

Complete Non-Orders and Fixed Points

Akihisa Yamada and Jérémy Dubut

February 23, 2021

Abstract

We develop an Isabelle/HOL library of order-theoretic concepts, such as various completeness conditions and fixed-point theorems. We keep our formalization as general as possible: we reprove several well-known results about complete orders, often without any properties of ordering, thus complete non-orders. In particular, we generalize the Knaster–Tarski theorem so that we ensure the existence of a quasi-fixed point of monotone maps over complete non-orders, and show that the set of quasi-fixed points is complete under a mild condition—*attractivity*—which is implied by either antisymmetry or transitivity. This result generalizes and strengthens a result by Stauti and Maaden. Finally, we recover Kleene’s fixed-point theorem for omega-complete non-orders, again using *attractivity* to prove that Kleene’s fixed points are least quasi-fixed points.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Binary Relations	4
2.1	Various Definitions	5
2.2	Locales for Binary Relations	9
2.2.1	Syntactic Locales	9
2.2.2	Basic Properties of Relations	10
2.3	Combined Properties	16
2.4	Totality	20
2.5	Well-Foundedness	23
2.6	Order Pairs	31
2.7	Relating to Classes	32
2.8	Declaring Duals	37
2.9	Instantiations	40

3	Completeness of Relations	40
3.1	Completeness Conditions	40
3.2	Pointed Ones	43
3.3	Relations between Completeness Conditions	43
3.4	Duality of Completeness Conditions	44
3.5	Completeness Results Requiring Order-Like Properties	45
3.6	Relating to Classes	45
3.7	Set-wise Completeness	45
4	Existence of Fixed Points in Complete Related Sets	46
5	Fixed Points in Well-Complete Antisymmetric Sets	48
6	Completeness of (Quasi-)Fixed Points	52
6.1	Least Quasi-Fixed Points for Attractive Relations.	52
6.2	General Completeness	52
6.3	Instances	53
6.3.1	Instances under attractivity	53
6.3.2	Usual instances under antisymmetry	54
7	Iterative Fixed Point Theorem	55
7.1	Scott Continuity, ω -Completeness, ω -Continuity	55
7.2	Existence of Iterative Fixed Points	56
7.3	Iterative Fixed Points are Least.	57

1 Introduction

The main driving force towards mechanizing mathematics using proof assistants has been the reliability they offer, exemplified prominently by [7], [8], [10], etc. In this work, we utilize another aspect of Isabelle/JEdit [17] as engineering tools for developing mathematical theories. We formalize order-theoretic concepts and results, adhering to an *as-general-as-possible* approach: most results concerning order-theoretic completeness and fixed-point theorems are proved without assuming the underlying relations to be orders (non-orders). In particular, we provide the following:

- A locale-based library for binary relations, as partly depicted in Figure 1.
- Various completeness results that generalize known theorems in order theory: Actually most relationships and duality of completeness conditions are proved without *any* properties of the underlying relations.
- Existence of fixed points: We show that a relation-preserving mapping $f : A \rightarrow A$ over a complete non-order $\langle A, \sqsubseteq \rangle$ admits a *quasi-fixed point*

the notion of order itself, removing transitivity (pseudo-orders [15]); by relaxing the notion of lattice, considering minimal upper bounds instead of least upper bounds (χ -posets [11]); by relaxing the notion of completeness, requiring the existence of least upper bounds for restricted classes of subsets (e.g., directed complete and ω -complete, see [5] for a textbook). Considering those generalizations, it was natural to prove new versions of classical fixed-point theorems for maps preserving those structures, e.g., existence of least fixed points for monotone maps on (weak chain) complete pseudo-orders [4, 16], construction of least fixed points for ω -continuous functions for ω -complete lattices [12], (weak chain) completeness of the set of fixed points for monotone functions on (weak chain) complete pseudo-orders [13].

Concerning Isabelle formalization, one can easily find several formalizations of complete partial orders or lattices in Isabelle's standard library. They are, however, defined on partial orders, either in form of classes or locales, and thus not directly reusable for non-orders. Nevertheless we tried to make our formalization compatible with the existing ones, and various correspondences are ensured.

This work has been published in the conference paper [18].

2 Binary Relations

We start with basic properties of binary relations.

```
theory Binary-Relations
imports
  Main
begin
```

```
lemma conj-imp-eq-imp-imp:  $(P \wedge Q \implies PROP R) \equiv (P \implies Q \implies PROP R)$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma tranclp-trancl:  $r^{++} = (\lambda x y. (x,y) \in \{(a,b). r a b\}^+)$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma tranclp-id[simp]:  $transp r \implies tranclp r = r$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma transp-tranclp[simp]:  $transp (tranclp r)$  <proof>
```

```
lemma funpow-dom:  $f \text{ ' } A \subseteq A \implies (f \sim n) \text{ ' } A \subseteq A$  <proof>
```

Below we introduce an Isabelle-notation for $\{\dots x \dots \mid x \in X\}$.

```
syntax
  -range :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  idts  $\Rightarrow$  'a set  $((I\{- \ /|\cdot / -\})$ )
  -image :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  ptttn  $\Rightarrow$  'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set  $((I\{- \ /|\cdot / (- \in -)\})$ )
translations
   $\{e \mid p\} \equiv \{e \mid p. CONST True\}$ 
```

$\{e \mid p \in A\} \equiv \text{CONST image } (\lambda p. e) A$

lemma *image-constant*:

assumes $\bigwedge i. i \in I \implies f i = y$

shows $f ` I = (\text{if } I = \{\} \text{ then } \{\} \text{ else } \{y\})$

<proof>

2.1 Various Definitions

Here we introduce various definitions for binary relations. The first one is our abbreviation for the dual of a relation.

abbreviation(*input*) *dual* $((-)) [1000] 1000$ **where** $r^- x y \equiv r y x$

lemma *conversep-is-dual*[*simp*]: *conversep* = *dual* *<proof>*

Monotonicity is already defined in the library, but we want one restricted to a domain.

definition *monotone-on* $X r s f \equiv \forall x y. x \in X \longrightarrow y \in X \longrightarrow r x y \longrightarrow s (f x) (f y)$

lemmas *monotone-onI* = *monotone-on-def*[*unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD2, rule-format*]

lemma *monotone-onD*: *monotone-on* $X r s f \implies r x y \implies x \in X \implies y \in X \implies s (f x) (f y)$

<proof>

lemmas *monotone-onE* = *monotone-on-def*[*unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD1, elim-format, rule-format*]

lemma *monotone-on-UNIV*[*simp*]: *monotone-on UNIV* = *monotone* *<proof>*

lemma *monotone-on-dual*: *monotone-on* $X r s f \implies \text{monotone-on } X r^- s^- f$ *<proof>*

lemma *monotone-on-id*: *monotone-on* $X r r \text{ id}$ *<proof>*

lemma *monotone-on-cmono*: $A \subseteq B \implies \text{monotone-on } B \leq \text{monotone-on } A$ *<proof>*

Here we define the following notions in a standard manner

The symmetric part of a relation:

definition *sympartp* **where** *sympartp* $r x y \equiv r x y \wedge r y x$

lemma *sympartpI*[*intro*]:

fixes r (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

assumes $x \sqsubseteq y$ **and** $y \sqsubseteq x$ **shows** *sympartp* $(\sqsubseteq) x y$

<proof>

lemma *sympartpE[elim]*:
fixes r (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
assumes *sympartp* (\sqsubseteq) $x y$ **and** $x \sqsubseteq y \implies y \sqsubseteq x \implies$ *thesis* **shows** *thesis*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *sympartp-dual*: *sympartp* $r^- =$ *sympartp* r
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *sympartp-eq[simp]*: *sympartp* $(=) = (=)$ \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *reflclp-sympartp[simp]*: $(\text{sympartp } r)^{==} = \text{sympartp } r^{==}$ \langle *proof* \rangle

definition *equivpartp* $r x y \equiv x = y \vee r x y \wedge r y x$

lemma *sympartp-reflclp-equiv[simp]*: *sympartp* $r^{==} =$ *equivpartp* r \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *equivpartI[simp]*: *equivpartp* $r x x$
and *sympartp-equivpartI*: *sympartp* $r x y \implies$ *equivpartp* $r x y$
and *equivpartCI[intro]*: $(x \neq y \implies \text{sympartp } r x y) \implies$ *equivpartp* $r x y$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *equivpartpE[elim]*:
assumes *equivpartp* $r x y$
and $x = y \implies$ *thesis*
and $r x y \implies r y x \implies$ *thesis*
shows *thesis*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *equivpartp-eq[simp]*: *equivpartp* $(=) = (=)$ \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *sympartp-equivpartp[simp]*: *sympartp* (*equivpartp* r) = (*equivpartp* r)
and *equivpartp-equivpartp[simp]*: *equivpartp* (*equivpartp* r) = (*equivpartp* r)
and *equivpartp-sympartp[simp]*: *equivpartp* (*sympartp* r) = (*equivpartp* r)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *equivpartp-dual*: *equivpartp* $r^- =$ *equivpartp* r
 \langle *proof* \rangle

The asymmetric part:

definition *asympartp* $r x y \equiv r x y \wedge \neg r y x$

lemma *asympartpE[elim]*:
fixes r (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
shows *asympartp* (\sqsubseteq) $x y \implies (x \sqsubseteq y \implies \neg y \sqsubseteq x \implies$ *thesis*) \implies *thesis*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemmas *asympartpI[intro]* = *asympartp-def[unfolding atomize-eq, THEN iffD2, unfolded conj-imp-eq-imp-imp, rule-format]*

lemma *asymptp-eq[simp]*: $asymptp (=) = bot$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *asymptp-symptp [simp]*: $asymptp (symptp r) = bot$
and *symptp-asymptp [simp]*: $symptp (asymptp r) = bot$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Restriction to a set:

definition *Restrp (infixl \uparrow 60)* **where** $(r \uparrow A) a b \equiv a \in A \wedge b \in A \wedge r a b$

lemmas *RestrpI[intro!]* = *Restrp-def[unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD2, unfolded conj-imp-eq-imp-imp]*

lemmas *RestrpE[elim!]* = *Restrp-def[unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD1, elim-format, unfolded conj-imp-eq-imp-imp]*

lemma *Restrp-UNIV[simp]*: $r \uparrow UNIV \equiv r$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Restrp-Restrp[simp]*: $r \uparrow A \uparrow B \equiv r \uparrow A \cap B$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *symptp-Restrp[simp]*: $symptp (r \uparrow A) \equiv symptp r \uparrow A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Relational images:

definition *Imagep (infixr $\overset{\curvearrowright}{\leftarrow}$ 59)* **where** $r \overset{\curvearrowright}{\leftarrow} A \equiv \{b. \exists a \in A. r a b\}$

lemma *Imagep-Image*: $r \overset{\curvearrowright}{\leftarrow} A = \{(a,b). r a b\} \overset{\curvearrowright}{\leftarrow} A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *in-Imagep*: $b \in r \overset{\curvearrowright}{\leftarrow} A \longleftrightarrow (\exists a \in A. r a b)$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ImagepI*: $a \in A \Longrightarrow r a b \Longrightarrow b \in r \overset{\curvearrowright}{\leftarrow} A$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *subset-Imagep*: $B \subseteq r \overset{\curvearrowright}{\leftarrow} A \longleftrightarrow (\forall b \in B. \exists a \in A. r a b)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Bounds of a set:

definition *bound X r b* $\equiv \forall x \in X. r x b$

lemma

fixes r (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

shows *boundI[intro!]*: $(\bigwedge x. x \in X \Longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq b) \Longrightarrow bound X (\sqsubseteq) b$

and *boundE[elim]*: $bound X (\sqsubseteq) b \Longrightarrow ((\bigwedge x. x \in X \Longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq b) \Longrightarrow thesis) \Longrightarrow thesis$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *bound-empty*: $bound \{\} = (\lambda r x. True)$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *bound-insert[simp]*:

fixes r (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

shows $\text{bound } (\text{insert } x \ X) \ (\sqsubseteq) \ b \longleftrightarrow x \sqsubseteq b \wedge \text{bound } X \ (\sqsubseteq) \ b \langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Extreme (greatest) elements in a set:

definition $\text{extreme } X \ r \ e \equiv e \in X \wedge (\forall x \in X. \ r \ x \ e)$

lemma

fixes r (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

shows $\text{extremeI}[\text{intro}]: e \in X \implies (\bigwedge x. x \in X \implies x \sqsubseteq e) \implies \text{extreme } X \ (\sqsubseteq) \ e$
and $\text{extremeD}: \text{extreme } X \ (\sqsubseteq) \ e \implies e \in X \ \text{extreme } X \ (\sqsubseteq) \ e \implies (\bigwedge x. x \in X \implies x \sqsubseteq e)$
and $\text{extremeE}[\text{elim}]: \text{extreme } X \ (\sqsubseteq) \ e \implies (e \in X \implies (\bigwedge x. x \in X \implies x \sqsubseteq e) \implies \text{thesis}) \implies \text{thesis}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma

fixes r (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

shows $\text{extreme-UNIV}[\text{simp}]: \text{extreme } \text{UNIV} \ (\sqsubseteq) \ t \longleftrightarrow (\forall x. x \sqsubseteq t) \langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{extremes-equiv}: \text{extreme } X \ r \ b \implies \text{extreme } X \ r \ c \implies \text{sympartp } r \ b \ c \langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{bound-cmono}: \text{assumes } X \subseteq Y \ \text{shows } \text{bound } Y \leq \text{bound } X \langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{sympartp-sympartp}[\text{simp}]: \text{sympartp } (\text{sympartp } r) = \text{sympartp } r \langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Now suprema and infima are given uniformly as follows. The definition is restricted to a given set.

context

fixes $A :: 'a \ \text{set}$ **and** $\text{less-eq} :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

begin

abbreviation $\text{extreme-bound } X \equiv \text{extreme } \{b \in A. \ \text{bound } X \ (\sqsubseteq) \ b\} \ (\lambda x \ y. \ y \sqsubseteq x)$

lemma $\text{extreme-boundI}[\text{intro}]:$

assumes $\bigwedge b. \ \text{bound } X \ (\sqsubseteq) \ b \implies b \in A \implies s \sqsubseteq b$ **and** $\bigwedge x. x \in X \implies x \sqsubseteq s$
and $s \in A$
shows $\text{extreme-bound } X \ s$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{extreme-bound-bound}: \text{extreme-bound } X \ y \implies x \in X \implies x \sqsubseteq y \langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{extreme-bound-mono}:$

assumes $XY: X \subseteq Y$

and $sX: \text{extreme-bound } X \ sX$

and $sY: \text{extreme-bound } Y \ sY$

shows $sX \sqsubseteq sY$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{extreme-bound-iff}:$

shows *extreme-bound* X $s \longleftrightarrow s \in A \wedge (\forall c \in A. (\forall x \in X. x \sqsubseteq c) \longrightarrow s \sqsubseteq c)$
 $\wedge (\forall x \in X. x \sqsubseteq s)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *extreme-bound-singleton-refl*[*simp*]:
extreme-bound $\{x\}$ $x \longleftrightarrow x \in A \wedge x \sqsubseteq x$ $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *extreme-bound-image-const*:
 $x \sqsubseteq x \Longrightarrow I \neq \{\}$ $\Longrightarrow (\bigwedge i. i \in I \Longrightarrow f i = x) \Longrightarrow x \in A \Longrightarrow \text{extreme-bound } (f$
 $\text{' } I) x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *extreme-bound-UN-const*:
 $x \sqsubseteq x \Longrightarrow I \neq \{\}$ $\Longrightarrow (\bigwedge i y. i \in I \Longrightarrow P i y \longleftrightarrow x = y) \Longrightarrow x \in A \Longrightarrow$
extreme-bound $(\bigcup_{i \in I}. \{y. P i y\}) x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

context

fixes $ir :: 'i \Rightarrow 'i \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ (**infix** \preceq 50)
and $r :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
and f **and** A **and** e **and** I
assumes $fIA: f \text{' } I \subseteq A$
and $mono: \text{monotone-on } I (\preceq) (\sqsubseteq) f$
and $e: \text{extreme } I (\preceq) e$

begin

lemma *monotone-extreme-imp-extreme-bound*:
extreme-bound $A (\sqsubseteq) (f \text{' } I) (f e)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *monotone-extreme-extreme-boundI*:
 $x = f e \Longrightarrow \text{extreme-bound } A (\sqsubseteq) (f \text{' } I) x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

2.2 Locales for Binary Relations

We now define basic properties of binary relations, in form of *locales* [9, 2].

2.2.1 Syntactic Locales

The following locales do not assume anything, but provide infix notations for relations.

locale *less-eq-syntax* =
fixes $\text{less-eq} :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

```

locale less-syntax =
  fixes less :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ bool (infix  $\sqsubset$  50)

locale equivalence-syntax =
  fixes equiv :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ bool (infix  $\sim$  50)
begin

abbreviation equiv-class ( $[-]_{\sim}$ ) where  $[x]_{\sim} \equiv \{ y. x \sim y \}$ 

end

```

Next ones introduce abbreviations for dual etc. To avoid needless constants, one should be careful when declaring them as sublocales.

```

locale less-eq-notations = less-eq-syntax
begin

abbreviation (input) greater-eq (infix  $\sqsupseteq$  50) where  $x \sqsupseteq y \equiv y \sqsubseteq x$ 
abbreviation sym (infix  $\sim$  50) where  $(\sim) \equiv \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$ 
abbreviation less (infix  $\sqsubset$  50) where  $(\sqsubset) \equiv \text{asymptp } (\sqsubseteq)$ 
abbreviation greater (infix  $\sqsupset$  50) where  $(\sqsupset) \equiv (\sqsubset)^-$ 
abbreviation equiv (infix  $\simeq$  50) where  $(\simeq) \equiv \text{equivpartp } (\sqsubseteq)$ 

lemma asym-cases[consumes 1, case-names asym sym]:
  assumes  $x \sqsubseteq y$  and  $x \sqsubset y \implies \text{thesis}$  and  $x \sim y \implies \text{thesis}$ 
  shows thesis
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

end

```

```

locale less-notations = less-syntax
begin

abbreviation (input) greater (infix  $\sqsupset$  50) where  $x \sqsupset y \equiv y \sqsubset x$ 

end

locale related-set =
  fixes A :: 'a set and less-eq :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ bool (infix  $\sqsubseteq$  50)

```

2.2.2 Basic Properties of Relations

In the following we define basic properties in form of locales.

Reflexivity restricted on a set:

```

locale reflexive = related-set +
  assumes refl[intro]:  $x \in A \implies x \sqsubseteq x$ 
begin

```

lemma *eq-implies*: $x = y \implies x \in A \implies x \sqsubseteq y$ *<proof>*

lemma *extreme-singleton[simp]*: $x \in A \implies \text{extreme } \{x\} (\sqsubseteq) y \longleftrightarrow x = y$ *<proof>*

lemma *extreme-bound-singleton*: $x \in A \implies \text{extreme-bound } A (\sqsubseteq) \{x\} x$ *<proof>*

lemma *reflexive-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{reflexive } B (\sqsubseteq)$ *<proof>*

end

declare *reflexive.intro*[intro!]

lemma *reflexiveE[elim]*:
assumes *reflexive* A r **and** $(\bigwedge x. x \in A \implies r x x) \implies \text{thesis}$ **shows** *thesis*
<proof>

lemma *reflexive-cong*:
 $(\bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b) \implies \text{reflexive } A r \longleftrightarrow \text{reflexive } A r'$
<proof>

locale *irreflexive = related-set* A (\sqsubseteq) **for** A **and** *less* (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50) +
assumes *irrefl*: $x \in A \implies \neg x \sqsubseteq x$
begin

lemma *irreflD[simp]*: $x \sqsubseteq x \implies \neg x \in A$ *<proof>*

lemma *implies-not-eq*: $x \sqsubseteq y \implies x \in A \implies x \neq y$ *<proof>*

lemma *Restrp-irreflexive*: *irreflexive* $UNIV ((\sqsubseteq) \upharpoonright A)$
<proof>

lemma *irreflexive-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{irreflexive } B (\sqsubseteq)$ *<proof>*

end

declare *irreflexive.intro*[intro!]

lemma *irreflexive-cong*:
 $(\bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b) \implies \text{irreflexive } A r \longleftrightarrow \text{irreflexive } A r'$
<proof>

locale *transitive = related-set* +
assumes *trans*[*trans*]: $x \sqsubseteq y \implies y \sqsubseteq z \implies x \in A \implies y \in A \implies z \in A \implies x \sqsubseteq z$
begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations**<proof>*

lemma *Restrp-transitive: transitive UNIV* $((\sqsubseteq)\upharpoonright A)$

<proof>

lemma *bound-trans[trans]: bound X* $(\sqsubseteq) b \implies b \sqsubseteq c \implies X \subseteq A \implies b \in A \implies c \in A \implies \text{bound } X (\sqsubseteq) c$

<proof>

lemma *transitive-subset:*

assumes *BA: B* $\subseteq A$ **shows** *transitive B* (\sqsubseteq)

<proof>

lemma *asymptp-transitive: transitive A* (\sqsubset)

<proof>

lemma *reflclp-transitive: transitive A* $(\sqsubseteq)^{==}$

<proof>

The symmetric part is also transitive, but this is done in the later semi-attractive locale

end

declare *transitive.intro* $[intro?]$

lemma *transitive-cong:*

assumes *r: $\bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$* **shows** *transitive A r*
 \longleftrightarrow *transitive A r'*

<proof>

lemma *tranclp-transitive: transitive A* $(\text{tranclp } r)$

<proof>

locale *symmetric = related-set A* (\sim) **for** *A* **and** *equiv* $(\text{infix } \sim 50) +$

assumes *sym[sym]: x* $\sim y \implies x \in A \implies y \in A \implies y \sim x$

begin

lemma *sym-iff: x* $\in A \implies y \in A \implies x \sim y \longleftrightarrow y \sim x$

<proof>

lemma *Restrp-symmetric: symmetric UNIV* $((\sim)\upharpoonright A)$

<proof>

lemma *symmetric-subset: B* $\subseteq A \implies$ *symmetric B* (\sim)

<proof>

end

declare *symmetric.intro* $[intro]$

lemma *symmetric-cong*:

$(\bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b) \implies \text{symmetric } A r \longleftrightarrow \text{symmetric } A r'$
<proof>

global-interpretation *sympartp*: *symmetric UNIV sympartp r*

rewrites $\bigwedge r. r \upharpoonright \text{UNIV} \equiv r$
and $\bigwedge x. x \in \text{UNIV} \equiv \text{True}$
and $\bigwedge P1. (\text{True} \implies P1) \equiv \text{Trueprop } P1$
and $\bigwedge P1 P2. (\text{True} \implies \text{PROP } P1 \implies \text{PROP } P2) \equiv (\text{PROP } P1 \implies \text{PROP } P2)$
<proof>

lemma *sympartp-symmetric*: *symmetric A (sympartp r) <proof>*

locale *antisymmetric* = *related-set* +

assumes *antisym*: $x \sqsubseteq y \implies y \sqsubseteq x \implies x \in A \implies y \in A \implies x = y$
begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations**<proof>*

lemma *sym-iff-eq-refl*: $x \in A \implies y \in A \implies x \sim y \longleftrightarrow x = y \wedge y \sqsubseteq x$ *<proof>*

lemma *equiv-iff-eq[simp]*: $x \in A \implies y \in A \implies x \simeq y \longleftrightarrow x = y$ *<proof>*

lemma *extreme-unique*: $X \subseteq A \implies \text{extreme } X (\sqsubseteq) x \implies \text{extreme } X (\sqsubseteq) y \longleftrightarrow x = y$
<proof>

lemma *ex-extreme-iff-ex1*:

$X \subseteq A \implies \text{Ex } (\text{extreme } X (\sqsubseteq)) \longleftrightarrow \text{Ex1 } (\text{extreme } X (\sqsubseteq))$ *<proof>*

lemma *ex-extreme-iff-the*:

$X \subseteq A \implies \text{Ex } (\text{extreme } X (\sqsubseteq)) \longleftrightarrow \text{extreme } X (\sqsubseteq) (\text{The } (\text{extreme } X (\sqsubseteq)))$
<proof>

lemma *Restrp-antisymmetric*: *antisymmetric UNIV ((\sqsubseteq) \upharpoonright A)*

<proof>

lemma *antisymmetric-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{antisymmetric } B (\sqsubseteq)$

<proof>

end

declare *antisymmetric.intro*[*intro*]

lemma *antisymmetric-cong*:

$(\bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b) \implies \text{antisymmetric } A r \longleftrightarrow$

antisymmetric A r'
<proof>

lemma antisymmetric-union:
fixes *less-eq* (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
assumes *A: antisymmetric A* (\sqsubseteq) **and** *B: antisymmetric B* (\sqsubseteq)
and *AB: $\forall a \in A. \forall b \in B. a \sqsubseteq b \longrightarrow b \sqsubseteq a \longrightarrow a = b$*
shows *antisymmetric (A \cup B)* (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

The following notion is new, generalizing antisymmetry and transitivity.

locale *semiattractive = related-set +*
assumes *attract: $x \sqsubseteq y \Longrightarrow y \sqsubseteq x \Longrightarrow y \sqsubseteq z \Longrightarrow x \in A \Longrightarrow y \in A \Longrightarrow z \in A \Longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq z$*
begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations**<proof>*

lemma equiv-order-trans[*trans*]:
assumes *xy: $x \simeq y$* **and** *yz: $y \sqsubseteq z$* **and** *x: $x \in A$* **and** *y: $y \in A$* **and** *z: $z \in A$*
shows *$x \sqsubseteq z$*
<proof>

lemma equiv-transitive: transitive A (\simeq)
<proof>

lemma sym-order-trans[*trans*]:
assumes *xy: $x \sim y$* **and** *yz: $y \sqsubseteq z$* **and** *x: $x \in A$* **and** *y: $y \in A$* **and** *z: $z \in A$*
shows *$x \sqsubseteq z$*
<proof>

interpretation *sym: transitive A* (\sim)
<proof>

lemmas *sym-transitive = sym.transitive-axioms*

lemma extreme-bound-quasi-const:
assumes *C: $C \subseteq A$* **and** *x: $x \in A$* **and** *C0: $C \neq \{\}$* **and** *const: $\forall y \in C. y \sim x$*
shows *extreme-bound A* (\sqsubseteq) *C x*
<proof>

lemma extreme-bound-quasi-const-iff:
assumes *C: $C \subseteq A$* **and** *x: $x \in A$* **and** *y: $y \in A$* **and** *C0: $C \neq \{\}$* **and** *const:*
 $\forall z \in C. z \sim x$
shows *extreme-bound A* (\sqsubseteq) *C y \longleftrightarrow $x \sim y$*
<proof>

lemma Restr-p-semiattractive: semiattractive UNIV ($(\sqsubseteq) \upharpoonright A$)
<proof>

lemma *semiattractive-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{semiattractive } B \ (\sqsubseteq)$
 ⟨proof⟩

end

lemma *semiattractive-cong*:
 assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$
 shows $\text{semiattractive } A r \longleftrightarrow \text{semiattractive } A r' \ (\text{is } ?l \longleftrightarrow ?r)$
 ⟨proof⟩

locale *attractive* = *semiattractive* +
 assumes $\text{semiattractive } A \ (\sqsubseteq)^-$
begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations*⟨proof⟩

sublocale *dual*: $\text{semiattractive } A \ (\sqsubseteq)^-$
 rewrites $\bigwedge r. \text{sympartp } (r \upharpoonright A) \equiv \text{sympartp } r \upharpoonright A$
 and $\bigwedge r. \text{sympartp } (\text{sympartp } r) \equiv \text{sympartp } r$
 and $\text{sympartp } ((\sqsubseteq) \upharpoonright A)^- \equiv (\sim) \upharpoonright A$
 and $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- \equiv (\sim)$
 and $\text{equivpartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- \equiv (\simeq)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *order-equiv-trans*[*trans*]:
 assumes $xy: x \sqsubseteq y$ and $yz: y \simeq z$ and $x: x \in A$ and $y: y \in A$ and $z: z \in A$
 shows $x \sqsubseteq z$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *order-sym-trans*[*trans*]:
 assumes $xy: x \sqsubseteq y$ and $yz: y \sim z$ and $x: x \in A$ and $y: y \in A$ and $z: z \in A$
 shows $x \sqsubseteq z$
 ⟨proof⟩

interpretation *Restr*: $\text{semiattractive } UNIV \ (\sqsubseteq) \upharpoonright A$ ⟨proof⟩

interpretation *dual.Restrict*: $\text{semiattractive } UNIV \ (\sqsubseteq)^- \upharpoonright A$ ⟨proof⟩

lemma *Restr-attractive*: $\text{attractive } UNIV \ ((\sqsubseteq) \upharpoonright A)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *attractive-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{attractive } B \ (\sqsubseteq)$
 ⟨proof⟩

end

lemma *attractive-cong*:
 assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$
 shows $\text{attractive } A r \longleftrightarrow \text{attractive } A r'$

```

    <proof>

context antisymmetric begin

sublocale attractive
    <proof>

end

context transitive begin

sublocale attractive
    rewrites  $\bigwedge r. \text{sympartp } (r \uparrow A) \equiv \text{sympartp } r \uparrow A$ 
    and  $\bigwedge r. \text{sympartp } (\text{sympartp } r) \equiv \text{sympartp } r$ 
    and  $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- \equiv \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$ 
    and  $(\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq))^- \equiv \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$ 
    and  $(\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq) \uparrow A)^- \equiv \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq) \uparrow A$ 
    and  $\text{asymptp } (\text{asymptp } (\sqsubseteq)) = \text{asymptp } (\sqsubseteq)$ 
    and  $\text{asymptp } (\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)) = \text{bot}$ 
    and  $\text{asymptp } (\sqsubseteq) \uparrow A = \text{asymptp } ((\sqsubseteq) \uparrow A)$ 
    <proof>

end

```

2.3 Combined Properties

Some combinations of the above basic properties are given names.

```

locale asymmetric = related-set  $A (\sqsubseteq)$  for  $A$  and less (infix  $\sqsubseteq$  50) +
    assumes asym:  $x \sqsubseteq y \implies y \sqsubseteq x \implies x \in A \implies y \in A \implies \text{False}$ 
begin

```

```

sublocale irreflexive
    <proof>

```

```

lemma antisymmetric-axioms: antisymmetric  $A (\sqsubseteq)$ 
    <proof>

```

```

lemma Restrp-asymmetric: asymmetric  $UNIV ((\sqsubseteq) \uparrow A)$ 
    <proof>

```

```

lemma asymmetric-subset:  $B \subseteq A \implies \text{asymmetric } B (\sqsubseteq)$ 
    <proof>

```

```

end

```

```

lemma asymmetric-iff-irreflexive-antisymmetric:
    fixes less (infix  $\sqsubseteq$  50)
    shows  $\text{asymmetric } A (\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow \text{irreflexive } A (\sqsubseteq) \wedge \text{antisymmetric } A (\sqsubseteq)$  (is ?l
 $\longleftrightarrow$  ?r)

```


<proof>

lemma *asymmetric-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$

shows $\text{asymmetric } A r \longleftrightarrow \text{asymmetric } A r'$

<proof>

locale *quasi-ordered-set* = *reflexive* + *transitive*

begin

lemma *quasi-ordered-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{quasi-ordered-set } B (\sqsubseteq)$

<proof>

end

lemma *quasi-ordered-set-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$

shows $\text{quasi-ordered-set } A r \longleftrightarrow \text{quasi-ordered-set } A r'$

<proof>

locale *near-ordered-set* = *antisymmetric* + *transitive*

begin

interpretation *Restrp*: *antisymmetric UNIV* (\sqsubseteq) $\upharpoonright A$ *<proof>*

interpretation *Restrp*: *transitive UNIV* (\sqsubseteq) $\upharpoonright A$ *<proof>*

lemma *Restrp-near-order*: *near-ordered-set UNIV* ($(\sqsubseteq)\upharpoonright A$)*<proof>*

lemma *near-ordered-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{near-ordered-set } B (\sqsubseteq)$

<proof>

end

lemma *near-ordered-set-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$

shows $\text{near-ordered-set } A r \longleftrightarrow \text{near-ordered-set } A r'$

<proof>

locale *pseudo-ordered-set* = *reflexive* + *antisymmetric*

begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations**<proof>*

lemma *sym-eq[simp]*: $x \in A \implies y \in A \implies x \sim y \longleftrightarrow x = y$

<proof>

lemma *extreme-bound-singleton-eq[simp]*: $x \in A \implies \text{extreme-bound } A (\sqsubseteq) \{x\} y$

$\longleftrightarrow x = y$

<proof>

lemma *eq-iff*: $x \in A \implies y \in A \implies x = y \longleftrightarrow x \sqsubseteq y \wedge y \sqsubseteq x$ *<proof>*

lemma *extreme-order-iff-eq*: $e \in A \implies \text{extreme } \{x \in A. x \sqsubseteq e\} (\sqsubseteq) s \longleftrightarrow e = s$
<proof>

lemma *pseudo-ordered-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{pseudo-ordered-set } B (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

end

lemma *pseudo-ordered-set-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$

shows $\text{pseudo-ordered-set } A r \longleftrightarrow \text{pseudo-ordered-set } A r'$

<proof>

locale *partially-ordered-set* = *reflexive* + *antisymmetric* + *transitive*
begin

sublocale *pseudo-ordered-set* + *quasi-ordered-set* + *near-ordered-set* *<proof>*

lemma *partially-ordered-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{partially-ordered-set } B (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

end

lemma *partially-ordered-set-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$

shows $\text{partially-ordered-set } A r \longleftrightarrow \text{partially-ordered-set } A r'$

<proof>

locale *strict-ordered-set* = *irreflexive* + *transitive* $A (\sqsubset)$
begin

sublocale *asymmetric*
<proof>

lemma *near-ordered-set-axioms*: $\text{near-ordered-set } A (\sqsubset)$
<proof>

interpretation *Restrp*: *asymmetric UNIV* $(\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A$ *<proof>*

interpretation *Restrp*: *transitive UNIV* $(\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A$ *<proof>*

lemma *Restrp-strict-order*: $\text{strict-ordered-set UNIV } ((\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A)$ *<proof>*

lemma *strict-ordered-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{strict-ordered-set } B (\sqsubset)$
<proof>

end

lemma *strict-ordered-set-cong*:
assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$
shows *strict-ordered-set* $A r \longleftrightarrow$ *strict-ordered-set* $A r'$
<proof>

locale *tolerance = symmetric + reflexive* $A (\sim)$
begin

lemma *tolerance-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies$ *tolerance* $B (\sim)$
<proof>

end

lemma *tolerance-cong*:
assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$
shows *tolerance* $A r \longleftrightarrow$ *tolerance* $A r'$
<proof>

global-interpretation *equiv: tolerance UNIV equivpartp r*
rewrites $\bigwedge r. r \upharpoonright UNIV \equiv r$
and $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv True$
and $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies P1) \equiv Trueprop P1$
and $\bigwedge P1 P2. (True \implies PROP P1 \implies PROP P2) \equiv (PROP P1 \implies PROP P2)$
<proof>

locale *partial-equivalence = symmetric +*
assumes *transitive* $A (\sim)$
begin

sublocale *transitive* $A (\sim)$
rewrites *sympartp* $(\sim) \upharpoonright A \equiv (\sim) \upharpoonright A$
and *sympartp* $((\sim) \upharpoonright A) \equiv (\sim) \upharpoonright A$
<proof>

lemma *partial-equivalence-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies$ *partial-equivalence* $B (\sim)$
<proof>

end

lemma *partial-equivalence-cong*:
assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$
shows *partial-equivalence* $A r \longleftrightarrow$ *partial-equivalence* $A r'$
<proof>

locale *equivalence = symmetric + reflexive* $A (\sim)$ **+ transitive** $A (\sim)$
begin

sublocale *tolerance + partial-equivalence + quasi-ordered-set* A (\sim) \langle proof \rangle

lemma *equivalence-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{equivalence } B$ (\sim)
 \langle proof \rangle

end

lemma *equivalence-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$

shows *equivalence* $A r \longleftrightarrow \text{equivalence } A r'$

\langle proof \rangle

Some combinations lead to uninteresting relations.

context

fixes $r :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ (**infix** \bowtie 50)

begin

proposition *reflexive-irreflexive-is-empty*:

assumes r : *reflexive* A (\bowtie) **and** ir : *irreflexive* A (\bowtie)

shows $A = \{\}$

\langle proof \rangle

proposition *symmetric-antisymmetric-imp-eq*:

assumes s : *symmetric* A (\bowtie) **and** as : *antisymmetric* A (\bowtie)

shows $(\bowtie) \upharpoonright A \leq (=)$

\langle proof \rangle

proposition *nontolerance*:

shows *irreflexive* A (\bowtie) \wedge *symmetric* A (\bowtie) \longleftrightarrow *tolerance* A ($\lambda x y. \neg x \bowtie y$)

\langle proof \rangle

proposition *irreflexive-transitive-symmetric-is-empty*:

assumes irr : *irreflexive* A (\bowtie) **and** tr : *transitive* A (\bowtie) **and** sym : *symmetric* A (\bowtie)

shows $(\bowtie) \upharpoonright A = \text{bot}$

\langle proof \rangle

end

2.4 Totality

locale *semiconnex = related-set* A (\sqsubset) **for** A **and** *less* (**infix** \sqsubset 50) +

assumes *semiconnex*: $x \in A \implies y \in A \implies x \sqsubset y \vee x = y \vee y \sqsubset x$

begin

lemma *cases*[*consumes 2, case-names less eq greater*]:

assumes $x \in A$ **and** $y \in A$ **and** $x \sqsubset y \implies P$ **and** $x = y \implies P$ **and** $y \sqsubset x \implies P$

shows P \langle proof \rangle

lemma *neqE*:
assumes $x \in A$ **and** $y \in A$
shows $x \neq y \implies (x \sqsubset y \implies P) \implies (y \sqsubset x \implies P) \implies P$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *semiconnex-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{semiconnex } B \ (\sqsubset)$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

end

declare *semiconnex.intro*[*intro*]

Totality is negated antisymmetry [14, Proposition 2.2.4].

proposition *semiconnex-iff-neg-antisymmetric*:

fixes *less* (**infix** \sqsubset 50)
shows $\text{semiconnex } A \ (\sqsubset) \longleftrightarrow \text{antisymmetric } A \ (\lambda x y. \neg x \sqsubset y)$ (**is** $?l \longleftrightarrow ?r$)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *semiconnex-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$
shows $\text{semiconnex } A \ r \longleftrightarrow \text{semiconnex } A \ r'$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

locale *semiconnex-irreflexive* = *semiconnex* + *irreflexive*
begin

lemma *neq-iff*: $x \in A \implies y \in A \implies x \neq y \longleftrightarrow x \sqsubset y \vee y \sqsubset x$ \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *semiconnex-irreflexive-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{semiconnex-irreflexive } B \ (\sqsubset)$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

end

lemma *semiconnex-irreflexive-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$
shows $\text{semiconnex-irreflexive } A \ r \longleftrightarrow \text{semiconnex-irreflexive } A \ r'$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

locale *connex* = *related-set* +

assumes *comparable*: $x \in A \implies y \in A \implies x \sqsubseteq y \vee y \sqsubseteq x$

begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations* \langle *proof* \rangle

sublocale *reflexive* \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *comparable-cases*[*consumes 2, case-names le ge*]:

assumes $x \in A$ **and** $y \in A$ **and** $x \sqsubseteq y \implies P$ **and** $y \sqsubseteq x \implies P$ **shows** P
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *comparable-three-cases*[consumes 2, case-names less eq greater]:
assumes $x \in A$ **and** $y \in A$ **and** $x \sqsubset y \implies P$ **and** $x \sim y \implies P$ **and** $y \sqsubset x \implies P$
shows P
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma
assumes $x: x \in A$ **and** $y: y \in A$
shows *not-iff-asym*: $\neg x \sqsubseteq y \longleftrightarrow y \sqsubset x$
and *not-asym-iff*[simp]: $\neg x \sqsubset y \longleftrightarrow y \sqsubseteq x$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *connex-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies \text{connex } B \ (\sqsubseteq)$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end

lemmas *connexE* = *connex.comparable-cases*

lemmas *connexI*[intro] = *connex.intro*

context

fixes *less-eq* :: $'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
begin

lemma *connex-iff-semiconnex-reflexive*: $\text{connex } A \ (\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow \text{semiconnex } A \ (\sqsubseteq) \wedge \text{reflexive } A \ (\sqsubseteq)$
 (**is** $?c \longleftrightarrow ?t \wedge ?r$)
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *chain-connect*: *Complete-Partial-Order.chain* $r \ A \equiv \text{connex } A \ r$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *connex-union*:

assumes $\text{connex } X \ (\sqsubseteq)$ **and** $\text{connex } Y \ (\sqsubseteq)$ **and** $\forall x \in X. \forall y \in Y. x \sqsubseteq y \vee y \sqsubseteq x$
shows $\text{connex } (X \cup Y) \ (\sqsubseteq)$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end

lemma *connex-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a \ b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r \ a \ b \longleftrightarrow r' \ a \ b$
shows $\text{connex } A \ r \longleftrightarrow \text{connex } A \ r'$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

locale *total-pseudo-ordered-set* = *connex* + *antisymmetric*
begin

sublocale *pseudo-ordered-set* \langle proof \rangle

lemma *not-weak-iff*:

assumes $x: x \in A$ **and** $y: y \in A$ **shows** $\neg y \sqsubseteq x \longleftrightarrow x \sqsubseteq y \wedge x \neq y$
 \langle proof \rangle

lemma *total-pseudo-ordered-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies$ *total-pseudo-ordered-set* B (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle proof \rangle

end

lemma *total-pseudo-ordered-set-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$
shows *total-pseudo-ordered-set* $A r \longleftrightarrow$ *total-pseudo-ordered-set* $A r'$
 \langle proof \rangle

locale *total-quasi-ordered-set* = *connex* + *transitive*

begin

sublocale *quasi-ordered-set* \langle proof \rangle

lemma *total-quasi-ordered-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies$ *total-quasi-ordered-set* B (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle proof \rangle

end

lemma *total-quasi-ordered-set-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$
shows *total-quasi-ordered-set* $A r \longleftrightarrow$ *total-quasi-ordered-set* $A r'$
 \langle proof \rangle

locale *total-ordered-set* = *total-quasi-ordered-set* + *antisymmetric*

begin

sublocale *partially-ordered-set* + *total-pseudo-ordered-set* \langle proof \rangle

lemma *total-ordered-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies$ *total-ordered-set* B (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle proof \rangle

end

lemma *total-ordered-set-cong*:

assumes $r: \bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$
shows *total-ordered-set* $A r \longleftrightarrow$ *total-ordered-set* $A r'$
 \langle proof \rangle

2.5 Well-Foundedness

locale *well-founded* = *related-set* A (\sqsubset) **for** A **and** *less* (**infix** \sqsubset 50) +

assumes *induct*[*consumes 1, case-names less, induct set*]:
 $a \in A \implies (\bigwedge x. x \in A \implies (\bigwedge y. y \in A \implies y \sqsubset x \implies P y) \implies P x) \implies P a$
begin

sublocale *asymmetric*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *prefixed-Imagep-imp-empty*:
assumes $a: X \subseteq ((\sqsubset) \text{ `` } X) \cap A$ **shows** $X = \{\}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *nonempty-imp-ex-extremal*:
assumes $QA: Q \subseteq A$ **and** $Q: Q \neq \{\}$
shows $\exists z \in Q. \forall y \in Q. \neg y \sqsubset z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation *Restrp: well-founded UNIV* $(\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A$
rewrites $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv True$
and $(\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A \upharpoonright UNIV = (\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A$
and $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies PROP P1) \equiv PROP P1$
and $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies P1) \equiv Trueprop P1$
and $\bigwedge P1 P2. (True \implies PROP P1 \implies PROP P2) \equiv (PROP P1 \implies PROP P2)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemmas *Restrp-well-founded = Restrp.well-founded-axioms*
lemmas *Restrp-induct*[*consumes 0, case-names less*] = *Restrp.induct*

interpretation *Restrp.tranclp: well-founded UNIV* $((\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A)^{++}$
rewrites $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv True$
and $((\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A)^{++} \upharpoonright UNIV = ((\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A)^{++}$
and $((\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A)^{++} \upharpoonright ((\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A)^{++} = ((\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A)^{++}$
and $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies PROP P1) \equiv PROP P1$
and $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies P1) \equiv Trueprop P1$
and $\bigwedge P1 P2. (True \implies PROP P1 \implies PROP P2) \equiv (PROP P1 \implies PROP P2)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemmas *Restrp-tranclp-well-founded = Restrp.tranclp.well-founded-axioms*
lemmas *Restrp-tranclp-induct*[*consumes 0, case-names less*] = *Restrp.tranclp.induct*

end

context
fixes $A :: 'a \text{ set}$ **and** $less :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow bool$ (**infix** \sqsubset 50)
begin

lemma *well-foundedI-pf*:
assumes $pre: \bigwedge X. X \subseteq A \implies X \subseteq ((\sqsubset) \text{ `` } X) \cap A \implies X = \{\}$

shows *well-founded* A (\square)
<proof>

lemma *well-foundedI-extremal*:

assumes a : $\bigwedge X. X \subseteq A \implies X \neq \{\}$ $\implies \exists x \in X. \forall y \in X. \neg y \sqsubset x$

shows *well-founded* A (\square)

<proof>

lemma *well-founded-iff-ex-extremal*:

well-founded A (\square) $\longleftrightarrow (\forall X \subseteq A. X \neq \{\} \longrightarrow (\exists x \in X. \forall z \in X. \neg z \sqsubset x))$

<proof>

end

lemma *well-founded-cong*:

assumes r : $\bigwedge a b. a \in A \implies b \in A \implies r a b \longleftrightarrow r' a b$

and A : $\bigwedge a b. r' a b \implies a \in A \longleftrightarrow a \in A'$

and B : $\bigwedge a b. r' a b \implies b \in A \longleftrightarrow b \in A'$

shows *well-founded* A $r \longleftrightarrow$ *well-founded* A' r'

<proof>

lemma *wfP-iff-well-founded-UNIV*: *wfP* $r \longleftrightarrow$ *well-founded UNIV* r

<proof>

lemma *well-founded-singleton*:

assumes $\neg r x x$ **shows** *well-founded* $\{x\}$ r

<proof>

lemma *well-founded-Restrp[simp]*: *well-founded* A $(r \upharpoonright B) \longleftrightarrow$ *well-founded* $(A \cap B)$

r (**is** $?l \longleftrightarrow ?r$)

<proof>

lemma (**in** *well-founded*) *well-founded-subset*:

assumes $B \subseteq A$ **shows** *well-founded* B (\square)

<proof>

lemma *well-founded-extend*:

fixes $less$ (**infix** \square 50)

assumes A : *well-founded* A (\square)

assumes B : *well-founded* B (\square)

assumes AB : $\forall a \in A. \forall b \in B. \neg b \sqsubset a$

shows *well-founded* $(A \cup B)$ (\square)

<proof>

lemma *closed-UN-well-founded*:

fixes r (**infix** \square 50)

assumes XX : $\forall X \in XX. \text{well-founded } X$ (\square) $\wedge (\forall x \in X. \forall y \in \bigcup XX. y \sqsubset x \longrightarrow y \in X)$

shows *well-founded* $(\bigcup XX)$ (\square)

<proof>

lemma *well-founded-cmono:*

assumes $r': r' \leq r$ **and** *wf: well-founded A r*

shows *well-founded A r'*

<proof>

locale *well-founded-ordered-set = well-founded + transitive - (\sqsubset)*

begin

sublocale *strict-ordered-set**<proof>*

interpretation *Restrp: strict-ordered-set UNIV (\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A + Restrp: well-founded UNIV (\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A*

<proof>

lemma *Restrp-well-founded-order: well-founded-ordered-set UNIV ((\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A)**<proof>*

lemma *well-founded-ordered-subset: B \subseteq A \implies well-founded-ordered-set B (\sqsubset)*

<proof>

end

lemma (**in** *well-founded*) *Restrp-tranclp-well-founded-ordered: well-founded-ordered-set UNIV ((\sqsubset) \upharpoonright A)⁺⁺*

<proof>

locale *well-related-set = related-set +*

assumes *nonempty-imp-ex-extreme: X \subseteq A \implies X \neq {} \implies \exists e. extreme X (\sqsubseteq)⁻*

begin

sublocale *connex*

<proof>

lemmas *connex-axioms = connex-axioms*

interpretation *less-eq-notations**<proof>*

sublocale *asym: well-founded A (\sqsubset)*

<proof>

lemma *well-related-subset: B \subseteq A \implies well-related-set B (\sqsubseteq)*

<proof>

end

context

fixes *less-eq :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow bool (infix \sqsubseteq 50)*

begin

lemma *well-related-iff-neg-well-founded*:

well-related-set A (\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow *well-founded* A $(\lambda x y. \neg y \sqsubseteq x)$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *well-related-singleton-refl*:

assumes $x \sqsubseteq x$ **shows** *well-related-set* $\{x\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *closed-UN-well-related*:

assumes $XX: \forall X \in XX. \text{well-related-set } X (\sqsubseteq) \wedge (\forall x \in X. \forall y \in \bigcup XX. \neg x \sqsubseteq y \rightarrow y \in X)$
shows *well-related-set* $(\bigcup XX)$ (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

end

lemma *well-related-extend*:

fixes r (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
assumes *well-related-set* A (\sqsubseteq) **and** *well-related-set* B (\sqsubseteq) **and** $\forall a \in A. \forall b \in B. a \sqsubseteq b$
shows *well-related-set* $(A \cup B)$ (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

locale *pre-well-ordered-set* = *semiattractive* + *well-related-set*

begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations* \langle *proof* \rangle

sublocale *transitive*

\langle *proof* \rangle

sublocale *total-quasi-ordered-set* \langle *proof* \rangle

lemmas *connex-axioms* = *connex-axioms*

lemma *strict-weak-trans* $[$ *trans* $]$:

assumes $xy: x \sqsubset y$ **and** $yz: y \sqsubseteq z$ **and** $x: x \in A$ **and** $y: y \in A$ **and** $z: z \in A$
shows $x \sqsubset z$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *weak-strict-trans* $[$ *trans* $]$:

assumes $xy: x \sqsubseteq y$ **and** $yz: y \sqsubset z$ **and** $x: x \in A$ **and** $y: y \in A$ **and** $z: z \in A$
shows $x \sqsubset z$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

end

lemma *pre-well-ordered-iff*:
pre-well-ordered-set A $r \longleftrightarrow$ *total-quasi-ordered-set* A $r \wedge$ *well-founded* A (*asymptp* r)
(is $?p \longleftrightarrow ?t \wedge ?w$)
<proof>

lemma (**in** *semiattractive*) *pre-well-ordered-iff-well-related*:
assumes $XA: X \subseteq A$
shows *pre-well-ordered-set* X $(\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow$ *well-related-set* X (\sqsubseteq) (**is** $?l \longleftrightarrow ?r$)
<proof>

lemma *semiattractive-extend*:
fixes r (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
assumes A : *semiattractive* A (\sqsubseteq) **and** B : *semiattractive* B (\sqsubseteq)
and $AB: \forall a \in A. \forall b \in B. a \sqsubseteq b \wedge \neg b \sqsubseteq a$
shows *semiattractive* $(A \cup B)$ (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

lemma *pre-well-order-extend*:
fixes r (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
assumes A : *pre-well-ordered-set* A (\sqsubseteq) **and** B : *pre-well-ordered-set* B (\sqsubseteq)
and $AB: \forall a \in A. \forall b \in B. a \sqsubseteq b \wedge \neg b \sqsubseteq a$
shows *pre-well-ordered-set* $(A \cup B)$ (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

locale *well-ordered-set = antisymmetric + well-related-set*
begin

sublocale *pre-well-ordered-set**<proof>*

sublocale *total-ordered-set**<proof>*

lemma *well-ordered-subset*: $B \subseteq A \implies$ *well-ordered-set* B (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

lemmas *connex-axioms = connex-axioms*

end

lemma (**in** *antisymmetric*) *well-ordered-iff-well-related*:
assumes $XA: X \subseteq A$
shows *well-ordered-set* X $(\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow$ *well-related-set* X (\sqsubseteq) (**is** $?l \longleftrightarrow ?r$)
<proof>

context
fixes A **and** *less-eq* (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
assumes $A: \forall a \in A. \forall b \in A. a \sqsubseteq b$
begin

interpretation *well-related-set* A (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

lemmas *trivial-well-related* = *well-related-set-axioms*

lemma *trivial-pre-well-order*: *pre-well-ordered-set* A (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

end

context

fixes *less-eq* :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow bool (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations**<proof>*

lemma *well-order-extend*:

assumes A : *well-ordered-set* A (\sqsubseteq) **and** B : *well-ordered-set* B (\sqsubseteq)
and ABA : $\forall a \in A. \forall b \in B. a \sqsubseteq b \longrightarrow b \sqsubseteq a \longrightarrow a = b$
and AB : $\forall a \in A. \forall b \in B. a \sqsubseteq b$
shows *well-ordered-set* $(A \cup B)$ (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

interpretation *singleton*: *antisymmetric* $\{a\}$ (\sqsubseteq) **for** a *<proof>*

lemmas *singleton-antisymmetric*[*intro!*] = *singleton.antisymmetric-axioms*

lemma *singleton-well-ordered*[*intro!*]: $a \sqsubseteq a \Longrightarrow$ *well-ordered-set* $\{a\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

lemma *closed-UN-well-ordered*:

assumes *anti*: *antisymmetric* $(\bigcup XX)$ (\sqsubseteq)
and XX : $\forall X \in XX. \text{well-ordered-set } X$ (\sqsubseteq) $\wedge (\forall x \in X. \forall y \in \bigcup XX. \neg x \sqsubseteq y \longrightarrow$
 $y \in X)$
shows *well-ordered-set* $(\bigcup XX)$ (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

end

Directed sets:

definition *directed* A $r \equiv \forall x \in A. \forall y \in A. \exists z \in A. r\ x\ z \wedge r\ y\ z$

lemmas *directedI*[*intro*] = *directed-def*[*unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD2, rule-format*]

lemmas *directedD* = *directed-def*[*unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD1, rule-format*]

context

fixes *less-eq* :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow bool (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)
begin

lemma *directedE*:

assumes *directed* A (\sqsubseteq) **and** $x \in A$ **and** $y \in A$
and $\bigwedge z. z \in A \implies x \sqsubseteq z \implies y \sqsubseteq z \implies$ *thesis*
shows *thesis*
<proof>

lemma *directed-empty[simp]*: *directed* $\{\}$ (\sqsubseteq) *<proof>*

lemma *directed-union*:

assumes dX : *directed* X (\sqsubseteq) **and** dY : *directed* Y (\sqsubseteq)
and XY : $\forall x \in X. \forall y \in Y. \exists z \in X \cup Y. x \sqsubseteq z \wedge y \sqsubseteq z$
shows *directed* $(X \cup Y)$ (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

lemma *directed-extend*:

assumes X : *directed* X (\sqsubseteq) **and** Y : *directed* Y (\sqsubseteq) **and** XY : $\forall x \in X. \forall y \in Y. x \sqsubseteq y$
shows *directed* $(X \cup Y)$ (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

end

context *connex* **begin**

lemma *directed*: *directed* A (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

end

context

fixes $ir :: 'i \Rightarrow 'i \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ (**infix** \preceq 50)
fixes $r :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

begin

lemma *monotone-connex-image*:

assumes $mono$: *monotone-on* I (\preceq) (\sqsubseteq) f
assumes $connex$: *connex* I (\preceq)
shows *connex* $(f \text{ ` } I)$ (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

lemma *monotone-directed-image*:

assumes $mono$: *monotone-on* I (\preceq) (\sqsubseteq) f
assumes dir : *directed* I (\preceq) **shows** *directed* $(f \text{ ` } I)$ (\sqsubseteq)
<proof>

end

2.6 Order Pairs

```

locale compatible = related-set + related-set A ( $\sqsubset$ ) for less (infix  $\sqsubset$  50) +
  assumes compat-right[trans]:  $x \sqsubset y \implies y \sqsubset z \implies x \in A \implies y \in A \implies z \in A$ 
 $\implies x \sqsubset z$ 
  assumes compat-left[trans]:  $x \sqsubset y \implies y \sqsubset z \implies x \in A \implies y \in A \implies z \in A$ 
 $\implies x \sqsubset z$ 

```

```

locale compatible-ordering = reflexive + irreflexive + compatible +
  assumes strict-implies-weak:  $x \sqsubset y \implies x \in A \implies y \in A \implies x \sqsubseteq y$ 
begin

```

The strict part is necessarily transitive.

The following sequence of declarations are in order to obtain fact names in a manner similar to the Isabelle/HOL facts of orders.

```

sublocale strict: transitive A ( $\sqsubset$ )
   $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 

```

```

sublocale strict-ordered-set A ( $\sqsubset$ )  $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 

```

```

thm strict.trans asym irrefl

```

```

lemma strict-implies-not-weak:  $x \sqsubset y \implies x \in A \implies y \in A \implies \neg y \sqsubseteq x$ 
   $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 

```

```

end

```

```

context transitive begin

```

```

interpretation less-eq-notations  $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 

```

```

lemma asym-trans[trans]:
  shows  $x \sqsubset y \implies y \sqsubseteq z \implies x \in A \implies y \in A \implies z \in A \implies x \sqsubset z$ 
  and  $x \sqsubseteq y \implies y \sqsubset z \implies x \in A \implies y \in A \implies z \in A \implies x \sqsubset z$ 
   $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 

```

```

end

```

```

locale attractive-ordering = compatible-ordering + attractive

```

```

locale pseudo-ordering = compatible-ordering + pseudo-ordered-set
begin

```

```

sublocale attractive-ordering  $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 

```

```

end

```

```

locale quasi-ordering = compatible-ordering + quasi-ordered-set
begin

```

```

sublocale attractive-ordering ⟨proof⟩

end

locale partial-ordering = compatible-ordering + partially-ordered-set
begin

sublocale pseudo-ordering + quasi-ordering ⟨proof⟩

end

locale well-founded-ordering = quasi-ordering + well-founded

locale total-ordering = compatible-ordering + total-ordered-set
begin

sublocale partial-ordering ⟨proof⟩

end

locale strict-total-ordering = partial-ordering + semiconnex A (□)
begin

sublocale semiconnex-irreflexive ⟨proof⟩

sublocale connex
  ⟨proof⟩

sublocale total-ordering ⟨proof⟩

lemma not-weak[simp]:
  assumes  $x \in A$  and  $y \in A$  shows  $\neg x \sqsubseteq y \longleftrightarrow y \sqsubset x$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma not-strict[simp]:  $x \in A \implies y \in A \implies \neg x \sqsubset y \longleftrightarrow y \sqsubseteq x$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

end

```

2.7 Relating to Classes

In Isabelle 2020, we should declare sublocales in class before declaring dual sublocales, since otherwise facts would be prefixed by “dual.dual.”

```

context ord begin

abbreviation least where  $least\ X \equiv extreme\ X\ (\lambda x\ y. y \leq x)$ 

```



```

abbreviation greatest where greatest  $X \equiv \text{extreme } X (\leq)$ 

abbreviation supremum where supremum  $X \equiv \text{least } (\text{Collect } (\text{bound } X (\leq)))$ 

abbreviation infimum where infimum  $X \equiv \text{greatest } (\text{Collect } (\text{bound } X (\lambda x y. y \leq x)))$ 

lemma Least-eq-The-least: Least  $P = \text{The } (\text{least } \{x. P x\})$ 
  <proof>

lemma Greatest-eq-The-greatest: Greatest  $P = \text{The } (\text{greatest } \{x. P x\})$ 
  <proof>

end

lemma Ball-UNIV[simp]: Ball  $UNIV = \text{All } <proof>$ 
lemma Bex-UNIV[simp]: Bex  $UNIV = \text{Ex } <proof>$ 

class compat = ord + assumes compatible-ordering  $UNIV (\leq) (<)$ 
begin

sublocale order: compatible-ordering  $UNIV$ 
  rewrites  $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv \text{True}$ 
  and  $\bigwedge X. X \subseteq UNIV \equiv \text{True}$ 
  and  $\bigwedge r. r \upharpoonright UNIV \equiv r$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P. \text{True} \wedge P \equiv P$ 
  and Ball  $UNIV \equiv \text{All}$ 
  and Bex  $UNIV \equiv \text{Ex}$ 
  and sympartp  $(\leq)^- \equiv \text{sympartp } (\leq)$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (\text{True} \implies \text{PROP } P1) \equiv \text{PROP } P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (\text{True} \implies P1) \equiv \text{Trueprop } P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1 P2. (\text{True} \implies \text{PROP } P1 \implies \text{PROP } P2) \equiv (\text{PROP } P1 \implies \text{PROP } P2)$ 
  <proof>

end

  We should have imported locale-based facts in classes, e.g.:

thm order.trans order.strict.trans order.refl order.irrefl order.asym order.extreme-bound-singleton

class attractive-order = ord + assumes attractive-ordering  $UNIV (\leq) (<)$ 
begin

  We need to declare subclasses before sublocales in order to preserve facts
  for superclasses.

interpretation attractive-ordering  $UNIV$ 
  <proof>

subclass compat <proof>

```

```

sublocale order: attractive-ordering UNIV
  rewrites  $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge X. X \subseteq UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge r. r \upharpoonright UNIV \equiv r$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P. True \wedge P \equiv P$ 
  and  $Ball UNIV \equiv All$ 
  and  $Bex UNIV \equiv Ex$ 
  and  $sympartp (\leq)^- \equiv sympartp (\leq)$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies PROP P1) \equiv PROP P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies P1) \equiv Trueprop P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1 P2. (True \implies PROP P1 \implies PROP P2) \equiv (PROP P1 \implies PROP$ 
P2)
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

end

thm order.extreme-bound-quasi-const

```

class psorder = ord + assumes pseudo-ordering UNIV ( $\leq$ ) ( $<$ )
begin

```

```

interpretation pseudo-ordering UNIV  $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

subclass attractive-order  $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

sublocale order: pseudo-ordering UNIV
  rewrites  $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge X. X \subseteq UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge r. r \upharpoonright UNIV \equiv r$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P. True \wedge P \equiv P$ 
  and  $Ball UNIV \equiv All$ 
  and  $Bex UNIV \equiv Ex$ 
  and  $sympartp (\leq)^- \equiv sympartp (\leq)$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies PROP P1) \equiv PROP P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies P1) \equiv Trueprop P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1 P2. (True \implies PROP P1 \implies PROP P2) \equiv (PROP P1 \implies PROP$ 
P2)
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

end

```

class qorder = ord + assumes quasi-ordering UNIV ( $\leq$ ) ( $<$ )
begin

```

```

interpretation quasi-ordering UNIV  $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

subclass attractive-order  $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

sublocale order: quasi-ordering UNIV
  rewrites  $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge X. X \subseteq UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge r. r \upharpoonright UNIV \equiv r$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P. True \wedge P \equiv P$ 
  and  $Ball\ UNIV \equiv All$ 
  and  $Bex\ UNIV \equiv Ex$ 
  and  $sympartp\ (\leq)^- \equiv sympartp\ (\leq)$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies PROP\ P1) \equiv PROP\ P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies P1) \equiv Trueprop\ P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1\ P2. (True \implies PROP\ P1 \implies PROP\ P2) \equiv (PROP\ P1 \implies PROP$ 
P2)
  <proof>

```

end

```

class porder = ord + assumes partial-ordering UNIV ( $\leq$ ) ( $<$ )
begin

```

```

interpretation partial-ordering UNIV
  <proof>

```

```

subclass psorder <proof>
subclass qorder <proof>

```

```

sublocale order: partial-ordering UNIV
  rewrites  $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge X. X \subseteq UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge r. r \upharpoonright UNIV \equiv r$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P. True \wedge P \equiv P$ 
  and  $Ball\ UNIV \equiv All$ 
  and  $Bex\ UNIV \equiv Ex$ 
  and  $sympartp\ (\leq)^- \equiv sympartp\ (\leq)$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies PROP\ P1) \equiv PROP\ P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies P1) \equiv Trueprop\ P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1\ P2. (True \implies PROP\ P1 \implies PROP\ P2) \equiv (PROP\ P1 \implies PROP$ 
P2)
  <proof>

```

end

```

class wf-qorder = ord + assumes well-founded-ordering UNIV ( $\leq$ ) ( $<$ )
begin

```

```

interpretation well-founded-ordering UNIV
  <proof>

```

```

subclass qorder <proof>

```

```

sublocale order: well-founded-ordering UNIV
  rewrites  $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge X. X \subseteq UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge r. r \upharpoonright UNIV \equiv r$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P. True \wedge P \equiv P$ 
  and  $Ball UNIV \equiv All$ 
  and  $Bex UNIV \equiv Ex$ 
  and  $sympartp (\leq)^- \equiv sympartp (\leq)$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies PROP P1) \equiv PROP P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies P1) \equiv Trueprop P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1 P2. (True \implies PROP P1 \implies PROP P2) \equiv (PROP P1 \implies PROP$ 
P2)
  <proof>

```

end

```

class totalorder = ord + assumes total-ordering UNIV ( $\leq$ ) ( $<$ )
begin

```

```

interpretation total-ordering UNIV
  <proof>

```

```

subclass porder <proof>

```

```

sublocale order: total-ordering UNIV
  rewrites  $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge X. X \subseteq UNIV \equiv True$ 
  and  $\bigwedge r. r \upharpoonright UNIV \equiv r$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P. True \wedge P \equiv P$ 
  and  $Ball UNIV \equiv All$ 
  and  $Bex UNIV \equiv Ex$ 
  and  $sympartp (\leq)^- \equiv sympartp (\leq)$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies PROP P1) \equiv PROP P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies P1) \equiv Trueprop P1$ 
  and  $\bigwedge P1 P2. (True \implies PROP P1 \implies PROP P2) \equiv (PROP P1 \implies PROP$ 
P2)
  <proof>

```

end

Isabelle/HOL's *preorder* belongs to *qorder*, but not vice versa.

```

subclass (in preorder) qorder
  <proof>

```

```

subclass (in order) porder <proof>

```

```

subclass (in wellorder) wf-qorder
  <proof>

```

Isabelle/HOL's *linorder* is equivalent to our locale *strict-total-ordering*.

context *linorder* **begin**

interpretation *strict-total-ordering UNIV*
⟨*proof*⟩

subclass *totalorder* ⟨*proof*⟩

sublocale *order: strict-total-ordering UNIV*

rewrites $\bigwedge x. x \in UNIV \equiv True$
and $\bigwedge X. X \subseteq UNIV \equiv True$
and $\bigwedge r. r \upharpoonright UNIV \equiv r$
and $\bigwedge P. True \wedge P \equiv P$
and *Ball UNIV* $\equiv All$
and *Bex UNIV* $\equiv Ex$
and *sympartp* $(\leq)^- \equiv sympartp (\leq)$
and $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies PROP P1) \equiv PROP P1$
and $\bigwedge P1. (True \implies P1) \equiv Trueprop P1$
and $\bigwedge P1 P2. (True \implies PROP P1 \implies PROP P2) \equiv (PROP P1 \implies PROP P2)$
⟨*proof*⟩

end

Tests: facts should be available in the most general classes.

thm *order.strict.trans*[**where** $'a='a::compat$]
thm *order.extreme-bound-quasi-const*[**where** $'a='a::attractive-order$]
thm *order.extreme-bound-singleton-eq*[**where** $'a='a::psorder$]
thm *order.trans*[**where** $'a='a::qorder$]
thm *order.comparable-cases*[**where** $'a='a::totalorder$]
thm *order.cases*[**where** $'a='a::linorder$]

2.8 Declaring Duals

sublocale *reflexive* $\subseteq sym: reflexive A sympartp (\sqsubseteq)$
rewrites $sympartp (\sqsubseteq)^- \equiv sympartp (\sqsubseteq)$
and $\bigwedge r. sympartp (sympartp r) \equiv sympartp r$
and $\bigwedge r. sympartp r \upharpoonright A \equiv sympartp (r \upharpoonright A)$
⟨*proof*⟩

sublocale *quasi-ordered-set* $\subseteq sym: quasi-ordered-set A sympartp (\sqsubseteq)$
rewrites $sympartp (\sqsubseteq)^- = sympartp (\sqsubseteq)$
and $sympartp (sympartp (\sqsubseteq)) = sympartp (\sqsubseteq)$
⟨*proof*⟩

At this point, we declare dual as sublocales. In the following, “rewrites” eventually cleans up redundant facts.

sublocale *reflexive* $\subseteq dual: reflexive A (\sqsubseteq)^-$
rewrites $sympartp (\sqsubseteq)^- \equiv sympartp (\sqsubseteq)$
and $\bigwedge r. sympartp (r \upharpoonright A) \equiv sympartp r \upharpoonright A$

and $(\sqsubseteq)^- \uparrow A \equiv ((\sqsubseteq) \uparrow A)^-$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

context *attractive* **begin**

interpretation *less-eq-notations* $\langle proof \rangle$

sublocale *dual: attractive* $A (\sqsupset)$
rewrites $sympartp (\sqsupset) = (\sim)$
and $equivpartp (\sqsupset) \equiv (\simeq)$
and $\bigwedge r. sympartp (r \uparrow A) \equiv sympartp r \uparrow A$
and $\bigwedge r. sympartp (sympartp r) \equiv sympartp r$
and $(\sqsubseteq)^- \uparrow A \equiv ((\sqsubseteq) \uparrow A)^-$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

context *irreflexive* **begin**

sublocale *dual: irreflexive* $A (\sqsubset)^-$
rewrites $(\sqsubset)^- \uparrow A \equiv ((\sqsubset) \uparrow A)^-$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

sublocale *transitive* \subseteq *dual: transitive* $A (\sqsubseteq)^-$
rewrites $(\sqsubseteq)^- \uparrow A \equiv ((\sqsubseteq) \uparrow A)^-$
and $sympartp (\sqsubseteq)^- = sympartp (\sqsubseteq)$
and $asympartp (\sqsubseteq)^- = (asympartp (\sqsubseteq))^-$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

sublocale *antisymmetric* \subseteq *dual: antisymmetric* $A (\sqsubseteq)^-$
rewrites $(\sqsubseteq)^- \uparrow A \equiv ((\sqsubseteq) \uparrow A)^-$
and $sympartp (\sqsubseteq)^- = sympartp (\sqsubseteq)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

sublocale *semiconnex* \subseteq *dual: semiconnex* $A (\sqsubset)^-$
rewrites $sympartp (\sqsubset)^- = sympartp (\sqsubset)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

sublocale *connex* \subseteq *dual: connex* $A (\sqsubseteq)^-$
rewrites $sympartp (\sqsubseteq)^- = sympartp (\sqsubseteq)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

sublocale *semiconnex-irreflexive* \subseteq *dual: semiconnex-irreflexive* $A (\sqsubset)^-$
rewrites $sympartp (\sqsubset)^- = sympartp (\sqsubset)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

sublocale *pseudo-ordered-set* \subseteq *dual: pseudo-ordered-set* $A (\sqsubseteq)^-$

rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{quasi-ordered-set } \subseteq \text{ dual: quasi-ordered-set } A (\sqsubseteq)^-$
rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{partially-ordered-set } \subseteq \text{ dual: partially-ordered-set } A (\sqsubseteq)^-$
rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{total-pseudo-ordered-set } \subseteq \text{ dual: total-pseudo-ordered-set } A (\sqsubseteq)^-$
rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{total-quasi-ordered-set } \subseteq \text{ dual: total-quasi-ordered-set } A (\sqsubseteq)^-$
rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{compatible-ordering } \subseteq \text{ dual: compatible-ordering } A (\sqsubseteq)^- (\sqsubset)^-$
rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{attractive-ordering } \subseteq \text{ dual: attractive-ordering } A (\sqsubseteq)^- (\sqsubset)^-$
rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{pseudo-ordering } \subseteq \text{ dual: pseudo-ordering } A (\sqsubseteq)^- (\sqsubset)^-$
rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{quasi-ordering } \subseteq \text{ dual: quasi-ordering } A (\sqsubseteq)^- (\sqsubset)^-$
rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{partial-ordering } \subseteq \text{ dual: partial-ordering } A (\sqsubseteq)^- (\sqsubset)^-$
rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{total-ordering } \subseteq \text{ dual: total-ordering } A (\sqsubseteq)^- (\sqsubset)^-$
rewrites $\text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)^- = \text{sympartp } (\sqsubseteq)$
<proof>

lemma(in *antisymmetric*) *monotone-extreme-imp-extreme-bound-iff*:
fixes ir (**infix** \preceq 50)
assumes $f \text{ ' } C \subseteq A$ **and** *monotone-on* $C (\preceq) (\sqsubseteq) f$ **and** i : *extreme* $C (\preceq) i$
shows *extreme-bound* $A (\sqsubseteq) (f \text{ ' } C) x \longleftrightarrow f i = x$
<proof>

2.9 Instantiations

Finally, we instantiate our classes for sanity check.

instance *nat* :: *linorder* \langle *proof* \rangle

Pointwise ordering of functions are compatible only if the weak part is transitive.

instance *fun* :: (*type*,*qorder*) *compat*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

instance *fun* :: (*type*,*qorder*) *qorder*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

instance *fun* :: (*type*,*porder*) *porder*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

end

3 Completeness of Relations

Here we formalize various order-theoretic completeness conditions.

theory *Complete-Relations*
imports *Binary-Relations*
begin

3.1 Completeness Conditions

Order-theoretic completeness demands certain subsets of elements to admit suprema or infima.

definition *complete* (*--complete*[999]1000) **where**
CC-complete *A r* $\equiv \forall X \subseteq A. X \in CC \longrightarrow (\exists s. \textit{extreme-bound } A r X s)$

lemmas *completeI* = *complete-def*[*unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD2, rule-format*]
lemmas *completeD* = *complete-def*[*unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD1, rule-format*]

lemma *complete-cmono*: $CC \subseteq DD \implies DD\text{-complete} \leq CC\text{-complete}$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *complete-empty[simp]*: $CC\text{-complete } \{ \} r \longleftrightarrow \{ \} \notin CC$ \langle *proof* \rangle

A related set $\langle A, \sqsubseteq \rangle$ is called *topped* if there is a “top” element $\top \in A$, a greatest element in A . Note that there might be multiple tops if $\langle \sqsubseteq \rangle$ is not antisymmetric.

definition *extremed* *A r* $\equiv \exists e. \textit{extreme } A r e$

lemma *extremed-imp-ex-bound*: $\textit{extremed } A r \implies X \subseteq A \implies \exists b \in A. \textit{bound } X r b$

<proof>

context

fixes *less-eq* :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ bool (**infix** ⊆ 50)

begin

Toppedness can be also seen as a completeness condition, since it is equivalent to saying that the universe has a supremum.

lemma *extremed-iff-UNIV-complete*: *extremed* A (⊆) ↔ {A}-complete A (⊆)

(**is** ?l ↔ ?r)

<proof>

The dual notion of topped is called “pointed”, equivalently ensuring a supremum of the empty set.

lemma *pointed-iff-empty-complete*: *extremed* A (⊆) ↔ {{}}-complete A (⊆)⁻

<proof>

end

One of the most well-studied notion of completeness would be the semi-lattice condition: every pair of elements x and y has a supremum $x \sqcup y$ (not necessarily unique if the underlying relation is not antisymmetric).

definition *pair-complete* ≡ {{x,y} |. x y :: 'a}-complete

lemma *pair-completeI*:

assumes $\bigwedge x y. x \in A \implies y \in A \implies \exists s. \text{extreme-bound } A \ r \ \{x,y\} \ s$

shows *pair-complete* A r

<proof>

lemma *pair-completeD*:

assumes *pair-complete* A r

shows $x \in A \implies y \in A \implies \exists s. \text{extreme-bound } A \ r \ \{x,y\} \ s$

<proof>

context

fixes *less-eq* :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ bool (**infix** ⊆ 50)

begin

lemma *pair-complete-imp-directed*:

assumes *comp*: *pair-complete* A (⊆) **shows** *directed* A (⊆)

<proof>

end

lemma (**in** *connex*) *pair-complete*: *pair-complete* A (⊆)

<proof>

The next one assumes that every nonempty finite set has a supremum.

abbreviation *finite-complete* $\equiv \{X. \text{finite } X \wedge X \neq \{\}\} \text{--complete}$

lemma *finite-complete-le-pair-complete*: *finite-complete* \leq *pair-complete*
 ⟨proof⟩

The next one assumes that every nonempty bounded set has a supremum. It is also called the Dedekind completeness.

abbreviation *conditionally-complete* $A \ r \equiv \{X. \exists b \in A. \text{bound } X \ r \ b \wedge X \neq \{\}\} \text{--complete } A \ r$

lemma *conditionally-complete-imp-nonempty-imp-ex-extreme-bound-iff-ex-bound*:
assumes *comp*: *conditionally-complete* $A \ r$
assumes $X \subseteq A$ **and** $X \neq \{\}$
shows $(\exists s. \text{extreme-bound } A \ r \ X \ s) \longleftrightarrow (\exists b \in A. \text{bound } X \ r \ b)$
 ⟨proof⟩

The ω -completeness condition demands a supremum for an ω -chain, $a_1 \sqsubseteq a_2 \sqsubseteq \dots$. We model ω -chain as the range of a monotone map $f : i \mapsto a_i$.

definition *omega-complete* $A \ r \equiv \{\text{range } f \mid f :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a. \text{monotone } (\leq) \ r \ f\} \text{--complete } A \ r$

lemma (in *transitive*) *local-chain*:
assumes $CA: \text{range } C \subseteq A$
shows $(\forall i :: \text{nat}. C \ i \sqsubseteq C \ (\text{Suc } i)) \longleftrightarrow \text{monotone } (<) \ (\sqsubseteq) \ C$
 ⟨proof⟩

Directed completeness is an important notion in domain theory [1], asserting that every nonempty directed set has a supremum. Here, a set X is *directed* if any pair of two elements in X has a bound in X .

definition *directed-complete* $A \ r \equiv \{X. \text{directed } X \ r \wedge X \neq \{\}\} \text{--complete } A \ r$

lemma *monotone-directed-complete*:
assumes *comp*: *directed-complete* $A \ r$
assumes $fI: f \ ' I \subseteq A$ **and** *dir*: *directed* $I \ r_i$ **and** $I0: I \neq \{\}$ **and** *mono*:
monotone-on $I \ r_i \ r \ f$
shows $\exists s. \text{extreme-bound } A \ r \ (f \ ' I) \ s$
 ⟨proof⟩

The next one is quite complete, only the empty set may fail to have a supremum. The terminology follows [3], although there it is defined more generally depending on a cardinal α such that a nonempty set X of cardinality below α has a supremum.

abbreviation *semicomplete* $\equiv \{X. X \neq \{\}\} \text{--complete}$

lemma *semicomplete-nonempty-imp-extremed*:
semicomplete $A \ r \implies A \neq \{\} \implies \text{extremed } A \ r$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *connex-dual-semicomplete*: *semicomplete* $\{C. \text{connex } C\ r\}$ (\supseteq)
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

3.2 Pointed Ones

The term ‘pointed’ refers to the dual notion of toppedness, i.e., there is a global least element. This serves as the supremum of the empty set.

lemma *complete-union*: $(CC \cup CC')\text{-complete } A\ r \iff CC\text{-complete } A\ r \wedge CC'\text{-complete } A\ r$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *pointed-directed-complete*:

$\{X. \text{directed } X\ r\}\text{-complete } A\ r \iff \text{directed-complete } A\ r \wedge \text{extremed } A\ r^-$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

“Bounded complete” refers to pointed conditional complete, but this notion is just the dual of semicompleteness. We prove this later.

abbreviation *bounded-complete* $A\ r \equiv \{X. \exists b \in A. \text{bound } X\ r\ b\}\text{-complete } A\ r$

3.3 Relations between Completeness Conditions

context

fixes *less-eq* :: $'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations* $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Pair-completeness implies that the universe is directed. Thus, with directed completeness implies toppedness.

proposition *directed-complete-pair-complete-imp-extremed*:

assumes *dc*: *directed-complete* $A\ (\sqsubseteq)$ **and** *pc*: *pair-complete* $A\ (\sqsubseteq)$ **and** $A: A \neq \{\}$

shows *extremed* $A\ (\sqsubseteq)$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Semicomplete is conditional complete and topped.

proposition *semicomplete-iff-conditionally-complete-extremed*:

assumes $A: A \neq \{\}$

shows *semicomplete* $A\ (\sqsubseteq) \iff \text{conditionally-complete } A\ (\sqsubseteq) \wedge \text{extremed } A\ (\sqsubseteq)$

(**is** $?l \iff ?r$)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

proposition *complete-iff-pointed-semicomplete*:

$\text{UNIV-complete } A\ (\sqsubseteq) \iff \text{semicomplete } A\ (\sqsubseteq) \wedge \text{extremed } A\ (\supseteq)$ (**is** $?l \iff ?r$)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Conditional completeness only lacks top and bottom to be complete.

proposition *complete-iff-conditionally-complete-extremed-pointed*:

UNIV-complete $A (\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow$ conditionally-complete $A (\sqsubseteq) \wedge$ extremed $A (\sqsubseteq) \wedge$ extremed $A (\supseteq)$

<proof>

If the universe is directed, then every pair is bounded, and thus has a supremum. On the other hand, supremum gives an upper bound, witnessing directedness.

proposition *conditionally-complete-imp-pair-complete-iff-directed:*

assumes *comp*: conditionally-complete $A (\sqsubseteq)$

shows pair-complete $A (\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow$ directed $A (\sqsubseteq)$ (**is** ?l \longleftrightarrow ?r)

<proof>

end

Following is a new generalization of (weak) chain-completeness:

abbreviation *well-complete* $A r \equiv \{X. \text{well-related-set } X r\}$ -complete $A r$

3.4 Duality of Completeness Conditions

Conditional completeness is symmetric.

context fixes *less-eq* :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow bool (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations**<proof>*

lemma *conditionally-complete-dual:*

assumes *comp*: conditionally-complete $A (\sqsubseteq)$ **shows** conditionally-complete $A (\supseteq)$

<proof>

Full completeness is symmetric.

lemma *complete-dual:*

UNIV-complete $A (\sqsubseteq) \implies$ *UNIV*-complete $A (\supseteq)$

<proof>

Now we show that bounded completeness is the dual of semicompleteness.

lemma *pointed-conditionally-complete-iff-bounded-complete:*

assumes $A: A \neq \{\}$

shows conditionally-complete $A (\sqsubseteq) \wedge$ extremed $A (\supseteq) \longleftrightarrow$ bounded-complete $A (\sqsubseteq)$

<proof>

proposition *bounded-complete-iff-dual-semicomplete:*

bounded-complete $A (\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow$ semicomplete $A (\supseteq)$

<proof>

end

lemmas *connex-bounded-complete* = *connex-dual-semicomplete*[*folded bounded-complete-iff-dual-semicomplete*]

3.5 Completeness Results Requiring Order-Like Properties

Above results hold without any assumption on the relation. This part demands some order-like properties.

It is well known that in a semilattice, i.e., a pair-complete partial order, every finite nonempty subset of elements has a supremum. We prove the result assuming transitivity, but only that.

lemma (in *transitive*) *pair-complete-iff-finite-complete*:

pair-complete $A (\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow$ *finite-complete* $A (\sqsubseteq)$ (is ?l \longleftrightarrow ?r)

<proof>

Gierz et al. [6] showed that a directed complete partial order is semicomplete if and only if it is also a semilattice. We generalize the claim so that the underlying relation is only transitive.

proposition(in *transitive*) *semicomplete-iff-directed-complete-pair-complete*:

semicomplete $A (\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow$ *directed-complete* $A (\sqsubseteq) \wedge$ *pair-complete* $A (\sqsubseteq)$ (is ?l \longleftrightarrow ?r)

<proof>

The last argument in the above proof requires transitivity, but if we had reflexivity then x itself is a supremum of $\{x\}$ (see \llbracket *reflexive* ?A ?less-eq; ?x \in ?A $\rrbracket \implies$ *extreme-bound* ?A ?less-eq $\{?x\}$?x) and so $x \sqsubseteq s$ would be immediate. Thus we can replace transitivity by reflexivity, but then pair-completeness does not imply finite completeness. We obtain the following result.

proposition (in *reflexive*) *semicomplete-iff-directed-complete-finite-complete*:

semicomplete $A (\sqsubseteq) \longleftrightarrow$ *directed-complete* $A (\sqsubseteq) \wedge$ *finite-complete* $A (\sqsubseteq)$ (is ?l \longleftrightarrow ?r)

<proof>

3.6 Relating to Classes

Isabelle's class *complete-lattice* is *UNIV-complete*.

lemma (in *complete-lattice*) *UNIV-complete* *UNIV* (\leq)

<proof>

3.7 Set-wise Completeness

lemma *directed-sets-directed-complete*:

assumes *cl*: $\forall DC. DC \subseteq AA \longrightarrow (\forall X \in DC. \text{directed } X \ r) \longrightarrow (\bigcup DC) \in AA$

shows $\{DC. \text{directed } DC (\subseteq)\}$ -*complete* $\{X \in AA. \text{directed } X \ r\} (\subseteq)$

<proof>

lemma *connex-directed-Un*:

assumes $ch: CC \subseteq \{C. \text{connex } C \ r\}$ **and** $dir: \text{directed } CC \ (\sqsubseteq)$
shows $\text{connex } (\bigcup CC) \ r$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *connex-directed-complete*: $\{\text{DC. directed } DC \ (\sqsubseteq)\}$ -complete $\{C. \text{connex } C \ r\} \ (\sqsubseteq)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

theory *Fixed-Points*
imports *Complete-Relations*
begin

4 Existence of Fixed Points in Complete Related Sets

The following proof is simplified and generalized from Stouti–Maaden [16]. We construct some set whose extreme bounds – if they exist, typically when the underlying related set is complete – are fixed points of a monotone or inflationary function on any related set. When the related set is attractive, those are actually the least fixed points. This generalizes [16], relaxing reflexivity and antisymmetry.

locale *fixed-point-proof = related-set +*
fixes f
assumes $f: f \ ' \ A \subseteq A$
begin

sublocale *less-eq-notations* $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition *AA* **where** $AA \equiv \{X. X \subseteq A \wedge f \ ' \ X \subseteq X \wedge (\forall Y \ s. Y \subseteq X \longrightarrow \text{extreme-bound } A \ (\sqsubseteq) \ Y \ s \longrightarrow s \in X)\}$

lemma *AA-I*:
 $X \subseteq A \Longrightarrow f \ ' \ X \subseteq X \Longrightarrow (\bigwedge Y \ s. Y \subseteq X \Longrightarrow \text{extreme-bound } A \ (\sqsubseteq) \ Y \ s \Longrightarrow s \in X) \Longrightarrow X \in AA$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *AA-E*:
 $X \in AA \Longrightarrow (X \subseteq A \Longrightarrow f \ ' \ X \subseteq X \Longrightarrow (\bigwedge Y \ s. Y \subseteq X \Longrightarrow \text{extreme-bound } A \ (\sqsubseteq) \ Y \ s \Longrightarrow s \in X) \Longrightarrow \text{thesis}) \Longrightarrow \text{thesis}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition *C* **where** $C \equiv \bigcap AA$

lemma *A-AA*: $A \in AA$ *<proof>*

lemma *C-AA*: $C \in AA$
<proof>

lemma *CA*: $C \subseteq A$ *<proof>*

lemma *fC*: $f \text{ ' } C \subseteq C$ *<proof>*

context

fixes *c* **assumes** *Cc*: *extreme-bound* A (\sqsubseteq) C *c*
begin

private lemma *cA*: $c \in A$ *<proof>* **lemma** *cC*: $c \in C$ *<proof>* **lemma** *fcC*: $f c \in C$ *<proof>* **lemma** *fcA*: $f c \in A$ *<proof>*

lemma *qfp-as-extreme-bound*:

assumes *infl-mono*: $\forall x \in A. x \sqsubseteq f x \vee (\forall y \in A. y \sqsubseteq x \longrightarrow f y \sqsubseteq f x)$
shows $f c \sim c$
<proof>

lemma *extreme-qfp*:

assumes *attract*: $\forall q \in A. \forall x \in A. f q \sim q \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq f q \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq q$
and *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows *extreme* $\{q \in A. f q \sim q \vee f q = q\}$ (\exists) c
<proof>

end

lemma *ex-qfp*:

assumes *comp*: *CC-complete* A (\sqsubseteq) **and** $C: C \in CC$
and *infl-mono*: $\forall a \in A. a \sqsubseteq f a \vee (\forall b \in A. b \sqsubseteq a \longrightarrow f b \sqsubseteq f a)$
shows $\exists s \in A. f s \sim s$
<proof>

lemma *ex-extreme-qfp-fp*:

assumes *comp*: *CC-complete* A (\sqsubseteq) **and** $C: C \in CC$
and *attract*: $\forall q \in A. \forall x \in A. f q \sim q \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq f q \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq q$
and *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows $\exists c. \text{extreme } \{q \in A. f q \sim q \vee f q = q\}$ (\exists) c
<proof>

lemma *ex-extreme-qfp*:

assumes *comp*: *CC-complete* A (\sqsubseteq) **and** $C: C \in CC$
and *attract*: $\forall q \in A. \forall x \in A. f q \sim q \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq f q \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq q$
and *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows $\exists c. \text{extreme } \{q \in A. f q \sim q\}$ (\exists) c
<proof>

end

context

fixes $less\text{-}eq :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow bool$ (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50) **and** $A :: 'a\ set$ **and** f
assumes $f: f ' A \subseteq A$

begin

interpretation $less\text{-}eq\text{-}notations\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation $fixed\text{-}point\text{-}proof\ A\ (\sqsubseteq)\ f\ \langle proof \rangle$

theorem $complete\text{-}infl\text{-}mono\text{-}imp\text{-}ex\text{-}qfp$:

assumes $comp: UNIV\text{-}complete\ A\ (\sqsubseteq)$ **and** $infl\text{-}mono: \forall a \in A. a \sqsubseteq f\ a \vee (\forall b \in A. b \sqsubseteq a \longrightarrow f\ b \sqsubseteq f\ a)$
shows $\exists s \in A. f\ s \sim s$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

corollary (**in antisymmetric**) $complete\text{-}infl\text{-}mono\text{-}imp\text{-}ex\text{-}fp$:

assumes $comp: UNIV\text{-}complete\ A\ (\sqsubseteq)$ **and** $f: f ' A \subseteq A$
and $infl\text{-}mono: \forall a \in A. a \sqsubseteq f\ a \vee (\forall b \in A. b \sqsubseteq a \longrightarrow f\ b \sqsubseteq f\ a)$
shows $\exists s \in A. f\ s = s$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

context $semiattractive$ **begin**

interpretation $less\text{-}eq\text{-}notations\langle proof \rangle$

theorem $complete\text{-}mono\text{-}imp\text{-}ex\text{-}extreme\text{-}qfp$:

assumes $comp: UNIV\text{-}complete\ A\ (\sqsubseteq)$ **and** $f: f ' A \subseteq A$
and $mono: monotone\text{-}on\ A\ (\sqsubseteq)\ (\sqsubseteq)\ f$
shows $\exists s. extreme\ \{p \in A. f\ p \sim p\}\ (\sqsubseteq)\ s$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

corollary (**in antisymmetric**) $complete\text{-}mono\text{-}imp\text{-}ex\text{-}extreme\text{-}fp$:

assumes $comp: UNIV\text{-}complete\ A\ (\sqsubseteq)$ **and** $f: f ' A \subseteq A$
and $mono: monotone\text{-}on\ A\ (\sqsubseteq)\ (\sqsubseteq)\ f$
shows $\exists s. extreme\ \{s \in A. f\ s = s\}\ (\sqsubseteq)^-\ s$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

5 Fixed Points in Well-Complete Antisymmetric Sets

In this section, we prove that an inflationary or monotone map over a well-complete antisymmetric set has a fixed point.

In order to formalize such a theorem in Isabelle, we followed Grall's [?] elementary proof for Bourbaki–Witt and Markowsky's theorems. His idea is to consider well-founded derivation trees over A , where from a set $C \subseteq A$ of premises one can derive $f(\bigsqcup C)$ if C is a chain. The main observation is as follows: Let D be the set of all the derivable elements; that is, for each $d \in D$ there exists a well-founded derivation whose root is d . It is shown that D is a chain, and hence one can build a derivation yielding $f(\bigsqcup D)$, and $f(\bigsqcup D)$ is shown to be a fixed point.

lemma *bound-monotone-on*:

assumes *mono: monotone-on A r s f* **and** *XA: X ⊆ A* **and** *aA: a ∈ A* **and** *rXa: bound X r a*

shows *bound (f'X) s (f a)*

<proof>

context *fixed-point-proof* **begin**

To avoid the usage of the axiom of choice, we carefully define derivations so that any derivable element determines its lower set. This led to the following definition:

definition *derivation X ≡ X ⊆ A ∧ well-ordered-set X (⊆) ∧*

(∀ x ∈ X. let Y = {y ∈ X. y ⊆ x} in

(∃ y. extreme Y (⊆) y ∧ x = f y) ∨

f' Y ⊆ Y ∧ extreme-bound A (⊆) Y x)

lemma **assumes** *derivation P*

shows *derivation-A: P ⊆ A* **and** *derivation-well-ordered: well-ordered-set P (⊆)*

<proof>

lemma *derivation-cases[consumes 2, case-names suc lim]:*

assumes *derivation X* **and** *x ∈ X*

and $\bigwedge Y y. Y = \{y \in X. y \subseteq x\} \implies \text{extreme } Y \text{ (}\subseteq\text{) } y \implies x = f y \implies \text{thesis}$

and $\bigwedge Y. Y = \{y \in X. y \subseteq x\} \implies f' Y \subseteq Y \implies \text{extreme-bound } A \text{ (}\subseteq\text{) } Y x \implies \text{thesis}$

shows *thesis*

<proof>

definition *derivable x ≡ ∃ X. derivation X ∧ x ∈ X*

lemma *derivableI[intro?]: derivation X ⟹ x ∈ X ⟹ derivable x* *<proof>*

lemma *derivableE: derivable x ⟹ (⋀ P. derivation P ⟹ x ∈ P ⟹ thesis) ⟹ thesis*

<proof>

lemma *derivable-A: derivable x ⟹ x ∈ A* *<proof>*

lemma *UN-derivations-eq-derivable: (⋃ {P. derivation P}) = {x. derivable x}*

<proof>

context

assumes *ord*: antisymmetric A (\sqsubseteq)

begin

interpretation *antisymmetric* \langle proof \rangle

lemma *derivation-lim*:

assumes P : derivation P **and** fP : $f \cdot P \subseteq P$ **and** Pp : extreme-bound A (\sqsubseteq) P p
shows derivation $(P \cup \{p\})$

\langle proof \rangle

context

assumes *derivation-infl*: $\forall X$ x y . derivation $X \longrightarrow x \in X \longrightarrow y \in X \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq y \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq f y$

and *derivation-f-refl*: $\forall X$ x . derivation $X \longrightarrow x \in X \longrightarrow f x \sqsubseteq f x$

begin

lemma *derivation-suc*:

assumes P : derivation P **and** Pp : extreme P (\sqsubseteq) p **shows** derivation $(P \cup \{f p\})$

\langle proof \rangle

lemma *derivable-closed*:

assumes x : derivable x **shows** derivable $(f x)$

\langle proof \rangle

The following lemma is derived from Grall's proof. We simplify the claim so that we consider two elements from one derivation, instead of two derivations.

lemma *derivation-useful*:

assumes X : derivation X **and** xX : $x \in X$ **and** yX : $y \in X$ **and** xy : $x \sqsubset y$
shows $f x \sqsubseteq y$

\langle proof \rangle

Next one is the main lemma of this section, stating that elements from two possibly different derivations are comparable, and moreover the lower one is in the derivation of the upper one. The latter claim, not found in Grall's proof, is crucial in proving that the union of all derivations is well-related.

lemma *derivations-cross-compare*:

assumes X : derivation X **and** Y : derivation Y **and** xX : $x \in X$ **and** yY : $y \in Y$
shows $(x \sqsubset y \wedge x \in Y) \vee x = y \vee (y \sqsubset x \wedge y \in X)$

\langle proof \rangle

interpretation *derivable*: well-ordered-set $\{x$. derivable $x\}$ (\sqsubseteq)

\langle proof \rangle

lemmas *derivable-well-ordered* = *derivable.well-ordered-set-axioms*

lemmas *derivable-total-ordered* = *derivable.total-ordered-set-axioms*

lemmas *derivable-well-related* = *derivable.well-related-set-axioms*

lemma *pred-unique*:

assumes *X*: *derivation X* **and** *xX*: $x \in X$

shows $\{z \in X. z \sqsubseteq x\} = \{z. \text{derivable } z \wedge z \sqsubseteq x\}$

<proof>

The set of all derivable elements is itself a derivation.

lemma *derivation-derivable*: *derivation* $\{x. \text{derivable } x\}$

<proof>

Finally, if the set of all derivable elements admits a supremum, then it is a fixed point.

lemma

assumes *p*: *extreme-bound* $A (\sqsubseteq) \{x. \text{derivable } x\} p$

shows *sup-derivable-qfp*: $f p \sim p$ **and** *sup-derivable-fp*: $f p = p$

<proof>

end

The assumptions are satisfied by monotone functions.

context

assumes *mono*: *monotone-on* $A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f$

begin

lemma *mono-imp-derivation-infl*:

$\forall X x y. \text{derivation } X \longrightarrow x \in X \longrightarrow y \in X \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq y \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq f y$

<proof>

lemma *mono-imp-derivation-f-refl*:

$\forall X x. \text{derivation } X \longrightarrow x \in X \longrightarrow f x \sqsubseteq f x$

<proof>

corollary *mono-imp-sup-derivable-fp*:

assumes *p*: *extreme-bound* $A (\sqsubseteq) \{x. \text{derivable } x\} p$

shows $f p = p$

<proof>

lemma *mono-imp-sup-derivable-lfp*:

assumes *p*: *extreme-bound* $A (\sqsubseteq) \{x. \text{derivable } x\} p$

shows *extreme* $\{q \in A. f q = q\} (\sqsupseteq) p$

<proof>

lemma *mono-imp-ex-least-fp*:

assumes *comp*: *well-complete* $A (\sqsubseteq)$

shows $\exists p. \text{extreme } \{q \in A. f q = q\} (\sqsupseteq) p$

<proof>

end

end

end

Bourbaki-Witt Theorem on well-complete pseudo-ordered set:

theorem (in *pseudo-ordered-set*) *well-complete-infl-imp-ex-fp*:

assumes *comp*: *well-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)

and f : $f \text{ ' } A \subseteq A$ **and** *infl*: $\forall x \in A. \forall y \in A. x \sqsubseteq y \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq f y$

shows $\exists p \in A. f p = p$

<proof>

6 Completeness of (Quasi-)Fixed Points

We now prove that, under attractivity, the set of quasi-fixed points is complete.

definition *setwise where* $setwise\ r\ X\ Y \equiv \forall x \in X. \forall y \in Y. r\ x\ y$

lemmas *setwiseI*[*intro*] = *setwise-def*[*unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD2, rule-format*]

lemmas *setwiseE*[*elim*] = *setwise-def*[*unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD1, elim-format, rule-format*]

context *fixed-point-proof* **begin**

abbreviation *setwise-less-eq* (**infix** \sqsubseteq^s 50) **where** (\sqsubseteq^s) $\equiv setwise\ (\sqsubseteq)$

6.1 Least Quasi-Fixed Points for Attractive Relations.

lemma *attract-mono-imp-least-qfp*:

assumes *attract*: *attractive* A (\sqsubseteq)

and *comp*: *well-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)

and *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f

shows $\exists c. extreme\ \{p \in A. f p \sim p \vee f p = p\}$ (\exists) $c \wedge f c \sim c$

<proof>

6.2 General Completeness

lemma *attract-mono-imp-fp-qfp-complete*:

assumes *attract*: *attractive* A (\sqsubseteq)

and *comp*: *CC-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)

and *wr-CC*: $\forall C \subseteq A. well-related-set\ C$ (\sqsubseteq) $\longrightarrow C \in CC$

and *extend*: $\forall X \in CC. \forall Y \in CC. X \sqsubseteq^s Y \longrightarrow X \cup Y \in CC$

and *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f

and P : $P \subseteq \{x \in A. f x = x\}$

shows *CC-complete* ($\{q \in A. f q \sim q\} \cup P$) (\sqsubseteq)

<proof>

lemma *attract-mono-imp-qfp-complete*:

assumes *attractive* A (\sqsubseteq)
and *CC-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
and $\forall C \subseteq A. \textit{well-related-set } C$ (\sqsubseteq) $\longrightarrow C \in CC$
and $\forall X \in CC. \forall Y \in CC. X \sqsubseteq^s Y \longrightarrow X \cup Y \in CC$
and *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows *CC-complete* $\{p \in A. f p \sim p\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 $\langle \textit{proof} \rangle$

lemma *antisym-mono-imp-fp-complete*:

assumes *anti*: *antisymmetric* A (\sqsubseteq)
and *comp*: *CC-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
and *wr-CC*: $\forall C \subseteq A. \textit{well-related-set } C$ (\sqsubseteq) $\longrightarrow C \in CC$
and *extend*: $\forall X \in CC. \forall Y \in CC. X \sqsubseteq^s Y \longrightarrow X \cup Y \in CC$
and *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows *CC-complete* $\{p \in A. f p = p\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 $\langle \textit{proof} \rangle$

end

6.3 Instances

6.3.1 Instances under attractivity

context *attractive* **begin**

interpretation *less-eq-notations* $\langle \textit{proof} \rangle$

Full completeness

theorem *mono-imp-qfp-UNIV-complete*:

assumes *comp*: *UNIV-complete* A (\sqsubseteq) **and** $f: f' A \subseteq A$ **and** *mono*: *monotone-on*
 A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows *UNIV-complete* $\{p \in A. f p \sim p\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 $\langle \textit{proof} \rangle$

Connex completeness

theorem *mono-imp-qfp-connex-complete*:

assumes *comp*: $\{X. \textit{connex } X$ (\sqsubseteq) $\}$ -*complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
and $f: f' A \subseteq A$ **and** *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows $\{X. \textit{connex } X$ (\sqsubseteq) $\}$ -*complete* $\{p \in A. f p \sim p\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 $\langle \textit{proof} \rangle$

Directed completeness

theorem *mono-imp-qfp-directed-complete*:

assumes *comp*: $\{X. \textit{directed } X$ (\sqsubseteq) $\}$ -*complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
and $f: f' A \subseteq A$ **and** *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows $\{X. \textit{directed } X$ (\sqsubseteq) $\}$ -*complete* $\{p \in A. f p \sim p\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 $\langle \textit{proof} \rangle$

Well Completeness

theorem *mono-imp-qfp-well-complete*:

assumes *comp*: *well-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
and $f: f' A \subseteq A$ **and** *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows *well-complete* $\{p \in A. f p \sim p\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

end

6.3.2 Usual instances under antisymmetry

context *antisymmetric* **begin**

Knaster–Tarski

theorem *mono-imp-fp-complete*:

assumes *comp*: *UNIV-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
and $f: f' A \subseteq A$ **and** *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows *UNIV-complete* $\{p \in A. f p = p\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

Markowsky 1976

theorem *mono-imp-fp-connex-complete*:

assumes *comp*: $\{X. \textit{connex } X (\sqsubseteq)\}$ –*complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
and $f: f' A \subseteq A$ **and** *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows $\{X. \textit{connex } X (\sqsubseteq)\}$ –*complete* $\{p \in A. f p = p\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

Pataraia

theorem *mono-imp-fp-directed-complete*:

assumes *comp*: $\{X. \textit{directed } X (\sqsubseteq)\}$ –*complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
and $f: f' A \subseteq A$ **and** *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows $\{X. \textit{directed } X (\sqsubseteq)\}$ –*complete* $\{p \in A. f p = p\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

Bhatta & George 2011

theorem *mono-imp-fp-well-complete*:

assumes *comp*: *well-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
and $f: f' A \subseteq A$ **and** *mono*: *monotone-on* A (\sqsubseteq) (\sqsubseteq) f
shows *well-complete* $\{p \in A. f p = p\}$ (\sqsubseteq)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

end

end

theory *Kleene-Fixed-Point*

imports *Complete-Relations*

begin

7 Iterative Fixed Point Theorem

Kleene's fixed-point theorem states that, for a pointed directed complete partial order $\langle A, \sqsubseteq \rangle$ and a Scott-continuous map $f : A \rightarrow A$, the supremum of $\{f^n(\perp) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ exists in A and is a least fixed point. Mashburn [12] generalized the result so that $\langle A, \sqsubseteq \rangle$ is a ω -complete partial order and f is ω -continuous.

In this section we further generalize the result and show that for ω -complete relation $\langle A, \sqsubseteq \rangle$ and for every bottom element $\perp \in A$, the set $\{f^n(\perp) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has suprema (not necessarily unique, of course) and, they are quasi-fixed points. Moreover, if (\sqsubseteq) is attractive, then the suprema are precisely the least quasi-fixed points.

7.1 Scott Continuity, ω -Completeness, ω -Continuity

In this Section, we formalize ω -completeness, Scott continuity and ω -continuity. We then prove that a Scott continuous map is ω -continuous and that an ω -continuous map is "nearly" monotone.

context

fixes $A :: 'a \text{ set}$ and $\text{less-eq} :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50)

begin

definition $\text{omega-continuous } f \equiv$

$f ' A \subseteq A \wedge$

$(\forall c :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a. \forall b \in A.$

$\text{range } c \subseteq A \longrightarrow$

$\text{monotone } (\leq) (\sqsubseteq) c \longrightarrow$

$\text{extreme-bound } A (\sqsubseteq) (\text{range } c) b \longrightarrow \text{extreme-bound } A (\sqsubseteq) (f ' \text{range } c) (f b)$)

lemmas omega-continuousI [intro?] =

$\text{omega-continuous-def}$ [unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD2, unfolded conj-imp-eq-imp-imp, rule-format]

lemmas $\text{omega-continuousDdom}$ =

$\text{omega-continuous-def}$ [unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD1, unfolded conj-imp-eq-imp-imp, THEN conjunct1]

lemmas omega-continuousD =

$\text{omega-continuous-def}$ [unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD1, unfolded conj-imp-eq-imp-imp, THEN conjunct2, rule-format]

lemmas omega-continuousE [elim] =

$\text{omega-continuous-def}$ [unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD1, elim-format, unfolded conj-imp-eq-imp-imp, rule-format]

lemma $\text{omega-continuous-imp-mono-refl}$:

assumes cont : $\text{omega-continuous } f$

and $x: x \in A$ **and** $y: y \in A$
and $xy: x \sqsubseteq y$ **and** $xx: x \sqsubseteq x$ **and** $yy: y \sqsubseteq y$
shows $f x \sqsubseteq f y$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

definition *scott-continuous* $f \equiv$
 $f \text{ ' } A \subseteq A \wedge$
 $(\forall X s. X \subseteq A \longrightarrow \text{directed } X (\sqsubseteq) \longrightarrow X \neq \{\} \longrightarrow \text{extreme-bound } A (\sqsubseteq) X s$
 $\longrightarrow \text{extreme-bound } A (\sqsubseteq) (f \text{ ' } X) (f s))$

lemmas *scott-continuousI*[*intro?*] =
scott-continuous-def[*unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD2, unfolded conj-imp-eq-imp-imp, rule-format*]

lemmas *scott-continuousE* =
scott-continuous-def[*unfolded atomize-eq, THEN iffD1, elim-format, unfolded conj-imp-eq-imp-imp, rule-format*]

lemma *scott-continuous-imp-mono-refl*:
assumes *scott: scott-continuous f*
and $x: x \in A$ **and** $y: y \in A$ **and** $xy: x \sqsubseteq y$ **and** $yy: y \sqsubseteq y$
shows $f x \sqsubseteq f y$
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *scott-continuous-imp-omega-continuous*:
assumes *scott: scott-continuous f* **shows** *omega-continuous f*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

end

7.2 Existence of Iterative Fixed Points

The first part of Kleene's theorem demands to prove that the set $\{f^n(\perp) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has a supremum and that all such are quasi-fixed points. We prove this claim without assuming anything on the relation \sqsubseteq besides ω -completeness and one bottom element.

notation *compower* $(\hat{\ }^{-}[1000,1000]1000)$

lemma *mono-funpow*: **assumes** $f: f \text{ ' } A \subseteq A$ **and** *mono: monotone-on A r r f*
shows *monotone-on A r r (f[^]n)*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

no-notation *bot* (\perp)

context

fixes A **and** *less-eq* (**infix** \sqsubseteq 50) **and** *bot* (\perp) **and** f
assumes *bot*: $\perp \in A \forall q \in A. \perp \sqsubseteq q$
assumes *cont*: *omega-continuous A* $(\sqsubseteq) f$
begin

interpretation *less-eq-notations*⟨proof⟩ **lemma** $f: f \text{ ' } A \subseteq A$ ⟨proof⟩ **abbrevia-**
tion(*input*) $Fn \equiv \{f \hat{\ }^n \perp \mid . n :: nat\}$

private lemma *fn-ref*: $f \hat{\ }^n \perp \sqsubseteq f \hat{\ }^n \perp$ **and** *fnA*: $f \hat{\ }^n \perp \in A$
 ⟨proof⟩ **lemma** *FnA*: $Fn \subseteq A$ ⟨proof⟩ **lemma** *fn-monotone*: *monotone* (\leq) (\sqsubseteq)
 ($\lambda n. f \hat{\ }^n \perp$)
 ⟨proof⟩ **lemma** *Fn*: $Fn = \text{range } (\lambda n. f \hat{\ }^n \perp)$ ⟨proof⟩

theorem *kleene-qfp*:
assumes *q*: *extreme-bound* A (\sqsubseteq) Fn q
shows f $q \sim q$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *ex-kleene-qfp*:
assumes *comp*: *omega-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
shows $\exists p. \text{extreme-bound } A$ (\sqsubseteq) Fn p
 ⟨proof⟩

7.3 Iterative Fixed Points are Least.

Kleene's theorem also states that the quasi-fixed point found this way is a least one. Again, attractivity is needed to prove this statement.

lemma *kleene-qfp-is-least*:
assumes *attract*: $\forall q \in A. \forall x \in A. f$ $q \sim q \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq f$ $q \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq q$
assumes *q*: *extreme-bound* A (\sqsubseteq) Fn q
shows *extreme* $\{s \in A. f$ $s \sim s\}$ (\sqsupseteq) q
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *kleene-qfp-iff-least*:
assumes *comp*: *omega-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
assumes *attract*: $\forall q \in A. \forall x \in A. f$ $q \sim q \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq f$ $q \longrightarrow x \sqsubseteq q$
assumes *dual-attract*: $\forall p \in A. \forall q \in A. \forall x \in A. p \sim q \longrightarrow q \sqsubseteq x \longrightarrow p \sqsubseteq x$
shows *extreme-bound* A (\sqsubseteq) $Fn = \text{extreme } \{s \in A. f$ $s \sim s\}$ (\sqsupseteq)
 ⟨proof⟩

end

context *attractive* **begin**

interpretation *less-eq-notations*⟨proof⟩

theorem *kleene-qfp-is-dual-extreme*:
assumes *comp*: *omega-complete* A (\sqsubseteq)
and *cont*: *omega-continuous* A (\sqsubseteq) f **and** *bA*: $b \in A$ **and** *bot*: $\forall x \in A. b \sqsubseteq x$
shows *extreme-bound* A (\sqsubseteq) $\{f \hat{\ }^n b \mid . n :: nat\} = \text{extreme } \{s \in A. f$ $s \sim s\}$ (\sqsupseteq)
 ⟨proof⟩

end

corollary(in *antisymmetric*) *kleene-fp*:
assumes *cont*: *omega-continuous* $A \sqsubseteq f$
and $b \in A \forall x \in A. b \sqsubseteq x$
and p : *extreme-bound* $A \sqsubseteq \{f^n b \mid n :: nat\} p$
shows $f p = p$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

no-notation *compower* $(- \hat{=} [1000,1000] 1000)$

end

References

- [1] S. Abramsky and A. Jung. *Domain Theory*. Number III in Handbook of Logic in Computer Science. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [2] C. Ballarin. Interpretation of locales in Isabelle: Theories and proof contexts. In J. M. Borwein and W. M. Farmer, editors, *Mathematical Knowledge Management*, pages 31–43, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [3] G. M. Bergman. *Lattices, Closure Operators, and Galois Connections*, pages 173–212. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2015.
- [4] S. P. Bhatta. Weak chain-completeness and fixed point property for pseudo-ordered sets. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 55(2):365–369, 2005.
- [5] B. A. Davey and H. A. Priestley. *Introduction to Lattices and Order*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [6] G. Gierz, K. H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. D. Lawson, M. W. Mislove, and D. S. Scott. *Continuous Lattices and Domains*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [7] G. Gonthier. Formal proof – the four-color theorem. *Notices of the AMS*, 55(11):1382–1393, 2008.
- [8] T. Hales, M. Adams, G. Bauer, T. D. Dang, J. Harrison, H. Le Truong, C. Kaliszyk, V. Magron, S. McLaughlin, T. T. Nguyen, et al. A formal proof of the Kepler conjecture. *Forum of Mathematics, Pi*, 5, 2017.
- [9] F. Kammüller. Modular reasoning in Isabelle. In D. McAllester, editor, *Automated Deduction - CADE-17*, pages 99–114, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- [10] G. Klein, K. Elphinstone, G. Heiser, J. Andronick, D. Cock, P. Derrin, D. Elkaduwe, K. Engelhardt, R. Kolanski, M. Norrish, et al. seL4: Formal verification of an OS kernel. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 22nd Symposium on Operating Systems principles*, pages 207–220. ACM, 2009.
- [11] K. Leutola and J. Nieminen. Posets and generalized lattices. *Algebra Universalis*, 16(1):344–354, 1983.
- [12] J. D. Mashburn. The least fixed point property for omega-chain continuous functions. *Houston Journal of Mathematics*, 9(2):231–244, 1983.
- [13] S. Parameshwara Bhatta and S. George. Some fixed point theorems for pseudo ordered sets. *Algebra and Discrete Mathematics*, 11(1):17–22, 2011.
- [14] G. Schmidt and T. Ströhlein. *Relations and Graphs: Discrete Mathematics for Computer Scientists*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1993.
- [15] H. Skala. Trellis theory. *Algebra Univ.*, 1:218–233, 1971.
- [16] A. Stouti and A. Maaden. Fixed points and common fixed points theorems in pseudo-ordered sets. *Proyecciones. Revista de Matemática*, 32(4):409–418, 2013.
- [17] M. Wenzel. Isabelle/jEdit—a prover IDE within the PIDE framework. In *International Conference on Intelligent Computer Mathematics*, pages 468–471. Springer, 2012.
- [18] A. Yamada and J. Dubut. Complete Non-Orders and Fixed Points. In J. Harrison, J. O’Leary, and A. Tolmach, editors, *10th International Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving (ITP 2019)*, volume 141 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 30:1–30:16, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2019. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.