

On a Mathematical Model of Programs

Yatsuka Nakamura
Shinshu University
Nagano

Andrzej Trybulec
Warsaw University
Białystok

Summary. We continue the work on mathematical modeling of hardware and software started in [17]. The main objective of this paper is the definition of a program. We start with the concept of partial product, i.e. the set of all partial functions f from I to $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$, fulfilling the condition $f.i \in A_i$ for $i \in \text{dom} f$. The computation and the result of a computation are defined in usual way. A finite partial state is called autonomic if the result of a computation starting with it does not depend on the remaining memory and an AMI is called programmable if it has a non empty autonomic partial finite state. We prove the consistency of the following set of properties of an AMI: data-oriented, halting, steady-programmed, realistic and programmable. For this purpose we define a trivial AMI. It has only the instruction counter and one instruction location. The only instruction of it is the halt instruction. A preprogram is a finite partial state that halts. We conclude with the definition of a program of a partial function F mapping the set of the finite partial states into itself. It is a finite partial state s such that for every finite partial state $s' \in \text{dom} F$ the result of any computation starting with $s + s'$ includes $F.s'$.

MML Identifier: AMI_2.

The papers [24], [22], [28], [6], [7], [23], [14], [1], [19], [26], [25], [10], [3], [5], [15], [29], [21], [2], [20], [8], [18], [4], [9], [12], [13], [27], [11], [16], and [17] provide the notation and terminology for this paper.

1. PRELIMINARIES

For simplicity we follow the rules: A, B, C will denote sets, f, g, h will denote functions, x, y, z will be arbitrary, and i, j, k will denote natural numbers. The scheme *UniqSet* concerns a set \mathcal{A} , a set \mathcal{B} , and a unary predicate \mathcal{P} , and states that:

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$$

provided the following requirements are met:

- for every x holds $x \in \mathcal{A}$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}[x]$,
- for every x holds $x \in \mathcal{B}$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}[x]$.

The following propositions are true:

- (1) A misses $B \setminus C$ if and only if B misses $A \setminus C$.
- (2) For every function f holds $\pi_1(\text{dom } f \times \text{rng } f) \circ f = \text{dom } f$.
- (3) If $f \approx g$ and $\langle x, y \rangle \in f$ and $\langle x, z \rangle \in g$, then $y = z$.
- (4) If for every x such that $x \in A$ holds x is a function and for all functions f, g such that $f \in A$ and $g \in A$ holds $f \approx g$, then $\bigcup A$ is a function.
- (5) If $\text{dom } f \subseteq A \cup B$, then $f \upharpoonright A + \cdot f \upharpoonright B = f$.
- (6) $\text{dom } f \subseteq \text{dom}(f + \cdot g)$ and $\text{dom } g \subseteq \text{dom}(f + \cdot g)$.
- (7) For arbitrary x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 holds $[x_1 \mapsto y_1, x_2 \mapsto y_2] = (x_1 \mapsto y_1) + \cdot (x_2 \mapsto y_2)$.
- (8) For all x, y holds $x \mapsto y = \{\langle x, y \rangle\}$.
- (9) For arbitrary a, b, c holds $[a \mapsto b, a \mapsto c] = a \mapsto c$.
- (10) For every function f holds $\text{dom } f$ is finite if and only if f is finite.
- (11) If $x \in \prod f$, then x is a function.

2. PARTIAL PRODUCTS

Let f be a function. The functor $\prod \cdot f$ yields a non-empty set of functions and is defined by:

- (Def.1) $x \in \prod \cdot f$ if and only if there exists g such that $x = g$ and $\text{dom } g \subseteq \text{dom } f$ and for every x such that $x \in \text{dom } g$ holds $g(x) \in f(x)$.

Next we state a number of propositions:

- (12) $x \in \prod \cdot f$ if and only if there exists g such that $x = g$ and $\text{dom } g \subseteq \text{dom } f$ and for every x such that $x \in \text{dom } g$ holds $g(x) \in f(x)$.
- (13) If $\text{dom } g \subseteq \text{dom } f$ and for every x such that $x \in \text{dom } g$ holds $g(x) \in f(x)$, then $g \in \prod \cdot f$.
- (14) If $g \in \prod \cdot f$, then $\text{dom } g \subseteq \text{dom } f$ and for every x such that $x \in \text{dom } g$ holds $g(x) \in f(x)$.
- (15) $\square \in \prod \cdot f$.
- (16) $\prod f \subseteq \prod \cdot f$.
- (17) If $x \in \prod \cdot f$, then x is a partial function from $\text{dom } f$ to $\bigcup \text{rng } f$.
- (18) If $g \in \prod \cdot f$ and $h \in \prod \cdot f$, then $g + \cdot h \in \prod \cdot f$.
- (19) If $\prod \cdot f \neq \emptyset$, then $g \in \prod \cdot f$ if and only if there exists h such that $h \in \prod \cdot f$ and $g \leq h$.
- (20) $\prod \cdot f \subseteq \text{dom } f \dot{\rightarrow} \bigcup \text{rng } f$.
- (21) If $f \subseteq g$, then $\prod \cdot f \subseteq \prod \cdot g$.
- (22) $\prod \cdot \square = \{\square\}$.

- (23) $A \dot{\rightarrow} B = \prod (A \mapsto B)$.
- (24) For all non-empty sets A, B and for every function f from A into B holds $\prod f = \prod (f \upharpoonright \{x : f(x) \neq \emptyset\})$, where x ranges over elements of A .
- (25) If $x \in \text{dom } f$ and $y \in f(x)$, then $x \mapsto y \in \prod f$.
- (26) $\prod f = \{\square\}$ if and only if for every x such that $x \in \text{dom } f$ holds $f(x) = \emptyset$.
- (27) If $A \subseteq \prod f$ and for all functions h_1, h_2 such that $h_1 \in A$ and $h_2 \in A$ holds $h_1 \approx h_2$, then $\cup A \in \prod f$.
- (28) If $g \approx h$ and $g \in \prod f$ and $h \in \prod f$, then $g \cup h \in \prod f$.
- (29) If $g \subseteq h$ and $h \in \prod f$, then $g \in \prod f$.
- (30) If $g \in \prod f$, then $g \upharpoonright A \in \prod f$.
- (31) If $g \in \prod f$, then $g \upharpoonright A \in \prod (f \upharpoonright A)$.
- (32) If $h \in \prod (f + \cdot g)$, then there exist functions f', g' such that $f' \in \prod f$ and $g' \in \prod g$ and $h = f' + \cdot g'$.
- (33) For all functions f', g' such that $\text{dom } g$ misses $\text{dom } f' \setminus \text{dom } g'$ and $f' \in \prod f$ and $g' \in \prod g$ holds $f' + \cdot g' \in \prod (f + \cdot g)$.
- (34) For all functions f', g' such that $\text{dom } f'$ misses $\text{dom } g \setminus \text{dom } g'$ and $f' \in \prod f$ and $g' \in \prod g$ holds $f' + \cdot g' \in \prod (f + \cdot g)$.
- (35) If $g \in \prod f$ and $h \in \prod f$, then $g + \cdot h \in \prod f$.
- (36) For arbitrary x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 such that $x_1 \in \text{dom } f$ and $y_1 \in f(x_1)$ and $x_2 \in \text{dom } f$ and $y_2 \in f(x_2)$ holds $[x_1 \mapsto y_1, x_2 \mapsto y_2] \in \prod f$.

3. COMPUTATIONS

In the sequel N is a non-empty set with non-empty elements.

We now define five new constructions. Let us consider N , and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let s be a state of S . The functor $\text{CurInstr}(s)$ yields an instruction of S and is defined as follows:

(Def.2) $\text{CurInstr}(s) = s(\mathbf{IC}_s)$.

Let us consider N , and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let s be a state of S . The functor $\text{Following}(s)$ yielding a state of S is defined by:

(Def.3) $\text{Following}(s) = \text{Exec}(\text{CurInstr}(s), s)$.

Let us consider N , and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let s be a state of S . The functor $\text{Computation}(s)$ yielding a function from \mathbb{N} into \prod (the object kind of S) **qua** a non-empty set is defined by:

(Def.4) $(\text{Computation}(s))(0) = s$ **qua** an element of \prod (the object kind of S) **qua** a non-empty set and for every i and for every element x of \prod (the object kind of S) **qua** a non-empty set such that $x = (\text{Computation}(s))(i)$ holds $(\text{Computation}(s))(i+1) = \text{Following}(x)$.

Let us consider N , and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N . A state of S is halting if:

(Def.5) there exists k such that $\text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation(it)})(k)) = \mathbf{halt}_S$.

Let us consider N , and let S be an AMI over N , and let f be a function from \mathbb{N} into \prod (the object kind of S) **qua** a non-empty set, and let us consider k . Then $f(k)$ is a state of S . Let us consider N . An AMI over N is realistic if:

(Def.6) the instructions of it \neq the instruction locations of it.

One can prove the following proposition

(37) For every S being a von Neumann definite AMI over N such that S is realistic holds for no instruction-location l of S holds $\mathbf{IC}_S = l$.

In the sequel S denotes a von Neumann definite AMI over N and s denotes a state of S . One can prove the following propositions:

(38) $(\text{Computation}(s))(0) = s$.

(39) $(\text{Computation}(s))(k+1) = \text{Following}((\text{Computation}(s))(k))$.

(40) For every k holds

$(\text{Computation}(s))(i+k) = (\text{Computation}((\text{Computation}(s))(i)))(k)$.

(41) If $i \leq j$, then for every N and for every S being a halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every state s of S such that

$\text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s))(i)) = \mathbf{halt}_S$

holds $(\text{Computation}(s))(j) = (\text{Computation}(s))(i)$.

Let us consider N , and let S be a halting von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let s be a state of S satisfying the condition: s is halting. The functor $\text{Result}(s)$ yields a state of S and is defined as follows:

(Def.7) there exists k such that $\text{Result}(s) = (\text{Computation}(s))(k)$ and $\text{CurInstr}(\text{Result}(s)) = \mathbf{halt}_S$.

Next we state the proposition

(42) For every N and for every S being a steady-programmed von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every state s of S and for every instruction-location i of S holds $s(i) = (\text{Following}(s))(i)$.

Let us consider N , and let S be a definite AMI over N , and let s be a state of S , and let l be an instruction-location of S . Then $s(l)$ is an instruction of S .

Next we state several propositions:

(43) For every N and for every S being a steady-programmed von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every state s of S and for every instruction-location i of S and for every k holds $s(i) = (\text{Computation}(s))(k)(i)$.

(44) For every N and for every S being a steady-programmed von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every state s of S holds $(\text{Computation}(s))(k+1) = \text{Exec}(s(\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s))(k)}), (\text{Computation}(s))(k))$.

(45) For every N and for every S being a steady-programmed von Neumann halting definite AMI over N and for every state s of S and for every k such that $s(\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s))(k)}) = \mathbf{halt}_S$ holds $\text{Result}(s) = (\text{Computation}(s))(k)$.

- (46) For every N and for every S being a steady-programmed von Neumann halting definite AMI over N and for every state s of S such that there exists k such that $s(\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s))(k)}) = \mathbf{halt}_S$ and for every i holds $\text{Result}(s) = \text{Result}((\text{Computation}(s))(i))$.
- (47) For every S being an AMI over N and for every object o of S holds $\text{ObjectKind}(o)$ is non-empty.

4. FINITE PARTIAL STATES

We now define five new constructions. Let us consider N , and let S be an AMI over N . The functor $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ yielding a subset of \mathbb{P} (the object kind of S) is defined by:

- (Def.8) $\text{FinPartSt}(S) = \{p : p \text{ is finite}\}$, where p ranges over elements of \mathbb{P} (the object kind of S).

Let us consider N , and let S be an AMI over N . An element of \mathbb{P} (the object kind of S) is called a finite partial state of S if:

- (Def.9) it is finite.

Let us consider N , and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N . A finite partial state of S is autonomic if:

- (Def.10) for all states s_1, s_2 of S such that $it \subseteq s_1$ and $it \subseteq s_2$ and for every i holds $(\text{Computation}(s_1))(i) \upharpoonright \text{dom } it = (\text{Computation}(s_2))(i) \upharpoonright \text{dom } it$.

A finite partial state of S is halting if:

- (Def.11) for every state s of S such that $it \subseteq s$ holds s is halting.

Let us consider N . A von Neumann definite AMI over N is programmable if:

- (Def.12) there exists a finite partial state of it which is non-empty and autonomic.

We now state two propositions:

- (48) For every S being a von Neumann definite AMI over N and for all non-empty sets A, B and for all objects l_1, l_2 of S such that $\text{ObjectKind}(l_1) = A$ and $\text{ObjectKind}(l_2) = B$ and for every element a of A and for every element b of B holds $[l_1 \mapsto a, l_2 \mapsto b]$ is a finite partial state of S .
- (49) For every S being a von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every non-empty set A and for every object l_1 of S such that $\text{ObjectKind}(l_1) = A$ and for every element a of A holds $l_1 \mapsto a$ is a finite partial state of S .

Let us consider N , and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let l_1 be an object of S , and let a be an element of $\text{ObjectKind}(l_1)$. Then $l_1 \mapsto a$ is a finite partial state of S . Let us consider N , and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let l_1, l_2 be objects of S , and let a be an element of $\text{ObjectKind}(l_1)$, and let b be an element of $\text{ObjectKind}(l_2)$. Then $[l_1 \mapsto a, l_2 \mapsto b]$ is a finite partial state of S .

5. TRIVIAL AMI

Let us consider N . The functor \mathbf{AMI}_t yields a strict AMI over N and is defined by the conditions (Def.13).

- (Def.13) (i) The objects of $\mathbf{AMI}_t = \{0, 1\}$,
(ii) the instruction counter of $\mathbf{AMI}_t = 0$,
(iii) the instruction locations of $\mathbf{AMI}_t = \{1\}$,
(iv) the instruction codes of $\mathbf{AMI}_t = \{0\}$,
(v) the halt instruction of $\mathbf{AMI}_t = 0$,
(vi) the instructions of $\mathbf{AMI}_t = \{\langle 0, \varepsilon \rangle\}$,
(vii) the object kind of $\mathbf{AMI}_t = [0 \mapsto \{1\}, 1 \mapsto \{\langle 0, \varepsilon \rangle\}]$,
(viii) the execution of $\mathbf{AMI}_t = \{\langle 0, \varepsilon \rangle\} \mapsto \text{id}_{\prod_{[0 \mapsto \{1\}, 1 \mapsto \{\langle 0, \varepsilon \rangle\}]}}$.

Next we state several propositions:

- (50) \mathbf{AMI}_t is von Neumann.
(51) \mathbf{AMI}_t is data-oriented.
(52) \mathbf{AMI}_t is halting.
(53) For all states s_1, s_2 of \mathbf{AMI}_t holds $s_1 = s_2$.
(54) \mathbf{AMI}_t is steady-programmed.
(55) \mathbf{AMI}_t is definite.
(56) \mathbf{AMI}_t is realistic.

Let us consider N . Then \mathbf{AMI}_t is a von Neumann definite strict AMI over N .

One can prove the following proposition

- (57) \mathbf{AMI}_t is programmable.

Let us consider N . Note that there exists a von Neumann definite strict AMI over N which is data-oriented halting steady-programmed realistic and programmable.

One can prove the following two propositions:

- (58) For every S being an AMI over N and for every state s of S and for every finite partial state p of S holds $s \upharpoonright \text{dom } p$ is a finite partial state of S .
(59) For every S being an AMI over N holds \emptyset is a finite partial state of S .

Let us consider N , and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N . Observe that there exists a non-empty autonomic finite partial state of S .

Let us consider N , and let S be an AMI over N , and let f, g be finite partial states of S . Then $f + \cdot g$ is a finite partial state of S .

6. AUTONOMIC FINITE PARTIAL STATES

We now state four propositions:

- (60) For every S being a realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every instruction-location l_3 of S and for every element l of $\text{ObjectKind}(\mathbf{IC}_S)$ such that $l = l_3$ and for every element h of $\text{ObjectKind}(l_3)$ such that $h = \mathbf{halt}_S$ and for every state s of S such that $[\mathbf{IC}_S \mapsto l, l_3 \mapsto h] \subseteq s$ holds $\text{CurInstr}(s) = \mathbf{halt}_S$.
- (61) For every S being a realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every instruction-location l_3 of S and for every element l of $\text{ObjectKind}(\mathbf{IC}_S)$ such that $l = l_3$ and for every element h of $\text{ObjectKind}(l_3)$ such that $h = \mathbf{halt}_S$ holds $[\mathbf{IC}_S \mapsto l, l_3 \mapsto h]$ is halting.
- (62) Let S be a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N . Then for every instruction-location l_3 of S and for every element l of $\text{ObjectKind}(\mathbf{IC}_S)$ such that $l = l_3$ and for every element h of $\text{ObjectKind}(l_3)$ such that $h = \mathbf{halt}_S$ and for every state s of S such that $[\mathbf{IC}_S \mapsto l, l_3 \mapsto h] \subseteq s$ and for every i holds $(\text{Computation}(s))(i) = s$.
- (63) For every S being a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every instruction-location l_3 of S and for every element l of $\text{ObjectKind}(\mathbf{IC}_S)$ such that $l = l_3$ and for every element h of $\text{ObjectKind}(l_3)$ such that $h = \mathbf{halt}_S$ holds $[\mathbf{IC}_S \mapsto l, l_3 \mapsto h]$ is autonomic.

We now define two new constructions. Let us consider N , and let S be a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N . One can check that there exists a finite partial state of S which is autonomic and halting.

Let us consider N , and let S be a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N . A pre-program of S is an autonomic halting finite partial state of S .

Let us consider N , and let S be a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let s be a finite partial state of S . Let us assume that s is a pre-program of S . The functor $\text{Result}(s)$ yields a finite partial state of S and is defined as follows:

- (Def.14) for every state s' of S such that $s \subseteq s'$ holds $\text{Result}(s) = \text{Result}(s') \upharpoonright \text{dom } s$.

7. PRE-PROGRAMS AND PROGRAMS

Let us consider N , and let S be a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let p be a finite partial state of S , and let F be a function. We say that p computes F if and only if:

- (Def.15) for an arbitrary x such that $x \in \text{dom } F$ there exists a finite partial state s of S such that $x = s$ and $p + \cdot s$ is a pre-program of S and $F(s) \subseteq \text{Result}(p + \cdot s)$.

The following three propositions are true:

- (64) For every S being a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every finite partial state p of S holds p computes \square .
- (65) For every S being a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every finite partial state p of S holds p is a pre-program of S if and only if p computes $\emptyset \mapsto \text{Result}(p)$.
- (66) For every S being a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every finite partial state p of S holds p is a pre-program of S if and only if p computes $\emptyset \mapsto \emptyset$.

Let us consider N , and let S be a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N . A partial function from $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ to $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ is computable if:

- (Def.16) there exists a finite partial state p of S such that p computes it.

Next we state three propositions:

- (67) For every N and for every S being a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every partial function F from $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ to $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ such that $F = \square$ holds F is computable.
- (68) For every N and for every S being a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every partial function F from $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ to $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ such that $F = \emptyset \mapsto \emptyset$ holds F is computable.
- (69) For every N and for every S being a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every pre-program p of S and for every partial function F from $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ to $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ such that $F = \emptyset \mapsto \text{Result}(p)$ holds F is computable.

Let us consider N , and let S be a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let F be a partial function from $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ to $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ satisfying the condition: F is computable. A finite partial state of S is called a program of F if:

- (Def.17) it computes F .

The following propositions are true:

- (70) For every N and for every S being a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every partial function F from $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ to $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ such that $F = \square$ every finite partial state of S is a program of F .
- (71) For every N and for every S being a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every partial function F from $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ to $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ such that $F = \emptyset \mapsto \emptyset$ every pre-program of S is a program of F .
- (72) For every N and for every S being a realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and for every pre-program p of S and for every partial function F from $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ to $\text{FinPartSt}(S)$ such that $F = \emptyset \mapsto \text{Result}(p)$ holds p is a program of F .

REFERENCES

- [1] Grzegorz Bancerek. The fundamental properties of natural numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):41–46, 1990.
- [2] Grzegorz Bancerek. König's theorem. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):589–593, 1990.
- [3] Grzegorz Bancerek and Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Segments of natural numbers and finite sequences. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):107–114, 1990.
- [4] Czesław Byliński. Basic functions and operations on functions. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):245–254, 1990.
- [5] Czesław Byliński. A classical first order language. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(4):669–676, 1990.
- [6] Czesław Byliński. Functions and their basic properties. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):55–65, 1990.
- [7] Czesław Byliński. Functions from a set to a set. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):153–164, 1990.
- [8] Czesław Byliński. Graphs of functions. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):169–173, 1990.
- [9] Czesław Byliński. The modification of a function by a function and the iteration of the composition of a function. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):521–527, 1990.
- [10] Czesław Byliński. Partial functions. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(2):357–367, 1990.
- [11] Czesław Byliński. Products and coproducts in categories. *Formalized Mathematics*, 2(5):701–709, 1991.
- [12] Czesław Byliński. Subcategories and products of categories. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(4):725–732, 1990.
- [13] Agata Darmochwał. Finite sets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):165–167, 1990.
- [14] Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Basic properties of real numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):35–40, 1990.
- [15] Rafał Kwiatek and Grzegorz Zwara. The divisibility of integers and integer relative primes. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(5):829–832, 1990.
- [16] Michał Muzalewski. Rings and modules - part II. *Formalized Mathematics*, 2(4):579–585, 1991.
- [17] Yatsuka Nakamura and Andrzej Trybulec. A mathematical model of CPU. *Formalized Mathematics*, 3(2):151–160, 1992.
- [18] Henryk Orszczyżyn and Krzysztof Prażmowski. Real functions spaces. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):555–561, 1990.
- [19] Jan Popiołek. Some properties of functions modul and signum. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(2):263–264, 1990.
- [20] Dariusz Surowik. Cyclic groups and some of their properties - part I. *Formalized Mathematics*, 2(5):623–627, 1991.
- [21] Andrzej Trybulec. Binary operations applied to functions. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(2):329–334, 1990.
- [22] Andrzej Trybulec. Enumerated sets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):25–34, 1990.
- [23] Andrzej Trybulec. Function domains and Frænkel operator. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):495–500, 1990.
- [24] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):9–11, 1990.
- [25] Andrzej Trybulec. Tuples, projections and Cartesian products. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):97–105, 1990.
- [26] Michał J. Trybulec. Integers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):501–505, 1990.
- [27] Wojciech A. Trybulec. Pigeon hole principle. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):575–579, 1990.
- [28] Zinaida Trybulec. Properties of subsets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):67–71, 1990.
- [29] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations and their basic properties. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):73–83, 1990.

Received December 29, 1992
