

From Abstract to Concrete Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems—Part II

Andrei Popescu Dmitriy Traytel

March 17, 2025

Abstract

We validate an abstract formulation of Gödels Second Incompleteness Theorem from a [separate AFP entry](#) by instantiating it to the case of *finite consistent extensions of the Hereditarily Finite (HF) Set theory*, i.e., consistent FOL theories extending the HF Set theory with a finite set of axioms.

The instantiation draws heavily on infrastructure previously developed by Larry Paulson in his [direct formalisation of the concrete result](#). It strengthens Paulsons formalization of Gödel's Second from that entry by *not* assuming soundness, and in fact not relying on any notion of model or semantic interpretation. The strengthening was obtained by first replacing some of Paulsons semantic arguments with proofs within his HF calculus, and then plugging in some of Paulson's (modified) lemmas to instantiate our soundness-free Gödel's Second locale.

Contents

1 Syntax of Terms and Formulas using Nominal Logic	2
1.1 Terms and Formulas	2
1.1.1 Hf is a pure permutation type	2
1.1.2 The datatypes	2
1.1.3 Substitution	3
1.1.4 Derived syntax	4
1.1.5 Derived logical connectives	5
1.2 Axioms and Theorems	5
1.2.1 Logical axioms	5
1.2.2 Concrete variables	6
1.2.3 The HF axioms	6
1.2.4 Equality axioms	6
1.2.5 The proof system	7
1.2.6 Derived rules of inference	7
1.2.7 The Deduction Theorem	10
1.2.8 Cut rules	10
1.3 Miscellaneous logical rules	10
1.3.1 Quantifier reasoning	13
1.3.2 Congruence rules	14
1.4 Equality reasoning	15
1.4.1 The congruence property for <i>(EQ)</i> , and other basic properties of equality	15
1.4.2 The congruence property for <i>(IN)</i>	15
1.4.3 The congruence properties for <i>Eats</i> and <i>HPair</i>	15
1.4.4 Substitution for Equalities	15
1.4.5 Congruence Rules for Predicates	16
1.5 Zero and Falsity	16
1.5.1 The Formula <i>Fls</i>	17
1.5.2 More properties of <i>Zero</i>	17
1.5.3 Basic properties of <i>Eats</i>	18
1.6 Bounded Quantification involving <i>Eats</i>	19
1.7 Induction	20
2 De Bruijn Syntax, Quotations, Codes, V-Codes	21
2.1 de Bruijn Indices (locally-nameless version)	21
2.2 Characterising the Well-Formed de Bruijn Formulas	23
2.2.1 Well-Formed Terms	23
2.2.2 Well-Formed Formulas	24
2.3 Well formed terms and formulas (de Bruijn representation)	24
2.4 Quotations	26
2.4.1 Quotations of de Bruijn terms	26
2.4.2 Quotations of de Bruijn formulas	26
2.5 Definitions Involving Coding	28

2.5.1	The set Γ of Definition 1.1, constant terms used for coding	29
2.6	V-Coding for terms and formulas, for the Second Theorem	29
3	Basic Predicates	31
3.1	The Subset Relation	31
3.2	Extensionality	32
3.3	The Disjointness Relation	33
3.4	The Foundation Theorem	34
3.5	The Ordinal Property	34
3.6	Induction on Ordinals	36
3.7	Linearity of Ordinals	36
3.8	The predicate <i>OrdNotEqP</i>	37
3.9	Predecessor of an Ordinal	37
3.10	Case Analysis and Zero/SUCC Induction	38
3.11	The predicate <i>HFun_Sigma</i>	38
3.12	The predicate <i>HDomain_Incl</i>	39
3.13	<i>HPair</i> is Provably Injective	40
3.14	<i>SUCC</i> is Provably Injective	41
3.15	The predicate <i>LstSeqP</i>	41
4	Sigma-Formulas and Theorem 2.5	43
4.1	Ground Terms and Formulas	43
4.2	Sigma Formulas	44
4.2.1	Strict Sigma Formulas	44
4.2.2	Closure properties for Sigma-formulas	44
4.3	Lemma 2.2: Atomic formulas are Sigma-formulas	44
4.4	Universal Quantification Bounded by an Arbitrary Term	46
4.5	Lemma 2.3: Sequence-related concepts are Sigma-formulas	46
5	Predicates for Terms, Formulas and Substitution	47
5.1	Predicates for atomic terms	47
5.1.1	Free Variables	47
5.1.2	De Bruijn Indexes	47
5.1.3	Various syntactic lemmas	48
5.2	The predicate <i>SeqCTermP</i> , for Terms and Constants	48
5.3	The predicates <i>TermP</i> and <i>ConstP</i>	49
5.3.1	Definition	49
5.3.2	Correctness properties for constants	49
5.4	Abstraction over terms	49
5.4.1	Defining the syntax: main predicate	50
5.5	Substitution over terms	51
5.5.1	Defining the syntax	51
5.6	Abstraction over formulas	51
5.6.1	The predicate <i>AbstAtomicP</i>	51
5.6.2	The predicate <i>AbsMakeForm</i>	52
5.6.3	Defining the syntax: the main AbstForm predicate	53
5.7	Substitution over formulas	53
5.7.1	The predicate <i>SubstAtomicP</i>	53
5.7.2	The predicate <i>SubstMakeForm</i>	54
5.7.3	Defining the syntax: the main SubstForm predicate	54
5.8	The predicate <i>AtomicP</i>	55
5.9	The predicate <i>MakeForm</i>	55
5.10	The predicate <i>SeqFormP</i>	56
5.11	The predicate <i>FormP</i>	56

5.11.1	Definition	56
5.11.2	The predicate <i>VarNonOccFormP</i> (Derived from <i>SubstFormP</i>)	57
6	Formalizing Provability	58
6.1	Section 4 Predicates (Leading up to <i>Pf</i>)	58
6.1.1	The predicate <i>SentP</i> , for the Sentential (Boolean) Axioms	58
6.1.2	The predicate <i>Equality_axP</i> , for the Equality Axioms	58
6.1.3	The predicate <i>HF_axP</i> , for the HF Axioms	58
6.1.4	The specialisation axioms	59
6.1.5	The induction axioms	59
6.1.6	The predicate <i>AxiomP</i> , for any Axioms	60
6.1.7	The predicate <i>ModPonP</i> , for the inference rule Modus Ponens	60
6.1.8	The predicate <i>ExistsP</i> , for the existential rule	60
6.1.9	The predicate <i>SubstP</i> , for the substitution rule	61
6.1.10	The predicate <i>PrfP</i>	61
6.1.11	The predicate <i>PfP</i>	62
7	Syntactic Preliminaries for the Second Incompleteness Theorem	63
7.1	<i>NotInDom</i>	63
7.2	Restriction of a Sequence to a Domain	64
7.3	Applications to <i>LstSeqP</i>	65
7.4	Ordinal Addition	65
7.4.1	Predicate form, defined on sequences	65
7.4.2	Proving that these relations are functions	66
7.5	A Shifted Sequence	67
7.6	Union of Two Sets	68
7.7	Append on Sequences	69
7.8	<i>LstSeqP</i> and <i>SeqAppendP</i>	70
7.9	Substitution and Abstraction on Terms	70
7.9.1	Atomic cases	70
7.9.2	Non-atomic cases	71
7.9.3	Substitution over a constant	71
7.10	Substitution on Formulas	71
7.10.1	Membership	71
7.10.2	Equality	72
7.10.3	Negation	72
7.10.4	Disjunction	72
7.10.5	Existential	72
7.11	Constant Terms	72
7.12	Proofs	73
7.13	Formulas	73
7.14	Abstraction on Formulas	73
7.14.1	Membership	73
7.14.2	Equality	74
7.14.3	Negation	74
7.14.4	Disjunction	74
7.14.5	Existential	74
7.14.6	<i>MakeForm</i>	76
7.14.7	Negation	76
7.14.8	Disjunction	76
7.14.9	Existential	76

8 Pseudo-Coding: Section 7 Material	78
8.1 General Lemmas	78
8.2 Simultaneous Substitution	79
8.3 The Main Theorems of Section 7	81
9 Quotations of the Free Variables	83
9.1 Sequence version of the “Special p-Function, F*”	83
9.1.1 Defining the syntax: quantified body	83
9.1.2 Correctness properties	84
9.2 The “special function” itself	84
9.2.1 Correctness properties	84
9.3 The Operator <i>quote_all</i>	85
9.3.1 Definition and basic properties	85
9.3.2 Transferring theorems to the level of derivability	85
9.4 Star Property. Equality and Membership: Lemmas 9.3 and 9.4	87
9.5 Star Property. Universal Quantifier: Lemma 9.7	87
9.6 The Derivability Condition, Theorem 9.1	87
10 Uniqueness Results: Syntactic Relations are Functions	89
10.0.1 SeqStTermP	89
10.0.2 SubstAtomicP	90
10.0.3 SeqSubstFormP	90
10.0.4 SubstFormP	90
11 Section 6 Material and Gödel’s First Incompleteness Theorem	91
11.1 The Function W and Lemma 6.1	91
11.1.1 Predicate form, defined on sequences	91
11.1.2 Predicate form of W	92
11.1.3 Proving that these relations are functions	92
11.2 The Function HF and Lemma 6.2	93
11.2.1 Defining the syntax: quantified body	93
11.2.2 Defining the syntax: main predicate	94
11.2.3 Proving that these relations are functions	94
11.3 The Function K and Lemma 6.3	95
12 The Instantiation	96

Chapter 1

Syntax of Terms and Formulas using Nominal Logic

```
theory SyntaxN
imports Nominal2.Nominal2_HereditarilyFinite.OrdArith
begin

instantiation hf :: pt
begin
definition p · (s::hf) = s
instance
  ⟨proof⟩
end

instance hf :: pure
  ⟨proof⟩

atom_decl name

declare fresh_set_empty [simp]

lemma supp_name [simp]: fixes i::name shows supp i = {atom i}
  ⟨proof⟩
```

1.1.2 The datatypes

```
nominal_datatype tm = Zero | Var name | Eats tm tm
```

```
nominal_datatype fm =
  Mem tm tm  (infixr `IN` 150)
  | Eq tm tm  (infixr `EQ` 150)
  | Disj fm fm (infixr `OR` 130)
  | Neg fm
  | Ex x::name f::fm binds x in f
```

Mem, Eq are atomic formulas; Disj, Neg, Ex are non-atomic

```
declare tm.supp [simp] fm.supp [simp]
```

1.1.3 Substitution

nominal_function $\text{subst} :: \text{name} \Rightarrow \text{tm} \Rightarrow \text{tm} \Rightarrow \text{tm}$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{subst } i \ x \ \text{Zero} &= \text{Zero} \\ | \ \text{subst } i \ x \ (\text{Var } k) &= (\text{if } i=k \text{ then } x \text{ else } \text{Var } k) \\ | \ \text{subst } i \ x \ (\text{Eats } t \ u) &= \text{Eats} \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ t) \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ u) \end{aligned}$$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

nominal_termination (eqvt)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{fresh_subst_if [simp]}:$

$$j \ # \ \text{subst } i \ x \ t \longleftrightarrow (\text{atom } i \ # \ t \wedge j \ # \ t) \vee (j \ # \ x \wedge (j \ # \ t \vee j = \text{atom } i))$$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{forget_subst_tm [simp]}: \text{atom } a \ # \ \text{tm} \implies \text{subst } a \ x \ \text{tm} = \text{tm}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{subst_tm_id [simp]}: \text{subst } a \ (\text{Var } a) \ \text{tm} = \text{tm}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{subst_tm_commute [simp]}:$

$$\text{atom } j \ # \ \text{tm} \implies \text{subst } j \ u \ (\text{subst } i \ t \ \text{tm}) = \text{subst } i \ (\text{subst } j \ u \ t) \ \text{tm}$$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{subst_tm_commute2 [simp]}:$

$$\text{atom } j \ # \ t \implies \text{atom } i \ # \ u \implies i \neq j \implies \text{subst } j \ u \ (\text{subst } i \ t \ \text{tm}) = \text{subst } i \ t \ (\text{subst } j \ u \ \text{tm})$$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{repeat_subst_tm [simp]}: \text{subst } i \ u \ (\text{subst } i \ t \ \text{tm}) = \text{subst } i \ (\text{subst } i \ u \ t) \ \text{tm}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

nominal_function $\text{subst_fm} :: \text{fm} \Rightarrow \text{name} \Rightarrow \text{tm} \Rightarrow \text{fm} \ (\langle \text{'(}_\text{::=}_ \text{)} \rangle [1000, 0, 0] \ 200)$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mem: } (\text{Mem } t \ u)(i ::= x) &= \text{Mem} \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ t) \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ u) \\ | \ \text{Eq: } (\text{Eq } t \ u)(i ::= x) &= \text{Eq} \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ t) \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ u) \\ | \ \text{Disj: } (\text{Disj } A \ B)(i ::= x) &= \text{Disj} \ (A(i ::= x)) \ (B(i ::= x)) \\ | \ \text{Neg: } (\text{Neg } A)(i ::= x) &= \text{Neg} \ (A(i ::= x)) \\ | \ \text{Ex: } \text{atom } j \ # \ (i, x) \implies (\text{Ex } j \ A)(i ::= x) &= \text{Ex } j \ (A(i ::= x)) \end{aligned}$$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

nominal_termination (eqvt)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{size_subst_fm [simp]}: \text{size } (A(i ::= x)) = \text{size } A$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{forget_subst_fm [simp]}: \text{atom } a \ # \ A \implies A(a ::= x) = A$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{subst_fm_id [simp]}: A(a ::= \text{Var } a) = A$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{fresh_subst_fm_if [simp]}:$

$$j \ # \ (A(i ::= x)) \longleftrightarrow (\text{atom } i \ # \ A \wedge j \ # \ A) \vee (j \ # \ x \wedge (j \ # \ A \vee j = \text{atom } i))$$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{subst_fm_commute [simp]}:$

atom $j \notin A \implies (A(i ::= t))(j ::= u) = A(i ::= \text{subst } j u t)$
(proof)

lemma *repeat_subst_fm* [simp]: $(A(i ::= t))(i ::= u) = A(i ::= \text{subst } i u t)$
(proof)

lemma *subst_fm_Ex_with_renaming*:
atom $i' \notin (A, i, j, t) \implies (\text{Ex } i A)(j ::= t) = \text{Ex } i' (((i \leftrightarrow i') \cdot A)(j ::= t))$
(proof)

the simplifier cannot apply the rule above, because it introduces a new variable at the right hand side.

(ML)

1.1.4 Derived syntax

Ordered pairs

definition *HPair* :: $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm$
where $\text{HPair } a b = \text{Eats} (\text{Eats Zero} (\text{Eats} (\text{Eats Zero } b) a)) (\text{Eats} (\text{Eats Zero } a) a)$

lemma *HPair_eqvt* [eqvt]: $(p \cdot \text{HPair } a b) = \text{HPair} (p \cdot a) (p \cdot b)$
(proof)

lemma *fresh_HPair* [simp]: $x \notin \text{HPair } a b \longleftrightarrow (x \notin a \wedge x \notin b)$
(proof)

lemma *HPair_injective_iff* [iff]: $\text{HPair } a b = \text{HPair } a' b' \longleftrightarrow (a = a' \wedge b = b')$
(proof)

lemma *subst_tm_HPair* [simp]: $\text{subst } i x (\text{HPair } a b) = \text{HPair} (\text{subst } i x a) (\text{subst } i x b)$
(proof)

Ordinals

definition
 $SUCC :: tm \Rightarrow tm$ **where**
 $SUCC x \equiv \text{Eats } x x$

fun *ORD_OF* :: $nat \Rightarrow tm$
where
 $\text{ORD_OF } 0 = \text{Zero}$
 $\mid \text{ORD_OF } (\text{Suc } k) = \text{SUCC} (\text{ORD_OF } k)$

lemma *SUCC_fresh_iff* [simp]: $a \notin \text{SUCC } t \longleftrightarrow a \notin t$
(proof)

lemma *SUCC_eqvt* [eqvt]: $(p \cdot \text{SUCC } a) = \text{SUCC} (p \cdot a)$
(proof)

lemma *SUCC_subst* [simp]: $\text{subst } i t (\text{SUCC } k) = \text{SUCC} (\text{subst } i t k)$
(proof)

lemma *ORD_OF_fresh* [simp]: $a \notin \text{ORD_OF } n$
(proof)

lemma *ORD_OF_eqvt* [eqvt]: $(p \cdot \text{ORD_OF } n) = \text{ORD_OF} (p \cdot n)$
(proof)

1.1.5 Derived logical connectives

abbreviation $\text{Imp} :: \text{fm} \Rightarrow \text{fm} \Rightarrow \text{fm}$ (**infixr** $\langle \text{IMP} \rangle$ 125)
where $\text{Imp } A \ B \equiv \text{Disj} (\text{Neg } A) \ B$

abbreviation $\text{All} :: \text{name} \Rightarrow \text{fm} \Rightarrow \text{fm}$
where $\text{All } i \ A \equiv \text{Neg} (\text{Ex } i (\text{Neg } A))$

abbreviation $\text{All2} :: \text{name} \Rightarrow \text{tm} \Rightarrow \text{fm} \Rightarrow \text{fm}$ — bounded universal quantifier, for Sigma formulas
where $\text{All2 } i \ t \ A \equiv \text{All } i ((\text{Var } i \text{ IN } t) \ \text{IMP } A)$

Conjunction

definition $\text{Conj} :: \text{fm} \Rightarrow \text{fm} \Rightarrow \text{fm}$ (**infixr** $\langle \text{AND} \rangle$ 135)
where $\text{Conj } A \ B \equiv \text{Neg} (\text{Disj} (\text{Neg } A) (\text{Neg } B))$

lemma $\text{Conj_eqvt} [\text{eqvt}]: p \cdot (A \text{ AND } B) = (p \cdot A) \text{ AND } (p \cdot B)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{fresh_Conj} [\text{simp}]: a \notin A \text{ AND } B \longleftrightarrow (a \notin A \wedge a \notin B)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{supp_Conj} [\text{simp}]: \text{supp} (A \text{ AND } B) = \text{supp } A \cup \text{supp } B$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{size_Conj} [\text{simp}]: \text{size} (A \text{ AND } B) = \text{size } A + \text{size } B + 4$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{Conj_injective_iff} [\text{iff}]: (A \text{ AND } B) = (A' \text{ AND } B') \longleftrightarrow (A = A' \wedge B = B')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{subst_fm_Conj} [\text{simp}]: (A \text{ AND } B)(i ::= x) = (A(i ::= x)) \text{ AND } (B(i ::= x))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

If and only if

definition $\text{Iff} :: \text{fm} \Rightarrow \text{fm} \Rightarrow \text{fm}$ (**infixr** $\langle \text{IFF} \rangle$ 125)
where $\text{Iff } A \ B = \text{Conj} (\text{Imp } A \ B) (\text{Imp } B \ A)$

lemma $\text{Iff_eqvt} [\text{eqvt}]: p \cdot (A \text{ IFF } B) = (p \cdot A) \text{ IFF } (p \cdot B)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{fresh_Iff} [\text{simp}]: a \notin A \text{ IFF } B \longleftrightarrow (a \notin A \wedge a \notin B)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{size_Iff} [\text{simp}]: \text{size} (A \text{ IFF } B) = 2 * (\text{size } A + \text{size } B) + 8$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{Iff_injective_iff} [\text{iff}]: (A \text{ IFF } B) = (A' \text{ IFF } B') \longleftrightarrow (A = A' \wedge B = B')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{subst_fm_Iff} [\text{simp}]: (A \text{ IFF } B)(i ::= x) = (A(i ::= x)) \text{ IFF } (B(i ::= x))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

1.2 Axioms and Theorems

1.2.1 Logical axioms

inductive_set $\text{boolean_axioms} :: \text{fm set}$

where

- | *Ident*: $A \text{ IMP } A \in \text{boolean_axioms}$
- | *DisjI1*: $A \text{ IMP } (A \text{ OR } B) \in \text{boolean_axioms}$
- | *DisjCont*: $(A \text{ OR } A) \text{ IMP } A \in \text{boolean_axioms}$
- | *DisjAssoc*: $(A \text{ OR } (B \text{ OR } C)) \text{ IMP } ((A \text{ OR } B) \text{ OR } C) \in \text{boolean_axioms}$
- | *DisjConj*: $(C \text{ OR } A) \text{ IMP } (((\text{Neg } C) \text{ OR } B) \text{ IMP } (A \text{ OR } B)) \in \text{boolean_axioms}$

```
inductive_set special_axioms :: fm set where
  I:  $A(i ::= x) \text{ IMP } (\text{Ex } i A) \in \text{special\_axioms}$ 

inductive_set induction_axioms :: fm set where
  ind:
    atom  $(j ::= \text{name}) \# (i, A)$ 
     $\implies A(i ::= \text{Zero}) \text{ IMP } (\text{All } i (\text{All } j (A \text{ IMP } (A(i ::= \text{Var } j) \text{ IMP } A(i ::= \text{Eats}(\text{Var } i)(\text{Var } j))))))$ 
       $\text{IMP } (\text{All } i A)$ 
     $\in \text{induction\_axioms}$ 
```

1.2.2 Concrete variables

declare *Abs_name_inject*[simp]

abbreviation

$X0 \equiv \text{Abs_name} (\text{Atom} (\text{Sort} "SyntaxN.name" [])) 0$

abbreviation

$X1 \equiv \text{Abs_name} (\text{Atom} (\text{Sort} "SyntaxN.name" [])) (\text{Suc } 0)$

— We prefer *Suc 0* because simplification will transform 1 to that form anyway.

abbreviation

$X2 \equiv \text{Abs_name} (\text{Atom} (\text{Sort} "SyntaxN.name" [])) 2$

abbreviation

$X3 \equiv \text{Abs_name} (\text{Atom} (\text{Sort} "SyntaxN.name" [])) 3$

abbreviation

$X4 \equiv \text{Abs_name} (\text{Atom} (\text{Sort} "SyntaxN.name" [])) 4$

1.2.3 The HF axioms

definition *HF1* :: fm **where** — the axiom $(z = 0) = (\forall x. x \notin z)$
 $HF1 = (\text{Var } X0 \text{ EQ Zero}) \text{ IFF } (\text{All } X1 (\text{Neg } (\text{Var } X1 \text{ IN Var } X0)))$

definition *HF2* :: fm **where** — the axiom $(z = x \triangleleft y) = (\forall u. (u \in z) = (u \in x \vee u = y))$
 $HF2 \equiv \text{Var } X0 \text{ EQ Eats } (\text{Var } X1) (\text{Var } X2) \text{ IFF }$
 $\text{All } X3 (\text{Var } X3 \text{ IN Var } X0) \text{ IFF } \text{Var } X3 \text{ IN Var } X1 \text{ OR } \text{Var } X3 \text{ EQ Var } X2$

definition *HF_axioms* **where** $\text{HF_axioms} = \{HF1, HF2\}$

1.2.4 Equality axioms

definition *refl_ax* :: fm **where**
 $\text{refl_ax} = \text{Var } X1 \text{ EQ Var } X1$

definition *eq_cong_ax* :: fm **where**
 $\text{eq_cong_ax} = ((\text{Var } X1 \text{ EQ Var } X2) \text{ AND } (\text{Var } X3 \text{ EQ Var } X4)) \text{ IMP }$
 $((\text{Var } X1 \text{ EQ Var } X3) \text{ IMP } (\text{Var } X2 \text{ EQ Var } X4))$

definition *mem_cong_ax* :: fm **where**
 $\text{mem_cong_ax} = ((\text{Var } X1 \text{ EQ Var } X2) \text{ AND } (\text{Var } X3 \text{ EQ Var } X4)) \text{ IMP }$

```
((Var X1 IN Var X3) IMP (Var X2 IN Var X4))
```

```
definition eats_cong_ax :: fm where
  eats_cong_ax = ((Var X1 EQ Var X2) AND (Var X3 EQ Var X4)) IMP
    ((Eats (Var X1) (Var X3)) EQ (Eats (Var X2) (Var X4)))

definition equality_axioms :: fm set where
  equality_axioms = {refl_ax, eq_cong_ax, mem_cong_ax, eats_cong_ax}
```

1.2.5 The proof system

This arbitrary additional axiom generalises the statements of the incompleteness theorems and other results to any formal system stronger than the HF theory. The additional axiom could be the conjunction of any finite number of assertions. Any more general extension must be a form that can be formalised for the proof predicate.

```
consts extra_axiom :: fm

inductive hfthm :: fm set ⇒ fm ⇒ bool (infixl ‹→› 55)
where
  Hyp: A ∈ H ⇒ H ⊢ A
  | Extra: H ⊢ extra_axiom
  | Bool: A ∈ boolean_axioms ⇒ H ⊢ A
  | Eq: A ∈ equality_axioms ⇒ H ⊢ A
  | Spec: A ∈ special_axioms ⇒ H ⊢ A
  | HF: A ∈ HF_axioms ⇒ H ⊢ A
  | Ind: A ∈ induction_axioms ⇒ H ⊢ A
  | MP: H ⊢ A IMP B ⇒ H' ⊢ A ⇒ H ∪ H' ⊢ B
  | Exists: H ⊢ A IMP B ⇒ atom i # B ⇒ ∀ C ∈ H. atom i # C ⇒ H ⊢ (Ex i A) IMP B
```

1.2.6 Derived rules of inference

```
lemma contraction: insert A (insert A H) ⊢ B ⇒ insert A H ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma thin_Un: H ⊢ A ⇒ H ∪ H' ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma thin: H ⊢ A ⇒ H ⊆ H' ⇒ H' ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma thin0: {} ⊢ A ⇒ H ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma thin1: H ⊢ B ⇒ insert A H ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma thin2: insert A1 H ⊢ B ⇒ insert A1 (insert A2 H) ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma thin3: insert A1 (insert A2 H) ⊢ B ⇒ insert A1 (insert A2 (insert A3 H)) ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma thin4:
  insert A1 (insert A2 (insert A3 H)) ⊢ B
  ⇒ insert A1 (insert A2 (insert A3 (insert A4 H))) ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma rotate2: insert A2 (insert A1 H) ⊢ B ⇒ insert A1 (insert A2 H) ⊢ B
```



```

lemma rotate13:
  insert A13 (insert A1 (insert A2 (insert A3 (insert A4 (insert A5 (insert A6 (insert A7 (insert A8 (insert A9 (insert A10 (insert A11 (insert A12 H))))))))))) ⊢ B
  ⇒ insert A1 (insert A2 (insert A3 (insert A4 (insert A5 (insert A6 (insert A7 (insert A8 (insert A9 (insert A10 (insert A11 (insert A12 (insert A13 H))))))))))) ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma rotate14:
  insert A14 (insert A1 (insert A2 (insert A3 (insert A4 (insert A5 (insert A6 (insert A7 (insert A8 (insert A9 (insert A10 (insert A11 (insert A12 (insert A13 H))))))))))) ⊢ B
  ⇒ insert A1 (insert A2 (insert A3 (insert A4 (insert A5 (insert A6 (insert A7 (insert A8 (insert A9 (insert A10 (insert A11 (insert A12 (insert A13 (insert A14 H))))))))))) ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma rotate15:
  insert A15 (insert A1 (insert A2 (insert A3 (insert A4 (insert A5 (insert A6 (insert A7 (insert A8 (insert A9 (insert A10 (insert A11 (insert A12 (insert A13 (insert A14 H))))))))))) ⊢ B
  ⇒ insert A1 (insert A2 (insert A3 (insert A4 (insert A5 (insert A6 (insert A7 (insert A8 (insert A9 (insert A10 (insert A11 (insert A12 (insert A13 (insert A14 (insert A15 H))))))))))) ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma MP_same:  $H \vdash A \text{ IMP } B \Rightarrow H \vdash A \Rightarrow H \vdash B$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma MP_thin:  $HA \vdash A \text{ IMP } B \Rightarrow HB \vdash A \Rightarrow HA \cup HB \subseteq H \Rightarrow H \vdash B$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma MP_null: {} ⊢ A IMP B ⇒ H ⊢ A ⇒ H ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Disj_commute:  $H \vdash B \text{ OR } A \Rightarrow H \vdash A \text{ OR } B$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma S: assumes  $H \vdash A \text{ IMP } (B \text{ IMP } C)$   $H' \vdash A \text{ IMP } B$  shows  $H \cup H' \vdash A \text{ IMP } C$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Assume: insert A H ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemmas AssumeH = Assume Assume [THEN rotate2] Assume [THEN rotate3] Assume [THEN rotate4]
Assume [THEN rotate5]
  Assume [THEN rotate6] Assume [THEN rotate7] Assume [THEN rotate8] Assume [THEN
rotate9] Assume [THEN rotate10]
  Assume [THEN rotate11] Assume [THEN rotate12]
declare AssumeH [intro!]

lemma Imp_triv_I:  $H \vdash B \Rightarrow H \vdash A \text{ IMP } B$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma DisjAssoc1:  $H \vdash A \text{ OR } (B \text{ OR } C) \Rightarrow H \vdash (A \text{ OR } B) \text{ OR } C$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma DisjAssoc2:  $H \vdash (A \text{ OR } B) \text{ OR } C \Rightarrow H \vdash A \text{ OR } (B \text{ OR } C)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Disj_commute_Imp:  $H \vdash (B \text{ OR } A) \text{ IMP } (A \text{ OR } B)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma Disj_Semicong_1:  $H \vdash A \text{ OR } C \implies H \vdash A \text{ IMP } B \implies H \vdash B \text{ OR } C$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma Imp_Imp_commutate:  $H \vdash B \text{ IMP } (A \text{ IMP } C) \implies H \vdash A \text{ IMP } (B \text{ IMP } C)$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

1.2.7 The Deduction Theorem

```

lemma deduction_Diff: assumes  $H \vdash B$  shows  $H - \{C\} \vdash C \text{ IMP } B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

theorem Imp_I [intro!]:  $\text{insert } A \ H \vdash B \implies H \vdash A \text{ IMP } B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma anti_deduction:  $H \vdash A \text{ IMP } B \implies \text{insert } A \ H \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

1.2.8 Cut rules

```

lemma cut:  $H \vdash A \implies \text{insert } A \ H' \vdash B \implies H \cup H' \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma cut_same:  $H \vdash A \implies \text{insert } A \ H \vdash B \implies H \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma cut_thin:  $HA \vdash A \implies \text{insert } A \ HB \vdash B \implies HA \cup HB \subseteq H \implies H \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma cut0:  $\{\} \vdash A \implies \text{insert } A \ H \vdash B \implies H \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma cut1:  $\{A\} \vdash B \implies H \vdash A \implies H \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma rcut1:  $\{A\} \vdash B \implies \text{insert } B \ H \vdash C \implies \text{insert } A \ H \vdash C$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma cut2:  $\llbracket \{A,B\} \vdash C; H \vdash A; H \vdash B \rrbracket \implies H \vdash C$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma rcut2:  $\{A,B\} \vdash C \implies \text{insert } C \ H \vdash D \implies H \vdash B \implies \text{insert } A \ H \vdash D$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma cut3:  $\llbracket \{A,B,C\} \vdash D; H \vdash A; H \vdash B; H \vdash C \rrbracket \implies H \vdash D$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma cut4:  $\llbracket \{A,B,C,D\} \vdash E; H \vdash A; H \vdash B; H \vdash C; H \vdash D \rrbracket \implies H \vdash E$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

1.3 Miscellaneous logical rules

```

lemma Disj_I1:  $H \vdash A \implies H \vdash A \text{ OR } B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma Disj_I2:  $H \vdash B \implies H \vdash A \text{ OR } B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

lemma *Peirce*: $H \vdash (\text{Neg } A) \text{ IMP } A \implies H \vdash A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Contra*: $\text{insert } (\text{Neg } A) H \vdash A \implies H \vdash A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Imp_Neg_I*: $H \vdash A \text{ IMP } B \implies H \vdash A \text{ IMP } (\text{Neg } B) \implies H \vdash \text{Neg } A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *NegNeg_I*: $H \vdash A \implies H \vdash \text{Neg } (\text{Neg } A)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *NegNeg_D*: $H \vdash \text{Neg } (\text{Neg } A) \implies H \vdash A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Neg_D*: $H \vdash \text{Neg } A \implies H \vdash A \implies H \vdash B$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Disj_Neg_1*: $H \vdash A \text{ OR } B \implies H \vdash \text{Neg } B \implies H \vdash A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Disj_Neg_2*: $H \vdash A \text{ OR } B \implies H \vdash \text{Neg } A \implies H \vdash B$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Neg_Disj_I*: $H \vdash \text{Neg } A \implies H \vdash \text{Neg } B \implies H \vdash \text{Neg } (A \text{ OR } B)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Conj_I* [*intro!*]: $H \vdash A \implies H \vdash B \implies H \vdash A \text{ AND } B$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Conj_E1*: $H \vdash A \text{ AND } B \implies H \vdash A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Conj_E2*: $H \vdash A \text{ AND } B \implies H \vdash B$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Conj_commute*: $H \vdash B \text{ AND } A \implies H \vdash A \text{ AND } B$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Conj_E*: **assumes** $\text{insert } A (\text{insert } B H) \vdash C$ **shows** $\text{insert } (A \text{ AND } B) H \vdash C$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemmas *Conj_EH* = *Conj_E* *Conj_E* [THEN *rotate2*] *Conj_E* [THEN *rotate3*] *Conj_E* [THEN *rotate4*] *Conj_E* [THEN *rotate5*]
Conj_E [THEN *rotate6*] *Conj_E* [THEN *rotate7*] *Conj_E* [THEN *rotate8*] *Conj_E* [THEN *rotate9*] *Conj_E* [THEN *rotate10*]
declare *Conj_EH* [*intro!*]

lemma *Neg_I0*: **assumes** $(\bigwedge B. \text{atom } i \notin B \implies \text{insert } A H \vdash B)$ **shows** $H \vdash \text{Neg } A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Neg_mono*: $\text{insert } A H \vdash B \implies \text{insert } (\text{Neg } B) H \vdash \text{Neg } A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Conj_mono*: $\text{insert } A H \vdash B \implies \text{insert } C H \vdash D \implies \text{insert } (A \text{ AND } C) H \vdash B \text{ AND } D$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Disj_mono*:

```

assumes insert A H ⊢ B insert C H ⊢ D shows insert (A OR C) H ⊢ B OR D
⟨proof⟩

lemma Disj_E:
assumes A: insert A H ⊢ C and B: insert B H ⊢ C shows insert (A OR B) H ⊢ C
⟨proof⟩

lemmas Disj_EH = Disj_E Disj_E [THEN rotate2] Disj_E [THEN rotate3] Disj_E [THEN rotate4]
Disj_E [THEN rotate5]
Disj_E [THEN rotate6] Disj_E [THEN rotate7] Disj_E [THEN rotate8] Disj_E [THEN
rotate9] Disj_E [THEN rotate10]
declare Disj_EH [intro!]

lemma Contra': insert A H ⊢ Neg A ==> H ⊢ Neg A
⟨proof⟩

lemma NegNeg_E [intro!]: insert A H ⊢ B ==> insert (Neg (Neg A)) H ⊢ B
⟨proof⟩

declare NegNeg_E [THEN rotate2, intro!]
declare NegNeg_E [THEN rotate3, intro!]
declare NegNeg_E [THEN rotate4, intro!]
declare NegNeg_E [THEN rotate5, intro!]
declare NegNeg_E [THEN rotate6, intro!]
declare NegNeg_E [THEN rotate7, intro!]
declare NegNeg_E [THEN rotate8, intro!]

lemma Imp_E:
assumes A: H ⊢ A and B: insert B H ⊢ C shows insert (A IMP B) H ⊢ C
⟨proof⟩

lemma Imp_cut:
assumes insert C H ⊢ A IMP B {A} ⊢ C
shows H ⊢ A IMP B
⟨proof⟩

lemma Iff_I [intro!]: insert A H ⊢ B ==> insert B H ⊢ A ==> H ⊢ A IFF B
⟨proof⟩

lemma Iff_MP_same: H ⊢ A IFF B ==> H ⊢ A ==> H ⊢ B

lemma Iff_MP2_same: H ⊢ A IFF B ==> H ⊢ B ==> H ⊢ A

lemma Iff_refl [intro!]: H ⊢ A IFF A
⟨proof⟩

lemma Iff_sym: H ⊢ A IFF B ==> H ⊢ B IFF A
⟨proof⟩

lemma Iff_trans: H ⊢ A IFF B ==> H ⊢ B IFF C ==> H ⊢ A IFF C
⟨proof⟩

lemma Iff_E:
insert A (insert B H) ⊢ C ==> insert (Neg A) (insert (Neg B) H) ⊢ C ==> insert (A IFF B) H ⊢ C
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma Iff_E1:
  assumes A:  $H \vdash A$  and B:  $\text{insert } B \ H \vdash C$  shows  $\text{insert } (A \text{ IFF } B) \ H \vdash C$ 
  (proof)

lemma Iff_E2:
  assumes A:  $H \vdash A$  and B:  $\text{insert } B \ H \vdash C$  shows  $\text{insert } (B \text{ IFF } A) \ H \vdash C$ 
  (proof)

lemma Iff_MP_left:  $H \vdash A \text{ IFF } B \implies \text{insert } A \ H \vdash C \implies \text{insert } B \ H \vdash C$ 
  (proof)

lemma Iff_MP_left':  $H \vdash A \text{ IFF } B \implies \text{insert } B \ H \vdash C \implies \text{insert } A \ H \vdash C$ 
  (proof)

lemma Swap:  $\text{insert } (\text{Neg } B) \ H \vdash A \implies \text{insert } (\text{Neg } A) \ H \vdash B$ 
  (proof)

lemma Cases:  $\text{insert } A \ H \vdash B \implies \text{insert } (\text{Neg } A) \ H \vdash B \implies H \vdash B$ 
  (proof)

lemma Neg_Conj_E:  $H \vdash B \implies \text{insert } (\text{Neg } A) \ H \vdash C \implies \text{insert } (\text{Neg } (A \text{ AND } B)) \ H \vdash C$ 
  (proof)

lemma Disj_CI:  $\text{insert } (\text{Neg } B) \ H \vdash A \implies H \vdash A \text{ OR } B$ 
  (proof)

lemma Disj_3I:  $\text{insert } (\text{Neg } A) \ (\text{insert } (\text{Neg } C) \ H) \vdash B \implies H \vdash A \text{ OR } B \text{ OR } C$ 
  (proof)

lemma Contrapos1:  $H \vdash A \text{ IMP } B \implies H \vdash \text{Neg } B \text{ IMP } \text{Neg } A$ 
  (proof)

lemma Contrapos2:  $H \vdash (\text{Neg } B) \text{ IMP } (\text{Neg } A) \implies H \vdash A \text{ IMP } B$ 
  (proof)

lemma ContraAssumeN [intro]:  $B \in H \implies \text{insert } (\text{Neg } B) \ H \vdash A$ 
  (proof)

lemma ContraAssume:  $\text{Neg } B \in H \implies \text{insert } B \ H \vdash A$ 
  (proof)

lemma ContraProve:  $H \vdash B \implies \text{insert } (\text{Neg } B) \ H \vdash A$ 
  (proof)

lemma Disj_IE1:  $\text{insert } B \ H \vdash C \implies \text{insert } (A \text{ OR } B) \ H \vdash A \text{ OR } C$ 
  (proof)

lemmas Disj_IE1H = Disj_IE1 Disj_IE1 [THEN rotate2] Disj_IE1 [THEN rotate3] Disj_IE1 [THEN
rotate4] Disj_IE1 [THEN rotate5]
  Disj_IE1 [THEN rotate6] Disj_IE1 [THEN rotate7] Disj_IE1 [THEN rotate8]
declare Disj_IE1H [intro!]

```

1.3.1 Quantifier reasoning

```

lemma Ex_I:  $H \vdash A(i:=x) \implies H \vdash \text{Ex } i \ A$ 
  (proof)

```

```

lemma Ex_E:

```

```

assumes insert A H ⊢ B atom i # B ∀ C ∈ H. atom i # C
shows insert (Ex i A) H ⊢ B
⟨proof⟩

lemma Ex_E_with_renaming:
assumes insert ((i ↔ i') · A) H ⊢ B atom i' # (A,i,B) ∀ C ∈ H. atom i' # C
shows insert (Ex i A) H ⊢ B
⟨proof⟩

lemmas Ex_EH = Ex_E Ex_E [THEN rotate2] Ex_E [THEN rotate3] Ex_E [THEN rotate4] Ex_E
[THEN rotate5]
Ex_E [THEN rotate6] Ex_E [THEN rotate7] Ex_E [THEN rotate8] Ex_E [THEN rotate9]
Ex_E [THEN rotate10]
declare Ex_EH [intro!]

lemma Ex_mono: insert A H ⊢ B ⇒ ∀ C ∈ H. atom i # C ⇒ insert (Ex i A) H ⊢ (Ex i B)
⟨proof⟩

lemma All_I [intro!]: H ⊢ A ⇒ ∀ C ∈ H. atom i # C ⇒ H ⊢ All i A
⟨proof⟩

lemma All_D: H ⊢ All i A ⇒ H ⊢ A(i ::= x)
⟨proof⟩

lemma All_E: insert (A(i ::= x)) H ⊢ B ⇒ insert (All i A) H ⊢ B
⟨proof⟩

lemma All_E': H ⊢ All i A ⇒ insert (A(i ::= x)) H ⊢ B ⇒ H ⊢ B
⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_E: [atom i # t; H ⊢ x IN t; insert (A(i ::= x)) H ⊢ B] ⇒ insert (All2 i t A) H ⊢ B
⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_E': [H ⊢ All2 i t A; H ⊢ x IN t; insert (A(i ::= x)) H ⊢ B; atom i # t] ⇒ H ⊢ B
⟨proof⟩



### 1.3.2 Congruence rules

lemma Neg_cong: H ⊢ A IFF A' ⇒ H ⊢ Neg A IFF Neg A'
⟨proof⟩

lemma Disj_cong: H ⊢ A IFF A' ⇒ H ⊢ B IFF B' ⇒ H ⊢ A OR B IFF A' OR B'
⟨proof⟩

lemma Conj_cong: H ⊢ A IFF A' ⇒ H ⊢ B IFF B' ⇒ H ⊢ A AND B IFF A' AND B'
⟨proof⟩

lemma Imp_cong: H ⊢ A IFF A' ⇒ H ⊢ B IFF B' ⇒ H ⊢ (A IMP B) IFF (A' IMP B')
⟨proof⟩

lemma Iff_cong: H ⊢ A IFF A' ⇒ H ⊢ B IFF B' ⇒ H ⊢ (A IFF B) IFF (A' IFF B')
⟨proof⟩

lemma Ex_cong: H ⊢ A IFF A' ⇒ ∀ C ∈ H. atom i # C ⇒ H ⊢ (Ex i A) IFF (Ex i A')
⟨proof⟩

lemma All_cong: H ⊢ A IFF A' ⇒ ∀ C ∈ H. atom i # C ⇒ H ⊢ (All i A) IFF (All i A')
⟨proof⟩

```

lemma *Subst*: $H \vdash A \implies \forall B \in H. \text{atom } i \notin B \implies H \vdash A (i ::= x)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

1.4 Equality reasoning

1.4.1 The congruence property for (*EQ*), and other basic properties of equality

lemma *Eq_cong1*: $\{\} \vdash (t \text{ EQ } t' \text{ AND } u \text{ EQ } u') \text{ IMP } (t \text{ EQ } u \text{ IMP } t' \text{ EQ } u')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Refl* [iff]: $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Apparently necessary in order to prove the congruence property.

lemma *Sym*: **assumes** $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } u$ **shows** $H \vdash u \text{ EQ } t$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Sym_L*: $\text{insert } (t \text{ EQ } u) H \vdash A \implies \text{insert } (u \text{ EQ } t) H \vdash A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Trans*: **assumes** $H \vdash x \text{ EQ } y$ $H \vdash y \text{ EQ } z$ **shows** $H \vdash x \text{ EQ } z$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Eq_cong*:
assumes $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t'$ $H \vdash u \text{ EQ } u'$ **shows** $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } u \text{ IFF } t' \text{ EQ } u'$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Eq_Trans_E*: $H \vdash x \text{ EQ } u \implies \text{insert } (t \text{ EQ } u) H \vdash A \implies \text{insert } (x \text{ EQ } t) H \vdash A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

1.4.2 The congruence property for (*IN*)

lemma *Mem_cong1*: $\{\} \vdash (t \text{ EQ } t' \text{ AND } u \text{ EQ } u') \text{ IMP } (t \text{ IN } u \text{ IMP } t' \text{ IN } u')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Mem_cong*:
assumes $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t'$ $H \vdash u \text{ EQ } u'$ **shows** $H \vdash t \text{ IN } u \text{ IFF } t' \text{ IN } u'$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

1.4.3 The congruence properties for *Eats* and *HPair*

lemma *Eats_cong1*: $\{\} \vdash (t \text{ EQ } t' \text{ AND } u \text{ EQ } u') \text{ IMP } (\text{Eats } t \text{ } u \text{ EQ } \text{Eats } t' \text{ } u')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Eats_cong*: $\llbracket H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t'; H \vdash u \text{ EQ } u' \rrbracket \implies H \vdash \text{Eats } t \text{ } u \text{ EQ } \text{Eats } t' \text{ } u'$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *HPair_cong*: $\llbracket H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t'; H \vdash u \text{ EQ } u' \rrbracket \implies H \vdash \text{HPair } t \text{ } u \text{ EQ } \text{HPair } t' \text{ } u'$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *SUCC_cong*: $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t' \implies H \vdash \text{SUCC } t \text{ EQ } \text{SUCC } t'$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

1.4.4 Substitution for Equalities

lemma *Eq_subst_tm_Iff*: $\{t \text{ EQ } u\} \vdash \text{subst } i \text{ } t \text{ tm } \text{EQ } \text{subst } i \text{ } u \text{ tm}$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Eq_subst_fm_Iff*: *insert* (*t EQ u*) *H* $\vdash A(i:=t) \text{ IFF } A(i:=u)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Var_Eq_subst_Iff*: *insert* (*Var i EQ t*) *H* $\vdash A(i:=t) \text{ IFF } A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Var_Eq_imp_subst_Iff*: *H* $\vdash \text{Var } i \text{ EQ } t \implies H \vdash A(i:=t) \text{ IFF } A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

1.4.5 Congruence Rules for Predicates

lemma *P1_cong*:

fixes *tms* :: *tm list*
 assumes $\bigwedge i t x. \text{atom } i \notin \text{tms} \implies (P t)(i:=x) = P(\text{subst } i x t)$ **and** *H* $\vdash x \text{ EQ } x'$
 shows *H* $\vdash P x \text{ IFF } P x'$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *P2_cong*:

fixes *tms* :: *tm list*
 assumes *sub*: $\bigwedge i t u x. \text{atom } i \notin \text{tms} \implies (P t u)(i:=x) = P(\text{subst } i x t)$ (*subst i x u*)
 and eq: *H* $\vdash x \text{ EQ } x' \text{ H } \vdash y \text{ EQ } y'$
 shows *H* $\vdash P x y \text{ IFF } P x' y'$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *P3_cong*:

fixes *tms* :: *tm list*
 assumes *sub*: $\bigwedge i t u v x. \text{atom } i \notin \text{tms} \implies$
 $(P t u v)(i:=x) = P(\text{subst } i x t)$ (*subst i x u*) (*subst i x v*)
 and eq: *H* $\vdash x \text{ EQ } x' \text{ H } \vdash y \text{ EQ } y' \text{ H } \vdash z \text{ EQ } z'$
 shows *H* $\vdash P x y z \text{ IFF } P x' y' z'$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *P4_cong*:

fixes *tms* :: *tm list*
 assumes *sub*: $\bigwedge i t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4 x. \text{atom } i \notin \text{tms} \implies$
 $(P t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4)(i:=x) = P(\text{subst } i x t_1)$ (*subst i x t2*) (*subst i x t3*) (*subst i x t4*)
 and eq: *H* $\vdash x_1 \text{ EQ } x_1' \text{ H } \vdash x_2 \text{ EQ } x_2' \text{ H } \vdash x_3 \text{ EQ } x_3' \text{ H } \vdash x_4 \text{ EQ } x_4'$
 shows *H* $\vdash P x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4 \text{ IFF } P x_1' x_2' x_3' x_4'$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

1.5 Zero and Falsity

lemma *Mem_Zero_iff*:

assumes *atom i* \notin *t* **shows** *H* $\vdash (t \text{ EQ } \text{Zero}) \text{ IFF } (\text{All } i (\text{Neg } ((\text{Var } i) \text{ IN } t)))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Mem_Zero_E [intro!]*: *insert* (*x IN Zero*) *H* $\vdash A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

declare *Mem_Zero_E* [*THEN rotate2, intro!*]
declare *Mem_Zero_E* [*THEN rotate3, intro!*]
declare *Mem_Zero_E* [*THEN rotate4, intro!*]
declare *Mem_Zero_E* [*THEN rotate5, intro!*]
declare *Mem_Zero_E* [*THEN rotate6, intro!*]
declare *Mem_Zero_E* [*THEN rotate7, intro!*]
declare *Mem_Zero_E* [*THEN rotate8, intro!*]

1.5.1 The Formula Fls

definition Fls where $Fls \equiv Zero \ IN \ Zero$

lemma Fls_eqvt [eqvt]: $(p \cdot Fls) = Fls$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma Fls_fresh [simp]: $a \notin Fls$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma Neg_I [intro!]: $insert A H \vdash Fls \implies H \vdash Neg A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma Neg_E [intro!]: $H \vdash A \implies insert (Neg A) H \vdash Fls$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

declare Neg_E [THEN rotate2, intro!]
declare Neg_E [THEN rotate3, intro!]
declare Neg_E [THEN rotate4, intro!]
declare Neg_E [THEN rotate5, intro!]
declare Neg_E [THEN rotate6, intro!]
declare Neg_E [THEN rotate7, intro!]
declare Neg_E [THEN rotate8, intro!]

We need these because $Neg (A \ IMP B)$ doesn't have to be syntactically a conjunction.

lemma Neg_Imp_I [intro!]: $H \vdash A \implies insert B H \vdash Fls \implies H \vdash Neg (A \ IMP B)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma Neg_Imp_E [intro!]: $insert (Neg B) (insert A H) \vdash C \implies insert (Neg (A \ IMP B)) H \vdash C$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

declare Neg_Imp_E [THEN rotate2, intro!]
declare Neg_Imp_E [THEN rotate3, intro!]
declare Neg_Imp_E [THEN rotate4, intro!]
declare Neg_Imp_E [THEN rotate5, intro!]
declare Neg_Imp_E [THEN rotate6, intro!]
declare Neg_Imp_E [THEN rotate7, intro!]
declare Neg_Imp_E [THEN rotate8, intro!]

lemma Fls_E [intro!]: $insert Fls H \vdash A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

declare Fls_E [THEN rotate2, intro!]
declare Fls_E [THEN rotate3, intro!]
declare Fls_E [THEN rotate4, intro!]
declare Fls_E [THEN rotate5, intro!]
declare Fls_E [THEN rotate6, intro!]
declare Fls_E [THEN rotate7, intro!]
declare Fls_E [THEN rotate8, intro!]

lemma $truth_provable$: $H \vdash (Neg Fls)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $ExFalse$: $H \vdash Fls \implies H \vdash A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

1.5.2 More properties of $Zero$

lemma Eq_Zero_D :

```

assumes  $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } \text{Zero}$   $H \vdash u \text{ IN } t$  shows  $H \vdash A$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Eq_Zero_thm:
assumes atom  $i \notin t$  shows {All  $i$  ( $\text{Neg} ((\text{Var } i) \text{ IN } t)$ )}  $\vdash t \text{ EQ } \text{Zero}$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Eq_Zero_I:
assumes insi: insert  $((\text{Var } i) \text{ IN } t)$   $H \vdash \text{Fls}$  and i1: atom  $i \notin t$  and i2:  $\forall B \in H.$  atom  $i \notin B$ 
shows  $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } \text{Zero}$ 
⟨proof⟩

1.5.3 Basic properties of Eats

lemma Eq_Eats_iff:
assumes atom  $i \notin (z, t, u)$ 
shows  $H \vdash (z \text{ EQ } \text{Eats } t \ u) \text{ IFF } (\text{All } i (\text{Var } i \text{ IN } z \text{ IFF } \text{Var } i \text{ IN } t \text{ OR } \text{Var } i \text{ EQ } u))$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Eq_Eats_I:
 $H \vdash \text{All } i (\text{Var } i \text{ IN } z \text{ IFF } \text{Var } i \text{ IN } t \text{ OR } \text{Var } i \text{ EQ } u) \implies \text{atom } i \notin (z, t, u) \implies H \vdash z \text{ EQ } \text{Eats } t \ u$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Mem_Eats_Iff:
 $H \vdash x \text{ IN } (\text{Eats } t \ u) \text{ IFF } x \text{ IN } t \text{ OR } x \text{ EQ } u$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Mem_Eats_I1:  $H \vdash u \text{ IN } t \implies H \vdash u \text{ IN } \text{Eats } t \ z$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Mem_Eats_I2:  $H \vdash u \text{ EQ } z \implies H \vdash u \text{ IN } \text{Eats } t \ z$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Mem_Eats_E:
assumes A: insert  $(u \text{ IN } t)$   $H \vdash C$  and B: insert  $(u \text{ EQ } z)$   $H \vdash C$ 
shows insert  $(u \text{ IN } \text{Eats } t \ z)$   $H \vdash C$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemmas Mem_Eats_EH = Mem_Eats_E Mem_Eats_E [THEN rotate2] Mem_Eats_E [THEN rotate3] Mem_Eats_E [THEN rotate4] Mem_Eats_E [THEN rotate5]
 $\quad \quad \quad$  Mem_Eats_E [THEN rotate6] Mem_Eats_E [THEN rotate7] Mem_Eats_E [THEN rotate8]
declare Mem_Eats_EH [intro!]

lemma Mem_SUCC_I1:  $H \vdash u \text{ IN } t \implies H \vdash u \text{ IN } \text{SUCC } t$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Mem_SUCC_I2:  $H \vdash u \text{ EQ } t \implies H \vdash u \text{ IN } \text{SUCC } t$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Mem_SUCC_Refl [simp]:  $H \vdash k \text{ IN } \text{SUCC } k$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Mem_SUCC_E:
assumes insert  $(u \text{ IN } t)$   $H \vdash C$  insert  $(u \text{ EQ } t)$   $H \vdash C$  shows insert  $(u \text{ IN } \text{SUCC } t)$   $H \vdash C$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemmas Mem_SUCC_EH = Mem_SUCC_E Mem_SUCC_E [THEN rotate2] Mem_SUCC_E [THEN

```

```

rotate3] Mem_SUCC_E [THEN rotate4] Mem_SUCC_E [THEN rotate5]
        Mem_SUCC_E [THEN rotate6] Mem_SUCC_E [THEN rotate7] Mem_SUCC_E [THEN
rotate8]

lemma Eats_EQ_Zero_E: insert (Eats t u EQ Zero) H ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemmas Eats_EQ_Zero_EH = Eats_EQ_Zero_E Eats_EQ_Zero_E [THEN rotate2] Eats_EQ_Zero_E
[THEN rotate3] Eats_EQ_Zero_E [THEN rotate4] Eats_EQ_Zero_E [THEN rotate5]
        Eats_EQ_Zero_E [THEN rotate6] Eats_EQ_Zero_E [THEN rotate7] Eats_EQ_Zero_E
[THEN rotate8]
declare Eats_EQ_Zero_EH [intro!]

lemma Eats_EQ_Zero_E2: insert (Zero EQ Eats t u) H ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemmas Eats_EQ_Zero_E2H = Eats_EQ_Zero_E2 Eats_EQ_Zero_E2 [THEN rotate2] Eats_EQ_Zero_E2
[THEN rotate3] Eats_EQ_Zero_E2 [THEN rotate4] Eats_EQ_Zero_E2 [THEN rotate5]
        Eats_EQ_Zero_E2 [THEN rotate6] Eats_EQ_Zero_E2 [THEN rotate7] Eats_EQ_Zero_E2
[THEN rotate8]
declare Eats_EQ_Zero_E2H [intro!]

```

1.6 Bounded Quantification involving *Eats*

```

lemma All2_cong: H ⊢ t EQ t' ⇒ H ⊢ A IFF A' ⇒ ∀ C ∈ H. atom i # C ⇒ H ⊢ (All2 i t A) IFF
(All2 i t' A')
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_Zero_E [intro!]: H ⊢ B ⇒ insert (All2 i Zero A) H ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_Eats_I_D:
  atom i # (t,u) ⇒ { All2 i t A, A(i:=u) } ⊢ (All2 i (Eats t u) A)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_Eats_I:
  [atom i # (t,u); H ⊢ All2 i t A; H ⊢ A(i:=u)] ⇒ H ⊢ (All2 i (Eats t u) A)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_Eats_E1:
  [atom i # (t,u); ∀ C ∈ H. atom i # C] ⇒ insert (All2 i (Eats t u) A) H ⊢ All2 i t A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_Eats_E2:
  [atom i # (t,u); ∀ C ∈ H. atom i # C] ⇒ insert (All2 i (Eats t u) A) H ⊢ A(i:=u)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_Eats_E:
  assumes i: atom i # (t,u)
  and B: insert (All2 i t A) (insert (A(i:=u)) H) ⊢ B
  shows insert (All2 i (Eats t u) A) H ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_SUCC_I:
  atom i # t ⇒ H ⊢ All2 i t A ⇒ H ⊢ A(i:=t) ⇒ H ⊢ (All2 i (SUCC t) A)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_SUCC_E:

```

```

assumes atom i # t
  and insert (All2 i t A) (insert (A(i:=t)) H) ⊢ B
shows insert (All2 i (SUCC t) A) H ⊢ B
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma All2_SUCC_E':
assumes H ⊢ u EQ SUCC t
  and atom i # t ∀ C ∈ H. atom i # C
  and insert (All2 i t A) (insert (A(i:=t)) H) ⊢ B
shows insert (All2 i u A) H ⊢ B
⟨proof⟩

```

1.7 Induction

```

lemma Ind:
assumes j: atom (j::name) # (i,A)
  and prems: H ⊢ A(i:=Zero) H ⊢ All i (All j (A IMP (A(i:= Var j) IMP A(i:= Eats(Var i)(Var j)))))
shows H ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩
end

```

Chapter 2

De Bruijn Syntax, Quotations, Codes, V-Codes

```
theory Coding
imports SyntaxN
begin

declare fresh_Nil [iff]

nominal_datatype dbtm = DBZero | DBVar name | DBInd nat | DBEats dbtm dbtm

nominal_datatype dbfm =
  DBMem dbtm dbtm
| DBEq dbtm dbtm
| DBDisj dbfm dbfm
| DBNeg dbfm
| DBEx dbfm

declare dbtm.supp [simp]
declare dbfm.supp [simp]

fun lookup :: name list ⇒ nat ⇒ name ⇒ dbtm
where
  lookup [] n x = DBVar x
| lookup (y # ys) n x = (if x = y then DBInd n else (lookup ys (Suc n) x))

lemma fresh_imp_notin_env: atom name # e ⇒ name ∉ set e
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma lookup_notin: x ∉ set e ⇒ lookup e n x = DBVar x
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma lookup_in:
  x ∈ set e ⇒ ∃ k. lookup e n x = DBInd k ∧ n ≤ k ∧ k < n + length e
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma lookup_fresh: x # lookup e n y ←→ y ∈ set e ∨ x ≠ atom y
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma lookup_eqvt[eqvt]: (p · lookup xs n x) = lookup (p · xs) (p · n) (p · x)
```

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *lookup_inject* [iff]: $(\text{lookup } e n x = \text{lookup } e n y) \longleftrightarrow x = y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_function *trans_tm* :: *name list* \Rightarrow *tm* \Rightarrow *dbtm*
where

trans_tm *e* *Zero* = *DBZero*
| *trans_tm* *e* (*Var k*) = *lookup* *e* *0 k*
| *trans_tm* *e* (*Eats t u*) = *DBEats* (*trans_tm e t*) (*trans_tm e u*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (*eqvt*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fresh_trans_tm_iff* [simp]: $i \notin \text{trans_tm } e t \longleftrightarrow i \notin t \vee i \in \text{atom}^* \text{set } e$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *trans_tm_forget*: *atom i* \notin *t* \implies *trans_tm* [*i*] *t* = *trans_tm* [] *t*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_function (*invariant* $\lambda(xs, _) y.$ *atom* $^* \text{set } xs \#* y$)
trans_fm :: *name list* \Rightarrow *fm* \Rightarrow *dbfm*
where
style="padding-left: 2em;">| *trans_fm* *e* (*Mem t u*) = *DBMem* (*trans_tm e t*) (*trans_tm e u*)
| *trans_fm* *e* (*Eq t u*) = *DBEq* (*trans_tm e t*) (*trans_tm e u*)
| *trans_fm* *e* (*Disj A B*) = *DBDisj* (*trans_fm e A*) (*trans_fm e B*)
| *trans_fm* *e* (*Neg A*) = *DBNeg* (*trans_fm e A*)
| *atom k* \notin *e* \implies *trans_fm* *e* (*Ex k A*) = *DBEx* (*trans_fm* (*k#e*) *A*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (*eqvt*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fresh_trans_fm_iff* [simp]: $i \notin \text{trans_fm } e A \longleftrightarrow i \notin A \vee i \in \text{atom}^* \text{set } e$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

abbreviation *DBConj* :: *dbfm* \Rightarrow *dbfm* \Rightarrow *dbfm*
where *DBConj t u* \equiv *DBNeg* (*DBDisj* (*DBNeg t*) (*DBNeg u*))

lemma *trans_fm_Conj* [simp]: *trans_fm e* (*Conj A B*) = *DBConj* (*trans_fm e A*) (*trans_fm e B*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *trans_tm_inject* [iff]: $(\text{trans_tm } e t = \text{trans_tm } e u) \longleftrightarrow t = u$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *trans_fm_inject* [iff]: $(\text{trans_fm } e A = \text{trans_fm } e B) \longleftrightarrow A = B$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *trans_fm_perm*:
assumes *c: atom c* \notin *(i,j,A,B)*
and *t: trans_fm [i] A = trans_fm [j] B*
shows $(i \leftrightarrow c) \cdot A = (j \leftrightarrow c) \cdot B$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

2.2 Characterising the Well-Formed de Bruijn Formulas

2.2.1 Well-Formed Terms

```

inductive wf_dbtm :: dbtm  $\Rightarrow$  bool
  where
    | Zero: wf_dbtm DBZero
    | Var: wf_dbtm (DBVar name)
    | Eats: wf_dbtm t1  $\Longrightarrow$  wf_dbtm t2  $\Longrightarrow$  wf_dbtm (DBEats t1 t2)

equivariance wf_dbtm

inductive_cases Zero_wf_dbtm [elim!]: wf_dbtm DBZero
inductive_cases Var_wf_dbtm [elim!]: wf_dbtm (DBVar name)
inductive_cases Ind_wf_dbtm [elim!]: wf_dbtm (DBInd i)
inductive_cases Eats_wf_dbtm [elim!]: wf_dbtm (DBEats t1 t2)

declare wf_dbtm.intros [intro]

lemma wf_dbtm_imp_is_tm:
  assumes wf_dbtm x
  shows  $\exists t::tm. x = \text{trans\_tm} [] t$ 
   $\langle\text{proof}\rangle$ 

lemma wf_dbtm_trans_tm: wf_dbtm (trans_tm [] t)
   $\langle\text{proof}\rangle$ 

theorem wf_dbtm_iff_is_tm: wf_dbtm x  $\longleftrightarrow$  ( $\exists t::tm. x = \text{trans\_tm} [] t$ )
   $\langle\text{proof}\rangle$ 

nominal_function abst_dbtm :: name  $\Rightarrow$  nat  $\Rightarrow$  dbtm  $\Rightarrow$  dbtm
  where
    | abst_dbtm name i DBZero = DBZero
    | abst_dbtm name i (DBVar name') = (if name = name' then DBInd i else DBVar name')
    | abst_dbtm name i (DBInd j) = DBInd j
    | abst_dbtm name i (DBEats t1 t2) = DBEats (abst_dbtm name i t1) (abst_dbtm name i t2)
   $\langle\text{proof}\rangle$ 

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle\text{proof}\rangle$ 

nominal_function subst_dbtm :: dbtm  $\Rightarrow$  name  $\Rightarrow$  dbtm  $\Rightarrow$  dbtm
  where
    | subst_dbtm u i DBZero = DBZero
    | subst_dbtm u i (DBVar name) = (if i = name then u else DBVar name)
    | subst_dbtm u i (DBInd j) = DBInd j
    | subst_dbtm u i (DBEats t1 t2) = DBEats (subst_dbtm u i t1) (subst_dbtm u i t2)
   $\langle\text{proof}\rangle$ 

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle\text{proof}\rangle$ 

lemma fresh_iff_non_subst_dbtm: subst_dbtm DBZero i t = t  $\longleftrightarrow$  atom i  $\sharp$  t
   $\langle\text{proof}\rangle$ 

lemma lookup_append: lookup (e @ [j]) n j = abst_dbtm i (length e + n) (lookup e n j)
   $\langle\text{proof}\rangle$ 

lemma trans_tm_abs: trans_tm (e@[name]) t = abst_dbtm name (length e) (trans_tm e t)

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

2.2.2 Well-Formed Formulas

nominal_function $abst_dbfm :: name \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow dbfm \Rightarrow dbfm$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & | abst_dbfm\ name\ i\ (DBMem\ t1\ t2) = DBMem\ (abst_dbtm\ name\ i\ t1)\ (abst_dbtm\ name\ i\ t2) \\ & | abst_dbfm\ name\ i\ (DBEq\ t1\ t2) = DBEq\ (abst_dbtm\ name\ i\ t1)\ (abst_dbtm\ name\ i\ t2) \\ & | abst_dbfm\ name\ i\ (DBDisj\ A1\ A2) = DBDisj\ (abst_dbfm\ name\ i\ A1)\ (abst_dbfm\ name\ i\ A2) \\ & | abst_dbfm\ name\ i\ (DBNeg\ A) = DBNeg\ (abst_dbfm\ name\ i\ A) \\ & | abst_dbfm\ name\ i\ (DBEx\ A) = DBEx\ (abst_dbfm\ name\ (i+1)\ A) \end{aligned}$$

$\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination ($eqvt$)

$\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_function $subst_dbfm :: dbtm \Rightarrow name \Rightarrow dbfm \Rightarrow dbfm$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & | subst_dbfm\ u\ i\ (DBMem\ t1\ t2) = DBMem\ (subst_dbtm\ u\ i\ t1)\ (subst_dbtm\ u\ i\ t2) \\ & | subst_dbfm\ u\ i\ (DBEq\ t1\ t2) = DBEq\ (subst_dbtm\ u\ i\ t1)\ (subst_dbtm\ u\ i\ t2) \\ & | subst_dbfm\ u\ i\ (DBDisj\ A1\ A2) = DBDisj\ (subst_dbfm\ u\ i\ A1)\ (subst_dbfm\ u\ i\ A2) \\ & | subst_dbfm\ u\ i\ (DBNeg\ A) = DBNeg\ (subst_dbfm\ u\ i\ A) \\ & | subst_dbfm\ u\ i\ (DBEx\ A) = DBEx\ (subst_dbfm\ u\ i\ A) \end{aligned}$$

$\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination ($eqvt$)

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $fresh_iff_non_subst_dbfm: subst_dbfm\ DBZero\ i\ t = t \longleftrightarrow atom\ i\ \# t$

$\langle proof \rangle$

2.3 Well formed terms and formulas (de Bruijn representation)

inductive $wf_dbfm :: dbfm \Rightarrow bool$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & Mem: wf_dbtm\ t1 \implies wf_dbtm\ t2 \implies wf_dbfm\ (DBMem\ t1\ t2) \\ & | Eq: wf_dbtm\ t1 \implies wf_dbtm\ t2 \implies wf_dbfm\ (DBEq\ t1\ t2) \\ & | Disj: wf_dbfm\ A1 \implies wf_dbfm\ A2 \implies wf_dbfm\ (DBDisj\ A1\ A2) \\ & | Neg: wf_dbfm\ A \implies wf_dbfm\ (DBNeg\ A) \\ & | Ex: wf_dbfm\ A \implies wf_dbfm\ (DBEx\ (abst_dbfm\ name\ 0\ A)) \end{aligned}$$

equivariance wf_dbfm

lemma $atom_fresh_abst_dbtm\ [simp]: atom\ i\ \# abst_dbtm\ i\ n\ t$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $atom_fresh_abst_dbfm\ [simp]: atom\ i\ \# abst_dbfm\ i\ n\ A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

Setting up strong induction: "avoiding" for name. Necessary to allow some proofs to go through

nominal_inductive wf_dbfm

avoids $Ex: name$

$\langle proof \rangle$

inductive_cases $Mem_wf_dbfm\ [elim!]: wf_dbfm\ (DBMem\ t1\ t2)$

inductive_cases $Eq_wf_dbfm\ [elim!]: wf_dbfm\ (DBEq\ t1\ t2)$

```

inductive_cases Disj_wf_dbfm [elim!]: wf_dbfm (DBDisj A1 A2)
inductive_cases Neg_wf_dbfm [elim!]: wf_dbfm (DBNeg A)
inductive_cases Ex_wf_dbfm [elim!]: wf_dbfm (DBEx z)

declare wf_dbfm.intros [intro]

lemma trans_fm_abs: trans_fm (e@[name]) A = abst_dbfm name (length e) (trans_fm e A)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma abst_trans_fm: abst_dbfm name 0 (trans_fm [] A) = trans_fm [name] A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma abst_trans_fm2: i ≠ j ⇒ abst_dbfm i (Suc 0) (trans_fm [j] A) = trans_fm [j,i] A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma wf_dbfm_imp_is_fm:
  assumes wf_dbfm x shows ∃ A::fm. x = trans_fm [] A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma wf_dbfm_trans_fm: wf_dbfm (trans_fm [] A)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma wf_dbfm_iff_is_fm: wf_dbfm x ↔ (∃ A::fm. x = trans_fm [] A)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma dbtm_abst_ignore [simp]:
  abst_dbtm name i (abst_dbtm name j t) = abst_dbtm name j t
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma abst_dbtm_fresh_ignore [simp]: atom name # u ⇒ abst_dbtm name j u = u
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma dbtm_subst_ignore [simp]:
  subst_dbtm u name (abst_dbtm name j t) = abst_dbtm name j t
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma dbtm_abst_swap_subst:
  name ≠ name' ⇒ atom name' # u ⇒
  subst_dbtm u name (abst_dbtm name' j t) = abst_dbtm name' j (subst_dbtm u name t)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma dbfm_abst_swap_subst:
  name ≠ name' ⇒ atom name' # u ⇒
  subst_dbfm u name (abst_dbfm name' j A) = abst_dbfm name' j (subst_dbfm u name A)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_trans_commute [simp]:
  atom i # e ⇒ subst_dbtm (trans_tm e u) i (trans_tm e t) = trans_tm e (subst i u t)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_fm_trans_commute [simp]:
  subst_dbfm (trans_tm [] u) name (trans_fm [] A) = trans_fm [] (A (name::= u))
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_fm_trans_commute_eq:
  du = trans_tm [] u ⇒ subst_dbfm du i (trans_fm [] A) = trans_fm [] (A(i::=u))
  ⟨proof⟩

```

2.4 Quotations

```

fun HTuple :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  tm where
  HTuple 0 = HPair Zero Zero
  | HTuple (Suc k) = HPair Zero (HTuple k)

lemma fresh_HTuple [simp]:  $x \notin \text{HTuple } n$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma HTuple_eqvt[eqvt]:  $(p \cdot \text{HTuple } n) = \text{HTuple } (p \cdot n)$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

2.4.1 Quotations of de Bruijn terms

```

definition nat_of_name :: name  $\Rightarrow$  nat
  where nat_of_name x = nat_of (atom x)

lemma nat_of_name_inject [simp]: nat_of_name n1 = nat_of_name n2  $\longleftrightarrow$  n1 = n2
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

definition name_of_nat :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  name
  where name_of_nat n  $\equiv$  Abs_name (Atom (Sort "SyntaxN.name" []) n)

lemma nat_of_name_Abs_eq [simp]: nat_of_name (Abs_name (Atom (Sort "SyntaxN.name" []) n)) = n
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma nat_of_name_name_eq [simp]: nat_of_name (name_of_nat n) = n
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma name_of_nat_nat_of_name [simp]: name_of_nat (nat_of_name i) = i
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma HPair_neq_ORD_OF [simp]: HPair x y  $\neq$  ORD_OF i
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

Infinite support, so we cannot use nominal primrec.

```

function quot_dbtm :: dbtm  $\Rightarrow$  tm
  where
    quot_dbtm DBZero = Zero
    | quot_dbtm (DBVar name) = ORD_OF (Suc (nat_of_name name))
    | quot_dbtm (DBInd k) = HPair (HTuple 6) (ORD_OF k)
    | quot_dbtm (DBEats t u) = HPair (HTuple 1) (HPair (quot_dbtm t) (quot_dbtm u))
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

termination
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

2.4.2 Quotations of de Bruijn formulas

Infinite support, so we cannot use nominal primrec.

```

function quot_dbfm :: dbfm  $\Rightarrow$  tm
  where
    quot_dbfm (DBMem t u) = HPair (HTuple 0) (HPair (quot_dbtm t) (quot_dbtm u))
    | quot_dbfm (DBEq t u) = HPair (HTuple 2) (HPair (quot_dbtm t) (quot_dbtm u))
    | quot_dbfm (DBDisj A B) = HPair (HTuple 3) (HPair (quot_dbfm A) (quot_dbfm B))
    | quot_dbfm (DBNeg A) = HPair (HTuple 4) (quot_dbfm A)
    | quot_dbfm (DBEx A) = HPair (HTuple 5) (quot_dbfm A)

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

termination

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $HTuple_minus_1: n > 0 \implies HTuple\ n = HPair\ Zero\ (HTuple\ (n - 1))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemmas $HTS = HTuple_minus_1\ HTuple.simps$ — for freeness reasoning on codes

class $quot =$
 fixes $quot :: 'a \Rightarrow tm\ (\langle\langle _ \rangle\rangle)$

instantiation $tm :: quot$
begin
 definition $quot_tm :: tm \Rightarrow tm$
 where $quot_tm\ t = quot_dbtm\ (trans_tm\ []\ t)$

instance $\langle proof \rangle$
end

lemma $quot_dbtm_fresh [simp]: s \# (quot_dbtm\ t)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $quot_tm_fresh [simp]: \text{fixes } t::tm \text{ shows } s \# \langle\langle t \rangle\rangle$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $quot_Zero [simp]: \langle\langle Zero \rangle\rangle = Zero$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $quot_Var: \langle\langle Var\ x \rangle\rangle = SUCC\ (ORD_OF\ (nat_of_name\ x))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $quot_Eats: \langle\langle Eats\ x\ y \rangle\rangle = HPair\ (HTuple\ 1)\ (HPair\ \langle\langle x \rangle\rangle\ \langle\langle y \rangle\rangle)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

instantiation $fm :: quot$
begin
 definition $quot_fm :: fm \Rightarrow tm$
 where $quot_fm\ A = quot_dbfm\ (trans_fm\ []\ A)$

instance $\langle proof \rangle$
end

lemma $quot_dbfm_fresh [simp]: s \# (quot_dbfm\ A)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $quot_fm_fresh [simp]: \text{fixes } A::fm \text{ shows } s \# \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $quot_fm_permute [simp]: \text{fixes } A::fm \text{ shows } p \cdot \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $quot_Mem: \langle\langle x\ IN\ y \rangle\rangle = HPair\ (HTuple\ 0)\ (HPair\ (\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle)\ (\langle\langle y \rangle\rangle))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $quot_Eq: \langle\langle x\ EQ\ y \rangle\rangle = HPair\ (HTuple\ 2)\ (HPair\ (\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle)\ (\langle\langle y \rangle\rangle))$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *quot_Disj*: «*A OR B*» = *HPair* (*HTuple* 3) (*HPair* (*«A»*) (*«B»*))
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *quot_Neg*: «*Neg A*» = *HPair* (*HTuple* 4) (*«A»*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *quot_Ex*: «*Ex i A*» = *HPair* (*HTuple* 5) (*quot_dbfm* (*trans_fm* [*i*] *A*))
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemmas *quot_simps* = *quot_Var* *quot_Eats* *quot_Eq* *quot_Mem* *quot_Disj* *quot_Neg* *quot_Ex*

2.5 Definitions Involving Coding

abbreviation *Q_Eats* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_Eats t u* \equiv *HPair* (*HTuple* (*Suc* 0)) (*HPair t u*)

abbreviation *Q_Succ* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_Succ t* \equiv *Q_Eats t t*

lemma *quot_Succ*: «*SUCC x*» = *Q_Succ* «*x*»
 $\langle proof \rangle$

abbreviation *Q_HPair* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_HPair t u* \equiv

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_Eats (Q_Eats Zero (Q_Eats (Q_Eats Zero u) t)) \\ & (Q_Eats (Q_Eats Zero t) t) \end{aligned}$$

abbreviation *Q_Mem* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_Mem t u* \equiv *HPair* (*HTuple* 0) (*HPair t u*)

abbreviation *Q_Eq* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_Eq t u* \equiv *HPair* (*HTuple* 2) (*HPair t u*)

abbreviation *Q_Disj* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_Disj t u* \equiv *HPair* (*HTuple* 3) (*HPair t u*)

abbreviation *Q_Neg* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_Neg t* \equiv *HPair* (*HTuple* 4) *t*

abbreviation *Q_Conj* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_Conj t u* \equiv *Q_Neg* (*Q_Disj* (*Q_Neg t*) (*Q_Neg u*)))

abbreviation *Q_Imp* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_Imp t u* \equiv *Q_Disj* (*Q_Neg t*) *u*

abbreviation *Q_Ex* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_Ex t* \equiv *HPair* (*HTuple* 5) *t*

abbreviation *Q_All* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *tm*
where *Q_All t* \equiv *Q_Neg* (*Q_Ex* (*Q_Neg t*)))

lemma *quot_subst_eq*: «*A(i:=t)*» = *quot_dbfm* (*subst_dbfm* (*trans_tm* [] *t*) *i* (*trans_fm* [] *A*))
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Q_Succ_cong*: *H* \vdash *x EQ x'* \implies *H* \vdash *Q_Succ x EQ Q_Succ x'*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

2.5.1 The set Γ of Definition 1.1, constant terms used for coding

```

inductive coding_tm :: tm  $\Rightarrow$  bool
  where
    Ord:  $\exists i. x = ORD\_OF i \implies$  coding_tm x
    | HPair: coding_tm x  $\implies$  coding_tm y  $\implies$  coding_tm (HPair x y)

declare coding_tm.intros [intro]

lemma coding_tm_Zero [intro]: coding_tm Zero
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma coding_tm_HTuple [intro]: coding_tm (HTuple k)
  ⟨proof⟩

inductive_simps coding_tm_HPair [simp]: coding_tm (HPair x y)

lemma quot_dbtm_coding [simp]: coding_tm (quot_dbtm t)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma quot_dbfm_coding [simp]: coding_tm (quot_dbfm fm)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma quot_fm_coding: fixes A::fm shows coding_tm «A»
  ⟨proof⟩

```

2.6 V-Coding for terms and formulas, for the Second Theorem

Infinite support, so we cannot use nominal primrec.

```

function vquot_dbtm :: name set  $\Rightarrow$  dbtm  $\Rightarrow$  tm
  where
    vquot_dbtm V DBZero = Zero
    | vquot_dbtm V (DBVar name) = (if name  $\in$  V then Var name
      else ORD_OF (Suc (nat_of_name name)))
    | vquot_dbtm V (DBInd k) = HPair (HTuple 6) (ORD_OF k)
    | vquot_dbtm V (DBEats t u) = HPair (HTuple 1) (HPair (vquot_dbtm V t) (vquot_dbtm V u))
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

termination
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma fresh_vquot_dbtm [simp]: i  $\notin$  vquot_dbtm V tm  $\longleftrightarrow$  i  $\notin$  tm  $\vee$  i  $\notin$  atom ` V
  ⟨proof⟩

```

Infinite support, so we cannot use nominal primrec.

```

function vquot_dbfm :: name set  $\Rightarrow$  dbfm  $\Rightarrow$  tm
  where
    vquot_dbfm V (DBMem t u) = HPair (HTuple 0) (HPair (vquot_dbtm V t) (vquot_dbtm V u))
    | vquot_dbfm V (DBEq t u) = HPair (HTuple 2) (HPair (vquot_dbtm V t) (vquot_dbtm V u))
    | vquot_dbfm V (DBDisj A B) = HPair (HTuple 3) (HPair (vquot_dbfm V A) (vquot_dbfm V B))
    | vquot_dbfm V (DBNeg A) = HPair (HTuple 4) (vquot_dbfm V A)
    | vquot_dbfm V (DBEx A) = HPair (HTuple 5) (vquot_dbfm V A)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

termination
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma fresh_vquot_dbfm [simp]:  $i \notin vquot_dbfm V fm \longleftrightarrow i \notin fm \vee i \notin atom ` V$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

class vquot =
  fixes vquot :: 'a ⇒ name set ⇒ tm (⟨_⟩ [0,1000]1000)

instantiation tm :: vquot
begin
  definition vquot_tm :: tm ⇒ name set ⇒ tm
    where vquot_tm t V = vquot_dbtm V (trans_tm [] t)
  instance ⟨proof⟩
end

lemma vquot_dbtm_empty [simp]: vquot_dbtm {} t = quot_dbtm t
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma vquot_tm_empty [simp]: fixes t::tm shows ⟨t⟩{} = «t»
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma vquot_dbtm_eq: atom ` V ∩ supp t = atom ` W ∩ supp t ⇒ vquot_dbtm V t = vquot_dbtm W t
  ⟨proof⟩

instantiation fm :: vquot
begin
  definition vquot_fm :: fm ⇒ name set ⇒ tm
    where vquot_fm A V = vquot_dbfm V (trans_fm [] A)
  instance ⟨proof⟩
end

lemma vquot_fm_fresh [simp]: fixes A::fm shows  $i \notin [A]V \longleftrightarrow i \notin A \vee i \notin atom ` V$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma vquot_dbfm_empty [simp]: vquot_dbfm {} A = quot_dbfm A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma vquot_fm_empty [simp]: fixes A::fm shows ⟨A⟩{} = «A»
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma vquot_dbfm_eq: atom ` V ∩ supp A = atom ` W ∩ supp A ⇒ vquot_dbfm V A = vquot_dbfm W A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma vquot_fm_insert:
  fixes A::fm shows atom i ∉ supp A ⇒ [A](insert i V) = [A]V
  ⟨proof⟩

declare HTuple.simps [simp del]

end

```

Chapter 3

Basic Predicates

```
theory Predicates
imports SyntaxN
begin
```

3.1 The Subset Relation

```
nominal_function Subset :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm  (infixr <SUBS> 150)
  where atom z # (t, u) ==> t SUBS u = All2 z t ((Var z) IN u)
    ⟨proof⟩

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

declare Subset.simps [simp del]

lemma Subset_fresh_iff [simp]: a # t SUBS u ↔ a # t ∧ a # u
⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_fm_Subset [simp]: (t SUBS u)(i:=x) = (subst i x t) SUBS (subst i x u)
⟨proof⟩

lemma Subset_I:
  assumes insert ((Var i) IN t) H ⊢ (Var i) IN u atom i # (t,u) ∀ B ∈ H. atom i # B
  shows H ⊢ t SUBS u
⟨proof⟩

lemma Subset_D:
  assumes major: H ⊢ t SUBS u and minor: H ⊢ a IN t shows H ⊢ a IN u
⟨proof⟩

lemma Subset_E: H ⊢ t SUBS u ==> H ⊢ a IN t ==> insert (a IN u) H ⊢ A ==> H ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

lemma Subset_cong: H ⊢ t EQ t' ==> H ⊢ u EQ u' ==> H ⊢ t SUBS u IFF t' SUBS u'
⟨proof⟩

lemma Set_MP: x SUBS y ∈ H ==> z IN x ∈ H ==> insert (z IN y) H ⊢ A ==> H ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

lemma Zero_Subset_I [intro!]: H ⊢ Zero SUBS t
⟨proof⟩
```

```

lemma Zero_SubsetE:  $H \vdash A \implies \text{insert}(\text{Zero SUBS } X) H \vdash A$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Subset_Zero_D:
  assumes  $H \vdash t \text{ SUBS Zero}$  shows  $H \vdash t \text{ EQ Zero}$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Subset_refl:  $H \vdash t \text{ SUBS } t$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Eats_Subset_Iff:  $H \vdash \text{Eats } x y \text{ SUBS } z \text{ IFF } (\text{x SUBS } z) \text{ AND } (\text{y IN } z)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Eats_Subset_I [intro!]:  $H \vdash x \text{ SUBS } z \implies H \vdash y \text{ IN } z \implies H \vdash \text{Eats } x y \text{ SUBS } z$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Eats_Subset_E [intro!]:
   $\text{insert}(x \text{ SUBS } z) (\text{insert}(y \text{ IN } z) H) \vdash C \implies \text{insert}(\text{Eats } x y \text{ SUBS } z) H \vdash C$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

A surprising proof: a consequence of  $?H \vdash \text{Eats } ?x ?y \text{ SUBS } ?z \text{ IFF } ?x \text{ SUBS } ?z \text{ AND } ?y \text{ IN } ?z$   

and reflexivity!

lemma Subset_Eats_I [intro!]:  $H \vdash x \text{ SUBS } \text{Eats } x y$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma SUCC_Subset_I [intro!]:  $H \vdash x \text{ SUBS } z \implies H \vdash x \text{ IN } z \implies H \vdash \text{SUCC } x \text{ SUBS } z$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma SUCC_Subset_E [intro!]:
   $\text{insert}(x \text{ SUBS } z) (\text{insert}(x \text{ IN } z) H) \vdash C \implies \text{insert}(\text{SUCC } x \text{ SUBS } z) H \vdash C$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Subset_trans0:  $\{a \text{ SUBS } b, b \text{ SUBS } c\} \vdash a \text{ SUBS } c$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Subset_trans:  $H \vdash a \text{ SUBS } b \implies H \vdash b \text{ SUBS } c \implies H \vdash a \text{ SUBS } c$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Subset_SUCC:  $H \vdash a \text{ SUBS } (\text{SUCC } a)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_Subset_lemma:  $\text{atom } l \notin (k', k) \implies \{P\} \vdash P' \implies \{\text{All2 } l k P, k' \text{ SUBS } k\} \vdash \text{All2 } l k' P'$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma All2_Subset:  $\llbracket H \vdash \text{All2 } l k P; H \vdash k' \text{ SUBS } k; \{P\} \vdash P'; \text{atom } l \notin (k', k) \rrbracket \implies H \vdash \text{All2 } l k' P'$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

3.2 Extensionality

```

lemma Extensionality:  $H \vdash x \text{ EQ } y \text{ IFF } x \text{ SUBS } y \text{ AND } y \text{ SUBS } x$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Equality_I:  $H \vdash y \text{ SUBS } x \implies H \vdash x \text{ SUBS } y \implies H \vdash x \text{ EQ } y$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma EQ_imp_SUBS:  $\text{insert}(t \text{ EQ } u) H \vdash (t \text{ SUBS } u)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma EQ_imp_SUBS2: insert (u EQ t) H ⊢ (t SUBS u)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Equality_E: insert (t SUBS u) (insert (u SUBS t) H) ⊢ A ⟹ insert (t EQ u) H ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩

```

3.3 The Disjointness Relation

The following predicate is defined in order to prove Lemma 2.3, Foundation

```

nominal_function Disjoint :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
  where atom z # (t, u) ⟹ Disjoint t u = All2 z t (Neg ((Var z) IN u))
  ⟨proof⟩

nominal_termination (eqvt)
  ⟨proof⟩

declare Disjoint.simps [simp del]

lemma Disjoint_fresh_iff [simp]: a # Disjoint t u ⟷ a # t ∧ a # u
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_fm_Disjoint [simp]:
  (Disjoint t u)(i ::= x) = Disjoint (subst i x t) (subst i x u)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Disjoint_cong: H ⊢ t EQ t' ⟹ H ⊢ u EQ u' ⟹ H ⊢ Disjoint t u IFF Disjoint t' u'
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Disjoint_I:
  assumes insert ((Var i) IN t) (insert ((Var i) IN u) H) ⊢ Fls
    atom i # (t,u) ∀B ∈ H. atom i # B
  shows H ⊢ Disjoint t u
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Disjoint_E:
  assumes major: H ⊢ Disjoint t u and minor: H ⊢ a IN t H ⊢ a IN u shows H ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Disjoint_commute: { Disjoint t u } ⊢ Disjoint u t
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Disjoint_commute_I: H ⊢ Disjoint t u ⟹ H ⊢ Disjoint u t
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Disjoint_commute_D: insert (Disjoint t u) H ⊢ A ⟹ insert (Disjoint u t) H ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Zero_Disjoint_I1 [iff]: H ⊢ Disjoint Zero t
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Zero_Disjoint_I2 [iff]: H ⊢ Disjoint t Zero
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Disjoint_Eats_D1: { Disjoint (Eats x y) z } ⊢ Disjoint x z
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Disjoint_Eats_D2: { Disjoint (Eats x y) z } ⊢ Neg(y IN z)

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Disjoint_Eats_E*:

$insert (Disjoint x z) (insert (Neg(y IN z)) H) \vdash A \implies insert (Disjoint (Eats x y) z) H \vdash A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Disjoint_Eats_E2*:

$insert (Disjoint z x) (insert (Neg(y IN z)) H) \vdash A \implies insert (Disjoint z (Eats x y)) H \vdash A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Disjoint_Eats_Imp*: { *Disjoint x z*, *Neg(y IN z)* } $\vdash Disjoint (Eats x y) z$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Disjoint_Eats_I* [intro!]: $H \vdash Disjoint x z \implies insert (y IN z) H \vdash Fls \implies H \vdash Disjoint (Eats x y) z$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Disjoint_Eats_I2* [intro!]: $H \vdash Disjoint z x \implies insert (y IN z) H \vdash Fls \implies H \vdash Disjoint z (Eats x y)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

3.4 The Foundation Theorem

lemma *Foundation_lemma*:

assumes $i : atom i \# z$

shows { *All2 i z (Neg (Disjoint (Var i) z))* } $\vdash Neg (Var i IN z) AND Disjoint (Var i) z$

$\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Foundation*: $atom i \# z \implies \{ \} \vdash All2 i z (Neg (Disjoint (Var i) z)) IMP z EQ Zero$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Mem_Neg_refl*: { } $\vdash Neg (x IN x)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Mem_refl_E* [intro!]: $insert (x IN x) H \vdash A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Mem_non_refl*: **assumes** $H \vdash x IN x$ **shows** $H \vdash A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Mem_Neg_sym*: { *x IN y*, *y IN x* } $\vdash Fls$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Mem_not_sym*: $insert (x IN y) (insert (y IN x) H) \vdash A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

3.5 The Ordinal Property

nominal_function *OrdP* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *fm*

where $\llbracket atom y \# (x, z); atom z \# x \rrbracket \implies$

$OrdP x = All2 y x ((Var y) SUBS x AND All2 z (Var y) ((Var z) SUBS (Var y)))$

$\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (*eqvt*)

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma

```

shows OrdP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \notin \text{OrdP } x \longleftrightarrow a \notin x$       (is ?thesis1)
⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_fm_OrdP [simp]:  $(\text{OrdP } t)(i ::= x) = \text{OrdP } (\text{subst } i x t)$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_cong:  $H \vdash x \text{ EQ } x' \implies H \vdash \text{OrdP } x \text{ IFF } \text{OrdP } x'$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_Mem_lemma:
assumes z: atom  $z \notin (k, l)$  and l: insert ( $\text{OrdP } k$ )  $H \vdash l \text{ IN } k$ 
shows insert ( $\text{OrdP } k$ )  $H \vdash l \text{ SUBS } k$  AND All2 z l (Var z SUBS l)
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_Mem_E:
assumes atom  $z \notin (k, l)$ 
insert ( $\text{OrdP } k$ )  $H \vdash l \text{ IN } k$ 
insert ( $l \text{ SUBS } k$ ) (insert (All2 z l (Var z SUBS l)) H)  $\vdash A$ 
shows insert ( $\text{OrdP } k$ )  $H \vdash A$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_Mem_imp_Subset:
assumes k:  $H \vdash k \text{ IN } l$  and l:  $H \vdash \text{OrdP } l$  shows  $H \vdash k \text{ SUBS } l$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma SUCC_Subset_Ord_lemma: {  $k' \text{ IN } k$ ,  $\text{OrdP } k$  }  $\vdash \text{SUCC } k' \text{ SUBS } k$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma SUCC_Subset_Ord:  $H \vdash k' \text{ IN } k \implies H \vdash \text{OrdP } k \implies H \vdash \text{SUCC } k' \text{ SUBS } k$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_Trans_lemma: {  $\text{OrdP } k$ ,  $i \text{ IN } j$ ,  $j \text{ IN } k$  }  $\vdash i \text{ IN } k$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_Trans:  $H \vdash \text{OrdP } k \implies H \vdash i \text{ IN } j \implies H \vdash j \text{ IN } k \implies H \vdash i \text{ IN } k$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Ord_IN_Ord0:
assumes l:  $H \vdash l \text{ IN } k$ 
shows insert ( $\text{OrdP } k$ )  $H \vdash \text{OrdP } l$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Ord_IN_Ord:  $H \vdash l \text{ IN } k \implies H \vdash \text{OrdP } k \implies H \vdash \text{OrdP } l$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_I:
assumes insert (Var y IN x)  $H \vdash (\text{Var } y) \text{ SUBS } x$ 
and insert (Var z IN Var y) (insert (Var y IN x) H)  $\vdash (\text{Var } z) \text{ SUBS } (\text{Var } y)$ 
and atom y  $\notin (x, z) \forall B \in H. \text{atom } y \notin B$  atom z  $\notin x \forall B \in H. \text{atom } z \notin B$ 
shows  $H \vdash \text{OrdP } x$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_Zero [simp]:  $H \vdash \text{OrdP } \text{Zero}$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_SUCC_I0: {  $\text{OrdP } k$  }  $\vdash \text{OrdP } (\text{SUCC } k)$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma OrdP_SUCC_I:  $H \vdash \text{OrdP } k \implies H \vdash \text{OrdP } (\text{SUCC } k)$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma Zero_In_OrdP: { $\text{OrdP } x$ }  $\vdash x \text{ EQ Zero OR Zero IN } x$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma OrdP_HPairE:  $\text{insert } (\text{OrdP } (\text{HPair } x y)) H \vdash A$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemmas OrdP_HPairEH = OrdP_HPairE OrdP_HPairE [THEN rotate2] OrdP_HPairE [THEN rotate3]
  OrdP_HPairE [THEN rotate4] OrdP_HPairE [THEN rotate5]
  OrdP_HPairE [THEN rotate6] OrdP_HPairE [THEN rotate7] OrdP_HPairE [THEN rotate8]
  OrdP_HPairE [THEN rotate9] OrdP_HPairE [THEN rotate10]
declare OrdP_HPairEH [intro!]

lemma Zero_Eq_HPairE:  $\text{insert } (\text{Zero EQ HPair } x y) H \vdash A$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemmas Zero_Eq_HPairEH = Zero_Eq_HPairE Zero_Eq_HPairE [THEN rotate2] Zero_Eq_HPairE
  [THEN rotate3] Zero_Eq_HPairE [THEN rotate4] Zero_Eq_HPairE [THEN rotate5]
  Zero_Eq_HPairE [THEN rotate6] Zero_Eq_HPairE [THEN rotate7] Zero_Eq_HPairE
  [THEN rotate8] Zero_Eq_HPairE [THEN rotate9] Zero_Eq_HPairE [THEN rotate10]
declare Zero_Eq_HPairEH [intro!]

lemma HPair_Eq_ZeroE:  $\text{insert } (\text{HPair } x y \text{ EQ Zero}) H \vdash A$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemmas HPair_Eq_ZeroEH = HPair_Eq_ZeroE HPair_Eq_ZeroE [THEN rotate2] HPair_Eq_ZeroE
  [THEN rotate3] HPair_Eq_ZeroE [THEN rotate4] HPair_Eq_ZeroE [THEN rotate5]
  HPair_Eq_ZeroE [THEN rotate6] HPair_Eq_ZeroE [THEN rotate7] HPair_Eq_ZeroE
  [THEN rotate8] HPair_Eq_ZeroE [THEN rotate9] HPair_Eq_ZeroE [THEN rotate10]
declare HPair_Eq_ZeroEH [intro!]

```

3.6 Induction on Ordinals

```

lemma OrdInd_lemma:
  assumes  $j: \text{atom } (j::\text{name}) \# (i, A)$ 
  shows { $\text{OrdP } (\text{Var } i)$ }  $\vdash (\text{All } i (\text{OrdP } (\text{Var } i) \text{ IMP } ((\text{All2 } j (\text{Var } i) (A(i ::= \text{Var } j)) \text{ IMP } A))) \text{ IMP }$ 
  A
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma OrdInd:
  assumes  $j: \text{atom } (j::\text{name}) \# (i, A)$ 
  and  $x: H \vdash \text{OrdP } (\text{Var } i)$  and  $\text{step}: H \vdash \text{All } i (\text{OrdP } (\text{Var } i) \text{ IMP } (\text{All2 } j (\text{Var } i) (A(i ::= \text{Var } j)) \text{ IMP } A))$ 
  shows  $H \vdash A$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma OrdIndH:
  assumes  $\text{atom } (j::\text{name}) \# (i, A)$ 
  and  $H \vdash \text{All } i (\text{OrdP } (\text{Var } i) \text{ IMP } (\text{All2 } j (\text{Var } i) (A(i ::= \text{Var } j)) \text{ IMP } A))$ 
  shows  $\text{insert } (\text{OrdP } (\text{Var } i)) H \vdash A$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

3.7 Linearity of Ordinals

```
lemma OrdP_linear_lemma:
```

```

assumes  $j : \text{atom } j \# i$ 
shows  $\{ \text{OrdP}(\text{Var } i) \} \vdash \text{All } j (\text{OrdP}(\text{Var } j) \text{ IMP } (\text{Var } i \text{ IN } \text{Var } j \text{ OR } \text{Var } i \text{ EQ } \text{Var } j \text{ OR } \text{Var } j \text{ IN } \text{Var } i))$ 
      (is  $\_ \vdash ?\text{scheme}$ )
<proof>

lemma  $\text{OrdP\_linear\_imp}: \{ \} \vdash \text{OrdP } x \text{ IMP } \text{OrdP } y \text{ IMP } x \text{ IN } y \text{ OR } x \text{ EQ } y \text{ OR } y \text{ IN } x$ 
<proof>

lemma  $\text{OrdP\_linear}:$ 
assumes  $H \vdash \text{OrdP } x \ H \vdash \text{OrdP } y$ 
 $\quad \text{insert } (x \text{ IN } y) \ H \vdash A \ \text{insert } (x \text{ EQ } y) \ H \vdash A \ \text{insert } (y \text{ IN } x) \ H \vdash A$ 
shows  $H \vdash A$ 
<proof>

lemma  $\text{Zero\_In\_SUCC}: \{ \text{OrdP } k \} \vdash \text{Zero IN SUCC } k$ 
<proof>

```

3.8 The predicate OrdNotEqP

```

nominal_function  $\text{OrdNotEqP} :: tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$  (infixr  $\langle \text{NEQ} \rangle$  150)
where  $\text{OrdNotEqP } x \ y = \text{OrdP } x \text{ AND } \text{OrdP } y \text{ AND } (x \text{ IN } y \text{ OR } y \text{ IN } x)$ 
<proof>

nominal_termination ( $\text{eqvt}$ )
<proof>

lemma  $\text{OrdNotEqP\_fresh\_iff [simp]}: a \# \text{OrdNotEqP } x \ y \longleftrightarrow a \# x \wedge a \# y$ 
<proof>

lemma  $\text{OrdNotEqP\_subst [simp]}: (\text{OrdNotEqP } x \ y)(i ::= t) = \text{OrdNotEqP } (\text{subst } i \ t \ x) (\text{subst } i \ t \ y)$ 
<proof>

lemma  $\text{OrdNotEqP\_cong}: H \vdash x \text{ EQ } x' \implies H \vdash y \text{ EQ } y' \implies H \vdash \text{OrdNotEqP } x \ y \text{ IFF } \text{OrdNotEqP } x' \ y'$ 
<proof>

lemma  $\text{OrdNotEqP\_self\_contra}: \{ x \text{ NEQ } x \} \vdash \text{Fls}$ 
<proof>

lemma  $\text{OrdNotEqP\_OrdP\_E}: \text{insert } (\text{OrdP } x) (\text{insert } (\text{OrdP } y) H) \vdash A \implies \text{insert } (x \text{ NEQ } y) H \vdash A$ 
<proof>

lemma  $\text{OrdNotEqP\_I}: \text{insert } (x \text{ EQ } y) H \vdash \text{Fls} \implies H \vdash \text{OrdP } x \implies H \vdash \text{OrdP } y \implies H \vdash x \text{ NEQ } y$ 
<proof>

declare  $\text{OrdNotEqP.simps} [\text{simp del}]$ 

lemma  $\text{OrdNotEqP\_imp\_Neg\_Eq}: \{ x \text{ NEQ } y \} \vdash \text{Neg } (x \text{ EQ } y)$ 
<proof>

lemma  $\text{OrdNotEqP\_E}: H \vdash x \text{ EQ } y \implies \text{insert } (x \text{ NEQ } y) H \vdash A$ 
<proof>

```

3.9 Predecessor of an Ordinal

lemma $\text{OrdP_set_max_lemma}:$

```

assumes j: atom (j::name) # i and k: atom (k::name) # (i,j)
shows {} ⊢ (Neg (Var i EQ Zero) AND (All2 j (Var i) (OrdP (Var j)))) IMP
          (Ex j (Var j IN Var i AND (All2 k (Var i) (Var k SUBS Var j))))
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_max_imp:
  assumes j: atom j # (x) and k: atom k # (x,j)
  shows { OrdP x, Neg (x EQ Zero) } ⊢ Ex j (Var j IN x AND (All2 k x (Var k SUBS Var j)))
⟨proof⟩

declare OrdP.simps [simp del]

```

3.10 Case Analysis and Zero/SUCC Induction

```

lemma OrdP_cases_lemma:
  assumes p: atom p # x
  shows { OrdP x, Neg (x EQ Zero) } ⊢ Ex p (OrdP (Var p) AND x EQ SUCC (Var p))
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_cases_disj:
  assumes p: atom p # x
  shows insert (OrdP x) H ⊢ x EQ Zero OR Ex p (OrdP (Var p) AND x EQ SUCC (Var p))
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_cases_E:
  [insert (x EQ Zero) H ⊢ A;
   insert (x EQ SUCC (Var k)) (insert (OrdP (Var k)) H) ⊢ A;
   atom k # (x,A); ∀ C ∈ H. atom k # C]
  ==> insert (OrdP x) H ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdInd2_lemma:
  { OrdP (Var i), A(i ::= Zero), (All i (OrdP (Var i) IMP A IMP (A(i ::= SUCC (Var i))))) } ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdInd2:
  assumes H ⊢ OrdP (Var i)
    and H ⊢ A(i ::= Zero)
    and H ⊢ All i (OrdP (Var i) IMP A IMP (A(i ::= SUCC (Var i))))
  shows H ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdInd2H:
  assumes H ⊢ A(i ::= Zero)
    and H ⊢ All i (OrdP (Var i) IMP A IMP (A(i ::= SUCC (Var i))))
  shows insert (OrdP (Var i)) H ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

```

3.11 The predicate HFun_Sigma

To characterise the concept of a function using only bounded universal quantifiers.

See the note after the proof of Lemma 2.3.

```

definition hfun_sigma where
  hfun_sigma r ≡ ∀ z ∈ r. ∀ z' ∈ r. ∃ x y x' y'. z = ⟨x,y⟩ ∧ z' = ⟨x',y'⟩ ∧ (x=x' → y=y')

definition hfun_sigma_ord where

```

`hfun_sigma_ord r` $\equiv \forall z \in r. \forall z' \in r. \exists x y x' y'. z = \langle x, y \rangle \wedge z' = \langle x', y' \rangle \wedge Ord x \wedge Ord x' \wedge (x = x' \rightarrow y = y')$

nominal_function `HFun_Sigma :: tm \Rightarrow fm`
where $\llbracket atom z \# (r, z', x, y, x', y'); atom z' \# (r, x, y, x', y'); atom x \# (r, y, x', y'); atom y \# (r, x', y'); atom x' \# (r, y'); atom y' \# (r) \rrbracket \implies HFun_Sigma r = All2 z r (All2 z' r (Ex x (Ex y (Ex x' (Ex y' (Var z EQ HPair (Var x) (Var y) AND Var z' EQ HPair (Var x') (Var y') AND OrdP (Var x) AND OrdP (Var x') AND ((Var x EQ Var x') IMP (Var y EQ Var y'))))))))$

$\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (eqvt)

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma

shows `HFun_Sigma_fresh_iff [simp]: a # HFun_Sigma r \longleftrightarrow a # r` (**is** ?thesis1)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma `HFun_Sigma_subst [simp]: (HFun_Sigma r)(i:=t) = HFun_Sigma (subst i t r)`
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma `HFun_Sigma_Zero: H ⊢ HFun_Sigma Zero`
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma `Subset_HFun_Sigma: {HFun_Sigma s, s' SUBS s} ⊢ HFun_Sigma s'`
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Captures the property of being a relation, using fewer variables than the full definition

lemma `HFun_Sigma_Mem_imp_HPair:`
assumes $H \vdash HFun_Sigma r H \vdash a IN r$
and $xy: atom x \# (y, a, r) atom y \# (a, r)$
shows $H \vdash (Ex x (Ex y (a EQ HPair (Var x) (Var y))))$ (**is** $\vdash ?concl$)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

3.12 The predicate `HDomain_Incl`

This is an internal version of $\forall x \in d. \exists y z. z \in r \wedge z = \langle x, y \rangle$.

nominal_function `HDomain_Incl :: tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm`
where $\llbracket atom x \# (r, d, y, z); atom y \# (r, d, z); atom z \# (r, d) \rrbracket \implies HDomain_Incl r d = All2 x d (Ex y (Ex z (Var z IN r AND Var z EQ HPair (Var x) (Var y))))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (eqvt)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma

shows `HDomain_Incl_fresh_iff [simp]: a # HDomain_Incl r d \longleftrightarrow a # r \wedge a # d` (**is** ?thesis1)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma `HDomain_Incl_subst [simp]: (HDomain_Incl r d)(i:=t) = HDomain_Incl (subst i t r) (subst i t d)`
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma `HDomain_Incl_Subset_lemma: { HDomain_Incl r k, k' SUBS k } ⊢ HDomain_Incl r k'`

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *HDomain_Incl_Subset*: $H \vdash H\text{Domain_Incl } r k \implies H \vdash k' \text{ SUBS } k \implies H \vdash H\text{Domain_Incl } r k'$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *HDomain_Incl_Mem_Ord*: $H \vdash H\text{Domain_Incl } r k \implies H \vdash k' \text{ IN } k \implies H \vdash \text{OrdP } k \implies H \vdash H\text{Domain_Incl } r k'$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *HDomain_Incl_Zero [simp]*: $H \vdash H\text{Domain_Incl } r \text{ Zero}$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *HDomain_Incl_Eats*: $\{ H\text{Domain_Incl } r d \} \vdash H\text{Domain_Incl } (\text{Eats } r (H\text{Pair } d d')) (\text{SUCC } d)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *HDomain_Incl_Eats_I*: $H \vdash H\text{Domain_Incl } r d \implies H \vdash H\text{Domain_Incl } (\text{Eats } r (H\text{Pair } d d')) (\text{SUCC } d)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

3.13 *HPair* is Provably Injective

lemma *Doubleton_E*:

assumes $\text{insert } (a \text{ EQ } c) (\text{insert } (b \text{ EQ } d) H) \vdash A$
 $\text{insert } (a \text{ EQ } d) (\text{insert } (b \text{ EQ } c) H) \vdash A$

shows $\text{insert } ((\text{Eats } (\text{Eats Zero } b) a) \text{ EQ } (\text{Eats } (\text{Eats Zero } d) c)) H \vdash A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *HFST*: $\{ H\text{Pair } a b \text{ EQ } H\text{Pair } c d \} \vdash a \text{ EQ } c$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *b_EQ_d_1*: $\{ a \text{ EQ } c, a \text{ EQ } d, b \text{ EQ } c \} \vdash b \text{ EQ } d$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *HSND*: $\{ H\text{Pair } a b \text{ EQ } H\text{Pair } c d \} \vdash b \text{ EQ } d$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *HPair_E [intro!]*:

assumes $\text{insert } (a \text{ EQ } c) (\text{insert } (b \text{ EQ } d) H) \vdash A$
shows $\text{insert } (H\text{Pair } a b \text{ EQ } H\text{Pair } c d) H \vdash A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

declare *HPair_E* [*THEN rotate2, intro!*]

declare *HPair_E* [*THEN rotate3, intro!*]

declare *HPair_E* [*THEN rotate4, intro!*]

declare *HPair_E* [*THEN rotate5, intro!*]

declare *HPair_E* [*THEN rotate6, intro!*]

declare *HPair_E* [*THEN rotate7, intro!*]

declare *HPair_E* [*THEN rotate8, intro!*]

lemma *HFun_Sigma_E*:

assumes $r: H \vdash H\text{Fun_Sigma } r$

and $b: H \vdash H\text{Pair } a b \text{ IN } r$

and $b': H \vdash H\text{Pair } a b' \text{ IN } r$

shows $H \vdash b \text{ EQ } b'$

$\langle proof \rangle$

3.14 $SUCC$ is Provably Injective

```

lemma SUCC_SUBS_lemma: {SUCC x SUBS SUCC y} ⊢ x SUBS y
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma SUCC_SUBS: insert (SUCC x SUBS SUCC y) H ⊢ x SUBS y
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma SUCC_inject: insert (SUCC x EQ SUCC y) H ⊢ x EQ y
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma SUCC_inject_E [intro!]: insert (x EQ y) H ⊢ A ==> insert (SUCC x EQ SUCC y) H ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩

declare SUCC_inject_E [THEN rotate2, intro!]
declare SUCC_inject_E [THEN rotate3, intro!]
declare SUCC_inject_E [THEN rotate4, intro!]
declare SUCC_inject_E [THEN rotate5, intro!]
declare SUCC_inject_E [THEN rotate6, intro!]
declare SUCC_inject_E [THEN rotate7, intro!]
declare SUCC_inject_E [THEN rotate8, intro!]

lemma OrdP_IN_SUCC_lemma: {OrdP x, y IN x} ⊢ SUCC y IN SUCC x
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_IN_SUCC: H ⊢ OrdP x ==> H ⊢ y IN x ==> H ⊢ SUCC y IN SUCC x
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_IN_SUCC_D_lemma: {OrdP x, SUCC y IN SUCC x} ⊢ y IN x
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_IN_SUCC_D: H ⊢ OrdP x ==> H ⊢ SUCC y IN SUCC x ==> H ⊢ y IN x
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma OrdP_IN_SUCC_Iff: H ⊢ OrdP y ==> H ⊢ SUCC x IN SUCC y IFF x IN y
  ⟨proof⟩

```

3.15 The predicate $LstSeqP$

```

lemma hfun_sigma_ord_iff: hfun_sigma_ord s ↔ OrdDom s ∧ hfun_sigma s
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma hfun_sigma_iff: hfun_sigma r ↔ hfunction r ∧ hrelation r
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Seq_iff: Seq r d ↔ d ≤ hdomain r ∧ hfun_sigma r
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma LstSeq_iff: LstSeq s k y ↔ succ k ≤ hdomain s ∧ ⟨k,y⟩ ∈ s ∧ hfun_sigma_ord s
  ⟨proof⟩

nominal_function LstSeqP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
  where
    LstSeqP s k y = OrdP k AND HDomain_Incl s (SUCC k) AND HFun_Sigma s AND HPair k y IN s
  ⟨proof⟩

nominal_termination (eqvt)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma
  shows LstSeqP_fresh_iff [simp]:
     $a \notin LstSeqP s k y \longleftrightarrow a \notin s \wedge a \notin k \wedge a \notin y$       (is ?thesis1)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma LstSeqP_subst [simp]:
   $(LstSeqP s k y)(i:=t) = LstSeqP (subst i t s) (subst i t k) (subst i t y)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma LstSeqP_E:
  assumes insert (HDomain_Incl s (SUCC k))
    (insert (OrdP k) (insert (HFun_Sigma s)
      (insert (HPair k y IN s) H))) ⊢ B
  shows insert (LstSeqP s k y) H ⊢ B
  ⟨proof⟩

declare LstSeqP.simps [simp del]

lemma LstSeqP_cong:
  assumes H ⊢ s EQ s' H ⊢ k EQ k' H ⊢ y EQ y'
  shows H ⊢ LstSeqP s k y IFF LstSeqP s' k' y'
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma LstSeqP_OrdP: H ⊢ LstSeqP r k y ⟹ H ⊢ OrdP k
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma LstSeqP_Mem_lemma: { LstSeqP r k y, HPair k' z IN r, k' IN k } ⊢ LstSeqP r k' z
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma LstSeqP_Mem: H ⊢ LstSeqP r k y ⟹ H ⊢ HPair k' z IN r ⟹ H ⊢ k' IN k ⟹ H ⊢ LstSeqP r k' z
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma LstSeqP_imp_Mem: H ⊢ LstSeqP s k y ⟹ H ⊢ HPair k y IN s
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma LstSeqP_SUCC: H ⊢ LstSeqP r (SUCC d) y ⟹ H ⊢ HPair d z IN r ⟹ H ⊢ LstSeqP r d z
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma LstSeqP_EQ: [H ⊢ LstSeqP s k y; H ⊢ HPair k y' IN s] ⟹ H ⊢ y EQ y'
  ⟨proof⟩

end

```

Chapter 4

Sigma-Formulas and Theorem 2.5

```
theory Sigma
imports Predicates
begin

definition ground_aux :: tm ⇒ atom set ⇒ bool
  where "ground_aux t S ≡ (supp t ⊆ S)"

abbreviation ground :: tm ⇒ bool
  where "ground t ≡ ground_aux t {}"

definition ground_fm_aux :: fm ⇒ atom set ⇒ bool
  where "ground_fm_aux A S ≡ (supp A ⊆ S)"

abbreviation ground_fm :: fm ⇒ bool
  where "ground_fm A ≡ ground_fm_aux A {}"

lemma ground_aux.simps[simp]:
  ground_aux Zero S = True
  ground_aux (Var k) S = (if atom k ∈ S then True else False)
  ground_aux (Eats t u) S = (ground_aux t S ∧ ground_aux u S)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma ground_fm_aux.simps[simp]:
  ground_fm_aux Fls S = True
  ground_fm_aux (t IN u) S = (ground_aux t S ∧ ground_aux u S)
  ground_fm_aux (t EQ u) S = (ground_aux t S ∧ ground_aux u S)
  ground_fm_aux (A OR B) S = (ground_fm_aux A S ∨ ground_fm_aux B S)
  ground_fm_aux (A AND B) S = (ground_fm_aux A S ∧ ground_fm_aux B S)
  ground_fm_aux (A IFF B) S = (ground_fm_aux A S ∧ ground_fm_aux B S)
  ground_fm_aux (Neg A) S = (ground_fm_aux A S)
  ground_fm_aux (Ex x A) S = (ground_fm_aux A (S ∪ {atom x}))
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma ground_fresh[simp]:
  ground t ⟹ atom i # t
  ground_fm A ⟹ atom i # A
  ⟨proof⟩
```

4.2 Sigma Formulas

Section 2 material

4.2.1 Strict Sigma Formulas

Definition 2.1

```
inductive ss_fm :: fm ⇒ bool where
  MemI: ss_fm (Var i IN Var j)
  | DisjI: ss_fm A ⇒ ss_fm B ⇒ ss_fm (A OR B)
  | ConjI: ss_fm A ⇒ ss_fm B ⇒ ss_fm (A AND B)
  | ExI: ss_fm A ⇒ ss_fm (Ex i A)
  | All2I: ss_fm A ⇒ atom j # (i,A) ⇒ ss_fm (All2 i (Var j) A)
```

equivariance ss_fm

```
nominal_inductive ss_fm
  avoids ExI: i | All2I: i
  ⟨proof⟩
```

declare ss_fm.intros [intro]

```
definition Sigma_fm :: fm ⇒ bool
  where Sigma_fm A ↔ (exists B. ss_fm B ∧ supp B ⊆ supp A ∧ {} ⊢ A IFF B)
```

```
lemma Sigma_fm_Iff: [{} ⊢ B IFF A; supp A ⊆ supp B; Sigma_fm A] ⇒ Sigma_fm B
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma ss_fm_imp_Sigma_fm [intro]: ss_fm A ⇒ Sigma_fm A
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma Sigma_fm_Fls [iff]: Sigma_fm Fls
  ⟨proof⟩
```

4.2.2 Closure properties for Sigma-formulas

```
lemma
  assumes Sigma_fm A Sigma_fm B
  shows Sigma_fm_AND [intro!]: Sigma_fm (A AND B)
    and Sigma_fm_OR [intro!]: Sigma_fm (A OR B)
    and Sigma_fm_Ex [intro!]: Sigma_fm (Ex i A)
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma Sigma_fm_All2_Var:
  assumes H0: Sigma_fm A and ij: atom j # (i,A)
  shows Sigma_fm (All2 i (Var j) A)
  ⟨proof⟩
```

4.3 Lemma 2.2: Atomic formulas are Sigma-formulas

```
lemma Eq_Eats_Iff:
  assumes [unfolded fresh_Pair, simp]: atom i # (z,x,y)
  shows {} ⊢ z EQ Eats x y IFF (All2 i z (Var i IN x OR Var i EQ y)) AND x SUBS z AND y IN z
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma Subset_Zero_sf: Sigma_fm (Var i SUBS Zero)
```

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Eq_Zero_sf*: *Sigma_fm* (*Var i EQ Zero*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *theorem_sf*: **assumes** {} $\vdash A$ **shows** *Sigma_fm* *A*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The subset relation

lemma *Var_Subset_sf*: *Sigma_fm* (*Var i SUBS Var j*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Zero_Mem_sf*: *Sigma_fm* (*Zero IN Var i*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ijk*: *i + k < Suc (i + j + k)*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *All2_term_Iff_fresh*: *i ≠ j* \implies *atom j' # (i,j,A) \implies {} $\vdash (\text{All2 } i (\text{Var } j) A) \text{ IFF } \text{Ex } j' (\text{Var } j \text{ EQ Var } j' \text{ AND All2 } i (\text{Var } j') A)$*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Sigma_fm_All2_fresh*:
assumes *Sigma_fm A i ≠ j*
shows *Sigma_fm (All2 i (Var j) A)*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Subset_Eats_sf*:
assumes $\bigwedge j::\text{name} . \text{Sigma_fm} (\text{Var } j \text{ IN } t)$
and $\bigwedge k::\text{name} . \text{Sigma_fm} (\text{Var } k \text{ EQ } u)$
shows *Sigma_fm (Var i SUBS Eats t u)*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Eq_Eats_sf*:
assumes $\bigwedge j::\text{name} . \text{Sigma_fm} (\text{Var } j \text{ EQ } t)$
and $\bigwedge k::\text{name} . \text{Sigma_fm} (\text{Var } k \text{ EQ } u)$
shows *Sigma_fm (Var i EQ Eats t u)*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Eats_Mem_sf*:
assumes $\bigwedge j::\text{name} . \text{Sigma_fm} (\text{Var } j \text{ EQ } t)$
and $\bigwedge k::\text{name} . \text{Sigma_fm} (\text{Var } k \text{ EQ } u)$
shows *Sigma_fm (Eats t u IN Var i)*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Subset_Mem_sf_lemma*:
size t + size u < n \implies Sigma_fm (t SUBS u) \wedge Sigma_fm (t IN u)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Subset_sf [iff]*: *Sigma_fm (t SUBS u)*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Mem_sf [iff]*: *Sigma_fm (t IN u)*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The equality relation is a Sigma-Formula

lemma *Equality_sf [iff]*: *Sigma_fm (t EQ u)*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

4.4 Universal Quantification Bounded by an Arbitrary Term

```

lemma All2_term_Iff: atom i # t  $\implies$  atom j # (i,t,A)  $\implies$ 
  {}  $\vdash$  (All2 i t A) IFF Ex j (Var j EQ t AND All2 i (Var j) A)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Sigma_fm_All2 [intro!]:
  assumes Sigma_fm A atom i # t
  shows Sigma_fm (All2 i t A)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

4.5 Lemma 2.3: Sequence-related concepts are Sigma-formulas

```

lemma OrdP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (OrdP t)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma OrdNotEqP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (OrdNotEqP t u)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma HDomain_Incl_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (HDomain_Incl t u)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma HFun_Sigma_Iff:
  assumes atom z # (r,z',x,y,x',y') atom z' # (r,x,y,x',y')
    atom x # (r,y,x',y') atom y # (r,x',y')
    atom x' # (r,y') atom y' # (r)
  shows
  {}  $\vdash$  HFun_Sigma r IFF
    All2 z r (All2 z' r (Ex x (Ex y (Ex x' (Ex y'
      (Var z EQ HPair (Var x) (Var y) AND Var z' EQ HPair (Var x') (Var y')
      AND OrdP (Var x) AND OrdP (Var x') AND
      ((Var x NEQ Var x') OR (Var y EQ Var y'))))))))
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma HFun_Sigma_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (HFun_Sigma t)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma LstSeqP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (LstSeqP t u v)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

end

Chapter 5

Predicates for Terms, Formulas and Substitution

```
theory Coding_Predicates
imports Coding Sigma
begin
```

```
declare succ_iff [simp del]
```

This material comes from Section 3, greatly modified for de Bruijn syntax.

5.1 Predicates for atomic terms

5.1.1 Free Variables

```
definition VarP :: tm ⇒ fm where VarP x ≡ OrdP x AND Zero IN x
```

```
lemma VarP_eqvt [eqvt]: (p · VarP x) = VarP (p · x)
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma VarP_fresh_iff [simp]: a # VarP x ↔ a # x
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma VarP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (VarP x)
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma VarP_subst [simp]: (VarP x)(i:=t) = VarP (subst i t x)
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma VarP_cong: H ⊢ x EQ x' ⇒ H ⊢ VarP x IFF VarP x'
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma VarP_HPairE [intro!]: insert (VarP (HPair x y)) H ⊢ A
  ⟨proof⟩
```

5.1.2 De Bruijn Indexes

```
abbreviation Q_Ind :: tm ⇒ tm
  where Q_Ind k ≡ HPair (HTuple 6) k
```

```
nominal_function IndP :: tm ⇒ fm
  where atom m # x ⇒
```

IndP x = Ex m (OrdP (Var m) AND x EQ HPair (HTuple 6) (Var m))
(proof)

nominal_termination (eqvt)
(proof)

lemma

shows *IndP_fresh_iff [simp]*: $a \# IndP x \leftrightarrow a \# x$ (is ?thesis1)
 and *IndP_sf [iff]*: $\Sigma_{fm}(IndP x)$ (is ?thsf)
 and *OrdP_IndP_Q_Ind*: $\{OrdP x\} \vdash IndP(Q_Ind x)$ (is ?thqind)
(proof)

lemma *IndP_Q_Ind*: $H \vdash OrdP x \implies H \vdash IndP(Q_Ind x)$
(proof)

lemma *subst_fm_IndP [simp]*: $(IndP t)(i ::= x) = IndP(subst i x t)$
(proof)

lemma *IndP_cong*: $H \vdash x EQ x' \implies H \vdash IndP x IFF IndP x'$
(proof)

5.1.3 Various syntactic lemmas

5.2 The predicate *SeqCTermP*, for Terms and Constants

nominal_function *SeqCTermP :: bool ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm*
where $\llbracket atom l \# (s, k, sl, m, n, sm, sn); atom sl \# (s, m, n, sm, sn); atom m \# (s, n, sm, sn); atom n \# (s, sm, sn); atom sm \# (s, sn); atom sn \# (s) \rrbracket \implies SeqCTermP vf s k t = LstSeqP s k t AND All2 l (SUCC k) (Ex sl (HPair (Var l) (Var sl) IN s AND (Var sl EQ Zero OR (if vf then VarP (Var sl) else Fls) OR Ex m (Ex n (Ex sm (Ex sn (Var m IN Var l AND Var n IN Var l AND HPair (Var m) (Var sm) IN s AND HPair (Var n) (Var sn) IN s AND Var sl EQ Q_Eats (Var sm) (Var sn)))))))$
(proof)

nominal_termination (eqvt)
(proof)

lemma

shows *SeqCTermP_fresh_iff [simp]*:
 $a \# SeqCTermP vf s k t \leftrightarrow a \# s \wedge a \# k \wedge a \# t$ (is ?thesis1)
 and *SeqCTermP_sf [iff]*:
 $\Sigma_{fm}(SeqCTermP vf s k t)$ (is ?thsf)
 and *SeqCTermP_imp_LstSeqP*:
 $\{SeqCTermP vf s k t\} \vdash LstSeqP s k t$ (is ?thlstseq)
 and *SeqCTermP_imp_OrdP [simp]*:
 $\{SeqCTermP vf s k t\} \vdash OrdP k$ (is ?thord)
(proof)

lemma *SeqCTermP_subst [simp]*:
 $(SeqCTermP vf s k t)(j ::= w) = SeqCTermP vf (subst j w s) (subst j w k) (subst j w t)$
(proof)

declare *SeqCTermP.simps [simp del]*

```

abbreviation SeqTermP ::  $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$ 
  where SeqTermP  $\equiv$  SeqCTermP True

abbreviation SeqConstP ::  $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$ 
  where SeqConstP  $\equiv$  SeqCTermP False

lemma SeqConstP_imp_SeqTermP: {SeqConstP s k t}  $\vdash$  SeqTermP s k t
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

5.3 The predicates $TermP$ and $ConstP$

5.3.1 Definition

```

nominal_function CTermP ::  $bool \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$ 
  where  $\llbracket atom k \sharp (s,t); atom s \sharp t \rrbracket \implies$ 
     $CTermP vf t = Ex s (Ex k (SeqCTermP vf (Var s) (Var k) t))$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma
  shows CTermP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \sharp CTermP vf t \longleftrightarrow a \sharp t$  (is ?thesis1)
  and CTermP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (CTermP vf t) (is ?thsf)
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma CTermP_subst [simp]:  $(CTermP vf i)(j:=w) = CTermP vf (\text{subst } j w i)$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

abbreviation TermP ::  $tm \Rightarrow fm$ 
  where TermP  $\equiv$  CTermP True

```

```

abbreviation ConstP ::  $tm \Rightarrow fm$ 
  where ConstP  $\equiv$  CTermP False

```

5.3.2 Correctness properties for constants

```

lemma ConstP_imp_TermP: {ConstP t}  $\vdash$  TermP t
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

5.4 Abstraction over terms

```

nominal_function SeqStTermP ::  $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$ 
  where  $\llbracket atom l \sharp (s,k,v,i,sl,sl',m,n,sm,sm',sn,sn');$ 
     $atom sl \sharp (s,v,i,sl',m,n,sm,sm',sn,sn'); atom sl' \sharp (s,v,i,m,n,sm,sm',sn,sn');$ 
     $atom m \sharp (s,n,sm,sm',sn,sn'); atom n \sharp (s,sm,sm',sn,sn');$ 
     $atom sm \sharp (s,sm',sn,sn'); atom sm' \sharp (s,sn,sn');$ 
     $atom sn \sharp (s,sn'); atom sn' \sharp s \rrbracket \implies$ 
    SeqStTermP v i t u s k =
      VarP v AND LstSeqP s k (HPair t u) AND
      All2 l (SUCC k) (Ex sl (Ex sl' (HPair (Var l) (HPair (Var sl) (Var sl')) IN s AND
        (((Var sl EQ v AND Var sl' EQ i) OR
          ((IndP (Var sl) OR Var sl NEQ v) AND Var sl' EQ Var sl)) OR
        Ex m (Ex n (Ex sm (Ex sm' (Ex sn (Ex sn' (Var m IN Var l AND Var n IN Var l AND
          HPair (Var m) (HPair (Var sm) (Var sm')) IN s AND
          HPair (Var n) (HPair (Var sn) (Var sn')) IN s AND
          Var sl EQ Q_Eats (Var sm) (Var sn) AND
          Var sn EQ Q_Eats (Var sm) (Var sl)))))))

```

```

Var sl' EQ Q_Eats (Var sm') (Var sn')))))))))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

```

lemma

```

shows SeqStTermP_fresh_iff [simp]:
  a # SeqStTermP v i t u s k ↔ a # v ∧ a # i ∧ a # t ∧ a # u ∧ a # s ∧ a # k (is ?thesis1)
and SeqStTermP_sf [iff]:
  Sigma_fm (SeqStTermP v i t u s k) (is ?thsf)
and SeqStTermP_imp_OrdP:
  { SeqStTermP v i t u s k } ⊢ OrdP k (is ?thord)
and SeqStTermP_imp_VarP:
  { SeqStTermP v i t u s k } ⊢ VarP v (is ?thvar)
and SeqStTermP_imp_LstSeqP:
  { SeqStTermP v i t u s k } ⊢ LstSeqP s k (HPair t u) (is ?thlstseq)
⟨proof⟩

```

lemma SeqStTermP_subst [simp]:

```

  (SeqStTermP v i t u s k)(j:=w) =
    SeqStTermP (subst j w v) (subst j w i) (subst j w t) (subst j w u) (subst j w s) (subst j w k)
⟨proof⟩

```

lemma SeqStTermP_cong:

```

  [H ⊢ t EQ t'; H ⊢ u EQ u'; H ⊢ s EQ s'; H ⊢ k EQ k'] ⊢
  H ⊢ SeqStTermP v i t u s k IFF SeqStTermP v i t' u' s' k'
⟨proof⟩

```

declare SeqStTermP.simps [simp del]

5.4.1 Defining the syntax: main predicate

```

nominal_function AbstTermP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
  where [[atom s #: (v,i,t,u,k); atom k #: (v,i,t,u)]] ⇒
    AbstTermP v i t u =
      OrdP i AND Ex s (Ex k (SeqStTermP v (Q_Ind i) t u (Var s) (Var k)))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

```

lemma

```

shows AbstTermP_fresh_iff [simp]:
  a # AbstTermP v i t u ↔ a # v ∧ a # i ∧ a # t ∧ a # u (is ?thesis1)
and AbstTermP_sf [iff]:
  Sigma_fm (AbstTermP v i t u) (is ?thsf)
and AbstTermP_imp_VarP:
  { AbstTermP v i t u } ⊢ VarP v (is ?thvar)
and AbstTermP_imp_OrdP:
  { AbstTermP v i t u } ⊢ OrdP i (is ?thord)
⟨proof⟩

```

lemma AbstTermP_subst [simp]:

```

  (AbstTermP v i t u)(j:=w) = AbstTermP (subst j w v) (subst j w i) (subst j w t) (subst j w u)
⟨proof⟩

```

declare AbstTermP.simps [simp del]

5.5 Substitution over terms

5.5.1 Defining the syntax

```

nominal_function SubstTermP ::  $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$ 
  where  $\llbracket atom s \# (v,i,t,u,k); atom k \# (v,i,t,u) \rrbracket \implies$ 
     $SubstTermP v i t u = TermP i \text{ AND } Ex s (Ex k (SeqStTermP v i t u (Var s) (Var k)))$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma
  shows SubstTermP_fresh_iff [simp]:
     $a \# SubstTermP v i t u \iff a \# v \wedge a \# i \wedge a \# t \wedge a \# u$  (is ?thesis1)
  and SubstTermP_sf [iff]:
    Sigma_fm (SubstTermP v i t u)      (is ?thsf)
  and SubstTermP_imp_TermP:
     $\{ SubstTermP v i t u \} \vdash TermP i$  (is ?thterm)
  and SubstTermP_imp_VarP:
     $\{ SubstTermP v i t u \} \vdash VarP v$  (is ?thvar)
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma SubstTermP_subst [simp]:
   $(SubstTermP v i t u)(j:=w) = SubstTermP (subst j w v) (subst j w i) (subst j w t) (subst j w u)$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma SubstTermP_cong:
   $\llbracket H \vdash v EQ v'; H \vdash i EQ i'; H \vdash t EQ t'; H \vdash u EQ u' \rrbracket \implies$ 
   $H \vdash SubstTermP v i t u IFF SubstTermP v' i' t' u'$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

declare SubstTermP.simps [simp del]

```

5.6 Abstraction over formulas

5.6.1 The predicate AbstAtomicP

```

nominal_function AbstAtomicP ::  $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$ 
  where  $\llbracket atom t \# (v,i,y,y',t',u,u'); atom t' \# (v,i,y,y',u,u');$ 
     $atom u \# (v,i,y,y',u'); atom u' \# (v,i,y,y') \rrbracket \implies$ 
  AbstAtomicP v i y y' =
     $Ex t (Ex u (Ex t' (Ex u'$ 
     $(AbstTermP v i (Var t) (Var t') \text{ AND } AbstTermP v i (Var u) (Var u') \text{ AND }$ 
     $((y EQ Q_Eq (Var t) (Var u) \text{ AND } y' EQ Q_Eq (Var t') (Var u')) \text{ OR }$ 
     $(y EQ Q_Mem (Var t) (Var u) \text{ AND } y' EQ Q_Mem (Var t') (Var u'))))))))$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma
  shows AbstAtomicP_fresh_iff [simp]:
     $a \# AbstAtomicP v i y y' \iff a \# v \wedge a \# i \wedge a \# y \wedge a \# y'$  (is ?thesis1)
  and AbstAtomicP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (AbstAtomicP v i y y') (is ?thsf)
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma AbstAtomicP_subst [simp]:

```

$(\text{AbstAtomicP } v \text{ tm } y \text{ } y')(i ::= w) = \text{AbstAtomicP } (\text{subst } i \text{ w } v) \text{ } (\text{subst } i \text{ w } \text{tm}) \text{ } (\text{subst } i \text{ w } y) \text{ } (\text{subst } i \text{ w } y')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

declare *AbstAtomicP.simps* [*simp del*]

5.6.2 The predicate *AbsMakeForm*

nominal_function *SeqAbstFormP* :: $\text{tm} \Rightarrow \text{tm} \Rightarrow \text{tm} \Rightarrow \text{tm} \Rightarrow \text{tm} \Rightarrow \text{tm} \Rightarrow \text{fm}$
where $\llbracket \text{atom } l \# (s, k, v, \text{sli}, \text{sl}, \text{sl}', m, n, \text{smi}, \text{sm}, \text{sm}', \text{sni}, \text{sn}, \text{sn}') \rrbracket$
 $\quad \text{atom sli } \# (s, v, \text{sl}, \text{sl}', m, n, \text{smi}, \text{sm}, \text{sm}', \text{sni}, \text{sn}, \text{sn}');$
 $\quad \text{atom sl } \# (s, v, \text{sl}', m, n, \text{smi}, \text{sm}, \text{sm}', \text{sni}, \text{sn}, \text{sn}');$
 $\quad \text{atom sl}' \# (s, v, m, n, \text{smi}, \text{sm}, \text{sm}', \text{sni}, \text{sn}, \text{sn}');$
 $\quad \text{atom m } \# (s, n, \text{smi}, \text{sm}, \text{sm}', \text{sni}, \text{sn}, \text{sn}');$
 $\quad \text{atom n } \# (s, \text{smi}, \text{sm}, \text{sm}', \text{sni}, \text{sn}, \text{sn}'); \text{ atom smi } \# (s, \text{sm}, \text{sm}', \text{sni}, \text{sn}, \text{sn}');$
 $\quad \text{atom sm } \# (s, \text{sm}', \text{sni}, \text{sn}, \text{sn}'); \text{ atom sm}' \# (s, \text{sni}, \text{sn}, \text{sn}');$
 $\quad \text{atom sni } \# (s, \text{sn}, \text{sn}'); \text{ atom sn } \# (s, \text{sn}'); \text{ atom sn}' \# (s, \text{sn}') \implies$
 $\quad \text{SeqAbstFormP } v \text{ } i \text{ } x \text{ } x' \text{ } s \text{ } k =$
 $\quad \text{LstSeqP } s \text{ } k \text{ } (\text{HPair } i \text{ } (\text{HPair } x \text{ } x')) \text{ AND}$
 $\quad \text{All2 } l \text{ } (\text{SUCC } k) \text{ } (\text{Ex } \text{sli} \text{ } (\text{Ex } \text{sl} \text{ } (\text{Ex } \text{sl}' \text{ } (\text{HPair } (\text{Var } l) \text{ } (\text{HPair } (\text{Var } \text{sli}) \text{ } (\text{HPair } (\text{Var } \text{sl}) \text{ } (\text{Var } \text{sl}'))))$
 $\text{IN } s \text{ AND}$
 $\quad (\text{AbstAtomicP } v \text{ } (\text{Var } \text{sli}) \text{ } (\text{Var } \text{sl}) \text{ } (\text{Var } \text{sl}') \text{ OR}$
 $\quad \text{OrdP } (\text{Var } \text{sli}) \text{ AND}$
 $\quad \text{Ex } m \text{ } (\text{Ex } n \text{ } (\text{Ex } \text{smi} \text{ } (\text{Ex } \text{sm} \text{ } (\text{Ex } \text{sm}' \text{ } (\text{Ex } \text{sni} \text{ } (\text{Ex } \text{sn} \text{ } (\text{Ex } \text{sn}' \text{ } (\text{Var } m \text{ IN } \text{Var } l \text{ AND } \text{Var } n \text{ IN } \text{Var } l \text{ AND}$
 $\quad \text{HPair } (\text{Var } m) \text{ } (\text{HPair } (\text{Var } \text{smi}) \text{ } (\text{HPair } (\text{Var } \text{sm}) \text{ } (\text{Var } \text{sm}')))) \text{ IN } s \text{ AND}$
 $\quad \text{HPair } (\text{Var } n) \text{ } (\text{HPair } (\text{Var } \text{sni}) \text{ } (\text{HPair } (\text{Var } \text{sn}) \text{ } (\text{Var } \text{sn}')))) \text{ IN } s \text{ AND}$
 $\quad ((\text{Var } \text{sli} \text{ EQ } \text{Var } \text{smi} \text{ AND } \text{Var } \text{sli} \text{ EQ } \text{Var } \text{sni} \text{ AND}$
 $\quad \text{Var } \text{sl} \text{ EQ } \text{Q_Disj } (\text{Var } \text{sm}) \text{ } (\text{Var } \text{sn}) \text{ AND}$
 $\quad \text{Var } \text{sl}' \text{ EQ } \text{Q_Disj } (\text{Var } \text{sm}') \text{ } (\text{Var } \text{sn}')) \text{ OR}$
 $\quad (\text{Var } \text{sli} \text{ EQ } \text{Var } \text{smi} \text{ AND}$
 $\quad \text{Var } \text{sl} \text{ EQ } \text{Q_Neg } (\text{Var } \text{sm}) \text{ AND } \text{Var } \text{sl}' \text{ EQ } \text{Q_Neg } (\text{Var } \text{sm}')) \text{ OR}$
 $\quad (\text{SUCC } (\text{Var } \text{sli}) \text{ EQ } \text{Var } \text{smi} \text{ AND}$
 $\quad \text{Var } \text{sl} \text{ EQ } \text{Q_Ex } (\text{Var } \text{sm}) \text{ AND } \text{Var } \text{sl}' \text{ EQ } \text{Q_Ex } (\text{Var } \text{sm}')))))))))))))))))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

nominal_termination (*eqvt*)
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma
shows *SeqAbstFormP_fresh_iff* [*simp*]:
 $a \# \text{SeqAbstFormP } v \text{ } i \text{ } x \text{ } x' \text{ } s \text{ } k \longleftrightarrow a \# v \wedge a \# i \wedge a \# x \wedge a \# x' \wedge a \# s \wedge a \# k$ (**is** ?thesis1)
and *SeqAbstFormP_sf* [*iff*]:
 $\text{Sigma_fm } (\text{SeqAbstFormP } v \text{ } i \text{ } x \text{ } x' \text{ } s \text{ } k)$ (**is** ?thsf)
and *SeqAbstFormP_imp_OrdP*:
 $\{ \text{SeqAbstFormP } v \text{ } u \text{ } x \text{ } x' \text{ } s \text{ } k \} \vdash \text{OrdP } k$ (**is** ?thOrd)
and *SeqAbstFormP_imp_LstSeqP*:
 $\{ \text{SeqAbstFormP } v \text{ } u \text{ } x \text{ } x' \text{ } s \text{ } k \} \vdash \text{LstSeqP } s \text{ } k \text{ } (\text{HPair } u \text{ } (\text{HPair } x \text{ } x'))$ (**is** ?thLstSeq)
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *SeqAbstFormP_subst* [*simp*]:
 $(\text{SeqAbstFormP } v \text{ } u \text{ } x \text{ } x' \text{ } s \text{ } k)(i ::= t) =$
 $\text{SeqAbstFormP } (\text{subst } i \text{ } t \text{ } v) \text{ } (\text{subst } i \text{ } t \text{ } u) \text{ } (\text{subst } i \text{ } t \text{ } x) \text{ } (\text{subst } i \text{ } t \text{ } x') \text{ } (\text{subst } i \text{ } t \text{ } s) \text{ } (\text{subst } i \text{ } t \text{ } k)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

declare *SeqAbstFormP.simps* [*simp del*]

5.6.3 Defining the syntax: the main AbstForm predicate

```

nominal_function AbstFormP :: tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  fm
  where  $\llbracket \text{atom } s \# (v, i, x, x', k);$ 
     $\text{atom } k \# (v, i, x, x') \rrbracket \implies$ 
     $\text{AbstFormP } v i x x' = \text{VarP } v \text{ AND } \text{OrdP } i \text{ AND } \text{Ex } s (\text{Ex } k (\text{SeqAbstFormP } v i x x' (\text{Var } s) (\text{Var } k)))$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma
  shows AbstFormP_fresh_iff [simp]:
     $a \# \text{AbstFormP } v i x x' \longleftrightarrow a \# v \wedge a \# i \wedge a \# x \wedge a \# x' \text{ (is ?thesis1)}$ 
  and AbstFormP_sf [iff]:
     $\text{Sigma\_fm } (\text{AbstFormP } v i x x') \text{ (is ?thsf)}$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma AbstFormP_subst [simp]:
   $(\text{AbstFormP } v i x x')(j ::= t) = \text{AbstFormP } (\text{subst } j t v) (\text{subst } j t i) (\text{subst } j t x) (\text{subst } j t x')$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

declare AbstFormP.simps [simp del]

```

5.7 Substitution over formulas

5.7.1 The predicate SubstAtomicP

```

nominal_function SubstAtomicP :: tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  fm
  where  $\llbracket \text{atom } t \# (v, tm, y, y', t', u, u');$ 
     $\text{atom } t' \# (v, tm, y, y', u, u');$ 
     $\text{atom } u \# (v, tm, y, y', u');$ 
     $\text{atom } u' \# (v, tm, y, y') \rrbracket \implies$ 
     $\text{SubstAtomicP } v tm y y' =$ 
     $\text{Ex } t (\text{Ex } u (\text{Ex } t' (\text{Ex } u'$ 
     $(\text{SubstTermP } v tm (\text{Var } t) (\text{Var } t') \text{ AND } \text{SubstTermP } v tm (\text{Var } u) (\text{Var } u') \text{ AND}$ 
     $((y \text{ EQ } Q\_Eq (\text{Var } t) (\text{Var } u) \text{ AND } y' \text{ EQ } Q\_Eq (\text{Var } t') (\text{Var } u')) \text{ OR }$ 
     $(y \text{ EQ } Q\_Mem (\text{Var } t) (\text{Var } u) \text{ AND } y' \text{ EQ } Q\_Mem (\text{Var } t') (\text{Var } u'))))))))$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma
  shows SubstAtomicP_fresh_iff [simp]:
     $a \# \text{SubstAtomicP } v tm y y' \longleftrightarrow a \# v \wedge a \# tm \wedge a \# y \wedge a \# y' \text{ (is ?thesis1)}$ 
  and SubstAtomicP_sf [iff]:  $\text{Sigma\_fm } (\text{SubstAtomicP } v tm y y') \text{ (is ?thsf)}$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma SubstAtomicP_subst [simp]:
   $(\text{SubstAtomicP } v tm y y')(i ::= w) = \text{SubstAtomicP } (\text{subst } i w v) (\text{subst } i w tm) (\text{subst } i w y) (\text{subst } i w y')$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma SubstAtomicP_cong:
   $\llbracket H \vdash v \text{ EQ } v'; H \vdash tm \text{ EQ } tm'; H \vdash x \text{ EQ } x'; H \vdash y \text{ EQ } y' \rrbracket$ 
   $\implies H \vdash \text{SubstAtomicP } v tm x y \text{ IFF } \text{SubstAtomicP } v' tm' x' y'$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

5.7.2 The predicate *SubstMakeForm*

nominal_function *SeqSubstFormP* :: $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$
where $\llbracket atom\ l \# (s, k, v, u, sl, sl', m, n, sm, sm', sn, sn') ;$
 $atom\ sl \# (s, v, u, sl', m, n, sm, sm', sn, sn') ;$
 $atom\ sl' \# (s, v, u, m, n, sm, sm', sn, sn') ;$
 $atom\ m \# (s, n, sm, sm', sn, sn') ; atom\ n \# (s, sm, sm', sn, sn') ;$
 $atom\ sm \# (s, sm', sn, sn') ; atom\ sm' \# (s, sn, sn') ;$
 $atom\ sn \# (s, sn') ; atom\ sn' \# s \rrbracket \implies$
 $SeqSubstFormP\ v\ u\ x\ x'\ s\ k =$
 $LstSeqP\ s\ k\ (HPair\ x\ x')\ AND$
 $All2\ l\ (SUCC\ k)\ (Ex\ sl\ (Ex\ sl'\ (HPair\ (Var\ l)\ (HPair\ (Var\ sl)\ (Var\ sl'))\ IN\ s\ AND$
 $(SubstAtomicP\ v\ u\ (Var\ sl)\ (Var\ sl')\ OR$
 $Ex\ m\ (Ex\ n\ (Ex\ sm\ (Ex\ sm'\ (Ex\ sn\ (Ex\ sn'\ (Var\ m\ IN\ Var\ l\ AND\ Var\ n\ IN\ Var\ l\ AND$
 $HPair\ (Var\ m)\ (HPair\ (Var\ sm)\ (Var\ sm'))\ IN\ s\ AND$
 $HPair\ (Var\ n)\ (HPair\ (Var\ sn)\ (Var\ sn'))\ IN\ s\ AND$
 $((Var\ sl\ EQ\ Q_Disj\ (Var\ sm)\ (Var\ sn))\ AND$
 $Var\ sl'\ EQ\ Q_Disj\ (Var\ sm')\ (Var\ sn'))\ OR$
 $(Var\ sl\ EQ\ Q_Neg\ (Var\ sm)\ AND\ Var\ sl'\ EQ\ Q_Neg\ (Var\ sm'))\ OR$
 $(Var\ sl\ EQ\ Q_Ex\ (Var\ sm)\ AND\ Var\ sl'\ EQ\ Q_Ex\ (Var\ sm')))))))))))))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (*eqvt*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma

shows *SeqSubstFormP_fresh_iff* [*simp*]:
 $a \# SeqSubstFormP\ v\ u\ x\ x'\ s\ k \longleftrightarrow a \# v \wedge a \# u \wedge a \# x \wedge a \# x' \wedge a \# s \wedge a \# k$ (**is** ?thesis1)
and *SeqSubstFormP_sf* [*iff*]:
 $Sigma_fm\ (SeqSubstFormP\ v\ u\ x\ x'\ s\ k)$ (**is** ?thsf)
and *SeqSubstFormP_imp_OrdP*:
 $\{ SeqSubstFormP\ v\ u\ x\ x'\ s\ k \} \vdash OrdP\ k$ (**is** ?thOrd)
and *SeqSubstFormP_imp_LstSeqP*:
 $\{ SeqSubstFormP\ v\ u\ x\ x'\ s\ k \} \vdash LstSeqP\ s\ k\ (HPair\ x\ x')$ (**is** ?thLstSeq)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqSubstFormP_subst* [*simp*]:
 $(SeqSubstFormP\ v\ u\ x\ x'\ s\ k)(i ::= t) =$
 $SeqSubstFormP\ (subst\ i\ t\ v)\ (subst\ i\ t\ u)\ (subst\ i\ t\ x)\ (subst\ i\ t\ x')\ (subst\ i\ t\ s)\ (subst\ i\ t\ k)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqSubstFormP_cong*:

$\llbracket H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t'; H \vdash u \text{ EQ } u'; H \vdash s \text{ EQ } s'; H \vdash k \text{ EQ } k' \rrbracket$
 $\implies H \vdash SeqSubstFormP\ v\ i\ t\ u\ s\ k \text{ IFF } SeqSubstFormP\ v\ i\ t'\ u'\ s'\ k'$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

declare *SeqSubstFormP.simps* [*simp del*]

5.7.3 Defining the syntax: the main *SubstForm* predicate

nominal_function *SubstFormP* :: $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$
where $\llbracket atom\ s \# (v, i, x, x', k); atom\ k \# (v, i, x, x') \rrbracket \implies$
 $SubstFormP\ v\ i\ x\ x' =$
 $VarP\ v\ AND\ TermP\ i\ AND\ Ex\ s\ (Ex\ k\ (SeqSubstFormP\ v\ i\ x\ x'\ (Var\ s)\ (Var\ k)))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (*eqvt*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

```

lemma
  shows SubstFormP_fresh_iff [simp]:
     $a \# \text{SubstFormP } v i x x' \longleftrightarrow a \# v \wedge a \# i \wedge a \# x \wedge a \# x'$  (is ?thesis1)
  and SubstFormP_sf [iff]:
    Sigma_fm (SubstFormP v i x x') (is ?thsf)
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma SubstFormP_subst [simp]:
   $(\text{SubstFormP } v i x x')(j := t) = \text{SubstFormP } (\text{subst } j t v) (\text{subst } j t i) (\text{subst } j t x) (\text{subst } j t x')$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma SubstFormP_cong:
   $\llbracket H \vdash v \text{EQ } v'; H \vdash i \text{EQ } i'; H \vdash t \text{EQ } t'; H \vdash u \text{EQ } u' \rrbracket$ 
   $\implies H \vdash \text{SubstFormP } v i t u \text{ IFF } \text{SubstFormP } v' i' t' u'$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma ground_SubstFormP [simp]: ground_fm (SubstFormP v y x x')  $\longleftrightarrow$  ground v  $\wedge$  ground y  $\wedge$  ground x  $\wedge$  ground x'
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

declare SubstFormP.simps [simp del]

```

5.8 The predicate *AtomicP*

```

nominal_function AtomicP :: tm  $\Rightarrow$  fm
  where  $\llbracket \text{atom } t \# (u, y); \text{atom } u \# y \rrbracket \implies$ 
     $\text{AtomicP } y = \text{Ex } t (\text{Ex } u (\text{TermP } (\text{Var } t) \text{ AND } \text{TermP } (\text{Var } u) \text{ AND }$ 
     $y \text{EQ } Q_{\text{Eq}} (\text{Var } t) (\text{Var } u) \text{ OR }$ 
     $y \text{EQ } Q_{\text{Mem}} (\text{Var } t) (\text{Var } u)))$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma
  shows AtomicP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \# \text{AtomicP } y \longleftrightarrow a \# y$  (is ?thesis1)
  and AtomicP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (AtomicP y) (is ?thsf)
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma AtompicP_subst [simp]:  $(\text{AtomicP } t)(j := w) = \text{AtomicP } (\text{subst } j w t)$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

5.9 The predicate *MakeForm*

```

nominal_function MakeFormP :: tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  fm
  where  $\llbracket \text{atom } v \# (y, u, w, au); \text{atom } au \# (y, u, w) \rrbracket \implies$ 
    MakeFormP y u w =
     $y \text{EQ } Q_{\text{Disj}} u w \text{ OR } y \text{EQ } Q_{\text{Neg}} u \text{ OR }$ 
     $\text{Ex } v (\text{Ex } au (\text{AbstFormP } (\text{Var } v) \text{ Zero } u (\text{Var } au) \text{ AND } y \text{EQ } Q_{\text{Ex}} (\text{Var } au)))$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma
  shows MakeFormP_fresh_iff [simp]:
     $a \# \text{MakeFormP } y u w \longleftrightarrow a \# y \wedge a \# u \wedge a \# w$  (is ?thesis1)

```

```

and MakeFormP_sf [iff]:
  Sigma_fm (MakeFormP y u w) (is ?thsf)
⟨proof⟩

declare MakeFormP.simps [simp del]

lemma MakeFormP_subst [simp]: (MakeFormP y u t)(j::=w) = MakeFormP (subst j w y) (subst j w u)
  (subst j w t)
⟨proof⟩

```

5.10 The predicate *SqFormP*

```

nominal_function SqFormP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
  where [[atom l # (s,k,t,sl,m,n,sm,sn); atom sl # (s,k,t,m,n,sm,sn);
    atom m # (s,k,t,n,sm,sn); atom n # (s,k,t,sm,sn);
    atom sm # (s,k,t,sn); atom sn # (s,k,t)]] ==>
    SqFormP s k t =
      LstSeqP s k t AND
      All2 n (SUCC k) (Ex sn (HPair (Var n) (Var sn) IN s AND (AtomicP (Var sn) OR
        Ex m (Ex l (Ex sm (Ex sl (Var m IN Var n AND Var l IN Var n AND
          HPair (Var m) (Var sm) IN s AND HPair (Var l) (Var sl) IN s AND
          MakeFormP (Var sn) (Var sm) (Var sl))))))) )
⟨proof⟩

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma
  shows SeqFormP_fresh_iff [simp]:
    a # SeqFormP s k t ↔ a # s ∧ a # k ∧ a # t (is ?thesis1)
  and SeqFormP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (SeqFormP s k t) (is ?thsf)
  and SeqFormP_imp_OrdP:
    { SeqFormP s k t } ⊢ OrdP k (is ?thOrd)
  and SeqFormP_imp_LstSeqP:
    { SeqFormP s k t } ⊢ LstSeqP s k t (is ?thLstSeq)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma SeqFormP_subst [simp]:
  (SeqFormP s k t)(j::=w) = SeqFormP (subst j w s) (subst j w k) (subst j w t)
⟨proof⟩

```

5.11 The predicate *FormP*

5.11.1 Definition

```

nominal_function FormP :: tm ⇒ fm
  where [[atom k # (s,y); atom s # y]] ==>
    FormP y = Ex k (Ex s (SeqFormP (Var s) (Var k) y))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma
  shows FormP_fresh_iff [simp]: a # FormP y ↔ a # y (is ?thesis1)
  and FormP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (FormP y) (is ?thsf)
⟨proof⟩

```

```
lemma FormP_subst [simp]: (FormP y)(j:=w) = FormP (subst j w y)  
⟨proof⟩
```

5.11.2 The predicate *VarNonOccFormP* (Derived from *SubstFormP*)

```
nominal_function VarNonOccFormP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm  
  where VarNonOccFormP v x = FormP x AND SubstFormP v Zero x x  
⟨proof⟩
```

```
nominal_termination (eqvt)  
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma  
  shows VarNonOccFormP_fresh_iff [simp]: a # VarNonOccFormP v y ↔ a # v ∧ a # y (is ?thesis1)  
    and VarNonOccFormP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (VarNonOccFormP v y) (is ?thsf)  
⟨proof⟩
```

```
declare VarNonOccFormP.simps [simp del]
```

```
end
```

Chapter 6

Formalizing Provability

```
theory Pf_Predicates
imports Coding_Predicates
begin
```

6.1 Section 4 Predicates (Leading up to Pf)

6.1.1 The predicate *SentP*, for the Sentential (Boolean) Axioms

nominal_function *SentP* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *fm*

where $\llbracket \text{atom } y \# (z, w, x); \text{atom } z \# (w, x); \text{atom } w \# x \rrbracket \implies$

SentP *x* = *Ex* *y* (*Ex* *z* (*Ex* *w* (*FormP* (*Var* *y*) AND *FormP* (*Var* *z*) AND *FormP* (*Var* *w*) AND
(*x EQ Q_Imp* (*Var* *y*) (*Var* *y*)) OR
(*x EQ Q_Imp* (*Var* *y*) (*Q_Disj* (*Var* *y*) (*Var* *z*))) OR
(*x EQ Q_Imp* (*Q_Disj* (*Var* *y*) (*Var* *y*)) (*Var* *y*)) OR
(*x EQ Q_Imp* (*Q_Disj* (*Var* *y*) (*Q_Disj* (*Var* *z*) (*Var* *w*))))
(*Q_Disj* (*Q_Disj* (*Var* *y*) (*Var* *z*)) (*Var* *w*))) OR
(*x EQ Q_Imp* (*Q_Disj* (*Var* *y*) (*Var* *z*))
(*Q_Imp* (*Q_Disj* (*Q_Neg* (*Var* *y*)) (*Var* *w*)) (*Q_Disj* (*Var* *z*) (*Var* *w*))))))))

<proof>

nominal_termination (*eqvt*)

<proof>

lemma

shows *SentP_fresh_iff* [*simp*]: *a # SentP x* \longleftrightarrow *a # x* (is ?thesis1)

and *SentP_sf* [*tff*]: *Sigma_fm* (*SentP x*) (is ?thsf)

<proof>

6.1.2 The predicate *Equality_axP*, for the Equality Axioms

function *Equality_axP* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *fm*

where *Equality_axP x* =

x EQ «refl_ax» OR x EQ «eq_cong_ax» OR x EQ «mem_cong_ax» OR x EQ «eats_cong_ax»

<proof>

termination

<proof>

6.1.3 The predicate *HF_axP*, for the HF Axioms

function *HF_axP* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *fm*

where *HF_axP x* = *x EQ «HF1» OR x EQ «HF2»*

$\langle proof \rangle$

termination

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *HF_axP_sf* [iff]: *Sigma_fm* (*HF_axP t*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

6.1.4 The specialisation axioms

Defining the syntax

nominal_function *Special_axP* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *fm* **where**
 $\llbracket atom v \# (p,sx,y,ax,x); atom x \# (p,sx,y,ax);$
 $atom ax \# (p,sx,y); atom y \# (p,sx); atom sx \# p \rrbracket \implies$
Special_axP p = *Ex v* (*Ex x* (*Ex ax* (*Ex y* (*Ex sx*
 $(FormP (Var x) AND VarP (Var v) AND TermP (Var y) AND$
 $AbstFormP (Var v) Zero (Var x) (Var ax) AND$
 $SubstFormP (Var v) (Var y) (Var x) (Var sx) AND$
 $p EQ Q_Imp (Var sx) (Q_Ex (Var ax)))))))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (*eqvt*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma
shows *Special_axP_fresh_iff* [simp]: *a* $\#$ *Special_axP p* \longleftrightarrow *a* $\#$ *p* (**is** ?thesis1)
and *Special_axP_sf* [iff]: *Sigma_fm* (*Special_axP p*) (**is** ?thesis3)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

6.1.5 The induction axioms

Defining the syntax

nominal_function *Induction_axP* :: *tm* \Rightarrow *fm* **where**
 $\llbracket atom ax \# (p,v,w,x,x0,xw,xevw,allw,allvw);$
 $atom allvw \# (p,v,w,x,x0,xw,xevw,allw); atom allw \# (p,v,w,x,x0,xw,xevw);$
 $atom xevw \# (p,v,w,x,x0,xw); atom xw \# (p,v,w,x,x0);$
 $atom x0 \# (p,v,w,x); atom x \# (p,v,w);$
 $atom w \# (p,v); atom v \# p \rrbracket \implies$
Induction_axP p = *Ex v* (*Ex w* (*Ex x* (*Ex x0* (*Ex xw* (*Ex xevw* (*Ex allw* (*Ex allvw* (*Ex ax*
 $((Var v NEQ Var w) AND VarNonOccFormP (Var w) (Var x) AND$
 $SubstFormP (Var v) Zero (Var x) (Var x0) AND$
 $SubstFormP (Var v) (Var w) (Var x) (Var xw) AND$
 $SubstFormP (Var v) (Q_Eats (Var v) (Var w)) (Var x) (Var xevw) AND$
 $AbstFormP (Var w) Zero (Q_Imp (Var x) (Q_Imp (Var xw) (Var xevw))) (Var allw) AND$
 $AbstFormP (Var v) Zero (Q_All (Var allw)) (Var allvw) AND$
 $AbstFormP (Var v) Zero (Var x) (Var ax) AND$
 $p EQ Q_Imp (Var x0) (Q_Imp (Q_All (Var allw)) (Q_All (Var ax)))))))))))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (*eqvt*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma
shows *Induction_axP_fresh_iff* [simp]: *a* $\#$ *Induction_axP p* \longleftrightarrow *a* $\#$ *p* (**is** ?thesis1)
and *Induction_axP_sf* [iff]: *Sigma_fm* (*Induction_axP p*) (**is** ?thesis3)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

6.1.6 The predicate *AxiomP*, for any Axioms

definition *AxiomP* :: $tm \Rightarrow fm$
where $AxiomP\ x \equiv x\ EQ\ «extra_axiom»\ OR\ SentP\ x\ OR\ Equality_axP\ x\ OR\ HF_axP\ x\ OR\ Special_axP\ x\ OR\ Induction_axP\ x$

lemma *AxiomP_I*:

$\{\} \vdash AxiomP\ «extra_axiom»$
 $\{\} \vdash SentP\ x \implies \{\} \vdash AxiomP\ x$
 $\{\} \vdash Equality_axP\ x \implies \{\} \vdash AxiomP\ x$
 $\{\} \vdash HF_axP\ x \implies \{\} \vdash AxiomP\ x$
 $\{\} \vdash Special_axP\ x \implies \{\} \vdash AxiomP\ x$
 $\{\} \vdash Induction_axP\ x \implies \{\} \vdash AxiomP\ x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *AxiomP_eqvt* [eqvt]: $(p \cdot AxiomP\ x) = AxiomP\ (p \cdot x)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *AxiomP_fresh_iff* [simp]: $a \# AxiomP\ x \longleftrightarrow a \# x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *AxiomP_sf* [iff]: $Sigma_fm\ (AxiomP\ t)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

6.1.7 The predicate *ModPonP*, for the inference rule Modus Ponens

definition *ModPonP* :: $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$
where $ModPonP\ x\ y\ z = (y\ EQ\ Q_Imp\ x\ z)$

lemma *ModPonP_eqvt* [eqvt]: $(p \cdot ModPonP\ x\ y\ z) = ModPonP\ (p \cdot x)\ (p \cdot y)\ (p \cdot z)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ModPonP_fresh_iff* [simp]: $a \# ModPonP\ x\ y\ z \longleftrightarrow a \# x \wedge a \# y \wedge a \# z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ModPonP_sf* [iff]: $Sigma_fm\ (ModPonP\ t\ u\ v)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ModPonP_subst* [simp]:
 $(ModPonP\ t\ u\ v)(i ::= w) = ModPonP\ (subst\ i\ w\ t)\ (subst\ i\ w\ u)\ (subst\ i\ w\ v)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

6.1.8 The predicate *ExistsP*, for the existential rule

Definition

nominal_function *ExistsP* :: $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$ **where**
 $\llbracket atom\ x \# (p, q, v, y, x'); atom\ x' \# (p, q, v, y);$
 $atom\ y \# (p, q, v); atom\ v \# (p, q) \rrbracket \implies$
 $ExistsP\ p\ q = Ex\ x\ (Ex\ x'\ (Ex\ y\ (Ex\ v\ (FormP\ (Var\ x)\ AND\$
 $VarNonOccFormP\ (Var\ v)\ (Var\ y)\ AND\$
 $AbstFormP\ (Var\ v)\ Zero\ (Var\ x)\ (Var\ x')\ AND\$
 $p\ EQ\ Q_Imp\ (Var\ x)\ (Var\ y)\ AND\$
 $q\ EQ\ Q_Imp\ (Q_Ex\ (Var\ x'))\ (Var\ y))))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (eqvt)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

```

lemma
shows ExistsP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \notin \text{ExistsP } p q \longleftrightarrow a \notin p \wedge a \notin q$  (is ?thesis1)
and ExistsP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (ExistsP p q) (is ?thesis3)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma ExistsP_subst [simp]: (ExistsP p q)(j:=w) = ExistsP (subst j w p) (subst j w q)
⟨proof⟩

```

6.1.9 The predicate SubstP , for the substitution rule

Although the substitution rule is derivable in the calculus, the derivation is too complicated to reproduce within the proof function. It is much easier to provide it as an immediate inference step, justifying its soundness in terms of other inference rules.

Definition

```

nominal_function SubstP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm where
[atom u # (p,q,v); atom v # (p,q)] ==>
SubstP p q = Ex v (Ex u (SubstFormP (Var v) (Var u) p q))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma
shows SubstP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \notin \text{SubstP } p q \longleftrightarrow a \notin p \wedge a \notin q$  (is ?thesis1)
and SubstP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (SubstP p q) (is ?thesis3)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma SubstP_subst [simp]: (SubstP p q)(j:=w) = SubstP (subst j w p) (subst j w q)
⟨proof⟩

```

6.1.10 The predicate PrfP

```

nominal_function PrfP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
where [atom l # (s,sl,m,n,sm,sn); atom sl # (s,m,n,sm,sn);
atom m # (s,n,sm,sn); atom n # (s,k,sm,sn);
atom sm # (s,sn); atom sn # (s)] ==>
PrfP s k t =
LstSeqP s k t AND
All2 n (SUCC k) (Ex sn (HPair (Var n) (Var sn) IN s AND (AxiomP (Var sn) OR
Ex m (Ex l (Ex sm (Ex sl (Var m IN Var n AND Var l IN Var n AND
HPair (Var m) (Var sm) IN s AND HPair (Var l) (Var sl) IN s AND
(ModPonP (Var sm) (Var sl) (Var sn) OR
ExistsP (Var sm) (Var sn) OR
SubstP (Var sm) (Var sn))))))) )
⟨proof⟩

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma
shows PrfP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \notin \text{PrfP } s k t \longleftrightarrow a \notin s \wedge a \notin k \wedge a \notin t$  (is ?thesis1)
and PrfP_imp_OrdP [simp]: {PrfP s k t} ⊢ OrdP k (is ?thord)
and PrfP_imp_LstSeqP [simp]: {PrfP s k t} ⊢ LstSeqP s k t (is ?thlstseq)
and PrfP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (PrfP s k t) (is ?thsf)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma PrfP_subst [simp]:
  (PrfP t u v)(j:=w) = PrfP (subst j w t) (subst j w u) (subst j w v)
  <proof>

```

6.1.11 The predicate *PfP*

```

nominal_function PfP :: tm  $\Rightarrow$  fm
  where  $\llbracket \text{atom } k \# (s, y); \text{atom } s \# y \rrbracket \implies$ 
    PfP y = Ex k (Ex s (PrfP (Var s) (Var k) y))
  <proof>

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
  <proof>

```

```

lemma
  shows PfP_fresh_iff [simp]: a # PfP y  $\longleftrightarrow$  a # y           (is ?thesis1)
  and PfP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (PfP y)                                (is ?thsf)
  <proof>

```

```

lemma PfP_subst [simp]: (PfP t)(j:=w) = PfP (subst j w t)
  <proof>

```

```

lemma ground_PfP [simp]: ground_fm (PfP y) = ground y
  <proof>

```

```

end

```

Chapter 7

Syntactic Preliminaries for the Second Incompleteness Theorem

```
theory II_Prelims
imports Pf_Predicates
begin

declare IndP.simps [simp del]

lemma OrdP_ORD_OF [intro]:  $H \vdash \text{OrdP} (\text{ORD\_OF } n)$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma VarP_Var [intro]:  $H \vdash \text{VarP} \llbracket \text{Var } i \rrbracket$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma VarP_neq_IndP: { $t \text{ EQ } v, \text{VarP } v, \text{IndP } t\}$  ⊢ Fls
⟨proof⟩

lemma Mem_HFun_Sigma_OrdP: { $\text{HPair } t u \text{ IN } f, \text{HFun\_Sigma } f\}$  ⊢ OrdP t
⟨proof⟩

nominal_function NotInDom ::  $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$ 
  where atom  $z \# (t, r) \implies \text{NotInDom } t r = \text{All } z (\text{Neg} (\text{HPair } t (\text{Var } z) \text{ IN } r))$ 
⟨proof⟩

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

lemma NotInDom_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \# \text{NotInDom } t r \iff a \# (t, r)$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_fm_NotInDom [simp]:  $(\text{NotInDom } t r)(i ::= x) = \text{NotInDom} (\text{subst } i x t) (\text{subst } i x r)$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma NotInDom_cong:  $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t' \implies H \vdash r \text{ EQ } r' \implies H \vdash \text{NotInDom } t r \text{ IFF } \text{NotInDom } t' r'$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma NotInDom_Zero:  $H \vdash \text{NotInDom } t \text{ Zero}$ 
⟨proof⟩
```

```

lemma NotInDom_Fls: {HPair d d' IN r, NotInDom d r} ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

lemma NotInDom_Contra: H ⊢ NotInDom d r ==> H ⊢ HPair x y IN r ==> insert (x EQ d) H ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

```

7.2 Restriction of a Sequence to a Domain

```

nominal_function RestrictedP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
where [[atom x # (y,f,k,g); atom y # (f,k,g)] ==>
  RestrictedP f k g =
    g SUBS f AND
    All x (All y (HPair (Var x) (Var y) IN g IFF
      (Var x) IN k AND HPair (Var x) (Var y) IN f))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_fresh_iff [simp]: a # RestrictedP f k g <→ a # f ∧ a # k ∧ a # g
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma subst_fm_RestrictedP [simp]:
  (RestrictedP f k g)(i ::= u) = RestrictedP (subst i u f) (subst i u k) (subst i u g)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_cong:
  [[H ⊢ f EQ f'; H ⊢ k EQ A'; H ⊢ g EQ g]]
  ==> H ⊢ RestrictedP f k g IFF RestrictedP f' A' g'
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_Zero: H ⊢ RestrictedP Zero k Zero
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_Mem: { RestrictedP s k s', HPair a b IN s, a IN k } ⊢ HPair a b IN s'
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_imp_Subset: {RestrictedP s k s'} ⊢ s' SUBS s
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_Mem2:
  { RestrictedP s k s', HPair a b IN s' } ⊢ HPair a b IN s AND a IN k
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_Mem_D: H ⊢ RestrictedP s k t ==> H ⊢ a IN t ==> insert (a IN s) H ⊢ A ==> H
  ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_Eats:
  { RestrictedP s k s', a IN k } ⊢ RestrictedP (Eats s (HPair a b)) k (Eats s' (HPair a b)) ⟨proof⟩
lemma exists_RestrictedP:
  assumes s: atom s # (f,k)
  shows H ⊢ Ex s (RestrictedP f k (Var s)) ⟨proof⟩
lemma cut_RestrictedP:
  assumes s: atom s # (f,k,A) and ∀ C ∈ H. atom s # C
  shows insert (RestrictedP f k (Var s)) H ⊢ A ==> H ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_NotInDom: { RestrictedP s k s', Neg (j IN k) } ⊢ NotInDom j s'
⟨proof⟩

```

```

declare RestrictedP.simps [simp del]

```

7.3 Applications to LstSeqP

```

lemma HFun_Sigma_Eats:

```

```

  assumes H ⊢ HFun_Sigma r H ⊢ NotInDom d r H ⊢ OrdP d
  shows H ⊢ HFun_Sigma (Eats r (HPair d d')) ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma HFun_Sigma_single [iff]: H ⊢ OrdP d ==> H ⊢ HFun_Sigma (Eats Zero (HPair d d'))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma LstSeqP_single [iff]: H ⊢ LstSeqP (Eats Zero (HPair Zero x)) Zero x
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma NotInDom_LstSeqP_Eats:

```

```

  { NotInDom (SUCC k) s, LstSeqP s k y } ⊢ LstSeqP (Eats s (HPair (SUCC k) z)) (SUCC k) z
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_HDomain_Incl: {HDomain_Incl s k, RestrictedP s k s'} ⊢ HDomain_Incl s' k
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_HFun_Sigma: {HFun_Sigma s, RestrictedP s k s'} ⊢ HFun_Sigma s'
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_LstSeqP:

```

```

  { RestrictedP s (SUCC k) s', LstSeqP s k y } ⊢ LstSeqP s' k y
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma RestrictedP_LstSeqP_Eats:

```

```

  { RestrictedP s (SUCC k) s', LstSeqP s k y }
  ⊢ LstSeqP (Eats s' (HPair (SUCC k) z)) (SUCC k) z
⟨proof⟩

```

7.4 Ordinal Addition

7.4.1 Predicate form, defined on sequences

```

nominal_function SeqHaddP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm

```

```

  where [atom l # (sl,s,k,j); atom sl # (s,j)] ==>
  SeqHaddP s j k y = LstSeqP s k y AND
    HPair Zero j IN s AND
    All2 l k (Ex sl (HPair (Var l) (Var sl) IN s AND
      HPair (SUCC (Var l)) (SUCC (Var sl)) IN s))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma SeqHaddP_fresh_iff [simp]: a # SeqHaddP s j k y ↔ a # s ∧ a # j ∧ a # k ∧ a # y
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma SeqHaddP_subst [simp]:

```

```

  (SeqHaddP s j k y)(i:=t) = SeqHaddP (subst i t s) (subst i t j) (subst i t k) (subst i t y)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

declare SeqHaddP.simps [simp del]

nominal_function HaddP :: tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  fm
where  $\llbracket \text{atom } s \# (x,y,z) \rrbracket \implies$ 
 $HaddP x y z = \text{Ex } s (\text{SeqHaddP} (\text{Var } s) x y z)$ 
{proof}

nominal_termination (eqvt)
{proof}

lemma HaddP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \# HaddP x y z \longleftrightarrow a \# x \wedge a \# y \wedge a \# z$ 
{proof}

lemma HaddP_subst [simp]:  $(HaddP x y z)(i ::= t) = HaddP (\text{subst } i t x) (\text{subst } i t y) (\text{subst } i t z)$ 
{proof}

lemma HaddP_cong:  $\llbracket H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t'; H \vdash u \text{ EQ } u'; H \vdash v \text{ EQ } v' \rrbracket \implies H \vdash HaddP t u v \text{ IFF } HaddP t' u' v'$ 
{proof}

```

```
declare HaddP.simps [simp del]
```

```
lemma HaddP_Zero2:  $H \vdash HaddP x \text{ Zero } x$ 
{proof}
```

```
lemma HaddP_imp_OrdP:  $\{HaddP x y z\} \vdash \text{OrdP } y$ 
{proof}
```

```
lemma HaddP_SUCC2:  $\{HaddP x y z\} \vdash HaddP x (\text{SUCC } y) (\text{SUCC } z)$  {proof}
```

7.4.2 Proving that these relations are functions

```
lemma SeqHaddP_Zero_E:  $\{\text{SeqHaddP } s w \text{ Zero } z\} \vdash w \text{ EQ } z$ 
{proof}
```

```
lemma SeqHaddP_SUCC_lemma:
assumes  $y': \text{atom } y' \# (s,j,k,y)$ 
shows  $\{\text{SeqHaddP } s j (\text{SUCC } k) y\} \vdash \text{Ex } y' (\text{SeqHaddP } s j k (\text{Var } y') \text{ AND } y \text{ EQ } \text{SUCC } (\text{Var } y'))$ 
{proof}
```

```
lemma SeqHaddP_SUCC:
assumes  $H \vdash \text{SeqHaddP } s j (\text{SUCC } k) y \text{ atom } y' \# (s,j,k,y)$ 
shows  $H \vdash \text{Ex } y' (\text{SeqHaddP } s j k (\text{Var } y') \text{ AND } y \text{ EQ } \text{SUCC } (\text{Var } y'))$ 
{proof}
```

```
lemma SeqHaddP_unique:  $\{\text{OrdP } x, \text{SeqHaddP } s w x y, \text{SeqHaddP } s' w x y'\} \vdash y' \text{ EQ } y$  {proof}
lemma HaddP_unique:  $\{HaddP w x y, HaddP w x y'\} \vdash y' \text{ EQ } y$ 
{proof}
```

```
lemma HaddP_Zero1: assumes  $H \vdash \text{OrdP } x$  shows  $H \vdash HaddP \text{ Zero } x x$ 
{proof}
```

```
lemma HaddP_Zero_D1: insert ( $HaddP \text{ Zero } x y$ )  $H \vdash x \text{ EQ } y$ 
{proof}
```

```
lemma HaddP_Zero_D2: insert ( $HaddP \text{ zero } y$ )  $H \vdash x \text{ EQ } y$ 
{proof}
```

```

lemma HaddP_SUCC_Ex2:
  assumes  $H \vdash \text{HaddP } x (\text{SUCC } y) z$  atom  $z' \notin (x,y,z)$ 
  shows  $H \vdash \text{Ex } z' (\text{HaddP } x y (\text{Var } z') \text{ AND } z \text{ EQ SUCC } (\text{Var } z'))$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma HaddP_SUCC1: {  $\text{HaddP } x y z$  }  $\vdash \text{HaddP } (\text{SUCC } x) y (\text{SUCC } z)$  ⟨proof⟩
lemma HaddP_commute: {  $\text{HaddP } x y z, \text{OrdP } x$  }  $\vdash \text{HaddP } y x z$  ⟨proof⟩
lemma HaddP_SUCC_Ex1:
  assumes atom  $i \notin (x,y,z)$ 
  shows insert ( $\text{HaddP } (\text{SUCC } x) y z$ ) (insert ( $\text{OrdP } x$ )  $H$ )
     $\vdash \text{Ex } i (\text{HaddP } x y (\text{Var } i) \text{ AND } z \text{ EQ SUCC } (\text{Var } i))$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma HaddP_inv2: {  $\text{HaddP } x y z, \text{HaddP } x y' z, \text{OrdP } x$  }  $\vdash y' \text{ EQ } y$  ⟨proof⟩
lemma Mem_imp_subtract: ⟨proof⟩
lemma HaddP_OrdP:
  assumes  $H \vdash \text{HaddP } x y z H \vdash \text{OrdP } x$  shows  $H \vdash \text{OrdP } z$  ⟨proof⟩
lemma HaddP_Mem_cancel_left:
  assumes  $H \vdash \text{HaddP } x y' z' H \vdash \text{HaddP } x y z H \vdash \text{OrdP } x$ 
  shows  $H \vdash z' \text{ IN } z \text{ IFF } y' \text{ IN } y$  ⟨proof⟩
lemma HaddP_Mem_cancel_right_Mem:
  assumes  $H \vdash \text{HaddP } x' y z' H \vdash \text{HaddP } x y z H \vdash x' \text{ IN } x H \vdash \text{OrdP } x$ 
  shows  $H \vdash z' \text{ IN } z$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma HaddP_Mem_cases:
  assumes  $H \vdash \text{HaddP } k1 k2 k H \vdash \text{OrdP } k1$ 
    insert ( $x \text{ IN } k1$ )  $H \vdash A$ 
    insert ( $\text{Var } i \text{ IN } k2$ ) (insert ( $\text{HaddP } k1 (\text{Var } i) x$ )  $H \vdash A$ )
    and  $i: \text{atom } (i::\text{name}) \notin (k1,k2,k,x,A)$  and  $\forall C \in H. \text{atom } i \notin C$ 
    shows insert ( $x \text{ IN } k$ )  $H \vdash A$  ⟨proof⟩
lemma HaddP_Mem_contra:
  assumes  $H \vdash \text{HaddP } x y z H \vdash z \text{ IN } x H \vdash \text{OrdP } x$ 
  shows  $H \vdash A$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma exists_HaddP:
  assumes  $H \vdash \text{OrdP } y \text{ atom } j \notin (x,y)$ 
  shows  $H \vdash \text{Ex } j (\text{HaddP } x y (\text{Var } j))$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma HaddP_Mem_I:
  assumes  $H \vdash \text{HaddP } x y z H \vdash \text{OrdP } x$  shows  $H \vdash x \text{ IN SUCC } z$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

7.5 A Shifted Sequence

```

nominal_function ShiftP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
where  $\llbracket \text{atom } x \notin (x',y,z,f,\text{del},k); \text{atom } x' \notin (y,z,f,\text{del},k); \text{atom } y \notin (z,f,\text{del},k); \text{atom } z \notin (f,\text{del},g,k) \rrbracket \implies$ 
   $\text{ShiftP } f k \text{ del } g =$ 
  All  $z$  ( $\text{Var } z \text{ IN } g \text{ IFF }$ 
   $(\text{Ex } x (\text{Ex } x' (\text{Ex } y ((\text{Var } z) \text{ EQ HPair } (\text{Var } x') (\text{Var } y) \text{ AND }$ 
     $\text{HaddP } \text{del } (\text{Var } x) (\text{Var } x') \text{ AND }$ 
     $\text{HPair } (\text{Var } x) (\text{Var } y) \text{ IN } f \text{ AND } \text{Var } x \text{ IN } k)))$ )
  ⟨proof⟩

nominal_termination (eqvt)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma ShiftP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \# \text{ShiftP } f k \text{ del } g \longleftrightarrow a \# f \wedge a \# k \wedge a \# \text{del} \wedge a \# g$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_fm_ShiftP [simp]:
 $(\text{ShiftP } f k \text{ del } g)(i ::= u) = \text{ShiftP } (\text{subst } i u f) (\text{subst } i u k) (\text{subst } i u \text{ del}) (\text{subst } i u g)$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma ShiftP_Zero: {} ⊢ ShiftP Zero k d Zero
⟨proof⟩

lemma ShiftP_Mem1:
 $\{\text{ShiftP } f k \text{ del } g, \text{HPair } a b \text{ IN } f, \text{HaddP del } a a', a \text{ IN } k\} \vdash \text{HPair } a' b \text{ IN } g$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma ShiftP_Mem2:
assumes atom  $u \# (f, k, \text{del}, a, b)$ 
shows  $\{\text{ShiftP } f k \text{ del } g, \text{HPair } a b \text{ IN } g\} \vdash \text{Ex } u ((\text{Var } u) \text{ IN } k \text{ AND } \text{HaddP del } (\text{Var } u) a \text{ AND } \text{HPair } (\text{Var } u) b \text{ IN } f)$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma ShiftP_Mem_D:
assumes  $H \vdash \text{ShiftP } f k \text{ del } g H \vdash a \text{ IN } g$ 
 $\text{atom } x \# (x', y, a, f, \text{del}, k) \text{ atom } x' \# (y, a, f, \text{del}, k) \text{ atom } y \# (a, f, \text{del}, k)$ 
shows  $H \vdash (\text{Ex } x (\text{Ex } x' (\text{Ex } y (a \text{ EQ } \text{HPair } (\text{Var } x') (\text{Var } y) \text{ AND } \text{HaddP del } (\text{Var } x) (\text{Var } x') \text{ AND } \text{HPair } (\text{Var } x) (\text{Var } y) \text{ IN } f \text{ AND } \text{Var } x \text{ IN } k)))$ 
(is _ ⊢ ?concl)
⟨proof⟩

lemma ShiftP_Eats_Eats:
 $\{\text{ShiftP } f k \text{ del } g, \text{HaddP del } a a', a \text{ IN } k\}$ 
 $\vdash \text{ShiftP } (\text{Eats } f (\text{HPair } a b)) k \text{ del } (\text{Eats } g (\text{HPair } a' b))$  ⟨proof⟩
lemma ShiftP_Eats_Neg:
assumes atom  $u \# (u', v, f, k, \text{del}, g, c)$  atom  $u' \# (v, f, k, \text{del}, g, c)$  atom  $v \# (f, k, \text{del}, g, c)$ 
shows
 $\{\text{ShiftP } f k \text{ del } g,$ 
 $\text{Neg } (\text{Ex } u (\text{Ex } u' (\text{Ex } v (c \text{ EQ } \text{HPair } (\text{Var } u) (\text{Var } v) \text{ AND } \text{Var } u \text{ IN } k \text{ AND } \text{HaddP del } (\text{Var } u) (\text{Var } u')))))\}$ 
 $\vdash \text{ShiftP } (\text{Eats } f c) k \text{ del } g$  ⟨proof⟩
lemma exists_ShiftP:
assumes  $t: \text{atom } t \# (s, k, \text{del})$ 
shows  $H \vdash \text{Ex } t (\text{ShiftP } s k \text{ del } (\text{Var } t))$  ⟨proof⟩

```

7.6 Union of Two Sets

```

nominal_function UnionP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
where atom  $i \# (x, y, z) \implies \text{UnionP } x y z = \text{All } i (\text{Var } i \text{ IN } z \text{ IFF } (\text{Var } i \text{ IN } x \text{ OR } \text{Var } i \text{ IN } y))$ 
⟨proof⟩

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

lemma UnionP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \# \text{UnionP } x y z \longleftrightarrow a \# x \wedge a \# y \wedge a \# z$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_fm_UnionP [simp]:
 $(\text{UnionP } x y z)(i ::= u) = \text{UnionP } (\text{subst } i u x) (\text{subst } i u y) (\text{subst } i u z)$ 

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Union_Zero1*: $H \vdash \text{UnionP Zero } x \ x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Union_Eats*: $\{\text{UnionP } x \ y \ z\} \vdash \text{UnionP } (\text{Eats } x \ a) \ y \ (\text{Eats } z \ a)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *exists_Union_lemma*:
assumes $z: \text{atom } z \notin (i,y)$ **and** $i: \text{atom } i \notin y$
shows $\{\} \vdash \text{Ex } z \ (\text{UnionP } (\text{Var } i) \ y \ (\text{Var } z))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *exists_UnionP*:
assumes $z: \text{atom } z \notin (x,y)$ **shows** $H \vdash \text{Ex } z \ (\text{UnionP } x \ y \ (\text{Var } z))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *UnionP_Mem1*: $\{\text{UnionP } x \ y \ z, \ a \text{ IN } x\} \vdash a \text{ IN } z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *UnionP_Mem2*: $\{\text{UnionP } x \ y \ z, \ a \text{ IN } y\} \vdash a \text{ IN } z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *UnionP_Mem*: $\{\text{UnionP } x \ y \ z, \ a \text{ IN } z\} \vdash a \text{ IN } x \text{ OR } a \text{ IN } y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *UnionP_Mem_E*:
assumes $H \vdash \text{UnionP } x \ y \ z$
and $\text{insert } (a \text{ IN } x) \ H \vdash A$
and $\text{insert } (a \text{ IN } y) \ H \vdash A$
shows $\text{insert } (a \text{ IN } z) \ H \vdash A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

7.7 Append on Sequences

nominal_function *SeqAppendP* :: $tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$
where $[\![\text{atom } g1 \notin (g2,f1,k1,f2,k2,g); \text{atom } g2 \notin (f1,k1,f2,k2,g)]\!] \implies$
 $\text{SeqAppendP } f1 \ k1 \ f2 \ k2 \ g =$
 $(\text{Ex } g1 \ (\text{Ex } g2 \ (\text{RestrictedP } f1 \ k1 \ (\text{Var } g1) \text{ AND}$
 $\text{ShiftP } f2 \ k2 \ k1 \ (\text{Var } g2) \text{ AND}$
 $\text{UnionP } (\text{Var } g1) \ (\text{Var } g2) \ g)))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination (*eqvt*)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqAppendP_fresh_iff* [*simp*]:
 $a \notin \text{SeqAppendP } f1 \ k1 \ f2 \ k2 \ g \iff a \notin f1 \wedge a \notin k1 \wedge a \notin f2 \wedge a \notin k2 \wedge a \notin g$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *subst_fm_SeqAppendP* [*simp*]:
 $(\text{SeqAppendP } f1 \ k1 \ f2 \ k2 \ g)(i:=u) =$
 $\text{SeqAppendP } (\text{subst } i \ u \ f1) \ (\text{subst } i \ u \ k1) \ (\text{subst } i \ u \ f2) \ (\text{subst } i \ u \ k2) \ (\text{subst } i \ u \ g)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *exists_SeqAppendP*:
assumes $\text{atom } g \notin (f1,k1,f2,k2)$
shows $H \vdash \text{Ex } g \ (\text{SeqAppendP } f1 \ k1 \ f2 \ k2 \ (\text{Var } g))$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqAppendP_Mem1*: {*SeqAppendP f1 k1 f2 k2 g*, *HPair x y IN f1*, *x IN k1*} \vdash *HPair x y IN g*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqAppendP_Mem2*: {*SeqAppendP f1 k1 f2 k2 g*, *HaddP k1 x x'*, *x IN k2*, *HPair x y IN f2*} \vdash
HPair x' y IN g
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqAppendP_Mem_E*:
assumes $H \vdash SeqAppendP f1 k1 f2 k2 g$
and *insert* (*HPair x y IN f1*) (*insert* (*x IN k1*) H) $\vdash A$
and *insert* (*HPair (Var u) y IN f2*) (*insert* (*HaddP k1 (Var u) x*) (*insert* (*Var u IN k2*) H)) $\vdash A$
and *u: atom u* \notin (*f1,k1,f2,k2,x,y,g,A*) $\forall C \in H.$ *atom u* $\notin C$
shows *insert* (*HPair x y IN g*) $H \vdash A$ $\langle proof \rangle$

7.8 LstSeqP and SeqAppendP

lemma *HDomain_Incl_SeqAppendP*: — The And eliminates the need to prove *cut5*
{*SeqAppendP f1 k1 f2 k2 g*, *HDomain_Incl f1 k1 AND HDomain_Incl f2 k2*,
HaddP k1 k2 k, *OrdP k1*} \vdash *HDomain_Incl g k* $\langle proof \rangle$
declare *SeqAppendP.simps* [*simp del*]

lemma *HFun_Sigma_SeqAppendP*:
{*SeqAppendP f1 k1 f2 k2 g*, *HFun_Sigma f1*, *HFun_Sigma f2*, *OrdP k1*} \vdash *HFun_Sigma g* $\langle proof \rangle$
lemma *LstSeqP_SeqAppendP*:
assumes $H \vdash SeqAppendP f1 (SUCC k1) f2 (SUCC k2) g$
 $H \vdash LstSeqP f1 k1 y1 H \vdash LstSeqP f2 k2 y2 H \vdash HaddP k1 k2 k$
shows $H \vdash LstSeqP g (SUCC k) y2$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqAppendP_NotInDom*: {*SeqAppendP f1 k1 f2 k2 g*, *HaddP k1 k2 k*, *OrdP k1*} \vdash *NotInDom k g*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LstSeqP_SeqAppendP_Eats*:
assumes $H \vdash SeqAppendP f1 (SUCC k1) f2 (SUCC k2) g$
 $H \vdash LstSeqP f1 k1 y1 H \vdash LstSeqP f2 k2 y2 H \vdash HaddP k1 k2 k$
shows $H \vdash LstSeqP (Eats g (HPair (SUCC (SUCC k)) z)) (SUCC (SUCC k)) z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

7.9 Substitution and Abstraction on Terms

7.9.1 Atomic cases

lemma *SeqStTermP_Var_same*:
assumes *atom s* \notin (*k,v,i*) *atom k* \notin (*v,i*)
shows {*VarP v*} \vdash *Ex s (Ex k (SeqStTermP v i v i (Var s) (Var k)))*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqStTermP_Var_diff*:
assumes *atom s* \notin (*k,v,w,i*) *atom k* \notin (*v,w,i*)
shows {*VarP v*, *VarP w*, *Neg (v EQ w)*} \vdash *Ex s (Ex k (SeqStTermP v i w w (Var s) (Var k)))*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqStTermP_Zero*:
assumes *atom s* \notin (*k,v,i*) *atom k* \notin (*v,i*)
shows {*VarP v*} \vdash *Ex s (Ex k (SeqStTermP v i Zero Zero (Var s) (Var k)))* $\langle proof \rangle$

corollary *SubstTermP_Zero*: {TermP t} ⊢ SubstTermP «Var v» t Zero Zero
(proof)

corollary *SubstTermP_Var_same*: {VarP v, TermP t} ⊢ SubstTermP v t v t
(proof)

corollary *SubstTermP_Var_diff*: {VarP v, VarP w, Neg (v EQ w), TermP t} ⊢ SubstTermP v t w w
(proof)

lemma *SeqStTermP_Ind*:

assumes atom s # (k,v,t,i) atom k # (v,t,i)
shows {VarP v, IndP t} ⊢ Ex s (Ex k (SeqStTermP v i t t (Var s) (Var k)))
(proof)

corollary *SubstTermP_Ind*: {VarP v, IndP w, TermP t} ⊢ SubstTermP v t w w
(proof)

7.9.2 Non-atomic cases

lemma *SeqStTermP_Eats*:

assumes sk: atom s # (k,s1,s2,k1,k2,t1,t2,u1,u2,v,i)
atom k # (t1,t2,u1,u2,v,i)
shows {SeqStTermP v i t1 u1 s1 k1, SeqStTermP v i t2 u2 s2 k2}
 ⊢ Ex s (Ex k (SeqStTermP v i (Q_Eats t1 t2) (Q_Eats u1 u2) (Var s) (Var k))) *(proof)*

theorem *SubstTermP_Eats*:

{SubstTermP v i t1 u1, SubstTermP v i t2 u2} ⊢ SubstTermP v i (Q_Eats t1 t2) (Q_Eats u1 u2)
(proof)

7.9.3 Substitution over a constant

lemma *SeqConstP_lemma*:

assumes atom m # (s,k,c,n,sm,sn) atom n # (s,k,c,sm,sn)
atom sm # (s,k,c,sn) atom sn # (s,k,c)
shows {SeqConstP s k c}
 ⊢ c EQ Zero OR
 Ex m (Ex n (Ex sm (Ex sn (Var m IN k AND Var n IN k AND
 SeqConstP s (Var m) (Var sm) AND
 SeqConstP s (Var n) (Var sn) AND
 c EQ Q_Eats (Var sm) (Var sn)))))) *(proof)*

lemma *SeqConstP_imp_SubstTermP*: {SeqConstP s kk c, TermP t} ⊢ SubstTermP «Var w» t c c *(proof)*

theorem *SubstTermP_Const*: {ConstP c, TermP t} ⊢ SubstTermP «Var w» t c c
(proof)

7.10 Substitution on Formulas

7.10.1 Membership

lemma *SubstAtomicP_Mem*:

{SubstTermP v i x x', SubstTermP v i y y'} ⊢ SubstAtomicP v i (Q_Mem x y) (Q_Mem x' y')
(proof)

lemma *SeqSubstFormP_Mem*:

assumes atom s # (k,x,y,x',y',v,i) atom k # (x,y,x',y',v,i)
shows {SubstTermP v i x x', SubstTermP v i y y'}
 ⊢ Ex s (Ex k (SeqSubstFormP v i (Q_Mem x y) (Q_Mem x' y') (Var s) (Var k)))
(proof)

lemma *SubstFormP_Mem*:

$\{\text{SubstTermP } v \ i \ x \ x', \text{SubstTermP } v \ i \ y \ y'\} \vdash \text{SubstFormP } v \ i \ (\text{Q_Mem } x \ y) \ (\text{Q_Mem } x' \ y')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

7.10.2 Equality

lemma *SubstAtomicP_Eq*:

$\{\text{SubstTermP } v \ i \ x \ x', \text{SubstTermP } v \ i \ y \ y'\} \vdash \text{SubstAtomicP } v \ i \ (\text{Q_Eq } x \ y) \ (\text{Q_Eq } x' \ y')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *SeqSubstFormP_Eq*:

assumes $\text{atom } s \ \# \ (k, x, y, x', y', v, i)$ $\text{atom } k \ \# \ (x, y, x', y', v, i)$
shows $\{\text{SubstTermP } v \ i \ x \ x', \text{SubstTermP } v \ i \ y \ y'\}$
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s \ (\text{Ex } k \ (\text{SeqSubstFormP } v \ i \ (\text{Q_Eq } x \ y) \ (\text{Q_Eq } x' \ y') \ (\text{Var } s) \ (\text{Var } k)))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *SubstFormP_Eq*:

$\{\text{SubstTermP } v \ i \ x \ x', \text{SubstTermP } v \ i \ y \ y'\} \vdash \text{SubstFormP } v \ i \ (\text{Q_Eq } x \ y) \ (\text{Q_Eq } x' \ y')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

7.10.3 Negation

lemma *SeqSubstFormP_Neg*:

assumes $\text{atom } s \ \# \ (k, s1, k1, x, x', v, i)$ $\text{atom } k \ \# \ (s1, k1, x, x', v, i)$
shows $\{\text{SeqSubstFormP } v \ i \ x \ x' \ s1 \ k1, \text{TermP } i, \text{VarP } v\}$
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s \ (\text{Ex } k \ (\text{SeqSubstFormP } v \ i \ (\text{Q_Neg } x) \ (\text{Q_Neg } x') \ (\text{Var } s) \ (\text{Var } k)))$ $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
theorem *SubstFormP_Neg*: $\{\text{SubstFormP } v \ i \ x \ x'\} \vdash \text{SubstFormP } v \ i \ (\text{Q_Neg } x) \ (\text{Q_Neg } x')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

7.10.4 Disjunction

lemma *SeqSubstFormP_Disj*:

assumes $\text{atom } s \ \# \ (k, s1, s2, k1, k2, x, y, x', y', v, i)$ $\text{atom } k \ \# \ (s1, s2, k1, k2, x, y, x', y', v, i)$
shows $\{\text{SeqSubstFormP } v \ i \ x \ x' \ s1 \ k1,$
 $\text{SeqSubstFormP } v \ i \ y \ y' \ s2 \ k2, \text{TermP } i, \text{VarP } v\}$
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s \ (\text{Ex } k \ (\text{SeqSubstFormP } v \ i \ (\text{Q_Disj } x \ y) \ (\text{Q_Disj } x' \ y') \ (\text{Var } s) \ (\text{Var } k)))$ $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
theorem *SubstFormP_Disj*:
 $\{\text{SubstFormP } v \ i \ x \ x', \text{SubstFormP } v \ i \ y \ y'\} \vdash \text{SubstFormP } v \ i \ (\text{Q_Disj } x \ y) \ (\text{Q_Disj } x' \ y')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

7.10.5 Existential

lemma *SeqSubstFormP_Ex*:

assumes $\text{atom } s \ \# \ (k, s1, k1, x, x', v, i)$ $\text{atom } k \ \# \ (s1, k1, x, x', v, i)$
shows $\{\text{SeqSubstFormP } v \ i \ x \ x' \ s1 \ k1, \text{TermP } i, \text{VarP } v\}$
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s \ (\text{Ex } k \ (\text{SeqSubstFormP } v \ i \ (\text{Q_Ex } x) \ (\text{Q_Ex } x') \ (\text{Var } s) \ (\text{Var } k)))$ $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
theorem *SubstFormP_Ex*: $\{\text{SubstFormP } v \ i \ x \ x'\} \vdash \text{SubstFormP } v \ i \ (\text{Q_Ex } x) \ (\text{Q_Ex } x')$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

7.11 Constant Terms

lemma *ConstP_Zero*: $\{\} \vdash \text{ConstP Zero}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *SeqConstP_Eats*:

assumes $\text{atom } s \ \# \ (k, s1, s2, k1, k2, t1, t2)$ $\text{atom } k \ \# \ (s1, s2, k1, k2, t1, t2)$
shows $\{\text{SeqConstP } s1 \ k1 \ t1, \text{SeqConstP } s2 \ k2 \ t2\}$
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s \ (\text{Ex } k \ (\text{SeqConstP } (\text{Var } s) \ (\text{Var } k) \ (\text{Q_Eats } t1 \ t2)))$ $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
theorem *ConstP_Eats*: $\{\text{ConstP } t1, \text{ConstP } t2\} \vdash \text{ConstP } (\text{Q_Eats } t1 \ t2)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *TermP_Zero*: $\{\} \vdash \text{TermP Zero}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *TermP_Var*: $\{\} \vdash \text{TermP} \llbracket \text{Var } x \rrbracket$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqTermP_Eats*:
assumes $\text{atom } s \notin (k, s1, s2, k1, k2, t1, t2)$ $\text{atom } k \notin (s1, s2, k1, k2, t1, t2)$
shows $\{\text{SeqTermP } s1 \ k1 \ t1, \text{SeqTermP } s2 \ k2 \ t2\}$
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s (\text{Ex } k (\text{SeqTermP} (\text{Var } s) (\text{Var } k) (\text{Q_Eats } t1 \ t2))) \langle proof \rangle$
theorem *TermP_Eats*: $\{\text{TermP } t1, \text{TermP } t2\} \vdash \text{TermP} (\text{Q_Eats } t1 \ t2)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

7.12 Proofs

lemma *PrfP_inference*:
assumes $\text{atom } s \notin (k, s1, s2, k1, k2, \alpha1, \alpha2, \beta)$ $\text{atom } k \notin (s1, s2, k1, k2, \alpha1, \alpha2, \beta)$
shows $\{\text{PrfP } s1 \ k1 \ \alpha1, \text{PrfP } s2 \ k2 \ \alpha2, \text{ModPonP } \alpha1 \ \alpha2 \ \beta \text{ OR } \text{ExistsP } \alpha1 \ \beta \text{ OR } \text{SubstP } \alpha1 \ \beta\}$
 $\vdash \text{Ex } k (\text{Ex } s (\text{PrfP} (\text{Var } s) (\text{Var } k) \beta)) \langle proof \rangle$
corollary *Pfp_inference*: $\{\text{Pfp } \alpha1, \text{Pfp } \alpha2, \text{ModPonP } \alpha1 \ \alpha2 \ \beta \text{ OR } \text{ExistsP } \alpha1 \ \beta \text{ OR } \text{SubstP } \alpha1 \ \beta\}$
 $\vdash \text{Pfp } \beta$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Pfp_implies_SubstForm_Pfp*:
assumes $H \vdash \text{Pfp } y$ $H \vdash \text{SubstFormP } x \ t \ y \ z$
shows $H \vdash \text{Pfp } z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Pfp_implies_ModPon_Pfp*: $\llbracket H \vdash \text{Pfp} (\text{Q_Imp } x \ y); H \vdash \text{Pfp } x \rrbracket \implies H \vdash \text{Pfp } y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

corollary *Pfp_implies_ModPon_Pfp_quot*: $\llbracket H \vdash \text{Pfp} \llbracket \alpha \text{ IMP } \beta \rrbracket; H \vdash \text{Pfp} \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \rrbracket \implies H \vdash \text{Pfp} \llbracket \beta \rrbracket$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *TermP_quot*:
fixes $\alpha :: tm$
shows $\{\} \vdash \text{TermP} \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *TermP_quot_dbm*:
fixes $\alpha :: tm$
assumes $wf_dbm u$
shows $\{\} \vdash \text{TermP} (\text{quot_dbm } u)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

7.13 Formulas

7.14 Abstraction on Formulas

7.14.1 Membership

lemma *AbstAtomicP_Mem*:
 $\{\text{AbstTermP } v \ i \ x \ x', \text{AbstTermP } v \ i \ y \ y'\} \vdash \text{AbstAtomicP } v \ i (\text{Q_Mem } x \ y) (\text{Q_Mem } x' \ y')$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *SeqAbstFormP_Mem*:
assumes atom $s \# (k, x, y, x', y', v, i)$ atom $k \# (x, y, x', y', v, i)$
shows {*AbstTermP v i x x'*, *AbstTermP v i y y'*}
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s (\text{Ex } k (\text{SeqAbstFormP v i} (Q_{\text{Mem}} x y) (Q_{\text{Mem}} x' y') (\text{Var } s) (\text{Var } k)))$
(proof)

lemma *AbstFormP_Mem*:
{*AbstTermP v i x x'*, *AbstTermP v i y y'*} $\vdash \text{AbstFormP v i} (Q_{\text{Mem}} x y) (Q_{\text{Mem}} x' y')$
(proof)

7.14.2 Equality

lemma *AbstAtomicP_Eq*:
{*AbstTermP v i x x'*, *AbstTermP v i y y'*} $\vdash \text{AbstAtomicP v i} (Q_{\text{Eq}} x y) (Q_{\text{Eq}} x' y')$
(proof)

lemma *SeqAbstFormP_Eq*:
assumes sk: atom $s \# (k, x, y, x', y', v, i)$ atom $k \# (x, y, x', y', v, i)$
shows {*AbstTermP v i x x'*, *AbstTermP v i y y'*}
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s (\text{Ex } k (\text{SeqAbstFormP v i} (Q_{\text{Eq}} x y) (Q_{\text{Eq}} x' y') (\text{Var } s) (\text{Var } k)))$
(proof)

lemma *AbstFormP_Eq*:
{*AbstTermP v i x x'*, *AbstTermP v i y y'*} $\vdash \text{AbstFormP v i} (Q_{\text{Eq}} x y) (Q_{\text{Eq}} x' y')$
(proof)

7.14.3 Negation

lemma *SeqAbstFormP_Neg*:
assumes atom $s \# (k, s1, k1, x, x', v, i)$ atom $k \# (s1, k1, x, x', v, i)$
shows {*SeqAbstFormP v i x x' s1 k1*, *OrdP i*, *VarP v*}
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s (\text{Ex } k (\text{SeqAbstFormP v i} (Q_{\text{Neg}} x) (Q_{\text{Neg}} x') (\text{Var } s) (\text{Var } k)))$ *(proof)*
theorem *AbstFormP_Neg*: {*AbstFormP v i x x'*} $\vdash \text{AbstFormP v i} (Q_{\text{Neg}} x) (Q_{\text{Neg}} x')$
(proof)

7.14.4 Disjunction

lemma *SeqAbstFormP_Disj*:
assumes atom $s \# (k, s1, s2, k1, k2, x, y, x', y', v, i)$ atom $k \# (s1, s2, k1, k2, x, y, x', y', v, i)$
shows {*SeqAbstFormP v i x x' s1 k1*,
SeqAbstFormP v i y y' s2 k2, *OrdP i*, *VarP v*}
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s (\text{Ex } k (\text{SeqAbstFormP v i} (Q_{\text{Disj}} x y) (Q_{\text{Disj}} x' y') (\text{Var } s) (\text{Var } k)))$ *(proof)*
theorem *AbstFormP_Disj*: {*AbstFormP v i x x'*, *AbstFormP v i y y'*} $\vdash \text{AbstFormP v i} (Q_{\text{Disj}} x y) (Q_{\text{Disj}} x' y')$
(proof)

7.14.5 Existential

lemma *SeqAbstFormP_Ex*:
assumes atom $s \# (k, s1, k1, x, x', v, i)$ atom $k \# (s1, k1, x, x', v, i)$
shows {*SeqAbstFormP v (SUCC i) x x' s1 k1*, *OrdP i*, *VarP v*}
 $\vdash \text{Ex } s (\text{Ex } k (\text{SeqAbstFormP v i} (Q_{\text{Ex}} x) (Q_{\text{Ex}} x') (\text{Var } s) (\text{Var } k)))$ *(proof)*
theorem *AbstFormP_Ex*: {*AbstFormP v (SUCC i) x x'*} $\vdash \text{AbstFormP v i} (Q_{\text{Ex}} x) (Q_{\text{Ex}} x')$
(proof)

corollary *AbstTermP_Zero*: {*OrdP t*} $\vdash \text{AbstTermP} \llbracket \text{Var } v \rrbracket t \text{ Zero Zero}$
(proof)

corollary *AbstTermP_Var_same*: $\{VarP v, OrdP t\} \vdash AbstTermP v t v (Q_Ind t)$
(proof)

corollary *AbstTermP_Var_diff*: $\{VarP v, VarP w, Neg (v EQ w), OrdP t\} \vdash AbstTermP v t w w$
(proof)

theorem *AbstTermP_Eats*:
 $\{AbstTermP v i t1 u1, AbstTermP v i t2 u2\} \vdash AbstTermP v i (Q_Eats t1 t2) (Q_Eats u1 u2)$
(proof)

corollary *AbstTermP_Ind*: $\{VarP v, IndP w, OrdP t\} \vdash AbstTermP v t w w$
(proof)

lemma *ORD_OF_EQ_diff*: $x \neq y \implies \{ORD_OF x EQ ORD_OF y\} \vdash Fls$
(proof)

lemma *quot_Var_EQ_diff*: $i \neq x \implies \{\langle Var i \rangle EQ \langle Var x \rangle\} \vdash Fls$
(proof)

lemma *AbstTermP_dbm*: $\{\} \vdash AbstTermP \langle Var i \rangle (ORD_OF n) (quot_dbm u) (quot_dbm (abst_dbm i n u))$
(proof)

lemma *AbstFormP_dbfm*: $\{\} \vdash AbstFormP \langle Var i \rangle (ORD_OF n) (quot_dbfm db) (quot_dbfm (abst_dbfm i n db))$
(proof)

lemmas *AbstFormP = AbstFormP_dbfm* [where $db=trans_fm \sqcap A$ and $n = 0$ for A ,
simplified, folded quot_fm_def, unfolded abst_trans_fm]

lemma *SubstTermP_trivial_dbm*:
 $atom i \notin u \implies \{\} \vdash SubstTermP \langle Var i \rangle Zero (quot_dbm u) (quot_dbm u)$
(proof)

lemma *SubstTermP_dbm*: $wf_dbm t \implies \{\} \vdash SubstTermP \langle Var i \rangle (quot_dbm t) (quot_dbm u) (quot_dbm (subst_dbm t i u))$
(proof)

lemma *SubstFormP_trivial_dbfm*:
 $fixes X :: fm$
 $assumes atom i \notin db$
 $shows \{\} \vdash SubstFormP \langle Var i \rangle Zero (quot_dbfm db) (quot_dbfm db)$
(proof)

lemma *SubstFormP_dbfm*:
 $assumes wf_dbm t$
 $shows \{\} \vdash SubstFormP \langle Var i \rangle (quot_dbm t) (quot_dbfm db) (quot_dbfm (subst_dbfm t i db))$
(proof)

lemmas *SubstFormP_trivial = SubstFormP_trivial_dbfm* [where $db=trans_fm \sqcap A$ for A ,
simplified, folded quot_tm_def quot_fm_def quot_subst_eq]
lemmas *SubstFormP = SubstFormP_dbfm* [$OF wf_dbm_trans_tm$, where $db=trans_fm \sqcap A$ for A ,
simplified, folded quot_tm_def quot_fm_def quot_subst_eq]
lemmas *SubstFormP_Zero = SubstFormP_dbfm* [$OF wf_dbm.Zero$, where $db=trans_fm \sqcap A$ for A ,
simplified, folded trans_tm.simps[of []], folded quot_tm_def quot_fm_def quot_subst_eq]

```

lemma AtomicP_Mem:
  {TermP x, TermP y} ⊢ AtomicP (Q_Mem x y)
⟨proof⟩

lemma AtomicP_Eq:
  {TermP x, TermP y} ⊢ AtomicP (Q_Eq x y)
⟨proof⟩

lemma SeqFormP_Mem:
  assumes atom s # (k,x,y) atom k # (x,y)
  shows {TermP x, TermP y} ⊢ Ex k (Ex s (SeqFormP (Var s) (Var k) (Q_Mem x y)))
⟨proof⟩

lemma SeqFormP_Eq:
  assumes atom s # (k,x,y) atom k # (x,y)
  shows {TermP x, TermP y} ⊢ Ex k (Ex s (SeqFormP (Var s) (Var k) (Q_Eq x y)))
⟨proof⟩

lemma FormP_Mem:
  {TermP x, TermP y} ⊢ FormP (Q_Mem x y)
⟨proof⟩

lemma FormP_Eq:
  {TermP x, TermP y} ⊢ FormP (Q_Eq x y)
⟨proof⟩

```

7.14.6 MakeForm

```

lemma MakeFormP_Neg: {} ⊢ MakeFormP (Q_Neg x) x y
⟨proof⟩

lemma MakeFormP_Disj: {} ⊢ MakeFormP (Q_Disj x y) x y
⟨proof⟩

lemma MakeFormP_Ex: {AbstFormP v Zero t x} ⊢ MakeFormP (Q_Ex x) t y
⟨proof⟩

```

7.14.7 Negation

```

lemma SeqFormP_Neg:
  assumes atom s # (k,s1,k1,x) atom k # (s1,k1,x)
  shows {SeqFormP s1 k1 x} ⊢ Ex k (Ex s (SeqFormP (Var s) (Var k) (Q_Neg x))) ⟨proof⟩
theorem FormP_Neg: {FormP x} ⊢ FormP (Q_Neg x)
⟨proof⟩

```

7.14.8 Disjunction

```

lemma SeqFormP_Disj:
  assumes atom s # (k,s1,s2,k1,k2,x,y) atom k # (s1,s2,k1,k2,x,y)
  shows {SeqFormP s1 k1 x, SeqFormP s2 k2 y}
    ⊢ Ex k (Ex s (SeqFormP (Var s) (Var k) (Q_Disj x y))) ⟨proof⟩
theorem FormP_Disj:
  {FormP x, FormP y} ⊢ FormP (Q_Disj x y)
⟨proof⟩

```

7.14.9 Existential

```

lemma SeqFormP_Ex:
  assumes atom s # (k,s1,k1,x,y,v) atom k # (s1,k1,x,y,v)

```

```

shows {SeqFormP s1 k1 x, AbstFormP v Zero x y, VarP v} ⊢ Ex k (Ex s (SeqFormP (Var s) (Var k)
(Q_Ex y)))
⟨proof⟩

theorem FormP_Ex: {FormP t, AbstFormP «Var i» Zero t x} ⊢ FormP (Q_Ex x)
⟨proof⟩

lemma FormP_quot_dbfm:
  fixes A :: dbfm
  shows wf_dbfm A ==> {} ⊢ FormP (quot_dbfm A)
⟨proof⟩

lemma FormP_quot:
  fixes A :: fm
  shows {} ⊢ FormP «A»
⟨proof⟩

lemma PfP_I:
  assumes {} ⊢ PrfP S K A
  shows {} ⊢ PfP A
⟨proof⟩

lemmas PfP_Single_I = PfP_I[of Eats Zero (HPair Zero «A») Zero for A]

lemma PfP_extra: {} ⊢ PfP «extra_axiom»
⟨proof⟩

lemma SentP_I:
  assumes A ∈ boolean_axioms
  shows {} ⊢ SentP «A»
⟨proof⟩

lemma SentP_subst [simp]: (SentP A)(j::=w) = SentP (subst j w A)
⟨proof⟩

theorem proved_imp_proved_PfP:
  assumes {} ⊢ α
  shows {} ⊢ PfP «α»
⟨proof⟩

end

```

Chapter 8

Pseudo-Coding: Section 7 Material

```
theory Pseudo_Coding
imports II_Prelims
begin

lemma Collect_disj_Un: {f i |i. P i ∨ Q i} = {f i |i. P i} ∪ {f i |i. Q i}
  ⟨proof⟩

abbreviation Q_Subset :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm
  where Q_Subset t u ≡ (Q_All (Q_Imp (Q_Mem (Q_Ind Zero) t) (Q_Mem (Q_Ind Zero) u)))

lemma NEQ_quot_tm: i ≠ j ⟹ { } ⊢ «Var i» NEQ «Var j»
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma EQ_quot_tm_Fls: i ≠ j ⟹ insert («Var i» EQ «Var j») H ⊢ Fls
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma perm_commute: a # p ⟹ a' # p ⟹ (a = a') + p = p + (a = a')
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma perm_self_inverseI: [¬p = q; a # p; a' # p] ⟹ ¬((a = a') + p) = (a = a') + q
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma fresh_image:
  fixes f :: 'a ⇒ 'b::fs shows finite A ⟹ i # f ` A ⟷ (∀x∈A. i # f x)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma atom_in_atom_image [simp]: atom j ∈ atom ` V ⟷ j ∈ V
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma fresh_star_empty [simp]: { } #* bs
  ⟨proof⟩

declare fresh_star_insert [simp]

lemma fresh_star_finite_insert:
  fixes S :: ('a::fs) set shows finite S ⟹ a #* insert x S ⟷ a #* x ∧ a #* S
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```

lemma fresh_finite_Diff_single [simp]:
  fixes V :: name set  shows finite V ==> a # (V - {j}) <=> (a # j --> a # V)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma fresh_image_atom [simp]: finite A ==> i # atom ` A <=> i # A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma atom_fresh_star_atom_set_conv: [atom i # bs; finite bs] ==> bs #* i
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma notin_V:
  assumes p: atom i # p and V: finite V atom ` (p ∙ V) #* V
  shows i ∉ V i ∉ p ∙ V
  ⟨proof⟩

```

8.2 Simultaneous Substitution

```

definition ssubst :: tm ⇒ name set ⇒ (name ⇒ tm) ⇒ tm
  where ssubst t V F = Finite_Set.fold (λi. subst i (F i)) t V

```

```

definition make_F :: name set ⇒ perm ⇒ name ⇒ tm
  where make_F Vs p ≡ λi. if i ∈ Vs then Var (p ∙ i) else Var i

```

```

lemma ssubst_empty [simp]: ssubst t {} F = t
  ⟨proof⟩

```

Renaming a finite set of variables. Based on the theorem *at_set_avoiding*

```

locale quote_perm =
  fixes p :: perm and Vs :: name set and F :: name ⇒ tm
  assumes p: atom ` (p ∙ Vs) #* Vs
    and pinv: -p = p
    and Vs: finite Vs
  defines F ≡ make_F Vs p
begin

```

```

lemma F_unfold: F i = (if i ∈ Vs then Var (p ∙ i) else Var i)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma finite_V [simp]: V ⊆ Vs ==> finite V
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma perm_exits_Vs: i ∈ Vs ==> (p ∙ i) ∉ Vs
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma atom_fresh_perm: [x ∈ Vs; y ∈ Vs] ==> atom x # p ∙ y
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma fresh_pj: [a # p; j ∈ Vs] ==> a # p ∙ j
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma fresh_Vs: a # p ==> a # Vs
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma fresh_pVs: a # p ==> a # p ∙ Vs
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma assumes V ⊆ Vs a # p

```

```

shows fresh_p V [simp]:  $a \notin p \cdot V$  and fresh_V [simp]:  $a \notin V$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma qp_insert:
  fixes  $i::name$  and  $i'::name$ 
  assumes atom  $i \notin p$  atom  $i' \notin (i,p)$ 
  shows quote_perm ((atom  $i \rightleftharpoons$  atom  $i'$ ) +  $p$ ) (insert  $i$  Vs)
⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_F_left_commute: subst  $x$  (F  $x$ ) (subst  $y$  (F  $y$ )  $t$ ) = subst  $y$  (F  $y$ ) (subst  $x$  (F  $x$ )  $t$ )
⟨proof⟩

lemma
  assumes finite  $V$   $i \notin V$ 
  shows ssubst_insert: ssubst  $t$  (insert  $i$  V) F = subst  $i$  (F  $i$ ) (ssubst  $t$  V F) (is ?thesis1)
    and ssubst_insert2: ssubst  $t$  (insert  $i$  V) F = ssubst (subst  $i$  (F  $i$ )  $t$ ) V F (is ?thesis2)
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_insert_if:
  finite  $V \implies$ 
    ssubst  $t$  (insert  $i$  V) F = (if  $i \in V$  then ssubst  $t$  V F
                                else subst  $i$  (F  $i$ ) (ssubst  $t$  V F))
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_single [simp]: ssubst  $t \{i\}$  F = subst  $i$  (F  $i$ )  $t$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_Var_if [simp]:
  assumes finite  $V$ 
  shows ssubst (Var  $i$ ) V F = (if  $i \in V$  then F  $i$  else Var  $i$ )
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_Zero [simp]: finite  $V \implies$  ssubst Zero V F = Zero
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_Eats [simp]: finite  $V \implies$  ssubst (Eats  $t u$ ) V F = Eats (ssubst  $t$  V F) (ssubst  $u$  V F)
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_SUCC [simp]: finite  $V \implies$  ssubst (SUCC  $t$ ) V F = SUCC (ssubst  $t$  V F)
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_ORD_OF [simp]: finite  $V \implies$  ssubst (ORD_OF  $n$ ) V F = ORD_OF  $n$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_HPair [simp]:
  finite  $V \implies$  ssubst (HPair  $t u$ ) V F = HPair (ssubst  $t$  V F) (ssubst  $u$  V F)
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_HTuple [simp]: finite  $V \implies$  ssubst (HTuple  $n$ ) V F = (HTuple  $n$ )
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_Subset:
  assumes finite  $V$  shows ssubst [ $t$  SUBS  $u$ ] V F = Q_Subset (ssubst [ $t$ ] V V F) (ssubst [ $u$ ] V V F)
⟨proof⟩

lemma fresh_ssubst:
  assumes finite  $V$   $a \notin p \cdot V$   $a \notin t$ 
  shows  $a \notin$  ssubst  $t$  V F

```

```

⟨proof⟩

lemma fresh_ssubst':
  assumes finite V atom i # t atom (p · i) # t
  shows atom i # ssubst t V F
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_vquot_Ex:
  [|finite V; atom i # p · V|]
  ==> ssubst [Ex i A](insert i V) (insert i V) F = ssubst [Ex i A]V V F
⟨proof⟩

lemma ground_ssubst_eq: [|finite V; supp t = {}|] ==> ssubst t V F = t
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_quot_tm [simp]:
  fixes t::tm shows finite V ==> ssubst «t» V F = «t»
⟨proof⟩

lemma ssubst_quot_fm [simp]:
  fixes A::fm shows finite V ==> ssubst «A» V F = «A»
⟨proof⟩

lemma atom_in_p_Vs: [|i ∈ p · V; V ⊆ Vs|] ==> i ∈ p · Vs
⟨proof⟩

```

8.3 The Main Theorems of Section 7

```

lemma SubstTermP_vquot_dbtm:
  assumes w: w ∈ Vs – V and V: V ⊆ Vs V' = p · V
    and s: supp dbtm ⊆ atom ` Vs
  shows
    insert (ConstP (F w)) {ConstP (F i) | i. i ∈ V}
    ⊢ SubstTermP «Var w» (F w)
      (ssubst (vquot_dbtm V dbtm) V F)
      (subst w (F w) (ssubst (vquot_dbtm (insert w V) dbtm) V F))
⟨proof⟩

lemma SubstFormP_vquot_dbfm:
  assumes w: w ∈ Vs – V and V: V ⊆ Vs V' = p · V
    and s: supp dbfm ⊆ atom ` Vs
  shows
    insert (ConstP (F w)) {ConstP (F i) | i. i ∈ V}
    ⊢ SubstFormP «Var w» (F w)
      (ssubst (vquot_dbfm V dbfm) V F)
      (subst w (F w) (ssubst (vquot_dbfm (insert w V) dbfm) V F))
⟨proof⟩

```

Lemmas 7.5 and 7.6

```

lemma ssubst_SubstFormP:
  fixes A::fm
  assumes w: w ∈ Vs – V and V: V ⊆ Vs V' = p · V
    and s: supp A ⊆ atom ` Vs
  shows
    insert (ConstP (F w)) {ConstP (F i) | i. i ∈ V}
    ⊢ SubstFormP «Var w» (F w)
      (ssubst [A] V V F)
      (ssubst [A](insert w V) (insert w V) F)

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

Theorem 7.3

```
theorem PfP_implies_PfP_ssubst:
  fixes β::fm
  assumes β: {} ⊢ PfP «β»
    and V: V ⊆ Vs
    and s: supp β ⊆ atom ` Vs
  shows {ConstP (F i) | i. i ∈ V} ⊢ PfP (ssubst [β] V V F)
```

$\langle proof \rangle$

end

end

Chapter 9

Quotations of the Free Variables

```
theory Quote
imports Pseudo_Coding
begin
```

9.1 Sequence version of the “Special p-Function, F*”

The definition below describes a relation, not a function. This material relates to Section 8, but omits the ordering of the universe.

9.1.1 Defining the syntax: quantified body

```
nominal_function SeqQuoteP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
  where !!atom l #: (s,k,sl,sl',m,n,sm,sm',sn,sn');
        atom sl #: (s,sl',m,n,sm,sm',sn,sn'); atom sl' #: (s,m,n,sm,sm',sn,sn');
        atom m #: (s,n,sm,sm',sn,sn'); atom n #: (s,sm,sm',sn,sn');
        atom sm #: (s,sm',sn,sn'); atom sm' #: (s,sn,sn');
        atom sn #: (s,sn'); atom sn' #: s] ==>
SeqQuoteP t u s k =
  LstSeqP s k (HPair t u) AND
  All2 l (SUCC k) (Ex sl (Ex sl' (HPair (Var l) (HPair (Var sl) (Var sl')) IN s AND
    ((Var sl EQ Zero AND Var sl' EQ Zero) OR
    Ex m (Ex n (Ex sm (Ex sm' (Ex sn (Ex sn' (Var m IN Var l AND Var n IN Var l AND
      HPair (Var m) (HPair (Var sm) (Var sm')) IN s AND
      HPair (Var n) (HPair (Var sn) (Var sn')) IN s AND
      Var sl EQ Eats (Var sm) (Var sn) AND
      Var sl' EQ Q_Eats (Var sm') (Var sn')))))))))
```

$\langle proof \rangle$

```
nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩
```

lemma

```
shows SeqQuoteP_fresh_iff [simp]:
  a #: SeqQuoteP t u s k ↔ a #: t ∧ a #: u ∧ a #: s ∧ a #: k (is ?thesis1)
and SeqQuoteP_sf [iff]:
  Sigma_fm (SeqQuoteP t u s k) (is ?thsf)
and SeqQuoteP_imp_OrdP:
  { SeqQuoteP t u s k } ⊢ OrdP k (is ?thord)
and SeqQuoteP_imp_LstSeqP:
  { SeqQuoteP t u s k } ⊢ LstSeqP s k (HPair t u) (is ?thlstseq)
⟨proof⟩
```

```

lemma SeqQuoteP_subst [simp]:
  (SeqQuoteP t u s k)(j ::= w) =
    SeqQuoteP (subst j w t) (subst j w u) (subst j w s) (subst j w k)
  ⟨proof⟩

declare SeqQuoteP.simps [simp del]

```

9.1.2 Correctness properties

```

lemma SeqQuoteP_lemma:
  fixes m::name and sm::name and sm'::name and n::name and sn::name and sn'::name
  assumes atom m # (t,u,s,k,n,sm,sm',sn,sn') atom n # (t,u,s,k,sm,sm',sn,sn')
         atom sm # (t,u,s,k,sm',sn,sn') atom sm' # (t,u,s,k,sn,sn')
         atom sn # (t,u,s,k,sn') atom sn' # (t,u,s,k)
  shows { SeqQuoteP t u s k }
    ⊢ (t EQ Zero AND u EQ Zero) OR
      Ex m (Ex n (Ex sm (Ex sm' (Ex sn (Ex sn' (Var m IN k AND Var n IN k AND
        SeqQuoteP (Var sm) (Var sm') s (Var m) AND
        SeqQuoteP (Var sn) (Var sn') s (Var n) AND
        t EQ Eats (Var sm) (Var sn) AND
        u EQ Q_Eats (Var sm') (Var sn')))))))
  ⟨proof⟩

```

9.2 The “special function” itself

```

nominal_function QuoteP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
  where ⟦atom s # (t,u,k); atom k # (t,u)⟧ ==>
    QuoteP t u = Ex s (Ex k (SeqQuoteP t u (Var s) (Var k)))
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma
  shows QuoteP_fresh_iff [simp]: a # QuoteP t u ↔ a # t ∧ a # u (is ?thesis1)
  and QuoteP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (QuoteP t u) (is ?thsf)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma QuoteP_subst [simp]:
  (QuoteP t u)(j ::= w) = QuoteP (subst j w t) (subst j w u)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

declare QuoteP.simps [simp del]

```

9.2.1 Correctness properties

```

lemma QuoteP_Zero: {} ⊢ QuoteP Zero Zero
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma SeqQuoteP_Eats:
  assumes atom s # (k,s1,s2,k1,k2,t1,t2,u1,u2) atom k # (s1,s2,k1,k2,t1,t2,u1,u2)
  shows {SeqQuoteP t1 u1 s1 k1, SeqQuoteP t2 u2 s2 k2} ⊢
    Ex s (Ex k (SeqQuoteP (Eats t1 t2) (Q_Eats u1 u2) (Var s) (Var k)))
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma QuoteP_Eats: {QuoteP t1 u1, QuoteP t2 u2} ⊢ QuoteP (Eats t1 t2) (Q_Eats u1 u2)
<proof>

lemma exists_QuoteP:
  assumes j: atom j # x shows {} ⊢ Ex j (QuoteP x (Var j))
<proof>

lemma QuoteP_imp_ConstP: {QuoteP x y} ⊢ ConstP y
<proof>

lemma SeqQuoteP_imp_QuoteP: {SeqQuoteP t u s k} ⊢ QuoteP t u
<proof>

lemmas QuoteP_I = SeqQuoteP_imp_QuoteP [THEN cut1]

```

9.3 The Operator *quote_all*

9.3.1 Definition and basic properties

```

definition quote_all :: [perm, name set] ⇒ fm set
  where quote_all p V = {QuoteP (Var i) (Var (p · i)) | i. i ∈ V}
```

lemma *quote_all_empty* [*simp*]: *quote_all p {} = {}*
<proof>

lemma *quote_all_insert* [*simp*]:
 quote_all p (insert i V) = insert (QuoteP (Var i) (Var (p · i))) (quote_all p V)
<proof>

lemma *finite_quote_all* [*simp*]: *finite V ⇒ finite (quote_all p V)*
<proof>

lemma *fresh_quote_all* [*simp*]: *finite V ⇒ i # quote_all p V ↔ i # V ∧ i # p · V*
<proof>

lemma *fresh_quote_all_mem*: *⟦A ∈ quote_all p V; finite V; i # V; i # p · V⟧ ⇒ i # A*
<proof>

lemma *quote_all_perm_eq*:
 assumes *finite V atom i # (p, V) atom i' # (p, V)*
shows *quote_all ((atom i = atom i') + p) V = quote_all p V*
<proof>

9.3.2 Transferring theorems to the level of derivability

```

context quote_perm
begin

```

```

lemma QuoteP_imp_ConstP_F_hyps:
  assumes Us ⊆ Vs {ConstP (F i) | i. i ∈ Us} ⊢ A shows quote_all p Us ⊢ A
<proof>

```

Lemma 8.3

```

theorem quote_all_PfP_ssubst:
  assumes β: {} ⊢ β
    and V: V ⊆ Vs
    and s: supp β ⊆ atom ` Vs
  shows quote_all p V ⊢ PfP (ssubst [β] V V F)

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

Lemma 8.4

corollary quote_all_MonPon_PfP_ssubst:

assumes $A: \{\} \vdash \alpha \text{ IMP } \beta$

and $V: V \subseteq Vs$

and $s: \text{supp } \alpha \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs \text{ supp } \beta \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs$

shows quote_all $p: V \vdash PfP (\text{ssubst } [\alpha] V V F) \text{ IMP } PfP (\text{ssubst } [\beta] V V F)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

Lemma 8.4b

corollary quote_all_MonPon2_PfP_ssubst:

assumes $A: \{\} \vdash \alpha_1 \text{ IMP } \alpha_2 \text{ IMP } \beta$

and $V: V \subseteq Vs$

and $s: \text{supp } \alpha_1 \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs \text{ supp } \alpha_2 \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs \text{ supp } \beta \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs$

shows quote_all $p: V \vdash PfP (\text{ssubst } [\alpha_1] V V F) \text{ IMP } PfP (\text{ssubst } [\alpha_2] V V F) \text{ IMP } PfP (\text{ssubst } [\beta] V V F)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma quote_all_Disj_I1_PfP_ssubst:

assumes $V \subseteq Vs \text{ supp } \alpha \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs \text{ supp } \beta \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs$

and prems: $H \vdash PfP (\text{ssubst } [\alpha] V V F) \text{ quote_all } p: V \subseteq H$

shows $H \vdash PfP (\text{ssubst } [\alpha \text{ OR } \beta] V V F)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma quote_all_Disj_I2_PfP_ssubst:

assumes $V \subseteq Vs \text{ supp } \alpha \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs \text{ supp } \beta \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs$

and prems: $H \vdash PfP (\text{ssubst } [\beta] V V F) \text{ quote_all } p: V \subseteq H$

shows $H \vdash PfP (\text{ssubst } [\alpha \text{ OR } \beta] V V F)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma quote_all_Conj_I_PfP_ssubst:

assumes $V \subseteq Vs \text{ supp } \alpha \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs \text{ supp } \beta \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs$

and prems: $H \vdash PfP (\text{ssubst } [\alpha] V V F) \text{ } H \vdash PfP (\text{ssubst } [\beta] V V F) \text{ quote_all } p: V \subseteq H$

shows $H \vdash PfP (\text{ssubst } [\alpha \text{ AND } \beta] V V F)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma quote_all_Contra_PfP_ssubst:

assumes $V \subseteq Vs \text{ supp } \alpha \subseteq \text{atom} ` Vs$

shows quote_all $p: V$

$\vdash PfP (\text{ssubst } [\alpha] V V F) \text{ IMP } PfP (\text{ssubst } [\text{Neg } \alpha] V V F) \text{ IMP } PfP (\text{ssubst } [\text{Fls}] V V F)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fresh_ssubst_dbtm: $\llbracket \text{atom } i \# p \cdot V; V \subseteq Vs \rrbracket \implies \text{atom } i \# \text{ssubst } (\text{vquot_dbtm } V t) V F$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fresh_ssubst_dbfm: $\llbracket \text{atom } i \# p \cdot V; V \subseteq Vs \rrbracket \implies \text{atom } i \# \text{ssubst } (\text{vquot_dbfm } V A) V F$

$\langle proof \rangle$

end

9.4 Star Property. Equality and Membership: Lemmas 9.3 and 9.4

```

lemma SeqQuoteP_Mem_imp_QMem_and_Subset:
assumes atom i # (j,j',i',si,ki,sj,kj) atom i' # (j,j',si,ki,sj,kj)
atom j # (j',si,ki,sj,kj) atom j' # (si,ki,sj,kj)
atom si # (ki,sj,kj) atom sj # (ki,kj)
shows {SeqQuoteP (Var i) (Var i') (Var si) ki, SeqQuoteP (Var j) (Var j') (Var sj) kj}
  ⊢ (Var i IN Var j IMP PfP (Q_Mem (Var i') (Var j'))) AND
    (Var i SUBS Var j IMP PfP (Q_Subset (Var i') (Var j')))

⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma
assumes atom i # (j,j',i') atom i' # (j,j') atom j # (j')
shows QuoteP_Mem_imp_QMem:
  {QuoteP (Var i) (Var i'), QuoteP (Var j) (Var j'), Var i IN Var j}
    ⊢ PfP (Q_Mem (Var i') (Var j')) (is ?thesis1)
and QuoteP_Mem_imp_QSubset:
  {QuoteP (Var i) (Var i'), QuoteP (Var j) (Var j'), Var i SUBS Var j}
    ⊢ PfP (Q_Subset (Var i') (Var j')) (is ?thesis2)

⟨proof⟩

```

9.5 Star Property. Universal Quantifier: Lemma 9.7

```

lemma (in quote_perm) SeqQuoteP_Mem_imp_All2:
assumes IH: insert (QuoteP (Var i) (Var i')) (quote_all p Vs)
  ⊢ α IMP PfP (ssubst [α](insert i Vs) (insert i Vs) Fi)
and sp: supp α - {atom i} ⊆ atom ` Vs
and j: j ∈ Vs and j': p · j = j'
and pi: pi = (atom i ⇒ atom i') + p
and Fi: Fi = make_F (insert i Vs) pi
and atoms: atom i # (j,j',s,k,p) atom i' # (i,p,α)
  atom j # (j',s,k,α) atom j' # (s,k,α)
  atom s # (k,α) atom k # (α,p)
shows insert (SeqQuoteP (Var j) (Var j') (Var s) (Var k)) (quote_all p (Vs - {j}))
  ⊢ All2 i (Var j) α IMP PfP (ssubst [All2 i (Var j) α] Vs Vs F)

⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma (in quote_perm) quote_all_Mem_imp_All2:
assumes IH: insert (QuoteP (Var i) (Var i')) (quote_all p Vs)
  ⊢ α IMP PfP (ssubst [α](insert i Vs) (insert i Vs) Fi)
and supp (All2 i (Var j) α) ⊆ atom ` Vs
and j: atom j # (i,α) and i: atom i # p and i': atom i' # (i,p,α)
and pi: pi = (atom i ⇒ atom i') + p
and Fi: Fi = make_F (insert i Vs) pi
shows insert (All2 i (Var j) α) (quote_all p Vs) ⊢ PfP (ssubst [All2 i (Var j) α] Vs Vs F)

⟨proof⟩

```

9.6 The Derivability Condition, Theorem 9.1

```

lemma SpecI: H ⊢ A IMP Ex i A
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma star:
fixes p :: perm and F :: name ⇒ tm
assumes C: ss_fm α

```

```
and  $p: atom \in (p \cdot V) \#* V - p = p$ 
and  $V: finite V supp \alpha \subseteq atom \in V$ 
and  $F: F = make\_F V p$ 
shows  $insert \alpha (quote\_all p V) \vdash PfP (ssubst [\alpha] V V F)$ 
⟨proof⟩
```

theorem *Provability*:

```
assumes  $Sigma\_fm \alpha ground\_fm \alpha$ 
shows  $\{\alpha\} \vdash PfP \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$ 
⟨proof⟩
```

end

Chapter 10

Uniqueness Results: Syntactic Relations are Functions

```

theory Functions
imports Coding_Predicates
begin

10.0.1 SeqStTermP

lemma not_IndP_VarP: {IndP x, VarP x} ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

It IS a pair, but not just any pair.

lemma IndP_HPairE: insert (IndP (HPair (HPair Zero (HPair Zero Zero)) x)) H ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

lemma atom_HPairE:
assumes H ⊢ x EQ HPair (HPair Zero (HPair Zero Zero)) y
shows insert (IndP x OR x NEQ v) H ⊢ A
⟨proof⟩

lemma SeqStTermP_lemma:
assumes atom m # (v,i,t,u,s,k,n,sm,sm',sn,sn') atom n # (v,i,t,u,s,k,sm,sm',sn,sn')
      atom sm # (v,i,t,u,s,k,sm',sn,sn') atom sm' # (v,i,t,u,s,k,sn,sn')
      atom sn # (v,i,t,u,s,k,sn') atom sn' # (v,i,t,u,s,k)
shows { SeqStTermP v i t u s k }
  ⊢ ((t EQ v AND u EQ i) OR
      ((IndP t OR t NEQ v) AND u EQ t)) OR
      Ex m (Ex n (Ex sm (Ex sm' (Ex sn (Ex sn' (Var m IN k AND Var n IN k AND
          SeqStTermP v i (Var sm) (Var sm') s (Var m) AND
          SeqStTermP v i (Var sn) (Var sn') s (Var n) AND
          t EQ Q_Eats (Var sm) (Var sn) AND
          u EQ Q_Eats (Var sm') (Var sn'))))))))

⟨proof⟩

lemma SeqStTermP_unique: {SeqStTermP v a t u s kk, SeqStTermP v a t u' s' kk'} ⊢ u' EQ u
⟨proof⟩

theorem SubstTermP_unique: {SubstTermP v tm t u, SubstTermP v tm t u'} ⊢ u' EQ u
⟨proof⟩

```

10.0.2 SubstAtomicP

lemma *SubstTermP_eq*:
 $\llbracket H \vdash \text{SubstTermP } v \text{ tm } x \ z; \text{insert } (\text{SubstTermP } v \text{ tm } y \ z) \ H \vdash A \rrbracket \implies \text{insert } (x \ EQ \ y) \ H \vdash A$
(proof)

lemma *SubstAtomicP_unique*: $\{\text{SubstAtomicP } v \text{ tm } x \ y, \text{SubstAtomicP } v \text{ tm } x \ y'\} \vdash y' \ EQ \ y$
(proof)

10.0.3 SeqSubstFormP

lemma *SeqSubstFormP_lemma*:
assumes atom $m \notin (v, u, x, y, s, k, n, sm, sm', sn, sn')$ atom $n \notin (v, u, x, y, s, k, sm, sm', sn, sn')$
atom $sm \notin (v, u, x, y, s, k, sm', sn, sn')$ atom $sm' \notin (v, u, x, y, s, k, sn, sn')$
atom $sn \notin (v, u, x, y, s, k, sn')$ atom $sn' \notin (v, u, x, y, s, k)$
shows { *SeqSubstFormP* $v \ u \ x \ y \ s \ k$ }
 $\vdash \text{SubstAtomicP } v \ u \ x \ y \ OR$
 $Ex \ m \ (Ex \ n \ (Ex \ sm \ (Ex \ sm' \ (Ex \ sn \ (Ex \ sn' \ (Var \ m \ IN \ k \ AND \ Var \ n \ IN \ k \ AND \ SeqSubstFormP \ v \ u \ (Var \ sm) \ (Var \ sm') \ s \ (Var \ m) \ AND \ SeqSubstFormP \ v \ u \ (Var \ sn) \ (Var \ sn') \ s \ (Var \ n) \ AND \ ((x \ EQ \ Q_Disj \ (Var \ sm) \ (Var \ sn) \ AND \ y \ EQ \ Q_Disj \ (Var \ sm') \ (Var \ sn')) \ OR \ (x \ EQ \ Q_Neg \ (Var \ sm) \ AND \ y \ EQ \ Q_Neg \ (Var \ sm')) \ OR \ (x \ EQ \ Q_Ex \ (Var \ sm) \ AND \ y \ EQ \ Q_Ex \ (Var \ sm'))))))))$
(proof)

lemma
shows *Neg_SubstAtomicP_Fls*: $\{y \ EQ \ Q_Neg \ z, \ SubstAtomicP \ v \ tm \ y \ y'\} \vdash Fls$ (**is** ?thesis1)
and *Disj_SubstAtomicP_Fls*: $\{y \ EQ \ Q_Disj \ z \ w, \ SubstAtomicP \ v \ tm \ y \ y'\} \vdash Fls$ (**is** ?thesis2)
and *Ex_SubstAtomicP_Fls*: $\{y \ EQ \ Q_Ex \ z, \ SubstAtomicP \ v \ tm \ y \ y'\} \vdash Fls$ (**is** ?thesis3)
(proof)

lemma *SeqSubstFormP_eq*:
 $\llbracket H \vdash \text{SeqSubstFormP } v \text{ tm } x \ z \ s \ k; \text{insert } (\text{SeqSubstFormP } v \text{ tm } y \ z \ s \ k) \ H \vdash A \rrbracket \implies \text{insert } (x \ EQ \ y) \ H \vdash A$
(proof)

lemma *SeqSubstFormP_unique*: $\{\text{SeqSubstFormP } v \ a \ x \ y \ s \ kk, \text{SeqSubstFormP } v \ a \ x \ y' \ s' \ kk'\} \vdash y' \ EQ \ y$
(proof)

10.0.4 SubstFormP

theorem *SubstFormP_unique*: $\{\text{SubstFormP } v \text{ tm } x \ y, \text{SubstFormP } v \text{ tm } x \ y'\} \vdash y' \ EQ \ y$
(proof)

end

Chapter 11

Section 6 Material and Gödel's First Incompleteness Theorem

```
theory Goedel_I
imports Pf_Predicates Functions II_Prelims
begin
```

11.1 The Function W and Lemma 6.1

11.1.1 Predicate form, defined on sequences

```
nominal_function SeqWRP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
where [[atom l # (s,k,sl); atom sl # (s)]] ==>
  SeqWRP s k y = LstSeqP s k y AND
    HPair Zero Zero IN s AND
    All2 l k (Ex sl (HPair (Var l) (Var sl) IN s AND
      HPair (SUCC (Var l)) (Q_Succ (Var sl)) IN s))
⟨proof⟩
```

```
nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma
  shows SeqWRP_fresh_iff [simp]: a # SeqWRP s k y ↔ a # s ∧ a # k ∧ a # y (is ?thesis1)
  and SeqWRP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (SeqWRP s k y) (is ?thsf)
  and SeqWRP_imp_OrdP: {SeqWRP s k t} ⊢ OrdP k (is ?thOrd)
  and SeqWRP_LstSeqP: {SeqWRP s k t} ⊢ LstSeqP s k t (is ?thlstseq)
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma SeqWRP_subst [simp]:
  (SeqWRP s k y)(i ::= t) = SeqWRP (subst i t s) (subst i t k) (subst i t y)
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma SeqWRP_cong:
  assumes H ⊢ s EQ s' and H ⊢ k EQ k' and H ⊢ y EQ y'
  shows H ⊢ SeqWRP s k y IFF SeqWRP s' k' y'
⟨proof⟩
```

```
declare SeqWRP.simps [simp del]
```

11.1.2 Predicate form of W

```

nominal_function WRP :: tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  fm
  where  $\llbracket \text{atom } s \# (x,y) \rrbracket \implies$ 
     $WRP\ x\ y = \text{Ex } s\ (\text{SeqWRP}\ (\text{Var } s)\ x\ y)$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma
  shows WRP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \# WRP\ x\ y \longleftrightarrow a \# x \wedge a \# y$  (is ?thesis1)
  and sigma_fm_WRP [simp]: Sigma_fm (WRP x y) (is ?thsf)
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma WRP_subst [simp]:  $(WRP\ x\ y)(i ::= t) = WRP\ (\text{subst } i\ t\ x)\ (\text{subst } i\ t\ y)$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma WRP_cong:  $H \vdash t\ EQ\ t' \implies H \vdash u\ EQ\ u' \implies H \vdash WRP\ t\ u\ IFF\ WRP\ t'\ u'$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

declare WRP.simps [simp del]

lemma ground_WRP [simp]: ground_fm (WRP x y)  $\longleftrightarrow$  ground x  $\wedge$  ground y
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma SeqWRP_Zero:  $\{\} \vdash \text{SyntaxN.Ex } s\ (\text{SeqWRP}\ (\text{Var } s)\ \text{Zero}\ \text{Zero})$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma WRP_Zero:  $\{\} \vdash WRP\ \text{Zero}\ \text{Zero}$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma SeqWRP_HPair_Zero_Zero:  $\{\text{SeqWRP } s\ k\ y\} \vdash \text{HPair Zero Zero IN } s$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma SeqWRP_Succ:
  assumes atom s # (s1,k1,y)
  shows  $\{\text{SeqWRP } s1\ k1\ y\} \vdash \text{SyntaxN.Ex } s\ (\text{SeqWRP}\ (\text{Var } s)\ (\text{SUCC } k1)\ (\text{Q\_Succ } y))$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma WRP_Succ:  $\{\text{OrdP } i,\ WRP\ i\ y\} \vdash WRP\ (\text{SUCC } i)\ (\text{Q\_Succ } y)$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma WRP:  $\{\} \vdash WRP\ (\text{ORD\_OF } i) \llcorner \text{ORD\_OF } i \lrcorner$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma prove_WRP:  $\{\} \vdash WRP\ \llcorner \text{Var } x \lrcorner \llcorner \text{Var } x \lrcorner \lrcorner$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

```

11.1.3 Proving that these relations are functions

```

lemma SeqWRP_Zero_E:
  assumes insert (y EQ Zero) H ⊢ A  $H \vdash k\ EQ\ \text{Zero}$ 
  shows insert (SeqWRP s k y) H ⊢ A
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma SeqWRP_SUCC_lemma:
  assumes y': atom y' # (s,k,y)
  shows  $\{\text{SeqWRP } s\ (\text{SUCC } k)\ y\} \vdash \text{Ex } y'\ (\text{SeqWRP } s\ k\ (\text{Var } y') \text{ AND } y\ EQ\ \text{Q\_Succ } (\text{Var } y'))$ 

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

```

lemma SeqWRP_SUCC_E:
  assumes y': atom y' # (s,k,y) and k': H ⊢ k' EQ (SUCC k)
  shows insert (SeqWRP s k' y) H ⊢ Ex y' (SeqWRP s k (Var y') AND y EQ Q_Succ (Var y'))
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma SeqWRP_unique: {OrdP x, SeqWRP s x y, SeqWRP s' x y'} ⊢ y' EQ y
⟨proof⟩

theorem WRP_unique: {OrdP x, WRP x y, WRP x y'} ⊢ y' EQ y
⟨proof⟩

```

11.2 The Function HF and Lemma 6.2

11.2.1 Defining the syntax: quantified body

```

nominal_function SeqHRP :: tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ tm ⇒ fm
  where [[atom l # (s,k,sl,sl',m,n,sm,sm',sn,sn');
            atom sl # (s,sl',m,n,sm,sm',sn,sn');
            atom sl' # (s,m,n,sm,sm',sn,sn');
            atom m # (s,n,sm,sm',sn,sn');
            atom n # (s,sm,sm',sn,sn');
            atom sm # (s,sm',sn,sn');
            atom sm' # (s,sn,sn');
            atom sn # (s,sn');
            atom sn' # (s)]]
        ==>
    SeqHRP x x' s k =
      LstSeqP s k (HPair x x') AND
      All2 l (SUCC k) (Ex sl (Ex sl' (HPair (Var l) (HPair (Var sl) (Var sl')) IN s AND
        ((OrdP (Var sl) AND WRP (Var sl) (Var sl')) OR
         Ex m (Ex n (Ex sm (Ex sm' (Ex sn (Ex sn' (Var m IN Var l AND Var n IN Var l AND
           HPair (Var m) (HPair (Var sm) (Var sm')) IN s AND
           HPair (Var n) (HPair (Var sn) (Var sn')) IN s AND
           Var sl EQ HPair (Var sm) (Var sn) AND
           Var sl' EQ Q_HPair (Var sm') (Var sn')))))))))))))))

⟨proof⟩

```

```

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma
  shows SeqHRP_fresh_iff [simp]:
    a # SeqHRP x x' s k ↔ a # x ∧ a # x' ∧ a # s ∧ a # k (is ?thesis1)
  and SeqHRP_sf [iff]: Sigma_fm (SeqHRP x x' s k) (is ?thsf)
  and SeqHRP_imp_OrdP: { SeqHRP x y s k } ⊢ OrdP k (is ?thord)
  and SeqHRP_imp_LstSeqP: { SeqHRP x y s k } ⊢ LstSeqP s k (HPair x y) (is ?thlstseq)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma SeqHRP_subst [simp]:
  (SeqHRP x x' s k)(i:=t) = SeqHRP (subst i t x) (subst i t x') (subst i t s) (subst i t k)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma SeqHRP_cong:
  assumes H ⊢ x EQ x' and H ⊢ y EQ y' H ⊢ s EQ s' and H ⊢ k EQ k'
  shows H ⊢ SeqHRP x y s k IFF SeqHRP x' y' s' k'
  ⟨proof⟩

```

11.2.2 Defining the syntax: main predicate

nominal_function $HRP :: tm \Rightarrow tm \Rightarrow fm$
where $\llbracket atom s \# (x,x',k); atom k \# (x,x') \rrbracket \implies HRP x x' = Ex s (Ex k (SeqHRP x x' (Var s) (Var k)))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination ($eqvt$)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma
shows HRP_fresh_iff [$simp$]: $a \# HRP x x' \longleftrightarrow a \# x \wedge a \# x'$ (**is** $?thesis1$)
and HRP_sf [iff]: $Sigma_fm (HRP x x')$ (**is** $?thsf$)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma HRP_subst [$simp$]: $(HRP x x')(i ::= t) = HRP (subst i t x) (subst i t x')$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

11.2.3 Proving that these relations are functions

lemma $SeqHRP_lemma$:
assumes $atom m \# (x,x',s,k,n,sm,sm',sn,sn')$ $atom n \# (x,x',s,k,sm,sm',sn,sn')$
 $atom sm \# (x,x',s,k,sm',sn,sn')$ $atom sm' \# (x,x',s,k,sn,sn')$
 $atom sn \# (x,x',s,k,sn')$ $atom sn' \# (x,x',s,k)$
shows { $SeqHRP x x' s k$ }
 $\vdash (OrdP x AND WRP x x') OR$
 $Ex m (Ex n (Ex sm (Ex sm' (Ex sn (Ex sn' (Var m IN k AND Var n IN k AND$
 $SeqHRP (Var sm) (Var sm') s (Var m) AND$
 $SeqHRP (Var sn) (Var sn') s (Var n) AND$
 $x EQ HPair (Var sm) (Var sn) AND$
 $x' EQ Q_HPair (Var sm') (Var sn')))))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $SeqHRP_unique$: { $SeqHRP x y s u$, $SeqHRP x y' s' u'$ } $\vdash y' EQ y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem HRP_unique : { $HRP x y$, $HRP x y'$ } $\vdash y' EQ y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma HRP_ORD_OF : {} $\vdash HRP (ORD_OF i) \llbracket ORD_OF i \rrbracket$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $SeqHRP_HPair$:
assumes $atom s \# (k,s1,s2,k1,k2,x,y,x',y')$ $atom k \# (s1,s2,k1,k2,x,y,x',y')$
shows { $SeqHRP x x' s1 k1$,
 $SeqHRP y y' s2 k2$ }
 $\vdash Ex s (Ex k (SeqHRP (HPair x y) (Q_HPair x' y') (Var s) (Var k)))$ $\langle proof \rangle$
lemma HRP_HPair : { $HRP x x'$, $HRP y y'$ } $\vdash HRP (HPair x y) (Q_HPair x' y')$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma HRP_HPair_quot : { $HRP x \llbracket x \rrbracket$, $HRP y \llbracket y \rrbracket$ } $\vdash HRP (HPair x y) \llbracket HPair x y \rrbracket$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $prove_HRP_coding_tm$: **fixes** $t::tm$ **shows** $coding_tm t \implies \{ \} \vdash HRP t \llbracket t \rrbracket$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemmas $prove_HRP = prove_HRP_coding_tm[OF quot_fm_coding]$

11.3 The Function K and Lemma 6.3

```

nominal_function KRP :: tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  tm  $\Rightarrow$  fm
  where atom y  $\sharp$  (v,x,x')  $\implies$ 
     $KRP\ v\ x\ x' = \text{Ex } y\ (\text{HRP } x\ (\text{Var } y) \text{ AND } \text{SubstFormP } v\ (\text{Var } y)\ x\ x')$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

nominal_termination (eqvt)
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma KRP_fresh_iff [simp]:  $a \sharp KRP\ v\ x\ x' \iff a \sharp v \wedge a \sharp x \wedge a \sharp x'$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma KRP_subst [simp]:  $(KRP\ v\ x\ x')(i := t) = KRP\ (\text{subst } i\ t\ v)\ (\text{subst } i\ t\ x)\ (\text{subst } i\ t\ x')$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

declare KRP.simps [simp del]

lemma prove_SubstFormP: {}  $\vdash \text{SubstFormP}\ «\text{Var } i»\ ««A»»\ «A»\ «A(i := «A»)»$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma prove_KRP: {}  $\vdash KRP\ «\text{Var } i»\ «A»\ «A(i := «A»)»$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma KRP_unique:  $\{KRP\ v\ x\ y, KRP\ v\ x\ y'\} \vdash y' EQ y$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma KRP_subst_fm:  $\{KRP\ «\text{Var } i»\ «\beta»\ (\text{Var } j)\} \vdash \text{Var } j EQ «\beta(i := «\beta»)»$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

end

```

Chapter 12

The Instantiation

definition $Fvars t = \{a :: name. \neg atom a \# t\}$

lemma $Fvars_tm_simp[simp]$:

$Fvars Zero = \{\}$

$Fvars (Var a) = \{a\}$

$Fvars (Eats x y) = Fvars x \cup Fvars y$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $finite_Fvars_tm[simp]$:

fixes $t :: tm$

shows $finite (Fvars t)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $Fvars_fm_simp[simp]$:

$Fvars (x IN y) = Fvars x \cup Fvars y$

$Fvars (x EQ y) = Fvars x \cup Fvars y$

$Fvars (A OR B) = Fvars A \cup Fvars B$

$Fvars (A AND B) = Fvars A \cup Fvars B$

$Fvars (A IMP B) = Fvars A \cup Fvars B$

$Fvars Fls = \{\}$

$Fvars (Neg A) = Fvars A$

$Fvars (Ex a A) = Fvars A - \{a\}$

$Fvars (All a A) = Fvars A - \{a\}$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $finite_Fvars_fm[simp]$:

fixes $A :: fm$

shows $finite (Fvars A)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $subst_tm_subst_tm[simp]$:

$x \neq y \implies atom x \# u \implies subst y u (subst x t v) = subst x (subst y u t) (subst y u v)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $subst_fm_subst_fm[simp]$:

$x \neq y \implies atom x \# u \implies (A(x::=t))(y::=u) = (A(y::=u))(x::=subst y u t)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $Fvars_ground_aux$: $Fvars t \subseteq B \implies ground_aux t (atom ` B)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

```

lemma ground_Fvars: ground t  $\longleftrightarrow$  Fvars t = {}
  (proof)

lemma Fvars_ground_fm_aux: Fvars A  $\subseteq$  B  $\implies$  ground_fm_aux A (atom ` B)
  (proof)

lemma ground_fm_Fvars: ground_fm A  $\longleftrightarrow$  Fvars A = {}
  (proof)

interpretation Generic_Syntax where
  var = UNIV :: name set
  and trm = UNIV :: tm set
  and fmla = UNIV :: fm set
  and Var = Var
  and FvarsT = Fvars
  and substT =  $\lambda t u x. \text{subst } x u t$ 
  and Fvars = Fvars
  and subst =  $\lambda A u x. \text{subst\_fm } A x u$ 
  (proof)

lemma coding_tm_Fvars_empty[simp]: coding_tm t  $\implies$  Fvars t = {}
  (proof)

lemma Fvars_empty_ground[simp]: Fvars t = {}  $\implies$  ground t
  (proof)

interpretation Syntax_with_Numerals where
  var = UNIV :: name set
  and trm = UNIV :: tm set
  and fmla = UNIV :: fm set
  and num = {t. ground t}
  and Var = Var
  and FvarsT = Fvars
  and substT =  $\lambda t u x. \text{subst } x u t$ 
  and Fvars = Fvars
  and subst =  $\lambda A u x. \text{subst\_fm } A x u$ 
  (proof)

declare FvarsT_num[simp del]

interpretation Deduct2_with_False where
  var = UNIV :: name set
  and trm = UNIV :: tm set
  and fmla = UNIV :: fm set
  and num = {t. ground t}
  and Var = Var
  and FvarsT = Fvars
  and substT =  $\lambda t u x. \text{subst } x u t$ 
  and Fvars = Fvars
  and subst =  $\lambda A u x. \text{subst\_fm } A x u$ 
  and eql = (EQ)
  and cnj = (AND)
  and imp = (IMP)
  and all = All
  and exi = Ex
  and fls = Fls
  and prv = ( $\vdash$ ) {}
  and bprv = ( $\vdash$ ) {}

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation HBL1 where

var = UNIV :: name set
and **trm** = UNIV :: tm set
and **fmla** = UNIV :: fm set
and **num** = {t. ground t}
and **Var** = Var
and **FvarsT** = Fvars
and **substT** = $\lambda t u x. subst x u t$
and **Fvars** = Fvars
and **subst** = $\lambda A u x. subst_fm A x u$
and **eql** = (EQ)
and **cnj** = (AND)
and **imp** = (IMP)
and **all** = All
and **exi** = Ex
and **prv** = (\vdash) {}
and **bprv** = (\vdash) {}
and **enc** = quot
and **P** = PfP (Var xx)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation Goedel_Form where

var = UNIV :: name set
and **trm** = UNIV :: tm set
and **fmla** = UNIV :: fm set
and **num** = {t. ground t}
and **Var** = Var
and **FvarsT** = Fvars
and **substT** = $\lambda t u x. subst x u t$
and **Fvars** = Fvars
and **subst** = $\lambda A u x. subst_fm A x u$
and **eql** = (EQ)
and **cnj** = (AND)
and **imp** = (IMP)
and **all** = All
and **exi** = Ex
and **fls** = Fls
and **prv** = (\vdash) {}
and **bprv** = (\vdash) {}
and **enc** = quot
and **S** = KRP (quot (Var xx)) (Var xx) (Var yy)
and **P** = PfP (Var xx)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation g2: Goedel_Second_Assumptions where

var = UNIV :: name set
and **trm** = UNIV :: tm set
and **fmla** = UNIV :: fm set
and **num** = {t. ground t}
and **Var** = Var
and **FvarsT** = Fvars
and **substT** = $\lambda t u x. subst x u t$
and **Fvars** = Fvars
and **subst** = $\lambda A u x. subst_fm A x u$
and **eql** = (EQ)
and **cnj** = (AND)

```
and imp = (IMP)
and all = All
and exi = Ex
and fls = Fls
and prv = ( $\vdash$ ) {}
and bprv = ( $\vdash$ ) {}
and enc = quot
and S = KRP (quot (Var xx)) (Var xx) (Var yy)
and P = PfP (Var xx)
⟨proof⟩
```

```
theorem  $\neg \{ \} \vdash \text{Fls} \implies \neg \{ \} \vdash \text{neg } (\text{PfP } (\text{quot Fls}))$ 
⟨proof⟩
```