–31, 1893.
- [91] K. Weihrauch, *Computable Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2000.
- [92] F. Ye, Towards a constructive theory of unbounded operators, *J. Symb. Logic* **65**, 357–370, 2000.

- [93] R. Zach, Hilberts Program, in: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (E.N. Zalta, ed.), URL <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall12003/entries/hilbert-program/>.

The above list contains only a fraction of the publications on constructive mathematics that have appeared in the last forty years, and does not include the sources of all results in our book. The reader should not fall into the trap of believing that an unascribed result was first produced by the authors.

We mention two websites that may interest the reader:

<http://www.math.canterbury.ac.nz/php/groups/cm/faq/>  
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/mathematics-constructive/>

In addition, many of the authors of items in the bibliography have websites that are worth a visit.

The primary historical reference on constructive analysis is [9], the review of which [85] is interesting in its own right. Later references for Bishop-style constructivism are [12, 34], the latter of which gives comparisons between BISH, INT, and RUSS. Beeson [6] and Troelstra–van Dalen [88] contain a wealth of information about the logic, philosophy, and practice of constructive mathematics. For some applications of constructive mathematics, see [20, 33, 92]. The definitive reference for constructive algebra is [72], but [49] should be consulted for more recent work in the field.

The classic work on intuitionism is [48]. The life and works of Brouwer himself are discussed in [44, 45, 84]. Martin-Löfs early work on constructive mathematics is found in [68], and his theory of types appears in [69].

Among the most recent varieties of computable analysis is that of Weihrauch [91]; the translation of BISH into Weihrauchs framework is described in [5].