

Infinitarily Definable Non-Well-Founded Sets

Roger Bishop Jones

Abstract

This paper is my second approach to set theory conceived as a maximal consistent theory of set comprehension. The principle innovation in this version is to simplify the syntax by removing comprehension, so that the syntactic category of term is no longer required.

Created: 2006/11/29

Last Change Date: 2012/08/11 21:01:52

<http://www.rbjones.com/rbjpub/pp/doc/t021.pdf>

Id: t024.doc,v 1.19 2012/08/11 21:01:52 rbj Exp

© Roger Bishop Jones; Licenced under Gnu LGPL

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	INFINITARY LOGIC	3
2.1	Syntax	3
2.1.1	Constructors, Discriminators and Destructors	3
2.1.2	The Inductive Definition of Syntax	4
2.2	Semantics	7
2.2.1	Domains	7
2.2.2	Manipulating Valuations	8
2.2.3	Formula Evaluation	9
2.2.4	Some Orderings	12
2.2.5	Monotonicity	13
3	SET THEORY	14
3.1	Packing and Unpacking Relationship Pairs	14
3.2	Recasting of EvalForm	16
3.3	Membership and Equality	17
3.4	The Semantic Functor	19
4	INFINITARILY DEFINABLE MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURES	19
4.0.1	Extensionality of Equality	21
4.0.2	Proof Contexts	22
5	The Theory ifol	23
5.1	Parents	23
5.2	Constants	23
5.3	Type Abbreviations	24
5.4	Fixity	24
5.5	Definitions	24
5.6	Theorems	28
6	INDEX	32

To Do

-
-

References

- [1] Roger Bishop Jones. Set Theory as Consistent Infinitary Comprehension. *RBJones.com*, 2010. <http://www.rbjones.com/rbjpub/pp/doc/t021.pdf>.

1 INTRODUCTION

See t021 for previous discussion. I will put something better here if it works out.

2 INFINITARY LOGIC

SML

```
|open_theory "misc2";  
|force_new_theory "ifol";  
|force_new_pc "'ifol";  
|merge_pcs ["'savedthm_cs_∃_proof"] "'ifol";  
|set_merge_pcs ["hol1", "'GS1", "'misc1", "'misc2", "'ifol"];
```

2.1 Syntax

2.1.1 Constructors, Discriminators and Destructors

Preliminary to presenting the inductive definition of the required classes we define the nuts and bolts operations on the required syntactic entities (some of which will be used in the inductive definition).

A constructor puts together some syntactic entity from its constituents, discriminators distinguish between the different kinds of entity and destructors take them apart.

“Atomic” formulae consist of a relation name together with an indexed collection of arguments. The relation name may be any set. The indexed set of arguments is any set which is a function, i.e. a many-one relation represented as a set of (Wiener-Kuratovski) ordered pairs. The distinction between atomic and compound formulae is made by tagging the former with the ordinal zero and the latter with the ordinal 1, a tagged value in this case being an ordered pair of which the left element is the tag and the right element is the value.

HOL Constant

```
| MkAf : GS × GS → GS  
|-----  
|  $\forall lr \bullet \text{MkAf } lr = (\text{Nat}_g \ 0) \mapsto_g ((\text{Fst } lr) \mapsto_g (\text{Snd } lr))$ 
```

HOL Constant

```
| IsAf : GS → BOOL  
|-----  
|  $\forall t \bullet \text{IsAf } t = \text{fst } t = (\text{Nat}_g \ 0)$ 
```

HOL Constant

```
| AfRel : GS → GS  
|-----  
|  $\text{AfRel} = \lambda x \bullet \text{fst}(\text{snd } x)$ 
```

HOL Constant

```
| AfPars : GS → GS  
|-----  
|  $\text{AfPars} = \lambda x \bullet \text{snd}(\text{snd } x)$ 
```

HOL Constant

MkCf : $GS \times GS \rightarrow GS$

$\forall vc \bullet \text{MkCf } vc = (\text{Nat}_g \ 1) \mapsto_g ((\text{Fst } vc) \mapsto_g (\text{Snd } vc))$

HOL Constant

IsCf : $GS \rightarrow \text{BOOL}$

$\forall t \bullet \text{IsCf } t = \text{fst } t = (\text{Nat}_g \ 1)$

HOL Constant

CfVars : $GS \rightarrow GS$

$\text{CfVars} = \lambda x \bullet \text{fst}(\text{snd } x)$

HOL Constant

CfForms : $GS \rightarrow GS$

$\text{CfForms} = \lambda x \bullet \text{snd}(\text{snd } x)$

Is_clauses =

$\vdash (\forall x \bullet \text{IsAf } (\text{MkAf } x))$
 $\wedge (\forall x \bullet \neg \text{IsAf } (\text{MkCf } x))$
 $\wedge (\forall x \bullet \neg \text{IsCf } (\text{MkAf } x))$
 $\wedge (\forall x \bullet \text{IsCf } (\text{MkCf } x))$

Is_not_fc_clauses =

$\vdash (\forall x \bullet \text{IsAf } x \Rightarrow \neg \text{IsCf } x) \wedge (\forall x \bullet \text{IsCf } x \Rightarrow \neg \text{IsAf } x)$

Some derived syntax:

HOL Constant

MkNot : $GS \rightarrow GS$

$\forall f \bullet \text{MkNot } f = \text{MkCf } (\emptyset_g, \text{Pair}_g \ f \ f)$

2.1.2 The Inductive Definition of Syntax

This is accomplished by defining the required closure condition (closure under the above constructors for arguments of the right kind) and then taking the intersection of all sets which satisfy the closure condition.

The closure condition is:

HOL Constant

RepClosed: $GS\ SET \rightarrow BOOL$

$\forall s \bullet RepClosed\ s \Leftrightarrow$

$(\forall n\ is \bullet fun\ is \Rightarrow MkAf\ (n, is) \in s)$

$\wedge (\forall vars\ fs \bullet X_g\ fs \subseteq s \Rightarrow MkCf\ (vars, fs) \in s)$

The well-formed syntax is then the smallest set closed under these constructions.

HOL Constant

Syntax : $GS\ SET$

$Syntax = \bigcap \{x \mid RepClosed\ x\}$

syntax_⊆_repclosed_thm =

$\vdash \forall s \bullet RepClosed\ s \Rightarrow Syntax \subseteq s$

This is an “inductive datatype” so we should expect the usual kinds of theorems.

Informally these should say:

- Syntax is closed under the two constructors.
- The syntax constructors are injections, have disjoint ranges, and partition the syntax.
- Any syntactic property which is preserved by the constructors (i.e. is true of any construction if it is true of all its syntactic constituents) is true of everything in syntax (this is an induction principle).

repclosed_syntax_lemma =

$\vdash RepClosed\ Syntax$

repclosed_syntax_thm =

$\vdash (\forall n\ is \bullet fun\ is \Rightarrow MkAf\ (n, is) \in Syntax)$

$\wedge (\forall vars\ fs$

$\bullet (\forall x \bullet x \in X_g\ fs \Rightarrow x \in Syntax) \Rightarrow MkCf\ (vars, fs) \in Syntax)$

repclosed_syntax_lemma1 =

$\vdash \forall s \bullet RepClosed\ s \Rightarrow Syntax \subseteq s$

repclosed_syntax_lemma2 =

$\vdash \forall p \bullet RepClosed\ \{x \mid p\ x\} \Rightarrow (\forall x \bullet x \in Syntax \Rightarrow p\ x)$

We need to be able to define functions by recursion over this syntax. To do that we need to prove that the syntax of comprehensions is well-founded. This is itself equivalent to an induction principle, so we can try and derive it using the induction principles already available.

We must first define the relation of priority over the syntax, i.e. the relation between an element of the syntax and its constituents.

ScPrec : *GS REL*

$\forall \alpha \gamma \bullet \text{ScPrec } \alpha \gamma \Leftrightarrow$
 $\exists \text{ord } fs \bullet \alpha \in_g fs \wedge \{\alpha; \gamma\} \subseteq \text{Syntax} \wedge \gamma = \text{MkCf } (\text{ord}, fs)$

ScPrec_tc_∈_thm =

$\vdash \forall x y \bullet \text{ScPrec } x y \Rightarrow tc \ \$\in_g x y$

well_founded_ScPrec_thm =

$\vdash \text{well_founded } \text{ScPrec}$

well_founded_tcScPrec_thm =

$\vdash \text{well_founded } (tc \ \text{ScPrec})$

val SC_INDUCTION_T = *WFCV_INDUCTION_T well_founded_ScPrec_thm*;

val sc_induction_tac = *wfcv_induction_tac well_founded_ScPrec_thm*;

The set *Syntax* gives us the syntactically well-formed phrases of our language. It will be useful to have some predicates which incorporate well-formedness, which are defined here.

syntax_disj_thm =

$\vdash \forall x$
 $\bullet x \in \text{Syntax}$
 $\Rightarrow (\exists r \text{ pars} \bullet \text{fun } \text{pars} \wedge x = \text{MkAf } (r, \text{pars}))$
 $\vee (\exists \text{vars } fs \bullet (\forall y \bullet y \in_g fs \Rightarrow y \in \text{Syntax}) \wedge x = \text{MkCf } (\text{vars}, fs))$

syntax_cases_thm =

$\vdash \forall x \bullet x \in \text{Syntax} \Rightarrow \text{IsAf } x \vee \text{IsCf } x$

is_fc_clauses =

$\vdash \forall x$
 $\bullet x \in \text{Syntax}$
 $\Rightarrow (\text{IsAf } x \Rightarrow (\exists r \text{ pars} \bullet \text{fun } \text{pars} \wedge x = \text{MkAf } (r, \text{pars})))$
 $\wedge (\text{IsCf } x$
 $\Rightarrow (\exists \text{vars } fs$
 $\bullet (\forall y \bullet y \in_g fs \Rightarrow y \in \text{Syntax}) \wedge x = \text{MkCf } (\text{vars}, fs)))$

syn_proj_clauses =

$\vdash (\forall l r \bullet \text{AfRel } (\text{MkAf } (l, r)) = l)$
 $\wedge (\forall l r \bullet \text{AfPars } (\text{MkAf } (l, r)) = r)$
 $\wedge (\forall v f \bullet \text{CfVars } (\text{MkCf } (v, f)) = v)$
 $\wedge (\forall v f \bullet \text{CfForms } (\text{MkCf } (v, f)) = f)$

```

| is_fc_clauses2 =
|   ⊢ ∀ x • x ∈ Syntax ⇒ IsCf x ⇒ (∀ y • y ∈g CfForms x ⇒ y ∈ Syntax)
|
| stn_con_neq_clauses =
|   ⊢ ∀ x y • ¬ MkAf x = MkCf y
|
| syn_comp_fc_clauses =
|   ⊢ ∀ v f • MkCf (v, f) ∈ Syntax ⇒ (∀ y • y ∈g f ⇒ y ∈ Syntax)
|
| scprec_fc_clauses =
|   ⊢ ∀ α γ vars fs • γ ∈ Syntax ⇒ γ = MkCf (vars, fs) ∧ α ∈g fs ⇒ ScPrec α γ
|
| scprec_fc_clauses2 =
|   ⊢ ∀ t • t ∈ Syntax ⇒ IsCf t ⇒ (∀ f • f ∈g CfForms t ⇒ ScPrec f t)

```

2.2 Semantics

The semantics of infinitary first order logic is given by defining “truth in an interpretation”.

2.2.1 Domains

We consider here some of the value domains which are significant in the semantics.

The following type abbreviations are introduced:

RV Relation Value - the arguments to a relation can be represented by indexed sets (think of the indices as parameter names), and a relation is then a truth valued function over these indexed sets (a set of indexed sets won't do because we have three truth values). Note that relations need not have a definite arity, and the function representing a relation must be total over the entire type of indexed sets. There are questions about how best ordinary n-ary relations should be represented, one obvious choice would be to make the truth value undefined for any indexed sets which do not have exactly the right number of numerical indices.

ST Structure = a structure is a domain of discourse (a set) together with an indexed set of relations over that domain. Ordinals are used for relation names as well as for variable names (no ambiguity arises) and a collection of relations can therefore be modelled in the same way as a relation valued variable assignment.

SML

```

| declare_type_abbrev("RV", ["'a", "'b"], ⊢:'a IS → 'b⊔);
| declare_type_abbrev("ST", ["'a", "'b"], ⊢:'a SET × ('a, 'b) RV IS⊔);

```

To help in the location of fixed points we want a semantics which is monotonic, and therefore define here orderings on these domains relative to which we expect the semantics to be monotonic.

The ordering on relations derives from the ordering on the truth values, using the operator *Pw*.

HOL Constant

$\mathbf{RvO} : ('b \rightarrow 'b \rightarrow \text{BOOL}) \rightarrow ('a, 'b) \text{RV} \rightarrow ('a, 'b) \text{RV} \rightarrow \text{BOOL}$

$\forall r \bullet \text{RvO } r = \text{Pw } r$

$\mathbf{rvo_lubs_exist_thm} =$

$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{LubsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{LubsExist } (\text{RvO } r)$

$\mathbf{rvo_glbs_exist_thm} =$

$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{GlbsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{GlbsExist } (\text{RvO } r)$

HOL Constant

$\mathbf{RvIsO} : ('b \rightarrow 'b \rightarrow \text{BOOL}) \rightarrow ('a, 'b) \text{RV IS} \rightarrow ('a, 'b) \text{RV IS} \rightarrow \text{BOOL}$

$\forall r \bullet \text{RvIsO } r = \text{IsEO } (\text{RvO } r)$

$\mathbf{rviso_lubs_exist_thm} =$

$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{LubsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{LubsExist } (\text{RvIsO } r)$

$\mathbf{rviso_glbs_exist_thm} =$

$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{GlbsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{GlbsExist } (\text{RvIsO } r)$

HOL Constant

$\mathbf{StO} : ('b \rightarrow 'b \rightarrow \text{BOOL}) \rightarrow ('a, 'b) \text{ST} \rightarrow ('a, 'b) \text{ST} \rightarrow \text{BOOL}$

$\forall r \bullet \text{StO } r = \text{DerivedOrder Snd } (\text{IsEO } (\text{RvO } r))$

$\mathbf{sto_lubs_exist_thm} =$

$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{LubsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{LubsExist } (\text{StO } r)$

$\mathbf{sto_glbs_exist_thm} =$

$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{GlbsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{GlbsExist } (\text{StO } r)$

2.2.2 Manipulating Valuations

In this syntax, by contrast with that in [1], we do not require variables to be ordinals, they may be arbitrary sets, since no steps are necessary to avoid variable capture. There was no need even in [1], the use of a transfinite version of DeBriujn indices was a hang over from the PolySets where something of the kind really was needed.

This function is used in the evaluation of atomic formulae. Given a set of indices (the names of actual parameters to an atomic formula, which are always variables) and an indexed set (the values of the variables) this function returns an indexed set which contains the values for the actual parameters to the relation.

HOL Constant

```
VarComp : GS → 'a IS → 'a IS
```

```
∀m is • VarComp m is =  
  λv • if v ∈g dom m then is (m g v) else dpoB
```

2.2.3 Formula Evaluation

Now we define the evaluation of formulae, i.e. the notion of truth in a structure given a variable assignment.

There are two cases in the syntax, atomic and compound formulae. The truth values of the atomic formulae are obtained from an infinitary structure given the values of the arguments, which are always variables, i.e. to evaluate an atomic formula you look up the values of the arguments in the current context (variable assignment) and then look up the truth value of the stipulated relation for those arguments in the structure.

HOL Constant

```
EvalAf : 't REL → GS → ('a, 't) ST → ('a, 't) RV
```

```
∀$≤t (at:GS) (st:'a, 't) ST (va:'a IS) • EvalAf $≤t at st va =  
  let r = AfRel at  
  and pars = AfPars at  
  in  
    let rv = (Snd st) r  
    in  
      if dpoUdef rv  
      then Lub $≤t {}  
      else  
        if dpoOdef rv  
        then Glb $≤t {}  
        else (dpoV rv) (VarComp pars va)
```

To evaluate a compound formula you must first evaluate the constituent formulae in every context obtainable by modification of the variables bound by the compound formula. You need only remember the resulting truth values, the compound formulae are in this sense “truth functional”, and, though this may involve evaluating a very large number of instances of subformulae, it can only yield some subset of $\{pTrue, pFalse, pU\}$.

The following definition shows how the truth values of the constituents of a compound formula then determines the truth value of the compound formula.

SML

```
declare_type_abbrev("CFE", ["'t"], [⌈:'t SET → 't⌋]);
```

HOL Constant

EvalCf_tf3 : TTV CFE

$\forall results \bullet EvalCf_tf3 \ results =$
if $results \subseteq \{pTrue\}$ then $pFalse$
else if $(pFalse) \in results$ then $pTrue$
else pU

HOL Constant

EvalCf_tf4 : FTV CFE

$\forall results \bullet EvalCf_tf4 \ results =$
if $results \subseteq \{fTrue\}$ then $fFalse$
else if $results \subseteq \{fTrue; fB\}$ then fB
else if $fT \in results$ then fT else $fTrue$

This definition shows how the set of truth values of instances of the constituents is obtained from the denotations of the constituent formulae.

HOL Constant

EvalCf : 't CFE \rightarrow GS \rightarrow ('a, 't) ST \rightarrow ('a, 't) RV SET \rightarrow ('a, 't) RV

$\forall etf \ f \bullet EvalCf \ etf \ f = \lambda st \ rvs \ va \bullet$
let $\nu = CfVars \ f$
and $V = Fst \ st$
in $etf \ \{pb \mid \exists rv \ v \bullet$
 $rv \in rvs$
 $\wedge IsDom \ v = X_g \ \nu$
 $\wedge IsRan \ v \subseteq V$
 $\wedge pb = rv \ (IsOverride \ v \ va)\}$

Now we define a parameterised functor of which the semantic function is a fixed point.

HOL Constant

EvalFormFunct : 't CFE \times 't REL \times ('a, 't) ST \rightarrow (GS \rightarrow ('a, 't) RV) \rightarrow (GS \rightarrow ('a, 't) RV)

$\forall cfe \ \$_{\leq t} \ st \bullet EvalFormFunct \ (cfe, \$_{\leq t}, st) = \lambda ef \ f \bullet$
if $f \in Syntax$
then if $IsAf \ f$
 then $EvalAf \ \$_{\leq t} \ f \ st$
 else
 if $IsCf \ f$
 then let $rvs = FunImage \ ef \ (X_g(CfForms \ f))$
 in $EvalCf \ cfe \ f \ st \ rvs$
 else $\epsilon x \bullet T$
else $\epsilon x \bullet T$

$$\mathbf{EvalForm} : 't \text{ CFE} \times 't \text{ REL} \times ('a, 't) \text{ ST} \rightarrow \text{GS} \rightarrow ('a, 't) \text{ RV}$$

$$\forall cfe \ \$\leq_t \ st \bullet \text{EvalForm} (cfe, \ \$\leq_t, st) = \text{fix} (\text{EvalFormFunct} (cfe, \ \$\leq_t, st))$$

To use this definition we need to show that there exists a fixed point, for which we must show that the functor respects some well-founded relation.

$$\mathbf{evalformfunct_respect_thm} =$$

$$\vdash \forall (V, r) \bullet \text{EvalFormFunct} (V, r) \text{ respects } \text{ScPrec}$$

$$\mathbf{evalformfunct_fixp_lemma} =$$

$$\vdash \forall st \bullet \text{EvalForm} \ st = \text{EvalFormFunct} \ st (\text{EvalForm} \ st)$$

$$\mathbf{evalformfunct_thm} =$$

$$\vdash \forall st$$

- $\text{EvalForm} \ st$

$$= (\lambda f$$

- if $f \in \text{Syntax}$

then

if $\text{IsAf} \ f$

then $\text{EvalAf} \ f \ st$

else if $\text{IsCf} \ f$

then

let $rvs = \text{FunImage} (\text{EvalForm} \ st) (X_g (\text{CfForms} \ f))$

in $\text{EvalCf} \ f \ st \ rvs$

else $\in x \bullet T$

else $\in x \bullet T$)

$$\mathbf{evalformfunct_thm2} =$$

$$\vdash \forall st \ f$$

- $\text{EvalForm} \ st \ f$

$$= (\text{if } f \in \text{Syntax}$$

then

if $\text{IsAf} \ f$

then $\text{EvalAf} \ f \ st$

else if $\text{IsCf} \ f$

then

let $rvs = \text{FunImage} (\text{EvalForm} \ st) (X_g (\text{CfForms} \ f))$

in $\text{EvalCf} \ f \ st \ rvs$

else $\in f \bullet T$

else $\in f \bullet T$)

2.2.4 Some Orderings

In order to prove that the semantics is monotonic, we must first define the partial orderings relative to which the semantics is monotonic, and we must obtain fixpoint theorems for the orderings.

We have at present two cases under consideration, according to whether three or four truth values are adopted.

The three valued case turns out in some respects more complex than the four valued case, because it is necessary to make do with chain completeness and the fixed point theorem is more difficult to prove. I will therefore progress only the four valued case until I find a reason to further progress the three valued case.

Here is the beginning of the three valued case which I started before.

It is also necessary to prove that these partial orderings are CCPOs (chain complete partial orders), this being the weakest condition for which we have a suitable fixed point theorem. It is convenient to be slightly more definite, to make the orderings all reflexive, and show that they are reflexive CCPOs (for which we use the term CCRPO).

The following ordering is applicable to partial relations.

SML

```
| declare_infix(300, "≤ft3");
```

HOL Constant

```
| $≤ft3 : ('a → TTV) → ('a → TTV) → BOOL
```

```
| $≤ft3 = Pw $≤t3
```

```
| ccrpou_≤ft3_thm =
|   ⊢ CcRpoU $≤ft3
```

Lets now get on with the four valued case.

SML

```
| declare_infix(300, "≤ft4");
```

HOL Constant

```
| $≤ft4 : ('a → FTV) → ('a → FTV) → BOOL
```

```
| $≤ft4 = Pw $≤t4
```

```
| ccrpou_≤ft4_thm =
|   ⊢ $≤ft4
```

```
| evalcf_tf4_increasing_lemma =
|   ⊢ Increasing (SetO $≤t4) $≤t4 EvalCf_tf4
```

2.2.5 Monotonicity

evalaf_increasing_lemma =
 $\vdash \forall tr\ g \bullet CRpoU\ tr \Rightarrow Increasing\ (StO\ tr)\ (RvO\ tr)\ (EvalAf\ tr\ g)$

To get a monotonicity result for the semantics of first order logic it is necessary to adjust the type of the semantic function.

The function which we wish to be monotonic is the mappings for each fixed domain of discourse and each particular formula, which take an indexed set of relations (corresponding to some interpretation over the given domain) and return the relation represented by the formulae in that context.

The following function accepts one compound argument containing the relevant context and yields a function which we expect to be monotonic:

HOL Constant

MonoEvalForm : 't CFE \times 't REL \times 'a SET \times GS \rightarrow ('a, 't) RV IS \rightarrow ('a, 't) RV

 $\forall c\ r\ s\ g\ ris \bullet MonoEvalForm\ (c,\ r,\ s,\ g)\ ris = EvalForm\ (c,\ r,\ (s,\ ris))\ g$

monoevalform_increasing_lemma =
 $\vdash \forall c\ r\ s\ g$
 $\bullet CRpoU\ r \wedge Increasing\ (SetO\ r)\ r\ c$
 $\Rightarrow Increasing\ (RvIsO\ r)\ (RvO\ r)\ (MonoEvalForm\ (c,\ r,\ s,\ g))$

evalform_increasing_thm =
 $\vdash \forall c\ r\ s\ g$
 $\bullet CRpoU\ r \wedge Increasing\ (SetO\ r)\ r\ c$
 $\Rightarrow Increasing\ (RvIsO\ r)\ (RvO\ r)\ (\lambda\ ris \bullet EvalForm\ (c,\ r,\ s,\ ris)\ g)$

3 SET THEORY

We now narrow our interest to just one theory, set theory. This will be treated using the above formalisation of infinitary logic, and will be the infinitary language with just two binary relations, equality and membership.

We consider set theory as the theory of extensions. The ‘naive’ approach to this is the theory with equality and membership which has equality and extensionality axioms and the principle of set comprehension, according to which to every formula with one free variable there is a set whose extension is those elements for which the formula will be true if the free variable denotes that element. This theory unfortunately is inconsistent, but, more than one century after this discovery we still have neither a wholly satisfactory explanation of why this is the case, nor a theory which can be argued to be a maximal consistent weakening of that ontological principle. Of course, there may be no such theory, but it is our purpose here to look further into this matter.

This will be done by looking for maximal subsets of the infinitarily definable properties which can be realised in a consistent set theory. The definition of infinitary first order logic above stipulated a class of properties relative to some give relational structure, and tells us the meaning of these formulae. We will be seeking subsets of the formulae which provide an interpretation of set theory.

This will be done by formulating the semantics of set theory as a functor operating on the relational structure for which the existence of a fixed point determines the required interpretation.

We are seeking a functor which when supplied with membership and equality relations will deliver new relationships at least as detailed as the original (they are partial relationships). This is what we now define.

We define a functor which takes a relational structure containing a membership and an equality relation, over a domain which is some unspecified subset of the formulae of infinitary logic defined above, and computes a new similar structure. The new structure will be that of the sets infinitarily definable in the first structure by formulae in the domain of discourse. This functor may be view as the giving a semantics to the language of infinitary first order set theory, which is does by adding the the semantics of the logic above, an account of the meaning of the membership and equality relations. This account is recursive and is therefore expressed as a functor, and will be well-defined only if the functor has a fixed point. The functor will be monotone and will therefore have a fixed point, but this will be in general a pair of partial relations, and we will be seeking particular subsets of the language for which there is a definite fixed point such that the relations are everywhere either true or false. From such a definite fixed point an interpretation of the classical two-valued set theory may be constructed.

3.1 Packing and Unpacking Relationship Pairs

The format of a structure, as used in the specification of infinitary logic above, supports arbitrary structures as indexed sets. The definitions in this section provide for conversion between indexed sets and pairs of relationships.

SML

```
|declare_type_abbrev ("PR", ["'a", "'b"], ⌈:('a, 'b) BR × ('a, 'b) BR⌋);
```

HOL Constant

PackBinRel: $(\prime a, \prime t \text{ DPO}) BR \rightarrow (\prime a, \prime t \text{ DPO}) RV$

$\forall r \bullet \text{PackBinRel } r = \lambda isp: \prime a \text{ IS} \bullet$
if $\text{IsDom } isp = \{\text{Nat}_g \ 0; \text{Nat}_g \ 1\} \wedge \text{IsOd } isp = \{\}$
then $r \ (\text{dpoV } (\text{isp } (\text{Nat}_g \ 0))) \ (\text{dpoV } (\text{isp } (\text{Nat}_g \ 1)))$
else if $\text{IsOd } isp = \{\}$ then dpoB else dpoT

For the monotonicity proof it is useful to define the following ordering over binary relations:

HOL Constant

BrO: $(\prime t, \text{BOOL}) BR \rightarrow ((\prime a, \prime t) BR, \text{BOOL}) BR$

$\forall r \bullet \text{BrO } r = \text{Pw } (\text{Pw } r)$

packbinrel_increasing_lemma =

$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{Rpo } (\text{Universe}, r) \Rightarrow \text{Increasing } (\text{BrO } r) (\text{RvO } r) \text{PackBinRel}$

HOL Constant

UnpackBinRel : $(\prime a, \prime t) RV \rightarrow (\prime a, \prime t) BR$

$\forall rv \bullet \text{UnpackBinRel } rv = \lambda x \ y \bullet rv$
($\lambda p \bullet$
if $p = \text{Nat}_g \ 0$
then $\text{dpoE } x$
else
if $p = \text{Nat}_g \ 1$
then $\text{dpoE } y$
else dpoB)

unpackbinrel_increasing_lemma =

$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{Increasing } (\text{RvO } r) (\text{BrO } r) \text{UnpackBinRel}$

HOL Constant

PackRelPair : $(\prime a, \prime t \text{ DPO}) PR \rightarrow (\prime a, \prime t \text{ DPO}) RV \text{ IS}$

$\forall rp \bullet \text{PackRelPair } rp =$
let $(\mathbb{S}=_v, \mathbb{S}\in_v) = rp$ in
 $\lambda rn \bullet$
if $rn = \text{Nat}_g \ 0$ then $\text{dpoE } (\text{PackBinRel } \mathbb{S}=_v)$
else if $rn = \text{Nat}_g \ 1$ then $\text{dpoE } (\text{PackBinRel } \mathbb{S}=_v)$
else dpoB

Here is the relevant ordering on pairs of binary relations:

HOL Constant

PbrO: ('t, BOOL)BR → (('a, 't) PR, BOOL) BR

⊢ ∀ r • PbrO r = PrO (BrO r) (BrO r)

pbro_crpou_thm =

⊢ ∀ r • CRpoU r ⇒ CRpoU (PbrO r) crpou_increasing_lfp_lemma2 =

⊢ ∀ r f • CRpoU r ∧ Increasing r r f ⇒ IsLfp r f (Lfp_c r f)

pbro_≤t4_crpou_thm =

⊢ CRpoU (PbrO \$≤t4)

packrelpair_increasing_lemma =

⊢ ∀ r

• Rpo (Universe, r)

⇒ Increasing (PbrO r) (RvIsO r) PackRelPair

HOL Constant

UnpackRelPair : ('a, 't DPO) RV IS → ('a, 't DPO) PR

⊢ ∀ rvis:('a, 't DPO) RV IS • UnpackRelPair rvis =

let f = (λn •

if dpoOdef (rvis n)

then (λ x y • dpoT)

else

if dpoUdef (rvis n)

then (λ x y • dpoB)

else UnpackBinRel (dpoV (rvis n)))

in (f (Nat_g 0), f (Nat_g 1))

unpackrelpair_increasing_lemma =

⊢ Increasing (RvIsO Dpo) (PbrO Dpo) UnpackRelPair

3.2 Recasting of EvalForm

We now recast *EvalForm* for the special case that the structure relative to which formulae are evaluated is a pair of binary relations.

HOL Constant

EvalFormPr : ('t DPO) CFE × ('t DPO) REL × 'a SET × GS

→ ('a, 't DPO) PR → ('a, 't DPO) RV

⊢ ∀ p • EvalFormPr p = (MonoEvalForm p) o PackRelPair


```

|evalformpr_increasing_thm =
|  ⊢ ∀ c r s g
|    • CRpoU r ∧ Increasing (SetO r) r c
|      ⇒ Increasing (PbrO r) (RvO r) (EvalFormPr (c, r, s, g))

```

3.3 Membership and Equality

HOL Constant

```

| ParamZero : GS → GS IS
|-----
| ∀ p • ParamZero p = λx • if x = Natg 0 then dpoE p else dpoB

```

All the above material is generic in the type of truth values. The following material is specific to particular sets of truth values.

SML

```

| declare_infix (301, "∈v");
| declare_infix (301, "=v");

```

In the following definitions, we are working with four truth values, which may be thought of as true, false, neither or both. So that the definitions are monotonic, the criteria for truth and falsity are given independently so that it may be possible for both truth values to apply.

HOL Constant

```

| MemRel : GS SET → (GS, FTV) PR → (GS, FTV) BR
|-----
| ∀ V (pr : (GS, FTV) PR) • MemRel V pr =
|   let ($=v, $∈v) = pr
|   in λv w •
|     if v ∈ V ∧ w ∈ V
|     then EvalFormPr (EvalCf_tf4, $≤t4, V, w) pr (ParamZero v)
|     else fB

```

```

| memrel_increasing_lemma =
|  ⊢ ∀ V • Increasing (PbrO $≤t4) (BrO $≤t4) (MemRel V)
|
| memrel_increasing_lemma2 =
|  ⊢ ∀ V x y • PbrO $≤t4 x y ⇒ BrO $≤t4 (MemRel V x) (MemRel V y)

```

$$\mathbf{EqRel} : GS\ SET \rightarrow (GS, FTV)\ BR \rightarrow (GS, FTV)\ BR$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall V\ \$\in_v \bullet \mathbf{EqRel}\ V\ \$\in_v = & (\lambda v\ w \bullet \mathit{Lub}\ \$\leq_{t_4}\ \{t \mid \\ & v = w \wedge t = \mathit{fTrue} \\ & \vee (\exists x \bullet x \in V \wedge (\mathit{fTrue}\ \leq_{t_4}\ x \in_v v \wedge \mathit{fFalse}\ \leq_{t_4}\ x \in_v w \\ & \vee \mathit{fFalse}\ \leq_{t_4}\ x \in_v v \wedge \mathit{fTrue}\ \leq_{t_4}\ x \in_v w)) \\ & \wedge t = \mathit{fFalse} \\ & \vee (\forall x \bullet (x \in V \Rightarrow \mathit{fTrue}\ \leq_{t_4}\ x \in_v v \wedge \mathit{fTrue}\ \leq_{t_4}\ x \in_v w \\ & \vee \mathit{fFalse}\ \leq_{t_4}\ x \in_v v \wedge \mathit{fFalse}\ \leq_{t_4}\ x \in_v w) \\ & \wedge t = \mathit{fTrue}) \\ & \}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{eqrel_increasing_lemma} =$$

$$\vdash \forall V \bullet \mathit{Increasing}\ (\mathit{BrO}\ \$\leq_{t_4})\ (\mathit{BrO}\ \$\leq_{t_4})\ (\mathbf{EqRel}\ V)$$

$$\mathbf{eqrel_increasing_lemma2} =$$

$$\vdash \forall V\ x\ y \bullet \mathit{BrO}\ \$\leq_{t_4}\ x\ y \Rightarrow \mathit{BrO}\ \$\leq_{t_4}\ (\mathbf{EqRel}\ V\ x)\ (\mathbf{EqRel}\ V\ y)$$

$$\mathbf{eqrel_refl_lemma} =$$

$$\vdash \forall V\ pr\ x \bullet x \in V \Rightarrow \mathbf{EqRel}\ V\ pr\ x\ x = \mathit{fTrue}$$

$$\mathbf{eqrel_sym_lemma} =$$

$$\vdash \forall V\ pr\ x\ y \bullet x \in V \wedge y \in V \Rightarrow \mathbf{EqRel}\ V\ pr\ x\ y = \mathbf{EqRel}\ V\ pr\ y\ x$$

$$\mathbf{eqrel_ftrue_lemma} =$$

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash \forall V\ pr\ x\ y \\ \bullet x \in V \wedge y \in V \\ \Rightarrow (\mathbf{EqRel}\ V\ pr\ x\ y = \mathit{fTrue} \\ \Leftrightarrow x = y \\ \vee (\forall z \\ \bullet z \in V \\ \Rightarrow \mathit{Snd}\ pr\ z\ x = \mathit{fTrue} \wedge \mathit{Snd}\ pr\ z\ y = \mathit{fTrue} \\ \vee \mathit{Snd}\ pr\ z\ x = \mathit{fFalse} \wedge \mathit{Snd}\ pr\ z\ y = \mathit{fFalse})) \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{eqrel_trans_lemma} =$$

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash \forall V\ pr\ x\ y\ z \\ \bullet x \in V \wedge y \in V \wedge z \in V \\ \Rightarrow \mathbf{EqRel}\ V\ pr\ x\ y = \mathit{fTrue} \wedge \mathbf{EqRel}\ V\ pr\ y\ z = \mathit{fTrue} \\ \Rightarrow \mathbf{EqRel}\ V\ pr\ x\ z = \mathit{fTrue} \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{eqrel2_increasing_lemma} =$$

$$\vdash \forall V \bullet \mathit{Increasing}\ (\mathit{BrO}\ \$\leq_{t_4})\ (\mathit{BrO}\ \$\leq_{t_4})\ (\mathbf{EqRel2}\ V)$$

3.4 The Semantic Functor

We now define a monotone functor of which, we hope, total fixed points yield interpretations of the first order language of set theory.

HOL Constant

SemanticFunctor : $GS\ SET \rightarrow (GS, FTV)\ PR \rightarrow (GS, FTV)\ PR$

$\forall V \bullet \text{SemanticFunctor } V = \lambda(\$=, \$\in) \bullet (\text{EqRel } V\ \$\in, \text{MemRel } V\ (\$=, \$\in))$

semanticfunctor_increasing_thm =

$\vdash \forall V \bullet \text{Increasing } (PbrO\ \$\leq_{t_4})\ (PbrO\ \$\leq_{t_4})\ (\text{SemanticFunctor } V)$

sf_lfp_lemma1 =

$\vdash \forall V$

• *IsLfp*

$(PbrO\ \$\leq_{t_4})$

$(\text{SemanticFunctor } V)$

$(Lfp_c\ (PbrO\ \$\leq_{t_4})\ (\text{SemanticFunctor } V))$

sf_gfp_lemma1 =

$\vdash \forall V$

• *IsGfp*

$(PbrO\ \$\leq_{t_4})$

$(\text{SemanticFunctor } V)$

$(Gfp_c\ (PbrO\ \$\leq_{t_4})\ (\text{SemanticFunctor } V))$

4 INFINITARILY DEFINABLE MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURES

We are now able to identify and analyse a large class of interpretations of set theory.

Every fixedpoint of the semantic functor which is total, i.e. in which the equality and membership relations over the domain (the V parameter to the semantic functor) gives only true and false (not underdefined or overdefined) yields a membership structure in the usual sense, and this structure is extensional (i.e. satisfies the axiom of extensionality).

In order to define this class of structures it is necessary to prove some facts about total fixedpoints of the semantic functor. We need to know first that the equality relation in such a fixed point will be an equivalence relation (the equivalence classes will be the elements in the domain of the structure). This enables us to define the class of structures, and our next objective is to prove that they are indeed extensional.

From there we intend to proceed by identifying consistent constraints on the fixed points which effectively place lower bounds on the richness of the ontology and permit the proof of progressively stronger ontological principles, which may be thought of as an axiomatisation of a strong non-well-founded set theory. In this way we seek to approach a maximal theory of comprehension, i.e. of sets construed as the extensions of properties.

First we define the notion of a total fixed point of the semantic functor, and then prove various properties of these fixed points.

HOL Constant

TotalOver : 'a SET → ('a, FTV)BR → BOOL

$\forall V r \bullet \text{TotalOver } V r \Leftrightarrow \forall x y \bullet$
 if $x \in V \wedge y \in V$
 then $r x y = fTrue \vee r x y = fFalse$
 else $r x y = fB$

HOL Constant

PrTotalOver : 'a SET → ('a, FTV)PR → BOOL

$\forall V pr \bullet \text{PrTotalOver } V pr \Leftrightarrow \text{TotalOver } V (Fst pr) \wedge \text{TotalOver } V (Snd pr)$

HOL Constant

SFFixp : GS SET × (GS, FTV)PR → BOOL

$\forall p \bullet \text{SFFixp } p = \text{SemanticFunctor } (Fst p) (Snd p) = (Snd p)$

HOL Constant

BoolRel : (GS, FTV)BR → (GS, BOOL)BR

$\forall r \bullet \text{BoolRel } r = \lambda x y \bullet r x y = fTrue$

(not proven)

eqrel_equiv_lemma =

$\vdash \forall V pr \bullet \text{TotalOver } V (EqRel V pr) \Rightarrow \text{Equiv } (V, \text{BoolRel } (EqRel V pr))$

eqrel_totalmem_extensional_lemma =

$\vdash \forall V \$=v \\in_v
 • $\text{TotalOver } V \$\in_v$
 $\Rightarrow (\forall x y$
 • $x \in V \wedge y \in V$
 $\Rightarrow \text{EqRel } V (\$=v, \$\in_v) x y$
 $= (\text{if } \forall z \bullet z \in V \Rightarrow z \in_v x = z \in_v y \text{ then } fTrue \text{ else } fFalse))$

HOL Constant

SFTotalFixp : GS SET × (GS, FTV)PR → BOOL

$\forall p \bullet \text{SFTotalFixp } p \Leftrightarrow \text{SFFixp } p \wedge \text{PrTotalOver } (Fst p) (Snd p)$

4.0.1 Extensionality of Equality

For our purposes it is helpful to define the following notion of extensionality which applies to functions which operate on four-valued membership relations and yield four-valued relations.

The idea is that a function is extensional if its value for any pair of elements depends only on the extension of the two elements. Since we are working with four truth values, the extensions under consideration are not sets, they are four-valued characteristic functions. However, if the characteristic functions yield the undefined truth value anywhere in the domain under consideration, they are not really known to be equal so we require that these characteristic functions are everywhere defined (or overdefined).

HOL Constant

$$\mathbf{FtvExtensional} : 'a \text{ SET} \rightarrow (('a, \text{FTV}) \text{ BR} \rightarrow ('a, \text{FTV}) \text{ BR}) \rightarrow \text{BOOL}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall V f \bullet \mathbf{FtvExtensional} V f = & \forall \$\in_v x y z \bullet x \in V \wedge y \in V \wedge z \in V \\ & \wedge \mathbf{TotalOver} V \$\in_v \wedge (\forall v \bullet v \in V \Rightarrow v \in_v x = v \in_v y) \\ \Rightarrow f \$\in_v x z = f \$\in_v y z \wedge f \$\in_v z x = f \$\in_v z y \end{aligned}$$

We now show that $EqRel$ is in this sense extensional.

$$\mathbf{eqrel_ftvextensional_lemma} =$$

$$\vdash \forall V \$\in_v \bullet \mathbf{FtvExtensional} V (\lambda \$\in_v \bullet \mathbf{EqRel} V (\$=_v, \$\in_v))$$

$$\mathbf{totalfixp_extensional_lemma} =$$

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash \forall V eq mem \$\in_v \$\in_v \\ \bullet \mathbf{SFTotalFixp} (V, eq, mem) \\ \Rightarrow (\text{let } \$\in_v = \mathbf{BoolRel} \text{ eq and } \$\in_v = \mathbf{BoolRel} \text{ mem} \\ \text{in } \forall x y \\ \bullet x \in V \wedge y \in V \Rightarrow (x =_v y \Leftrightarrow (\forall z \bullet z \in V \Rightarrow (z \in_v x \Leftrightarrow z \in_v y)))) \end{aligned}$$

HOL Constant

$$\mathbf{MSfromSFF} : \text{GS SET} \times (\text{GS}, \text{FTV}) \text{ PR} \rightarrow \text{GS SET SET} \times (\text{GS SET}, \text{BOOL}) \text{ BR}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (V:\text{GS SET}) (pr:(\text{GS}, \text{FTV}) \text{ PR}) \bullet \mathbf{MSfromSFF} (V, pr) = \\ \text{let } (\$=_v, \$\in_v) = (\mathbf{BoolRel} (\text{Fst } pr), \mathbf{BoolRel} (\text{Snd } pr)) \text{ in} \\ (\mathbf{QuotientSet} V \$\in_v, \lambda s t \bullet \forall x y \bullet x \in s \wedge y \in t \Rightarrow x \in_v y) \end{aligned}$$

SML

$$\mathbf{new_parent} \text{ "membership"};$$

4.0.2 Proof Contexts

SML

```
| add_pc_thms "'ifol" [];  
| commit_pc "'ifol";  
  
| force_new_pc "ifol";  
| merge_pcs ["hol", "'GS1", "'misc1", "'misc2", "'ifol"] "ifol";  
| commit_pc "ifol";  
  
| force_new_pc "ifol1";  
| merge_pcs ["hol1", "'GS1", "'misc1", "'misc2", "'ifol"] "ifol1";  
| commit_pc "ifol1";
```

5 The Theory ifol

5.1 Parents

membership misc2

5.2 Constants

MkAf	$(GS, GS \times GS) VA$
IsAf	$(BOOL, GS) VA$
AfRel	$(GS, GS) VA$
AfPars	$(GS, GS) VA$
MkCf	$(GS, GS \times GS) VA$
IsCf	$(BOOL, GS) VA$
CfVars	$(GS, GS) VA$
CfForms	$(GS, GS) VA$
MkNot	$(GS, GS) VA$
RepClosed	$(BOOL, GS \mathbb{P}) VA$
Syntax	$GS \mathbb{P}$
ScPrec	$((BOOL, GS) VA, GS) VA$
RvO	$((BOOL, ('a, 'b) RV) VA, ('a, 'b) RV) VA,$ $((BOOL, 'b) VA, 'b) VA) VA$
RvIsO	$((('a, 'b) RV, (('a, 'b) RV, BOOL) RV) RV,$ $((BOOL, 'b) VA, 'b) VA) VA$
StO	$((BOOL, ('a, 'b) ST) VA, ('a, 'b) ST) VA,$ $((BOOL, 'b) VA, 'b) VA) VA$
VarComp	$(('a, ('a DPO, GS) VA) RV, GS) VA$
EvalAf	$((('a, 't) RV, ('a, 't) ST) VA, GS) VA,$ $((BOOL, 't) VA, 't) VA) VA$
EvalCf_tf3	$TTV CFE$
EvalCf_tf4	$FTV CFE$
EvalCf	$((('a, 't) RV CFE, ('a, 't) ST) VA, GS) VA, 't CFE) VA$
EvalFormFunct	$((('a, 't) RV, GS) VA, (('a, 't) RV, GS) VA) VA,$ $'t CFE \times ((BOOL, 't) VA, 't) VA \times ('a, 't) ST) VA$
EvalForm	$((('a, 't) RV, GS) VA,$ $'t CFE \times ((BOOL, 't) VA, 't) VA \times ('a, 't) ST) VA$
$\$ \leq_{ft3}$	$((BOOL, (TTV, 'a) VA) VA, (TTV, 'a) VA) VA$
$\$ \leq_{ft4}$	$((BOOL, (FTV, 'a) VA) VA, (FTV, 'a) VA) VA$
MonoEvalForm	$((('a, 't) RV, ('a, 't) RV) RV,$ $'t CFE \times ((BOOL, 't) VA, 't) VA \times 'a \mathbb{P} \times GS) VA$
PackBinRel	$((('a, 't DPO) RV, (('t DPO, 'a) VA, 'a) VA) VA$
BrO	$((BOOL, (('t, 'a) VA, 'a) VA) VA,$ $((t, 'a) VA, 'a) VA) VA,$ $((BOOL, 't) VA, 't) VA) VA$
UnpackBinRel	$((('t, 'a) VA, 'a) VA, ('a, 't) RV) VA$
PackRelPair	$((('a, 't DPO) RV DPO, GS) VA, ('a, 't DPO) PR) VA$
PbrO	$((BOOL, ('a, 't) PR) VA, ('a, 't) PR) VA,$ $((BOOL, 't) VA, 't) VA) VA$
UnpackRelPair	$((('a, 't DPO) RV, ('a, 't DPO) PR) RV$

EvalFormPr	$((('a, 't \text{ DPO}) \text{ RV}, ('a, 't \text{ DPO}) \text{ PR}) \text{ VA},$ $'t \text{ DPO CFE}$ $\times ((\text{BOOL}, 't \text{ DPO}) \text{ VA}, 't \text{ DPO}) \text{ VA}$ $\times 'a \mathbb{P}$ $\times \text{GS}) \text{ VA}$
ParamZero	$((\text{GS DPO}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}$
MemRel	$(((((\text{FTV}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}, (\text{GS}, \text{FTV}) \text{ PR}) \text{ VA}, \text{GS } \mathbb{P}) \text{ VA}$
EqRel	$(((((\text{FTV}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}, ((\text{FTV}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}) \text{ VA},$ $\text{GS } \mathbb{P}) \text{ VA}$
SemanticFunctor	$((((\text{GS}, \text{FTV}) \text{ PR}, (\text{GS}, \text{FTV}) \text{ PR}) \text{ VA}, \text{GS } \mathbb{P}) \text{ VA}$
TotalOver	$((\text{BOOL}, ((\text{FTV}, 'a) \text{ VA}, 'a) \text{ VA}) \text{ VA}, 'a \mathbb{P}) \text{ VA}$
PrTotalOver	$((\text{BOOL}, ('a, \text{FTV}) \text{ PR}) \text{ VA}, 'a \mathbb{P}) \text{ VA}$
SFFixp	$(\text{BOOL}, \text{GS } \mathbb{P} \times (\text{GS}, \text{FTV}) \text{ PR}) \text{ VA}$
BoolRel	$((((\text{BOOL}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}, ((\text{FTV}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}, \text{GS}) \text{ VA}) \text{ VA}$
SFTotalFixp	$(\text{BOOL}, \text{GS } \mathbb{P} \times (\text{GS}, \text{FTV}) \text{ PR}) \text{ VA}$
FtvExtensional	$((\text{BOOL},$ $((((\text{FTV}, 'a) \text{ VA}, 'a) \text{ VA}, ((\text{FTV}, 'a) \text{ VA}, 'a) \text{ VA}) \text{ VA})$ $\text{VA},$ $'a \mathbb{P}) \text{ VA}$
MSfromSFF	$(\text{GS } \mathbb{P} \text{ MS}, \text{GS } \mathbb{P} \times (\text{GS}, \text{FTV}) \text{ PR}) \text{ VA}$

5.3 Type Abbreviations

$('a, 'b) \text{ RV}$	$('a, 'b) \text{ RV}$
$('a, 'b) \text{ ST}$	$('a, 'b) \text{ ST}$
$'t \text{ CFE}$	$'t \text{ CFE}$
$('a, 'b) \text{ PR}$	$('a, 'b) \text{ PR}$

5.4 Fixity

Right Infix 300:

$$\leq_{ft3} \leq_{ft4}$$

Right Infix 301:

$$=_{\text{v}} \in_{\text{v}}$$

5.5 Definitions

MkAf	$\vdash \forall lr \bullet \text{MkAf } lr = \text{Nat}_g \ 0 \mapsto_g \text{Fst } lr \mapsto_g \text{Snd } lr$
IsAf	$\vdash \forall t \bullet \text{IsAf } t \Leftrightarrow \text{fst } t = \text{Nat}_g \ 0$
AfRel	$\vdash \text{AfRel} = (\lambda x \bullet \text{fst } (\text{snd } x))$
AfPars	$\vdash \text{AfPars} = (\lambda x \bullet \text{snd } (\text{snd } x))$
MkCf	$\vdash \forall vc \bullet \text{MkCf } vc = \text{Nat}_g \ 1 \mapsto_g \text{Fst } vc \mapsto_g \text{Snd } vc$
IsCf	$\vdash \forall t \bullet \text{IsCf } t \Leftrightarrow \text{fst } t = \text{Nat}_g \ 1$
CfVars	$\vdash \text{CfVars} = (\lambda x \bullet \text{fst } (\text{snd } x))$
CfForms	$\vdash \text{CfForms} = (\lambda x \bullet \text{snd } (\text{snd } x))$
MkNot	$\vdash \forall f \bullet \text{MkNot } f = \text{MkCf } (\emptyset_g, \text{Pair}_g \ f \ f)$
RepClosed	$\vdash \forall s$ $\bullet \text{RepClosed } s$

	$\Leftrightarrow (\forall n \text{ is} \bullet \text{fun } is \Rightarrow \text{MkAf } (n, is) \in s)$ $\wedge (\forall \text{vars } fs \bullet X_g fs \subseteq s \Rightarrow \text{MkCf } (\text{vars}, fs) \in s)$
Syntax	$\vdash \text{Syntax} = \bigcap \{x \mid \text{RepClosed } x\}$
ScPrec	$\vdash \forall \alpha \gamma$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\text{ScPrec } \alpha \gamma$ $\Leftrightarrow (\exists \text{ord } fs$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\alpha \in_g fs$ $\wedge \{\alpha; \gamma\} \subseteq \text{Syntax}$ $\wedge \gamma = \text{MkCf } (\text{ord}, fs))$
RvO	$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{RvO } r = \text{Pw } r$
RvIsO	$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{RvIsO } r = \text{IsEO } (\text{RvO } r)$
StO	$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{StO } r = \text{DerivedOrder } \text{Snd } (\text{IsEO } (\text{RvO } r))$
VarComp	$\vdash \forall m \text{ is}$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\text{VarComp } m \text{ is}$ $= (\lambda v$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if $v \in_g \text{dom } m$ then $\text{is } (m \text{ }_g v)$ else dpoB)
EvalAf	$\vdash \forall \leq_t \text{ at } st \text{ va}$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\text{EvalAf } \leq_t \text{ at } st \text{ va}$ $= (\text{let } r = \text{AfRel } \text{at and } \text{pars} = \text{AfPars } \text{at}$ $\text{in let } rv = \text{Snd } st \text{ r}$ $\text{in if } \text{dpoUdef } rv$ $\text{then } \text{Lub } \leq_t \{\}$ $\text{else if } \text{dpoOdef } rv$ $\text{then } \text{Glb } \leq_t \{\}$ $\text{else } \text{dpoV } rv (\text{VarComp } \text{pars } va))$
EvalCf_tf3	$\vdash \forall \text{results}$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\text{EvalCf_tf3 } \text{results}$ $= (\text{if } \text{results} \subseteq \{p\text{True}\}$ $\text{then } p\text{False}$ $\text{else if } p\text{False} \in \text{results}$ $\text{then } p\text{True}$ $\text{else } pU)$
EvalCf_tf4	$\vdash \forall \text{results}$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\text{EvalCf_tf4 } \text{results}$ $= (\text{if } \text{results} \subseteq \{f\text{True}\}$ $\text{then } f\text{False}$ $\text{else if } \text{results} \subseteq \{f\text{True}; fB\}$ $\text{then } fB$ $\text{else if } fT \in \text{results}$ $\text{then } fT$ $\text{else } f\text{True})$
EvalCf	$\vdash \forall \text{etf } f$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\text{EvalCf } \text{etf } f$ $= (\lambda st \text{ rvs } va$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $(\text{let } \nu = \text{CfVars } f \text{ and } V = \text{Fst } st$ in etf $\{pb$ $\exists rv \text{ v}$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $rv \in \text{rvs}$ $\wedge \text{IsDom } v = X_g \nu$ $\wedge \text{IsRan } v \subseteq V$

$$\wedge pb = rv (IsOverRide v va)))$$

EvalFormFunct

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash \forall cfe \leq_t st \\ &\bullet EvalFormFunct (cfe, \leq_t, st) \\ &= (\lambda ef f \\ &\bullet \text{if } f \in Syntax \\ &\text{then} \\ &\quad \text{if } IsAf f \\ &\quad \text{then } EvalAf \leq_t f st \\ &\quad \text{else if } IsCf f \\ &\quad \text{then} \\ &\quad \quad \text{let } rvs = FunImage ef (X_g (CfForms f)) \\ &\quad \quad \text{in } EvalCf cfe f st rvs \\ &\quad \text{else } \epsilon x \bullet T \\ &\quad \text{else } \epsilon x \bullet T) \end{aligned}$$

EvalForm

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash \forall cfe \leq_t st \\ &\bullet EvalForm (cfe, \leq_t, st) \\ &= fix (EvalFormFunct (cfe, \leq_t, st)) \end{aligned}$$

\leq_{ft3}

$$\vdash \$\leq_{ft3} = Pw \$\leq_{t3}$$

\leq_{ft4}

$$\vdash \$\leq_{ft4} = Pw \$\leq_{t4}$$

MonoEvalForm

$$\vdash \forall c r s g ris$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\bullet MonoEvalForm (c, r, s, g) ris \\ &= EvalForm (c, r, s, ris) g \end{aligned}$$

PackBinRel

$$\vdash \forall r$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\bullet PackBinRel r \\ &= (\lambda isp \\ &\bullet \text{if} \\ &\quad IsDom isp = \{Nat_g 0; Nat_g 1\} \\ &\quad \wedge IsOd isp = \{\} \\ &\text{then} \\ &\quad r \\ &\quad (dpoV (isp (Nat_g 0))) \\ &\quad (dpoV (isp (Nat_g 1))) \\ &\quad \text{else if } IsOd isp = \{\} \\ &\quad \text{then } dpoB \\ &\quad \text{else } dpoT) \end{aligned}$$

BrO

$$\vdash \forall r \bullet BrO r = Pw (Pw r)$$

UnpackBinRel

$$\vdash \forall rv$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\bullet UnpackBinRel rv \\ &= (\lambda x y \\ &\bullet rv \\ &\quad (\lambda p \\ &\quad \bullet \text{if } p = Nat_g 0 \\ &\quad \quad \text{then } dpoE x \\ &\quad \quad \text{else if } p = Nat_g 1 \\ &\quad \quad \text{then } dpoE y \\ &\quad \quad \text{else } dpoB)) \end{aligned}$$

PackRelPair

$$\vdash \forall rp$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\bullet PackRelPair rp \\ &= (let (\$=v, \$\in_v) = rp \\ &\quad \text{in } \lambda rn \end{aligned}$$

- if $rn = \text{Nat}_g\ 0$
then $\text{dpoE}\ (\text{PackBinRel}\ \$=v)$
- else if $rn = \text{Nat}_g\ 1$
then $\text{dpoE}\ (\text{PackBinRel}\ \$=v)$
- else dpoB

PbrO $\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{PbrO}\ r = \text{PrO}\ (\text{BrO}\ r)\ (\text{BrO}\ r)$

UnpackRelPair

- $\vdash \forall rvis$
 - $\text{UnpackRelPair}\ rvis$
= (let $f\ n$
= (if $\text{dpoOdef}\ (rvis\ n)$
then $\lambda x\ y \bullet \text{dpoT}$
else if $\text{dpoUdef}\ (rvis\ n)$
then $\lambda x\ y \bullet \text{dpoB}$
else $\text{UnpackBinRel}\ (\text{dpoV}\ (rvis\ n))$)
in ($f\ (\text{Nat}_g\ 0), f\ (\text{Nat}_g\ 1)$))

EvalFormPr $\vdash \forall p \bullet \text{EvalFormPr}\ p = \text{MonoEvalForm}\ p\ o\ \text{PackRelPair}$

ParamZero $\vdash \forall p$

- $\text{ParamZero}\ p$
= ($\lambda x \bullet$ if $x = \text{Nat}_g\ 0$ then $\text{dpoE}\ p$ else dpoB)

MemRel $\vdash \forall V\ pr$

- $\text{MemRel}\ V\ pr$
= (let ($\$=v, \\in_v) = pr
in $\lambda v\ w$
 - if $v \in V \wedge w \in V$
then
 EvalFormPr
($\text{EvalCf_tf4}, \$\leq_{t4}, V, w$)
 pr
($\text{ParamZero}\ v$)
else fB)

EqRel $\vdash \forall V\ \$\in_v$

- $\text{EqRel}\ V\ \$\in_v$
= ($\lambda v\ w$
 - Lub
 $\$ \leq_{t4}$
{ t
| $v = w \wedge t = fTrue$
 $\vee (\exists x$
 - $x \in V$
 $\wedge (fTrue \leq_{t4}\ x \in_v\ v$
 $\wedge fFalse \leq_{t4}\ x \in_v\ w$
 $\vee fFalse \leq_{t4}\ x \in_v\ v$
 $\wedge fTrue \leq_{t4}\ x \in_v\ w)$
 - $\wedge t = fFalse$
- $\vee (\forall x$
 - ($x \in V$
 $\Rightarrow fTrue \leq_{t4}\ x \in_v\ v$
 $\wedge fTrue \leq_{t4}\ x \in_v\ w$
 $\vee fFalse \leq_{t4}\ x \in_v\ v$
 $\wedge fFalse \leq_{t4}\ x \in_v\ w)$

$$\wedge t = fTrue\}})$$

SemanticFunctor

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash \forall V \\ &\bullet \text{SemanticFunctor } V \\ &= (\lambda (\$=v, \$\in_v) \\ &\bullet (\text{EqRel } V \ \$\in_v, \text{MemRel } V (\$=v, \$\in_v))) \end{aligned}$$

TotalOver

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash \forall V r \\ &\bullet \text{TotalOver } V r \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\forall x y \\ &\bullet \text{if } x \in V \wedge y \in V \\ &\text{then } r x y = fTrue \vee r x y = fFalse \\ &\text{else } r x y = fB) \end{aligned}$$

PrTotalOver

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash \forall V pr \\ &\bullet \text{PrTotalOver } V pr \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{TotalOver } V (\text{Fst } pr) \wedge \text{TotalOver } V (\text{Snd } pr) \end{aligned}$$

SFFixp

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash \forall p \\ &\bullet \text{SFFixp } p \Leftrightarrow \text{SemanticFunctor } (\text{Fst } p) (\text{Snd } p) = \text{Snd } p \end{aligned}$$

BoolRel

$$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{BoolRel } r = (\lambda x y \bullet r x y = fTrue)$$

SFTotalFixp

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash \forall p \\ &\bullet \text{SFTotalFixp } p \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{SFFixp } p \wedge \text{PrTotalOver } (\text{Fst } p) (\text{Snd } p) \end{aligned}$$

FtvExtensional

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash \forall V f \\ &\bullet \text{FtvExtensional } V f \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\forall \$\in_v x y z \\ &\bullet x \in V \\ &\quad \wedge y \in V \\ &\quad \wedge z \in V \\ &\quad \wedge \text{TotalOver } V \ \$\in_v \\ &\quad \wedge (\forall v \bullet v \in V \Rightarrow v \in_v x = v \in_v y) \\ &\Rightarrow f \ \$\in_v x z = f \ \$\in_v y z \\ &\quad \wedge f \ \$\in_v z x = f \ \$\in_v z y) \end{aligned}$$

MSfromSFF

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash \forall V pr \\ &\bullet \text{MSfromSFF } (V, pr) \\ &= (\text{let } (\$=v, \$\in_v) \\ &= (\text{BoolRel } (\text{Fst } pr), \text{BoolRel } (\text{Snd } pr)) \\ &\text{in } (V / \$=v, \\ &(\lambda s t \bullet \forall x y \bullet x \in s \wedge y \in t \Rightarrow x \in_v y))) \end{aligned}$$

5.6 Theorems

Is_not_fc_clauses

$$\vdash (\forall x \bullet \text{IsAf } x \Rightarrow \neg \text{IsCf } x) \wedge (\forall x \bullet \text{IsCf } x \Rightarrow \neg \text{IsAf } x)$$

repclosed_syntax_thm

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdash (\forall n \text{ is} \bullet \text{fun } \text{is} \Rightarrow \text{MkAf } (n, \text{is}) \in \text{Syntax}) \\ &\quad \wedge (\forall \text{vars } fs \\ &\bullet (\forall x \bullet x \in X_g fs \Rightarrow x \in \text{Syntax}) \\ &\Rightarrow \text{MkCf } (\text{vars}, fs) \in \text{Syntax}) \end{aligned}$$

repclosed_syntax_lemma1

$$\vdash \forall s \bullet \text{RepClosed } s \Rightarrow \text{Syntax} \subseteq s$$

repclosed_syntax_lemma2

$\vdash \forall p \bullet \text{RepClosed } \{x \mid p \ x\} \Rightarrow (\forall x \bullet x \in \text{Syntax} \Rightarrow p \ x)$
well_founded_ScPrec_thm
 $\vdash \text{well_founded } \text{ScPrec}$
well_founded_tcScPrec_thm
 $\vdash \text{well_founded } (\text{tc } \text{ScPrec})$
syntax_disj_thm
 $\vdash \forall x$

- $x \in \text{Syntax}$
 - $\Rightarrow (\exists r \ \text{pars} \bullet \text{fun } \text{pars} \wedge x = \text{MkAf } (r, \text{pars}))$
 - $\vee (\exists \text{vars } \text{fs}$
 - $(\forall y \bullet y \in_g \text{fs} \Rightarrow y \in \text{Syntax})$
 - $\wedge x = \text{MkCf } (\text{vars}, \text{fs}))$

syntax_cases_thm
 $\vdash \forall x \bullet x \in \text{Syntax} \Rightarrow \text{IsAf } x \vee \text{IsCf } x$
is_fc_clauses
 $\vdash \forall x$

- $x \in \text{Syntax}$
 - $\Rightarrow (\text{IsAf } x$
 - $\Rightarrow (\exists r \ \text{pars} \bullet \text{fun } \text{pars} \wedge x = \text{MkAf } (r, \text{pars})))$
 - $\wedge (\text{IsCf } x$
 - $\Rightarrow (\exists \text{vars } \text{fs}$
 - $(\forall y \bullet y \in_g \text{fs} \Rightarrow y \in \text{Syntax})$
 - $\wedge x = \text{MkCf } (\text{vars}, \text{fs}))$

syn_proj_clauses
 $\vdash (\forall l \ r \bullet \text{AfRel } (\text{MkAf } (l, r)) = l)$
 $\wedge (\forall l \ r \bullet \text{AfPars } (\text{MkAf } (l, r)) = r)$
 $\wedge (\forall v \ f \bullet \text{CfVars } (\text{MkCf } (v, f)) = v)$
 $\wedge (\forall v \ f \bullet \text{CfForms } (\text{MkCf } (v, f)) = f)$
is_fc_clauses2
 $\vdash \forall x$

- $x \in \text{Syntax}$
 - $\Rightarrow \text{IsCf } x$
 - $\Rightarrow (\forall y \bullet y \in_g \text{CfForms } x \Rightarrow y \in \text{Syntax})$

syn_con_neq_clauses
 $\vdash \forall x \ y \bullet \neg \text{MkAf } x = \text{MkCf } y$
syn_comp_fc_clauses
 $\vdash \forall v \ f$

- $\text{MkCf } (v, f) \in \text{Syntax} \Rightarrow (\forall y \bullet y \in_g f \Rightarrow y \in \text{Syntax})$

scprec_fc_clauses
 $\vdash \forall \alpha \ \gamma \ \text{vars } \text{fs}$

- $\gamma \in \text{Syntax}$
 - $\Rightarrow \gamma = \text{MkCf } (\text{vars}, \text{fs}) \wedge \alpha \in_g \text{fs}$
 - $\Rightarrow \text{ScPrec } \alpha \ \gamma$

scprec_fc_clauses2
 $\vdash \forall t$

- $t \in \text{Syntax}$
 - $\Rightarrow \text{IsCf } t$
 - $\Rightarrow (\forall f \bullet f \in_g \text{CfForms } t \Rightarrow \text{ScPrec } f \ t)$

rvo_lubs_exist_thm
 $\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{LubsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{LubsExist } (\text{RvO } r)$
rvo_glbs_exist_thm

$\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{GlbsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{GlbsExist } (\text{RvO } r)$
rviso_lubs_exist_thm
 $\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{LubsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{LubsExist } (\text{RvIsO } r)$
rviso_glbs_exist_thm
 $\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{GlbsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{GlbsExist } (\text{RvIsO } r)$
sto_lubs_exist_thm
 $\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{LubsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{LubsExist } (\text{StO } r)$
sto_glbs_exist_thm
 $\vdash \forall r \bullet \text{GlbsExist } r \Rightarrow \text{GlbsExist } (\text{StO } r)$
eval_form_funct_respect_thm
 $\vdash \forall \text{cfe} \leq_t \text{st}$

- *EvalFormFunct* (*cfe*, \leq_t , *st*) respects *ScPrec*

eval_form_funct_fixp_lemma
 $\vdash \forall \text{cfe} \leq_t \text{st}$

- *EvalForm* (*cfe*, \leq_t , *st*)
 $= \text{EvalFormFunct}$
(*cfe*, \leq_t , *st*)
(*EvalForm* (*cfe*, \leq_t , *st*))

eval_form_funct_thm
 $\vdash \forall \text{cfe} \leq_t \text{st}$

- *EvalForm* (*cfe*, \leq_t , *st*)
 $= (\lambda f$
 - if $f \in \text{Syntax}$
then
if *IsAf* *f*
then *EvalAf* \leq_t *f* *st*
else if *IsCf* *f*
then
let *rvs*
 $= \text{FunImage}$
(*EvalForm* (*cfe*, \leq_t , *st*))
(X_g (*CfForms* *f*))
in *EvalCf* *cfe* *f* *st* *rvs*
else $\in x \bullet T$
else $\in x \bullet T$)

eval_form_funct_thm2
 $\vdash \forall \text{cfe} \leq_t \text{st } f$

- *EvalForm* (*cfe*, \leq_t , *st*) *f*
 $= (\text{if } f \in \text{Syntax}$
then
if *IsAf* *f*
then *EvalAf* \leq_t *f* *st*
else if *IsCf* *f*
then
let *rvs*
 $= \text{FunImage}$
(*EvalForm* (*cfe*, \leq_t , *st*))
(X_g (*CfForms* *f*))
in *EvalCf* *cfe* *f* *st* *rvs*
else $\in f \bullet T$
else $\in f \bullet T$)

ccrpou- \leq_{ft3} -thm

$\vdash CcRpoU \ \$\leq_{ft3}$

evalform-increasing-thm

$\vdash \forall c r s g$

- $CRpoU r \wedge Increasing (SetO r) r c$
 $\Rightarrow Increasing$
 $(RvIsO r)$
 $(RvO r)$
 $(\lambda ris \bullet EvalForm (c, r, s, ris) g)$

pbro-crpou-thm

$\vdash \forall r \bullet CRpoU r \Rightarrow CRpoU (PbrO r)$

pbro- \leq_{t4} -crpou-thm

$\vdash CRpoU (PbrO \ \$\leq_{t4})$

evalformpr-increasing-thm

$\vdash \forall c r s g$

- $CRpoU r \wedge Increasing (SetO r) r c$
 $\Rightarrow Increasing$
 $(PbrO r)$
 $(RvO r)$
 $(EvalFormPr (c, r, s, g))$

6 INDEX

<i>i</i> fol	3	<i>IsCf</i>	4, 23, 24
$=_v$	17, 24	<i>MemRel</i>	17, 24, 27
$\$ \leq_{ft3}$	12	<i>memrel_increasing_lemma</i>	17
$\$ \leq_{ft4}$	12	<i>memrel_increasing_lemma2</i>	17
\in_v	17, 24	<i>MkAf</i>	3, 23, 24
\leq_{ft3}	23, 24, 26	<i>MkCf</i>	4, 23, 24
\leq_{ft4}	23, 24, 26	<i>MkNot</i>	4, 23, 24
<i>AfPars</i>	3, 23, 24	<i>MonoEvalForm</i>	13, 23, 26
<i>AfRel</i>	3, 23, 24	<i>monoevalform_increasing_lemma</i>	13
<i>BoolRel</i>	20, 24, 28	<i>MSfromSFF</i>	21, 24, 28
<i>BrO</i>	15, 23, 26	<i>PackBinRel</i>	15, 23, 26
<i>ccrpou_</i> \leq_{ft3} -thm	12, 31	<i>packbinrel_increasing_lemma</i>	15
<i>ccrpou_</i> \leq_{ft4} -thm	12	<i>PackRelPair</i>	15, 23, 26
<i>CfE</i>	9, 24	<i>packrelpair_increasing_lemma</i>	16
<i>CfForms</i>	4, 23, 24	<i>ParamZero</i>	17, 24, 27
<i>CfVars</i>	4, 23, 24	<i>PbrO</i>	16, 23, 27
<i>EqRel</i>	18, 24, 27	<i>pbro_</i> \leq_{t4} -crpou-thm	16, 31
<i>eqrel2_increasing_lemma</i>	18	<i>pbro_crpou_thm</i>	16, 31
<i>eqrel_equiv_lemma</i>	20	<i>PR</i>	24
<i>eqrel_fttrue_lemma</i>	18	<i>PrTotalOver</i>	20, 24, 28
<i>eqrel_ftvextensional_lemma</i>	21	<i>RepClosed</i>	5, 23, 24
<i>eqrel_increasing_lemma</i>	18	<i>repclosed_syntax_lemma</i>	5
<i>eqrel_increasing_lemma2</i>	18	<i>repclosed_syntax_lemma1</i>	5, 28
<i>eqrel_refl_lemma</i>	18	<i>repclosed_syntax_lemma2</i>	5, 28
<i>eqrel_sym_lemma</i>	18	<i>repclosed_syntax_thm</i>	5, 28
<i>eqrel_totalmem_extensional_lemma</i>	20	<i>RV</i>	7, 24
<i>eqrel_trans_lemma</i>	18	<i>RvIsO</i>	8, 23, 25
<i>EvalAf</i>	9, 23, 25	<i>rviso_glbs_exist_thm</i>	8, 30
<i>evalaf_increasing_lemma</i>	13	<i>rviso_lubs_exist_thm</i>	8, 30
<i>EvalCf</i>	10, 23, 25	<i>RvO</i>	8, 23, 25
<i>EvalCf_tf3</i>	10, 23, 25	<i>rvo_glbs_exist_thm</i>	8, 29
<i>EvalCf_tf4</i>	10, 23, 25	<i>rvo_lubs_exist_thm</i>	8, 29
<i>evalcf_tf4_increasing_lemma</i>	12	<i>SC-INDUCTION-T</i>	6
<i>EvalForm</i>	11, 23, 26	<i>sc_induction_tac</i>	6
<i>evalform_increasing_thm</i>	13, 31	<i>ScPrec</i>	6, 23, 25
<i>EvalFormFunct</i>	10, 23, 26	<i>scprec_fc_clauses</i>	7, 29
<i>evalform.funct_fixp_lemma</i>	11, 30	<i>scprec_fc_clauses2</i>	7, 29
<i>evalform.funct_respect_thm</i>	11, 30	<i>ScPrec_tc_</i> \in -thm	6
<i>evalform.funct_thm</i>	11, 30	<i>SemanticFunctor</i>	19, 24, 28
<i>evalform.funct_thm2</i>	11, 30	<i>semanticfunctor_increasing_thm</i>	19
<i>EvalFormPr</i>	16, 24, 27	<i>sf_gfp_lemma1</i>	19
<i>evalformpr_increasing_thm</i>	31	<i>sf_lfp_lemma1</i>	19
<i>FtvExtensional</i>	21, 24, 28	<i>SFFixp</i>	20, 24, 28
<i>ifol</i>	3, 22	<i>SFTotalFixp</i>	20, 24, 28
<i>ifol1</i>	22	<i>ST</i>	7, 24
<i>Is_clauses</i>	4	<i>stn_con_neq_clauses</i>	7
<i>is_fc_clauses</i>	6, 29	<i>StO</i>	8, 23, 25
<i>is_fc_clauses2</i>	7, 29	<i>sto_glbs_exist_thm</i>	8, 30
<i>Is_not_fc_clauses</i>	4, 28	<i>sto_lubs_exist_thm</i>	8, 30
<i>IsAf</i>	3, 23, 24	<i>syn_comp_fc_clauses</i>	7, 29
		<i>syn_con_neq_clauses</i>	29
		<i>syn_proj_clauses</i>	6, 29

<i>Syntax</i>	5, 23, 25
<i>syntax_⊆_reclosed_thm</i>	5
<i>syntax_cases_thm</i>	6, 29
<i>syntax_disj_thm</i>	6, 29
<i>totalfixp_extensional_lemma</i>	21
<i>TotalOver</i>	20, 24, 28
<i>UnpackBinRel</i>	15, 23, 26
<i>unpackbinrel_increasing_lemma</i>	15
<i>UnpackRelPair</i>	16, 23, 27
<i>unpackrelpair_increasing_lemma</i>	16
<i>VarComp</i>	9, 23, 25
<i>well_founded_ScPrec_thm</i>	6, 29
<i>well_founded_tcScPrec_thm</i>	6, 29