

Robinson Arithmetic

Andrei Popescu Dmitriy Traytel

March 17, 2025

Abstract

We instantiate our syntax-independent logic infrastructure developed in a separate AFP entry to the FOL theory of Robinson arithmetic (also known as Q). The latter was formalised using Nominal Isabelle by adapting Larry Paulson's formalization of the Hereditarily Finite Set theory.

Contents

1 Terms and Formulas	1
1.1 The datatypes	1
1.2 Substitution	1
1.3 Semantics	3
1.4 Derived logical connectives	4
1.4.1 Conjunction	4
1.4.2 If and only if	4
1.4.3 False	5
2 Axioms and Theorems	5
2.1 Logical axioms	5
2.2 Concrete variables	5
2.3 Equality axioms	6
2.4 The Q (Robinson-arithmetic-specific) axioms	6
2.5 The proof system	7
2.6 Derived rules of inference	7
2.7 The deduction theorem	9
2.8 Cut rules	10
3 Miscellaneous Logical Rules	10
3.1 Quantifier reasoning	13
3.2 Congruence rules	14
4 Equality Reasoning	14
4.1 The congruence property for (<i>EQ</i>), and other basic properties of equality	14
4.2 The congruence properties for <i>suc</i> , <i>pls</i> and <i>tms</i>	15
4.3 Substitution for equalities	15
4.4 Congruence rules for predicates	15
4.5 The formula <i>fls</i>	16
5 Instantiation of Syntax-Independent Logic Infrastructure	17
5.1 Preliminaries	17
5.2 Instantiation of the generic syntax and deduction relation	19
5.3 Instantiation of the arithmetic-enriched generic syntax and deduction relation	20
5.4 Instantiation of the abstract notion of standard model and truth	21

1 Terms and Formulas

nat is a pure permutation type

```
instance nat :: 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 The datatypes

```
nominal_datatype trm = zer | Var name | suc trm | pls trm trm | tms trm trm
```

```
nominal_datatype fmla =  
  eql trm trm (infixr ⟨EQ⟩ 150)  
  | dsj fmla fmla (infixr ⟨OR⟩ 130)  
  | neg fmla  
  | exi x::name f::fmla binds x in f
```

eql are atomic formulas; dsj, neg, exi are non-atomic

```
declare trm.supp [simp] fmla.supp [simp]
```

1.2 Substitution

```
nominal_function subst :: name ⇒ trm ⇒ trm ⇒ trm
```

where

```
subst i x zer = zer  
| subst i x (Var k) = (if i=k then x else Var k)  
| subst i x (suc t) = suc (subst i x t)  
| subst i x (pls t u) = pls (subst i x t) (subst i x u)  
| subst i x (tms t u) = tms (subst i x t) (subst i x u)  
⟨proof⟩
```

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

```
lemma fresh_subst_if [simp]:  
  j # subst i x t ←→ (atom i # t ∧ j # t) ∨ (j # x ∧ (j # t ∨ j = atom i))  
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma forget_subst_trm [simp]: atom a # trm ⇒ subst a x trm = trm  
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma subst_trm_id [simp]: subst a (Var a) trm = trm  
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma subst_trm_commute [simp]:  
  atom j # trm ⇒ subst j u (subst i t trm) = subst i (subst j u t) trm  
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma subst_trm_commute2 [simp]:  
  atom j # t ⇒ atom i # u ⇒ i ≠ j ⇒ subst j u (subst i t trm) = subst i t (subst j u trm)  
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma repeat_subst_trm [simp]: subst i u (subst i t trm) = subst i (subst i u t) trm
```

$\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_function $subst_fmla :: fmla \Rightarrow name \Rightarrow trm \Rightarrow fmla$ ($\langle _ \rangle'(_::=_')$ [1000, 0, 0] 200)

where

- | $eql: (eql t u)(i::=x) = eql (subst i x t) (subst i x u)$
- | $dsj: (dsj A B)(i::=x) = dsj (A(i::=x)) (B(i::=x))$
- | $neg: (neg A)(i::=x) = neg (A(i::=x))$
- | $exi: atom j \# (i, x) \implies (exi j A)(i::=x) = exi j (A(i::=x))$

$\langle proof \rangle$

nominal_termination ($eqvt$)

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $size_subst_fmla$ [*simp*]: $size (A(i::=x)) = size A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $forget_subst_fmla$ [*simp*]: $atom a \# A \implies A(a::=x) = A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $subst_fmla_id$ [*simp*]: $A(a::=Var a) = A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $fresh_subst_fmla_if$ [*simp*]:

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

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $subst_fmla_commute$ [*simp*]:

$atom j \# A \implies (A(i::=t))(j::=u) = A(i ::= subst j u t)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $repeat_subst_fmla$ [*simp*]: $(A(i::=t))(i::=u) = A(i ::= subst i u t)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $subst_fmla_exi_with_renaming$:

$atom i' \# (A, i, j, t) \implies (exi i A)(j ::= t) = exi i' (((i \leftrightarrow i') \cdot A)(j ::= t))$

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

lemma $flip_subst_trm$: $atom y \# t \implies (x \leftrightarrow y) \cdot t = subst x (Var y) t$

lemma $flip_subst_fmla$: $atom y \# \varphi \implies (x \leftrightarrow y) \cdot \varphi = \varphi(x::=Var y)$

lemma $exi_ren_subst_fresh$: $atom y \# \varphi \implies exi x \varphi = exi y (\varphi(x::=Var y))$

1.3 Semantics

definition $e0 :: (name, nat) finfun$ — the null environment
where $e0 \equiv finfun_const 0$

nominal_function $eval_trm :: (name, nat) finfun \Rightarrow trm \Rightarrow nat$

where

- | $eval_trm e \text{ zer} = 0$
- | $eval_trm e (Var k) = finfun_apply e k$
- | $eval_trm e (suc t) = Suc (eval_trm e t)$

```

| eval_trm e (pls t u) = eval_trm e t + eval_trm e u
| eval_trm e (tms t u) = eval_trm e t * eval_trm e u
⟨proof⟩

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

nominal_function eval_fmla :: (name, nat) finfun ⇒ fmla ⇒ bool
where
  eval_fmla e (t EQ u) ↔ eval_trm e t = eval_trm e u
| eval_fmla e (A OR B) ↔ eval_fmla e A ∨ eval_fmla e B
| eval_fmla e (neg A) ↔ (¬ eval_fmla e A)
| atom k # e ⇒ eval_fmla e (exi k A) ↔ (exists x. eval_fmla (finfun_update e k x) A)
⟨proof⟩

nominal_termination (eqvt)
⟨proof⟩

lemma eval_trm_rename:
assumes atom k' # t
shows eval_trm (finfun_update e k x) t =
eval_trm (finfun_update e k' x) ((k' ↔ k) · t)
⟨proof⟩

lemma eval_fmla_rename:
assumes atom k' # A
shows eval_fmla (finfun_update e k x) A = eval_fmla (finfun_update e k' x) ((k' ↔ k) · A)
⟨proof⟩

lemma better_ex_eval_fmla[simp]:
eval_fmla e (exi k A) ↔ (exists x. eval_fmla (finfun_update e k x) A)
⟨proof⟩

lemma forget_eval_trm [simp]: atom i # t ⇒
eval_trm (finfun_update e i x) t = eval_trm e t
⟨proof⟩

lemma forget_eval_fmla [simp]:
atom k # A ⇒ eval_fmla (finfun_update e k x) A = eval_fmla e A
⟨proof⟩

lemma eval_subst_trm: eval_trm e (subst i t u) =
eval_trm (finfun_update e i (eval_trm e t)) u
⟨proof⟩

lemma eval_subst_fmla: eval_fmla e (fmla(i ::= t)) =
eval_fmla (finfun_update e i (eval_trm e t)) fmla
⟨proof⟩

```

1.4 Derived logical connectives

abbreviation imp :: fmla ⇒ fmla ⇒ fmla (infixr ⟨IMP⟩ 125)
where imp A B ≡ dsj (neg A) B

abbreviation all :: name ⇒ fmla ⇒ fmla
where all i A ≡ neg (exi i (neg A))

1.4.1 Conjunction

definition *cnj* :: *fmla* \Rightarrow *fmla* \Rightarrow *fmla* (infixr ‘AND’ 135)
where *cnj A B* \equiv *neg (dsj (neg A) (neg B))*

lemma *cnj_eqvt* [eqvt]: $p \cdot (A \text{ AND } B) = (p \cdot A) \text{ AND } (p \cdot B)$
(proof)

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

lemma *supp_cnj* [simp]: $\text{supp } (A \text{ AND } B) = \text{supp } A \cup \text{supp } B$
(proof)

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

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

lemma *subst_fmla_cnj* [simp]: $(A \text{ AND } B)(i ::= x) = (A(i ::= x)) \text{ AND } (B(i ::= x))$
(proof)

lemma *eval_fmla_cnj* [simp]: $\text{eval_fmla } e \ (cnj \ A \ B) \longleftrightarrow (\text{eval_fmla } e \ A \wedge \text{eval_fmla } e \ B)$
(proof)

1.4.2 If and only if

definition *Iff* :: *fmla* \Rightarrow *fmla* \Rightarrow *fmla* (infixr ‘IFF’ 125)
where *Iff A B* $=$ *cnj (imp A B) (imp B A)*

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

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

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

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

lemma *subst_fmla_Iff* [simp]: $(A \text{ IFF } B)(i ::= x) = (A(i ::= x)) \text{ IFF } (B(i ::= x))$
(proof)

lemma *eval_fmla_Iff* [simp]: $\text{eval_fmla } e \ (Iff \ A \ B) \longleftrightarrow (\text{eval_fmla } e \ A \longleftrightarrow \text{eval_fmla } e \ B)$
(proof)

1.4.3 False

definition *fls* **where** *fls* \equiv *neg (zer EQ zer)*

lemma *fls_eqvt* [eqvt]: $(p \cdot fls) = fls$
(proof)

lemma *fls_fresh* [simp]: $a \notin fls$
(proof)

2 Axioms and Theorems

2.1 Logical axioms

```
inductive_set boolean_axioms :: fmla set
  where
    Ident:   A IMP A ∈ boolean_axioms
    | dsjII:  A IMP (A OR B) ∈ boolean_axioms
    | dsjCont: (A OR A) IMP A ∈ boolean_axioms
    | dsjAssoc: (A OR (B OR C)) IMP ((A OR B) OR C) ∈ boolean_axioms
    | dsjcnj:  (C OR A) IMP (((neg C) OR B) IMP (A OR B)) ∈ boolean_axioms
```

```
lemma boolean_axioms_hold: A ∈ boolean_axioms ==> eval_fmla e A
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
inductive_set special_axioms :: fmla set where
  I: A(i::=x) IMP (exi i A) ∈ special_axioms
```

```
lemma special_axioms_hold: A ∈ special_axioms ==> eval_fmla e A
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma twist_forget_eval_fmla [simp]:
  atom j # (i, A)
  ==> eval_fmla (finfun_update (finfun_update (finfun_update e i x) j y) i z) A =
    eval_fmla (finfun_update e i z) A
  ⟨proof⟩
```

2.2 Concrete variables

```
declare Abs_name_inject[simp]
```

abbreviation

```
X0 ≡ Abs_name (Atom (Sort "Theory_Syntax_Q.name" [])) 0)
```

abbreviation

```
X1 ≡ Abs_name (Atom (Sort "Robinson_Arithmetic.name" [])) (Suc 0))
```

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

abbreviation

```
X2 ≡ Abs_name (Atom (Sort "Robinson_Arithmetic.name" [])) 2)
```

abbreviation

```
X3 ≡ Abs_name (Atom (Sort "Robinson_Arithmetic.name" [])) 3)
```

abbreviation

```
X4 ≡ Abs_name (Atom (Sort "Robinson_Arithmetic.name" [])) 4)
```

2.3 Equality axioms

```
definition refl_ax :: fmla where
  refl_ax = Var X1 EQ Var X1
```

```
lemma refl_ax_holds: eval_fmla e refl_ax
  ⟨proof⟩
```

```
definition eq_cong_ax :: fmla where
  eq_cong_ax = ((Var X1 EQ Var X2) AND (Var X3 EQ Var X4)) IMP
    ((Var X1 EQ Var X3) IMP (Var X2 EQ Var X4))
```

```

lemma eq_cong_ax_holds: eval_fmla e eq_cong_ax
  ⟨proof⟩

definition syc_cong_ax :: fmla where
  syc_cong_ax = ((Var X1 EQ Var X2)) IMP
    ((suc (Var X1)) EQ (suc (Var X2)))

lemma syc_cong_ax_holds: eval_fmla e syc_cong_ax
  ⟨proof⟩

definition pls_cong_ax :: fmla where
  pls_cong_ax = ((Var X1 EQ Var X2) AND (Var X3 EQ Var X4)) IMP
    ((pls (Var X1) (Var X3)) EQ (pls (Var X2) (Var X4)))

lemma pls_cong_ax_holds: eval_fmla e pls_cong_ax
  ⟨proof⟩

definition tms_cong_ax :: fmla where
  tms_cong_ax = ((Var X1 EQ Var X2) AND (Var X3 EQ Var X4)) IMP
    ((tms (Var X1) (Var X3)) EQ (tms (Var X2) (Var X4)))

lemma tms_cong_ax_holds: eval_fmla e tms_cong_ax
  ⟨proof⟩

definition equality_axioms :: fmla set where
  equality_axioms = {refl_ax, eq_cong_ax, syc_cong_ax, pls_cong_ax, tms_cong_ax}

lemma equality_axioms_hold: A ∈ equality_axioms ⇒ eval_fmla e A
  ⟨proof⟩

```

2.4 The Q (Robinson-arithmetic-specific) axioms

```

definition Q_axioms ≡
{A | A X1 X2.
 X1 ≠ X2 ∧
(A = neg (zer EQ suc (Var X1)) ∨
 A = suc (Var X1) EQ suc (Var X2)) IMP Var X1 EQ Var X2 ∨
 A = Var X2 EQ zer OR exi X1 (Var X2 EQ suc (Var X1)) ∨
 A = pls (Var X1) zer EQ Var X1 ∨
 A = pls (Var X1) (suc (Var X2)) EQ suc (pls (Var X1) (Var X2)) ∨
 A = tms (Var X1) zer EQ zer ∨
 A = tms (Var X1) (suc (Var X2)) EQ pls (tms (Var X1) (Var X2)) (Var X1))} 

```

2.5 The proof system

```

inductive nprv :: fmla set ⇒ fmla ⇒ bool (infixl ↪ 55)
where
| Hyp: A ∈ H ⇒ H ⊢ A
| Q: A ∈ Q_axioms ⇒ H ⊢ A
| Bool: A ∈ boolean_axioms ⇒ H ⊢ A
| eql: A ∈ equality_axioms ⇒ H ⊢ A
| Spec: A ∈ special_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 ⊢ (exi i A) IMP B

```

2.6 Derived rules of inference

```

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

```

```

lemma thin_Un:  $H \vdash A \implies H \cup H' \vdash A$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma thin:  $H \vdash A \implies H \subseteq H' \implies H' \vdash A$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma thin0:  $\{\} \vdash A \implies H \vdash A$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma thin1:  $H \vdash B \implies insert A H \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma thin2:  $insert A_1 H \vdash B \implies insert A_1 (insert A_2 H) \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma thin3:  $insert A_1 (insert A_2 H) \vdash B \implies insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 H)) \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma thin4:
   $insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 H)) \vdash B$ 
   $\implies insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 H))) \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma rotate2:  $insert A_2 (insert A_1 H) \vdash B \implies insert A_1 (insert A_2 H) \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma rotate3:  $insert A_3 (insert A_1 (insert A_2 H)) \vdash B \implies insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 H)) \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma rotate4:
   $insert A_4 (insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 H))) \vdash B$ 
   $\implies insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 H))) \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma rotate5:
   $insert A_5 (insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 H)))) \vdash B$ 
   $\implies insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 (insert A_5 H)))) \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma rotate6:
   $insert A_6 (insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 (insert A_5 H))))) \vdash B$ 
   $\implies insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 (insert A_5 (insert A_6 H))))) \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma rotate7:
   $insert A_7 (insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 (insert A_5 (insert A_6 H)))))) \vdash B$ 
   $\implies insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 (insert A_5 (insert A_6 (insert A_7 H)))))) \vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma rotate8:
   $insert A_8 (insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 (insert A_5 (insert A_6 (insert A_7 H))))))) \vdash B$ 
   $\implies insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 (insert A_5 (insert A_6 (insert A_7 (insert A_8 H)))))))$ 
   $\vdash B$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma rotate9:
   $insert A_9 (insert A_1 (insert A_2 (insert A_3 (insert A_4 (insert A_5 (insert A_6 (insert A_7 (insert A_8 H))))))) \vdash B$ 

```



```

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

lemma Assume: insert A  $H \vdash A$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

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

lemma dsjAssoc1:  $H \vdash A \text{ OR } (B \text{ OR } C) \implies H \vdash (A \text{ OR } B) \text{ OR } C$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma dsjAssoc2:  $H \vdash (A \text{ OR } B) \text{ OR } C \implies H \vdash A \text{ OR } (B \text{ OR } C)$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma dsj_commute_imp:  $H \vdash (B \text{ OR } A) \text{ IMP } (A \text{ OR } B)$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

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

```

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

```

```

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

```

2.8 Cut rules

```

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

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

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

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

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

```

```

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

lemma cut2:  $[\{A,B\} \vdash C; H \vdash A; H \vdash B] \implies H \vdash C$ 
  (proof)

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

lemma cut3:  $[\{A,B,C\} \vdash D; H \vdash A; H \vdash B; H \vdash C] \implies H \vdash D$ 
  (proof)

lemma cut4:  $[\{A,B,C,D\} \vdash E; H \vdash A; H \vdash B; H \vdash C; H \vdash D] \implies H \vdash E$ 
  (proof)

```

3 Miscellaneous Logical Rules

```

lemma dsj_I1:  $H \vdash A \implies H \vdash A \text{ OR } B$ 
  (proof)

lemma dsj_I2:  $H \vdash B \implies H \vdash A \text{ OR } B$ 
  (proof)

lemma Peirce:  $H \vdash (\text{neg } A) \text{ IMP } A \implies H \vdash A$ 
  (proof)

lemma Contra:  $\text{insert } (\text{neg } A) H \vdash A \implies H \vdash A$ 
  (proof)

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

lemma negneg_I:  $H \vdash A \implies H \vdash \text{neg } (\text{neg } A)$ 
  (proof)

lemma negneg_D:  $H \vdash \text{neg } (\text{neg } A) \implies H \vdash A$ 
  (proof)

lemma neg_D:  $H \vdash \text{neg } A \implies H \vdash A \implies H \vdash B$ 
  (proof)

lemma dsj_neg_1:  $H \vdash A \text{ OR } B \implies H \vdash \text{neg } B \implies H \vdash A$ 
  (proof)

lemma dsj_neg_2:  $H \vdash A \text{ OR } B \implies H \vdash \text{neg } A \implies H \vdash B$ 
  (proof)

lemma neg_dsj_I:  $H \vdash \text{neg } A \implies H \vdash \text{neg } B \implies H \vdash \text{neg } (A \text{ OR } B)$ 
  (proof)

lemma cnj_I [intro!]:  $H \vdash A \implies H \vdash B \implies H \vdash A \text{ AND } B$ 
  (proof)

lemma cnj_E1:  $H \vdash A \text{ AND } B \implies H \vdash A$ 
  (proof)

lemma cnj_E2:  $H \vdash A \text{ AND } B \implies H \vdash B$ 

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

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

lemma *cnj_E*: **assumes** *insert A (insert B H) ⊢ C* **shows** *insert (A AND B) H ⊢ C*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

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

lemma *neg_I0*: **assumes** $(\bigwedge B. \text{atom } i \notin B \implies \text{insert } A H \vdash B)$ **shows** $H \vdash \text{neg } A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *neg_mono*: *insert A H ⊢ B* \implies *insert (neg B) H ⊢ neg A*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *cnj_mono*: *insert A H ⊢ B* \implies *insert C H ⊢ D* \implies *insert (A AND C) H ⊢ B AND D*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dsj_mono*:
assumes *insert A H ⊢ B insert C H ⊢ D* **shows** *insert (A OR C) H ⊢ B OR D*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dsj_E*:
assumes *A: insert A H ⊢ C and B: insert B H ⊢ C* **shows** *insert (A OR B) H ⊢ C*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

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

lemma *Contra'*: *insert A H ⊢ neg A* \implies *H ⊢ neg A*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *negneg_E [intro!]*: *insert A H ⊢ B* \implies *insert (neg (neg A)) H ⊢ B*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

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*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *imp_cut*:
assumes *insert C H ⊢ A IMP B {A} ⊢ C*
shows *H ⊢ A IMP B*

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_I* [*intro!*]: $insert A H \vdash B \implies insert B H \vdash A \implies H \vdash A IFF B$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_MP_same*: $H \vdash A IFF B \implies H \vdash A \implies H \vdash B$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_MP2_same*: $H \vdash A IFF B \implies H \vdash B \implies H \vdash A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_refl* [*intro!*]: $H \vdash A IFF A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_sym*: $H \vdash A IFF B \implies H \vdash B IFF A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_trans*: $H \vdash A IFF B \implies H \vdash B IFF C \implies H \vdash A IFF C$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_E*:
 $insert A (insert B H) \vdash C \implies insert (\neg A) (insert (\neg B) H) \vdash C \implies insert (A IFF B) H \vdash C$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_E1*:
 assumes *A*: $H \vdash A$ **and** *B*: $insert B H \vdash C$ **shows** $insert (A IFF B) H \vdash C$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_E2*:
 assumes *A*: $H \vdash A$ **and** *B*: $insert B H \vdash C$ **shows** $insert (B IFF A) H \vdash C$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_MP_left*: $H \vdash A IFF B \implies insert A H \vdash C \implies insert B H \vdash C$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Iff_MP_left'*: $H \vdash A IFF B \implies insert B H \vdash C \implies insert A H \vdash C$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Swap*: $insert (\neg B) H \vdash A \implies insert (\neg A) H \vdash B$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Cases*: $insert A H \vdash B \implies insert (\neg A) H \vdash B \implies H \vdash B$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *neg_cnj_E*: $H \vdash B \implies insert (\neg A) H \vdash C \implies insert (\neg (A AND B)) H \vdash C$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dsj_CI*: $insert (\neg B) H \vdash A \implies H \vdash A OR B$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dsj_3I*: $insert (\neg A) (insert (\neg C) H) \vdash B \implies H \vdash A OR B OR C$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Contrapos1*: $H \vdash A IMP B \implies H \vdash \neg B IMP \neg A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Contrapos2*: $H \vdash (\neg B) IMP (\neg A) \implies H \vdash A IMP B$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

```

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

lemma ContraAssume:  $\neg B \in H \implies \text{insert} B H \vdash A$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

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

lemma dsj1_IE1:  $\text{insert} B H \vdash C \implies \text{insert}(A \text{ OR } B) H \vdash A \text{ OR } C$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemmas dsj1_IE1H = dsj1_IE1 dsj1_IE1 [THEN rotate2] dsj1_IE1 [THEN rotate3] dsj1_IE1 [THEN rotate4] dsj1_IE1 [THEN rotate5]
  dsj1_IE1 [THEN rotate6] dsj1_IE1 [THEN rotate7] dsj1_IE1 [THEN rotate8]
declare dsj1_IE1H [intro!]

```

3.1 Quantifier reasoning

```

lemma exi_I:  $H \vdash A(i ::= x) \implies H \vdash \text{exi } i A$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma exi_E:
  assumes  $\text{insert } A H \vdash B$  atom  $i \notin B \forall C \in H.$  atom  $i \notin C$ 
  shows  $\text{insert}(\text{exi } i A) H \vdash B$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma exi_E_with_renaming:
  assumes  $\text{insert}((i \leftrightarrow i') \cdot A) H \vdash B$  atom  $i' \notin (A, i, B) \forall C \in H.$  atom  $i' \notin C$ 
  shows  $\text{insert}(\text{exi } i A) H \vdash B$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

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

```

```

lemma exi_mono:  $\text{insert } A H \vdash B \implies \forall C \in H. \text{atom } i \notin C \implies \text{insert}(\text{exi } i A) H \vdash (\text{exi } i B)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma all_I [intro!]:  $H \vdash A \implies \forall C \in H. \text{atom } i \notin C \implies H \vdash \text{all } i A$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma all_D:  $H \vdash \text{all } i A \implies H \vdash A(i ::= x)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma all_E:  $\text{insert}(A(i ::= x)) H \vdash B \implies \text{insert}(\text{all } i A) H \vdash B$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma all_E':  $H \vdash \text{all } i A \implies \text{insert}(A(i ::= x)) H \vdash B \implies H \vdash B$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

3.2 Congruence rules

```

lemma neg_cong:  $H \vdash A \text{ IFF } A' \implies H \vdash \neg A \text{ IFF } \neg A'$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma dsj_cong:  $H \vdash A \text{ IFF } A' \implies H \vdash B \text{ IFF } B' \implies H \vdash A \text{ OR } B \text{ IFF } A' \text{ OR } B'$   

  ⟨proof⟩

lemma cnj_cong:  $H \vdash A \text{ IFF } A' \implies H \vdash B \text{ IFF } B' \implies H \vdash A \text{ AND } B \text{ IFF } A' \text{ AND } B'$   

  ⟨proof⟩

lemma imp_cong:  $H \vdash A \text{ IFF } A' \implies H \vdash B \text{ IFF } B' \implies H \vdash (A \text{ IMP } B) \text{ IFF } (A' \text{ IMP } B')$   

  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Iff_cong:  $H \vdash A \text{ IFF } A' \implies H \vdash B \text{ IFF } B' \implies H \vdash (A \text{ IFF } B) \text{ IFF } (A' \text{ IFF } B')$   

  ⟨proof⟩

lemma exi_cong:  $H \vdash A \text{ IFF } A' \implies \forall C \in H. \text{ atom } i \notin C \implies H \vdash (\text{exi } i A) \text{ IFF } (\text{exi } i A')$   

  ⟨proof⟩

lemma all_cong:  $H \vdash A \text{ IFF } A' \implies \forall C \in H. \text{ atom } i \notin C \implies H \vdash (\text{all } i A) \text{ IFF } (\text{all } i A')$   

  ⟨proof⟩

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

  ⟨proof⟩

```

4 Equality Reasoning

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

```

lemma eql_cong1:  $\{\} \vdash (t \text{ EQ } t' \text{ AND } u \text{ EQ } u') \text{ IMP } (t \text{ EQ } u \text{ IMP } t' \text{ EQ } u')$   

  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma Refl [iff]:  $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t$   

  ⟨proof⟩

```

Apparently necessary in order to prove the congruence property.

```

lemma Sym: assumes  $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } u$  shows  $H \vdash u \text{ EQ } t$   

  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

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

  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

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

  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma eql_cong:  

  assumes  $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t'$   $H \vdash u \text{ EQ } u'$  shows  $H \vdash t \text{ EQ } u \text{ IFF } t' \text{ EQ } u'$   

  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma eql_Trans_E:  $H \vdash x \text{ EQ } u \implies \text{insert } (t \text{ EQ } u) H \vdash A \implies \text{insert } (x \text{ EQ } t) H \vdash A$   

  ⟨proof⟩

```

4.2 The congruence properties for suc , pls and tms

```

lemma suc_cong1:  $\{\} \vdash (t \text{ EQ } t') \text{ IMP } (\text{suc } t \text{ EQ } \text{suc } t')$   

  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma suc_cong:  $\llbracket H \vdash t \text{ EQ } t' \rrbracket \implies H \vdash \text{suc } t \text{ EQ } \text{suc } t'$   

  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma pls_cong1:  $\{\} \vdash (t \text{ EQ } t' \text{ AND } u \text{ EQ } u') \text{ IMP } (\text{pls } t \text{ u EQ } \text{pls } t' \text{ u}')$ 

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

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

lemma *tms_cong1*: $\{\} \vdash (t \text{ EQ } t' \text{ AND } u \text{ EQ } u') \text{ IMP } (tms \ t \ u \text{ EQ } tms \ t' \ u')$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

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

4.3 Substitution for equalities

lemma *eql_subst_trm_Iff*: $\{t \text{ EQ } u\} \vdash \text{subst } i \ t \ \text{trm} \text{ EQ } \text{subst } i \ u \ \text{trm}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

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

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

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

4.4 Congruence rules for predicates

lemma *P1_cong*:
fixes *tms* :: *trm 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* :: *trm list*
assumes $\text{sub}: \bigwedge i \ t \ u \ x. \ \text{atom } i \notin \text{tms} \implies (P \ t \ u)(i ::= x) = P \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ t) \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ u)$
and eq: $H \vdash x \text{ EQ } x' \ H \vdash y \text{ EQ } y'$
shows $H \vdash P \ x \ y \text{ IFF } P \ x' \ y'$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *P3_cong*:
fixes *tms* :: *trm list*
assumes $\text{sub}: \bigwedge i \ t \ u \ v \ x. \ \text{atom } i \notin \text{tms} \implies$
 $(P \ t \ u \ v)(i ::= x) = P \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ t) \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ u) \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ v)$
and eq: $H \vdash x \text{ EQ } x' \ H \vdash y \text{ EQ } y' \ H \vdash z \text{ EQ } z'$
shows $H \vdash P \ x \ y \ z \text{ IFF } P \ x' \ y' \ z'$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *P4_cong*:
fixes *tms* :: *trm list*
assumes $\text{sub}: \bigwedge i \ t1 \ t2 \ t3 \ t4 \ x. \ \text{atom } i \notin \text{tms} \implies$
 $(P \ t1 \ t2 \ t3 \ t4)(i ::= x) = P \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ t1) \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ t2) \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ t3) \ (\text{subst } i \ x \ t4)$
and eq: $H \vdash x1 \text{ EQ } x1' \ H \vdash x2 \text{ EQ } x2' \ H \vdash x3 \text{ EQ } x3' \ H \vdash x4 \text{ EQ } x4'$
shows $H \vdash P \ x1 \ x2 \ x3 \ x4 \text{ IFF } P \ x1' \ x2' \ x3' \ x4'$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

4.5 The formula *fls*

lemma *neg_I* [intro!]: $\text{insert } A \ H \vdash \text{fls} \implies H \vdash \text{neg } A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *neg_E* [intro!]: $H \vdash A \implies \text{insert}(\neg A) H \vdash \text{fls}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

```
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!]
```

lemma *neg_imp_I* [intro!]: $H \vdash A \implies \text{insert} B H \vdash \text{fls} \implies H \vdash \neg(A \text{ IMP } B)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *neg_imp_E* [intro!]: $\text{insert}(\neg B)(\text{insert} A H) \vdash C \implies \text{insert}(\neg(A \text{ IMP } B)) H \vdash C$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

```
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!]: $\text{insert} \text{fls} H \vdash A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

```
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*: $H \vdash (\neg \text{fls})$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *exFalse*: $H \vdash \text{fls} \implies H \vdash A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Soundness of the provability relation

theorem *nprv_sound*: **assumes** $H \vdash A$ **shows** $(\forall B \in H. \text{eval_fmla } e B) \implies \text{eval_fmla } e A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

5 Instantiation of Syntax-Independent Logic Infrastructure

5.1 Preliminaries

```
inductive_set num :: trm set where
  zer[intro!,simp]:  $\text{zer} \in \text{num}$ 
  | suc[simp]:  $t \in \text{num} \implies \text{suc } t \in \text{num}$ 
```

```
definition ground_aux :: trm  $\Rightarrow$  atom set  $\Rightarrow$  bool
  where  $\text{ground\_aux } t S \equiv (\text{supp } t \subseteq S)$ 
```

```

abbreviation ground :: trm  $\Rightarrow$  bool
where ground t  $\equiv$  ground_aux t {}

definition ground_fmla_aux :: fmla  $\Rightarrow$  atom set  $\Rightarrow$  bool
where ground_fmla_aux A S  $\equiv$  (supp A  $\subseteq$  S)

abbreviation ground_fmla :: fmla  $\Rightarrow$  bool
where ground_fmla A  $\equiv$  ground_fmla_aux A {}

lemma ground_aux.simps[simp]:
ground_aux zer S = True
ground_aux (Var k) S = (if atom k  $\in$  S then True else False)
ground_aux (suc t) S = (ground_aux t S)
ground_aux (pls t u) S = (ground_aux t S  $\wedge$  ground_aux u S)
ground_aux (tms t u) S = (ground_aux t S  $\wedge$  ground_aux u S)
⟨proof⟩

lemma ground_fmla_aux.simps[simp]:
ground_fmla_aux fls S = True
ground_fmla_aux (t EQ u) S = (ground_aux t S  $\wedge$  ground_aux u S)
ground_fmla_aux (A OR B) S = (ground_fmla_aux A S  $\wedge$  ground_fmla_aux B S)
ground_fmla_aux (A AND B) S = (ground_fmla_aux A S  $\wedge$  ground_fmla_aux B S)
ground_fmla_aux (A IFF B) S = (ground_fmla_aux A S  $\wedge$  ground_fmla_aux B S)
ground_fmla_aux (neg A) S = (ground_fmla_aux A S)
ground_fmla_aux (exi x A) S = (ground_fmla_aux A (S  $\cup$  {atom x}))
⟨proof⟩

lemma ground_fresh[simp]:
ground t  $\implies$  atom i  $\notin$  t
ground_fmla A  $\implies$  atom i  $\notin$  A
⟨proof⟩

definition Fvars t = {a :: name.  $\neg$  atom a  $\notin$  t}

lemma Fvars_trm.simps[simp]:
Fvars zer = {}
Fvars (Var a) = {a}
Fvars (suc x) = Fvars x
Fvars (pls x y) = Fvars x  $\cup$  Fvars y
Fvars (tms x y) = Fvars x  $\cup$  Fvars y
⟨proof⟩

lemma finite_Fvars_trm[simp]:
fixes t :: trm
shows finite (Fvars t)
⟨proof⟩

lemma Fvars_fmla.simps[simp]:
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 (exi a A) = Fvars A - {a}
Fvars (all a A) = Fvars A - {a}

```

```

⟨proof⟩

lemma finite_Fvars_fmla[simp]:
  fixes A :: fmla
  shows finite (Fvars A)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_trm_subst_trm[simp]:
  x ≠ y ⟹ atom x # u ⟹ subst y u (subst x t v) = subst x (subst y u t) (subst y u v)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subst_fmla_subst_fmla[simp]:
  x ≠ y ⟹ atom x # u ⟹ (A(x:=t))(y:=u) = (A(y:=u))(x:=subst y u t)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Fvars_empty_ground[simp]: Fvars t = {} ⟹ ground t
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Fvars_ground_aux: Fvars t ⊆ B ⟹ ground_aux t (atom ` B)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma ground_Fvars: ground t ↔ Fvars t = {}
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Fvars_ground_fmla_aux: Fvars A ⊆ B ⟹ ground_fmla_aux A (atom ` B)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma ground_fmla_Fvars: ground_fmla A ↔ Fvars A = {}
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma obtain_const_trm:
  obtains t where eval_trm e t = x t ∈ num
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma ex_eval_fmla_iff_exists_num:
  eval_fmla e (exi k A) ↔ (∃ t. eval_fmla e (A(k:=t)) ∧ t ∈ num)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma exi_ren: y ∉ Fvars φ ⟹ exi x φ = exi y (φ(x:=Var y))
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma all_ren: y ∉ Fvars φ ⟹ all x φ = all y (φ(x:=Var y))
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Fvars_num[simp]: t ∈ num ⟹ Fvars t = {}
  ⟨proof⟩

```

5.2 Instantiation of the generic syntax and deduction relation

interpretation Generic_Syntax **where**

```

var = UNIV :: name set
and trm = UNIV :: trm set
and fmla = UNIV :: fmla set
and Var = Var
and FvarsT = Fvars
and substT = λt u x. subst x u t
and Fvars = Fvars
and subst = λA u x. subst_fmla A x u

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation *Syntax_with_Numerals* **where**

```

var = UNIV :: name set
and trm = UNIV :: trm set
and fmla = UNIV :: fmla set
and num = num
and Var = Var
and FvarsT = Fvars
and substT =  $\lambda t u x. subst\ x\ u\ t$ 
and Fvars = Fvars
and subst =  $\lambda A u x. subst\_fmla\ A\ x\ u$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 
```

interpretation *Deduct_with_False* **where**

```

var = UNIV :: name set
and trm = UNIV :: trm set
and fmla = UNIV :: fmla set
and num = num
and Var = Var
and FvarsT = Fvars
and substT =  $\lambda t u x. subst\ x\ u\ t$ 
and Fvars = Fvars
and subst =  $\lambda A u x. subst\_fmla\ A\ x\ u$ 
and eql = eql and cnj = cnj and imp = imp and all = all
and exi = exi and fls = fls
and prv = ( $\vdash$ ) {}
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 
```

interpretation *Deduct_with_False_Disj* **where**

```

var = UNIV :: name set
and trm = UNIV :: trm set
and fmla = UNIV :: fmla set
and num = num
and Var = Var
and FvarsT = Fvars
and substT =  $\lambda t u x. subst\ x\ u\ t$ 
and Fvars = Fvars
and subst =  $\lambda A u x. subst\_fmla\ A\ x\ u$ 
and eql = eql and cnj = cnj and dsj = dsj and imp = imp
and all = all and exi = exi and fls = fls
and prv = ( $\vdash$ ) {}
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 
```

5.3 Instantiation of the arithmetic-enriched generic syntax and deduction relation

interpretation *Syntax_Arith_aux* **where**

```

var = UNIV :: name set
and trm = UNIV :: trm set
and fmla = UNIV :: fmla set
and num = num
and Var = Var
and FvarsT = Fvars
and substT =  $\lambda t u x. subst\ x\ u\ t$ 
and Fvars = Fvars
and subst =  $\lambda A u x. subst\_fmla\ A\ x\ u$ 
and eql = eql and cnj = cnj and imp = imp and all = all
```

```

and  $exi = exi$  and  $dsj = dsj$  and  $fls = fls$ 
and  $zer = zer$  and  $suc = suc$  and  $pls = pls$  and  $tms = tms$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma num_range_Num:  $num = range\ Num$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma [simp]: {} ⊢ neg (zer EQ suc (Var xx))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma [simp]: {} ⊢ Var yy EQ zer OR exi xx (Var yy EQ suc (Var xx))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma [simp]: {} ⊢ pls (Var xx) zer EQ Var xx
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma [simp]: {} ⊢ tms (Var xx) zer EQ zer
⟨proof⟩

```

interpretation S : Syntax_Arith **where**

```

var = UNIV :: name set
and trm = UNIV :: trm set
and fmla = UNIV :: fmla set
and num = num
and Var = Var
and FvarsT = Fvars
and substT =  $\lambda t u x. subst\ x\ u\ t$ 
and Fvars = Fvars
and subst =  $\lambda A u x. subst\_fmla\ A\ x\ u$ 
and eql = eql and cnj = cnj and imp = imp and all = all
and exi = exi and dsj = dsj and fls = fls and zer = zer
and suc = suc and pls = pls and tms = tms
⟨proof⟩

```

interpretation Deduct_Q **where**

```

var = UNIV :: name set
and trm = UNIV :: trm set
and fmla = UNIV :: fmla set
and num = num
and Var = Var
and FvarsT = Fvars
and substT =  $\lambda t u x. subst\ x\ u\ t$ 
and Fvars = Fvars
and subst =  $\lambda A u x. subst\_fmla\ A\ x\ u$ 
and eql = eql and cnj = cnj and imp = imp and all = all
and exi = exi and dsj = dsj and fls = fls and zer = zer
and suc = suc and pls = pls and tms = tms
and prv = (⊢) {}
⟨proof⟩

```

5.4 Instantiation of the abstract notion of standard model and truth

interpretation Minimal_Truth_Soundness **where**

```

var = UNIV :: name set
and trm = UNIV :: trm set
and fmla = UNIV :: fmla set
and num = num
and Var = Var

```

```
and FvarsT = Fvars
and substT =  $\lambda t\ u\ x.\ subst\ x\ u\ t$ 
and Fvars = Fvars
and subst =  $\lambda A\ u\ x.\ subst\_fmla\ A\ x\ u$ 
and eql = eql and cnj = cnj and dsj = dsj and imp = imp
and all = all and exi = exi and fls = fls
and prv = ( $\vdash$ ) []
and isTrue = eval_fmla e0
⟨proof⟩
```