

## 2 · Why

COMPREHENSIVE\_PROJECT\_ASSESSMENT.md

O6\_IRONCLAD\_RULEBOOK.md

O6\_Reusable\_Components.lean

### 2 · Why `eqW + recΔ` instead of the old “Boolean-encoding 5-operator” idea?

Criterion	<code>recΔ + eqW (current plan)</code>	“Boolean encoding” ( <code>OBool + and/or/not + cond + recursion?</code> )
<b>Termination proof</b>	Easy: $\delta$ -height strictly drops; equality witness is 1-step.	Each Boolean op needs its own measure; conditional can <i>increase</i> size → SN proof messier.
<b>Kernel size</b>	Adds 2 constructors, 4 rules.	Needs at least 4 new constructors ( <code>OBool</code> value, <code>oand</code> , <code>onot</code> , conditional) <b>plus</b> a recursion operator anyway.
<b>Confluence risk</b>	Minimal (orthogonal root rules).	Boolean conditionals overlap with merge/annihilation unless carefully ordered.
<b>Gödel plateau</b>	Built-in via <code>eqW</code> .	Must still invent an equality test that returns <code>OBool</code> → circles back to witness anyway.
<b>Reviewer perception</b>	“Primitive recursion + structural equality witness” is standard and respectable.	“Re-invented Boolean algebra inside non-Boolean calculus” looks like you smuggled <i>another</i> logic rather than eliminated it.
<b>Axiom-free bragging rights</b>	Kept: no truth table, just cancellation + equality witness.	Slightly diluted: <code>OBool</code> is basically a truth-table type; reviewers may call it a Boolean axiom in disguise.

Bottom line: **recΔ + eqW hits the sweet-spot**—smallest patch that removes Lean Bool/DecEq/Nat dependence and unlocks  $\Sigma_1$  recursion.

### 1 · Zero-rewrite path: keep files, patch in place

Phase	File(s) touched	What you do	LOC delta
P1 (drop external Bool)	Basic.lean Normalizer.lean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① Introduce <code>eqW</code> constructor + one root-step rule.</li> <li>② Replace every <code>if ... then ... else ...</code> and <code>beq</code> in <code>normalize</code> / helpers with a <i>pattern match</i> on <code>eqW</code> result (<code>void</code> vs <code>integrate ...</code>).</li> </ul>	$\approx +40$
P2 (add $\delta$ -recursor)	Arithmeti.c.lean (new) Normalizer.lean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① Add <code>recΔ</code> constructor + two rewrite rules.</li> <li>② Re-encode <code>add</code>, <code>mul</code>, bounded search loops through <code>recΔ</code> instead of <code>Nat</code> recursion.</li> <li>③ Extend lex-measure with “<math>\delta</math>-height” component (3 lines in measure definition, 1 lemma proof).</li> </ul>	$\approx +80$
P3 (purge DecidableEq/Nat in diagonal)	Diagonal.lean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① Replace <code>DecidableEq</code> code compare with <code>eqW</code> plateau test.</li> <li>② Drop meta-level <code>Nat</code> counter for plateau; reuse <code>recΔ</code> with <math>\delta</math>-budget.</li> </ul>	-20
P4 (finish Bool-out)	grep-replace across repo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① Remove open <code>classical</code>.</li> <li>② Delete <code>by_cases</code>, <code>decide</code>.</li> <li>③ Add tiny helper <code>oboolCond</code> built from merge &amp; cancellation if really needed (rare).</li> </ul>	-
P5 (update tests / CI)	lakefile.to.m1 test/*.lean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① Add static audit: grep -R "Bool DecidableEq Nat " (spaces) fails CI.</li> <li>② Add quick random-trace confluence harness using new rules.</li> </ul>	+15

Everything else (proof-predicate skeleton, substitution predicate, confluence proof outline) stays structurally identical—only their *dependencies* swap from Lean mathlib Booleans to your own equality witness.

### 3 · Refactor tip-sheet (Lean specifics)

#### 3522. Constructor injection

#### 3523. One-step rules added to `normalizeCore`

#### 3524. Measure extension (pseudo):

**3525. Replace every DecidableEq**

**3526. Bounded search with recΔ**

## 4 · Checklist to declare “Boolean/Numeral free”

- 4957. grep -R " Bool " → empty.
- 4958. grep -R "DecidableEq" → empty.
- 4959. grep -R " Nat " → allowed **only** inside separate TerminationProof.lean (meta).
- 4960. open classical gone everywhere except the one termination proof file (where it is harmless meta).
- 4961. CI job runs lake build , lake exe confluence-test , lake exe sn-test .

## 4 Do you need to start over?

No. You can **refactor the existing Lean scripts**:

- 4169. Introduce two new constructors** ( eqW , recΔ ) and 4 rewrite rules.
- 4170. Replace every Lean Bool / Nat usage** with operator forms ( void , delta -height, eqW plateaus).
- 4171. Re-prove strong normalization** with a lex measure extended by δ-height; the old β/annihilation proofs stay intact.
- 4172. Patch diagonal & provability** to use eqW witness and recΔ -bounded search.
- 4173. Run a CI script that fails on any Bool , Nat , DecidableEq , open classical , or axiom .  
That is incremental, not a rewrite-from-scratch.

## 5 Boolean-encoding alternative?

The older idea—add a whole OBool algebra—works but **bulks the kernel**: you end up with four–six extra constructors (true, false, and, not, cond) *plus* some recursion anyway. Reviewers will say you merely re-invented Booleans rather than eliminated them. eqW + recΔ keeps the kernel minimal and aligns with existing operator semantics, while still allowing an internal equality test essential for Gödel.

**Macros (erased before final kernel checking)** may exist for developer ergonomics, e.g. numeral , add , mul , variable encodings, quoting, etc. They must expand to pure Trace terms using the six constructors only.

## 3 · Refactor tip-sheet (Lean specifics)

### Constructor injection

```
inductive Trace where
| void
| delta : Trace → Trace
| integrate : Trace → Trace
| merge : Trace → Trace → Trace
| eqW : Trace → Trace → Trace -- NEW
| recΔ : Trace → Trace → Trace → Trace -- NEW
| ... -- keep var/lam/app/tag/pair as-is
```

## Constructor injection

```
inductive Trace where
| void
| delta : Trace → Trace
| integrate : Trace → Trace
| merge : Trace → Trace → Trace
| eqW : Trace → Trace → Trace -- NEW
| recΔ : Trace → Trace → Trace → Trace -- NEW
| ... -- keep var/lam/app/tag/pair as-is
```

## One-step rules added to `normalizeCore`

```
| eqW a b =>
let na := normalizeCore a
let nb := normalizeCore b
match structuralCompare na nb with
| .same => Trace.void
| .diff => Trace.integrate (Trace.merge na nb)

| recΔ b s Trace.void => normalizeCore b
| recΔ b s (Trace.delta n) =>
let r := normalizeCore (Trace.recΔ b s n)
normalizeCore (Trace.app (normalizeCore s) r)
```

## Measure extension (pseudo):

```
measure t :=
(betaSites t, annSites t, deltaHeight t, size t)
```

## Replace every `DecidableEq`

```
-- before
if h : a = b then void else integrate (merge a b)
-- after
Trace.eqW a b
```

## Bounded search with `recΔ`

```
def enumUpTo (B : Trace) (P : Trace → Trace) : Trace :=
Trace.recΔ Trace.void
(Trace.lam (Trace.app (Trace.merge
(Trace.app P (Trace.var 0)) -- merge cancels iff P(n)=void
(Trace.var 1)))) ) -- accumulator
```

## 2. Candidate “5th Operator” Archetypes (Evaluation)

Label	Informal Role	Power Gain	Complexity	Risks to Minimality	Solves Which Claims
<b>R</b> (Primitive Recursor)	R base step n (unary $\delta$ -chain iterator)	High (PR closure)	Moderate	Adds arithmetic bias	C14, C23, strengthens EqNat completeness
<b>Iter</b> (Fold / Catamorphism)	fold t f acc general structural fold	Very High (arbitrary structural recursion)	High	May look like cheating (“meta recursion smuggled in”)	Wide: substitution, proof enumeration
<b>Mu</b> (Well-Founded Fixpoint)	mu F seed reduces while measure drops	High (internal diagonal & derivability)	High	Harder termination proof	Diagonal, D1–D3
<b>EqW</b> (Equality Witness)	eqW a b → void iff nf(a)=nf(b)` else canonical non-void	Medium	Low	Focused, simple	Removes external Bool / DecEq reliance
<b>Search</b> (Bounded Existential)	seek B P tries P(0..B)	Medium	Low-Med	Narrow semantics	$\Sigma_1$ prov existential, provability bounding
<b>Quote</b> (Self Code)	quote t returns code trace	Medium	Low	Adds reflection primitive	Cleaner diagonal; still need recursion
<b>Pairing Recursor</b> (PR on pairs)	R2 base step m n	High	Moderate	More arity complexity	Encodes multi-arg PR without meta loops

**Key insight:** You do not need several; one *carefully shaped* operator that can *encode the rest* is better than scattering primitives.

### 3. Recommended Strategy

Pick **ONE of these two designs:**

#### Option A (Leanest, Safe Minimality): Equality-Guided Primitive Recursor $\text{rec}\Delta$

**Purpose:** Supply *total primitive recursion on  $\delta$ -chains* and internal equality tests via its base case branch outcome—killing external Bool and enabling  $\Sigma_1$  completeness for all PR predicates you actually need (Prov, SubF, substitution counters, size bounds).

##### Signature (core calculus extension)

```
css  
CopyEdit  
recΔ b s n
```

- $b$  : base trace (value for 0)
- $s$  : step operator expecting current accumulator
- $n$  :  $\delta$ -chain acting as unary numeral

##### Rewrite Rules (Left $\rightarrow$ Right)

3623.  $\text{rec}\Delta b s \text{ void} \rightarrow b$   
3624.  $\text{rec}\Delta b s (\text{delta } n) \rightarrow s (\text{rec}\Delta b s n)$  (where  $s x$  is encoded as  $\text{app } s x$  or  $\text{merge } (\text{tag step}) (\text{pair } s x)$  depending on your encoding choice)

*Side Conditions:* None (structural). Termination obvious:  $\delta$ -height decreases.

**Measure Impact:** Adds a “ $\Delta\text{height}(n)$ ” component—strictly drops each step.

##### Derivable Additions:

- Addition:  $\text{add } m n := \text{rec}\Delta n (\lambda r. \text{delta } r) m$
- Multiplication:  $\text{mul } m n := \text{rec}\Delta \text{ void } (\lambda r. \text{add } r n) m$
- Equality witness:  $\text{eqNatW } a b := \text{rec}\Delta (\text{testBase } a b) (\lambda r. \text{testStep } r a b) (\maxDepth a b)$  (below I'll show simpler EqW alternative)

##### Pros:

- Still *arithmetically flavored* but tiny and orthodox (reviewers accept primitive recursion).
- Easy termination & confluence integration (orthogonal critical pairs).

##### Cons:

- Only handles unary loops—multi-argument primitive recursion requires pairing encodings (acceptable).

#### Option B (More Dramatic, “Breakthrough Branding”): Reflective Fixpoint / Search Operator $\mu\pi$

##### Signature:

```
r  
CopyEdit  
μΠ F seed M
```

- $F$  : transformer (expects a code and a candidate)
- $\text{seed}$  : initial trace
- $M$  : measure budget ( $\delta$ -chain) guaranteeing finitude

### Rewrite Scheme:

- 4826.  $\text{mu} F \text{ seed void} \rightarrow \text{seed}$
- 4827.  $\text{mu} F \text{ seed } (\delta m) \rightarrow \text{stabilize}(\text{seed}, F \text{ seed}, \text{mu} F (F \text{ seed}) m)$

Where  $\text{stabilize}(x, Fx, \text{rest})$  reduces to  $x$  if an *internal equality witness* (see EqW below) shows  $\text{nf}(x)=\text{nf}(Fx)$ , otherwise  $\text{rest}$ .

### Pros:

- Directly internalizes *bounded* fixpoint iteration, diagonal plateau, Löb prerequisites.
- Lets you *drop* several ad hoc enumeration gadgets.

### Cons:

- Heavier termination argument (must show each non-stable iteration decrements  $M$ ).
- Risk of reviewer saying you imported a reflective engine disguised as a primitive.

If you pick Option B you still need an equality witness primitive or to embed it inside `stabilize`. That effectively makes EqW implicit anyway.

## 4. Equality Witness Primitive (If NOT Using Recursor First)

Even with Option A you likely still want **EqW** because it surgically removes external Bool / DecEq. It is ultra-cheap:

**Operator:** `eqW a b`

### Rewrite Rules (on fully normalized or as part of normalization):

- 5857. If pattern-structural match succeeds (constructor by constructor)  $\rightarrow \text{void}$ .
- 5858. First mismatch position  $\rightarrow \text{integrate } (\text{merge } a \ b)$  (or any canonical non-void marker with both original substraces embedded for refutational info).

### Implementation Tactic:

- Structural evaluator returns either `void` or `delta` marker but you can *stay purely rewrite* by expanding `eqW` into a one-step decision after recursively normalizing children.
- Confluence unaffected (deterministic, no overlapping left sides—only one root rule once children normalized).

### Payoff:

- All prior `beq` usages become `eqW`.
- Diagonal plateau detection internal: test `eqW ψ (F ψ)`.

## 5. Which Combination Maximizes “Breakthrough” with Minimal Rework?

Combo	New Primitives	Covered Gaps	Risk	Marketing Strength
Rec $\Delta$ + EqW	2	PR closure, $\Sigma_1$ repr., equality, diagonal plateau (still need simple iteration wrapper)	Low	"Minimal arithmetic + intrinsic equality"
$\mu\Pi$ (with baked EqW)	1 (but richer)	Equality, diagonal, search, partial recursion	Medium	"Single reflective fixpoint primitive"
EqW only	1	Equality / Bool removal	Low	Too small (doesn't solve $\Sigma_1$ completeness)

**Recommended:** Rec $\Delta$  + EqW if you want *credibility first*;  $\mu\Pi$  only if you're prepared to write a very clean termination + safety section so it doesn't look like a magical oracle.

## 6. Formal Specs (You Can Paste Into Draft)

### 6.1 Grammar Extension

```
go
CopyEdit
t ::= ... | rec $\Delta$  t t t | eqW t t
```

### 6.2 Measures

Extend measure triple to quadruple:  $\mu(t) = (\beta\text{Sites}(t), \text{annSites}(t), \delta\text{Height}(t), \text{size}(t))$

- rec $\Delta$  b s n contributes  $\delta\text{Height}(n)$  to third component.
- Rule application strictly decreases third component (or earlier components if inside  $\beta$  or annihilation contexts).

### 6.3 Critical Pair Audit (New)

Overlap	Reason Safe
recΔ inside β redex body	β reduces first; measure: βSites drop.
recΔ and annihilation (integrate/delta)	Independent root symbols.
eqW vs structural normalizer	eqW only fires after children in NF; no overlap.

## 6.4 Key Lemmas (Lean Skeleton Names)

Lemma	Statement Intent
recΔ_decrease	$\mu(\text{rec}\Delta \ b \ s \ (\delta n)) > \mu(s \ (\text{rec}\Delta \ b \ s \ n))$
recΔ_total	Termination & NF existence for all δ-chains.
eqW_sound	$\text{eq}\Delta \ a \ b = \text{void} \rightarrow \text{nf } a = \text{nf } b.$
eqW_complete	$\text{nf } a = \text{nf } b \rightarrow \text{eq}\Delta \ a \ b = \text{void}.$
eqW_irrefl_nonvoid	$\text{eq}\Delta \ a \ b \neq \text{void} \rightarrow \text{nf } a \neq \text{nf } b.$
add_repr	$\text{add } m \ n \equiv \delta^{\{\text{eval } m + \text{eval } n\}} \text{ void}.$
mul_repr	Analogous for multiplication.
prov_sigma1_full	Uses recΔ to bound enumeration internal.
diag_fixed_internal	Uses eqW as plateau test instead of external Bool.

## 7. Impact on Existing Claims

Claim (Cx)	Status After RecΔ + EqW (If Proved)
C16–C18 (freedom claims)	Move from NOT-COHERENT → PROVABLE ONCE Bool purged.
C14 Primitive Recursive Representability	Becomes NOW after addition + proofs.
C23 $\Sigma_1$ Completeness (restricted PR)	Downgrade from NEW-PRIM to LEMMA-MISSING (the primitive itself now exists).
Diagonal Lemma	Simplifies; no meta equality.
Derivability (second incompleteness)	Easier: can define internal reflection by iterating proof height encodings via <code>recΔ</code> .

## 8. Migration Plan (Exact Order)

Step	Action	Outcome
1	Introduce <code>eqW</code> + rewrite <code>EqNat</code> & diagonal plateau to use it	Remove all external Boolean equality cases
2	Remove <code>beq</code> , <code>Bool</code> branches in normalizer ( <code>OBool</code> optional now)	Clean “boolean-free” core
3	Introduce <code>recΔ</code> & port <code>add</code> , <code>mul</code> , enumeration loops	Internal primitive recursion
4	Rewrite Prov enumerator using <code>recΔ</code> over size bound $\delta$ -chain	$\Sigma_1$ predicate no external Nat loops
5	Replace diagonal’s meta loop with <code>recΔ</code> – based bounded unfold producing $(\psi_k, \psi_{\{k+1\}})$ and <code>eqW</code> plateau test	Fully internal diagonal
6	Prove <code>EqNat</code> completeness via <code>recΔ</code> (induction internal)	Arithmetic closure credible
7	Add derivability skeleton using <code>recΔ</code> to replicate “proof height” reasoning	Stage for second incompleteness
8	Update paper: <i>Core now: {void, delta, integrate, merge, recΔ, eqW}</i> (justify <code>eqW</code> as <i>internal decision operator</i> ; maybe group <code>eqW</code> under “structural witness” not counted as logical axiom).	Narrative breakthrough anchored
9	Run axiom/Bool audit; attach hash	External credibility

## 9. Draft Language Upgrade (Sample Paragraph)

*Primitive Recursor & Equality Witness.* We extend the kernel with a **single arithmetic-neutral iterator** `recΔ` (primitive recursion on  $\delta$ -chains) and a **structural equality witness** `eqW`. The former internalizes all bounded primitive recursive loops (addition, multiplication, enumerative provability search) without importing external numerals; the latter replaces Boolean equality with a normalization witness: `eqW a b` reduces to `void` iff  $\text{nf}(a)=\text{nf}(b)$ . This pair eliminates host-level Booleans, collapses meta enumeration into object computation, and enables internal diagonal fixation via plateau detection, thereby discharging the only prior external dependencies in the incompleteness pipeline.\*

## 10. Risk & Justification

Concern	Mitigation
"You added two operators, not minimalist"	Argue $\text{eqW}$ is <i>not</i> a logical constructor—just a structural <i>certificate</i> operator. Only one <i>computational</i> new constructor ( $\text{rec}\Delta$ ).
Termination proof complexity	Trivial lex decrease on $\delta$ -height; independent of $\beta$ / merge rules.
Confluence interference	No overlapping LHS with existing root symbols; minimal CP additions.
Accusation of smuggling arithmetic	Base + step only; exactly primitive recursion (same strength used in Gödel original).

## 11. If You Want Maximum Flash (Less Conservative)

Adopt  $\mu\Pi$  instead of  $\text{rec}\Delta + \text{eqW}$ , but you *must* write a razor-tight termination proof based on a *supplied budget numeral* plus a lemma that any non-stable unfolding strictly consumes it. Harder to sell minimality, but you get: primitive recursion, minimization (bounded), diagonal all in one symbol. I only recommend this if you're ready to craft a dedicated "Termination of  $\mu\Pi$ " subsection (formal lex measure: (budgetHeight, unfoldingHeight, size)).

## 12. My Recommendation (Actionable Now)

**Go with Option A: Add  $\text{rec}\Delta$  and  $\text{eqW}$ .** It is the *cleanest* story: "We resisted smuggling dozens of rules; we added exactly the one primitive recursion operator and a structural equality witness necessary to internalize (i) arithmetic closure, (ii)  $\Sigma_1$  provability, (iii) diagonal plateau detection, while deleting *all* external Boolean / meta enumeration scaffolding." That *lands* as a tangible advancement beyond a student exercise.

## 13. Immediate Next Micro-Tasks (You Can Assign / Script)

Label	Task	Notes
MT1	Implement <code>eqW</code> (post-normalization pattern)	Replace all <code>beq</code> uses
MT2	Purge <code>Bool</code> & <code>if</code> in <code>normalize</code> ; rerun build	OBool layer optional afterward
MT3	Implement <code>recΔ</code> , add size/ΔHeight measure & lemma	Keep code <50 LOC
MT4	Re-define <code>add</code> , <code>mul</code> , <code>enumerateProofs</code> via <code>recΔ</code>	Remove meta loops
MT5	Rewrite diagonal to use <code>recΔ</code> iteration + <code>eqW</code> plateau	Eliminate meta plateau check
MT6	Draft lemmas: <code>eqW_sound</code> , <code>eqW_complete</code> , <code>recΔ_total</code>	Quick wins
MT7	Update paper Sections 2, 4, 7, 8, 15 + Axiom Freedom Statement	Clarify added operator rationale

## 14. Sample Lean-ish Skeleton (Conceptual)

```

lean
CopyEdit
-- NEW constructors (sketch)
inductive Trace
| void | delta (t : Trace) | integrate (t : Trace) | merge (a b : Trace)
| lam (b : Trace) | app (f x : Trace) | var (idx : Trace) -- still unary chain for index
| tag (k : Trace) | pair (a b : Trace)
| recΔ (base step n : Trace) | eqW (a b : Trace)

-- eqW normalization (conceptual)
def normalizeEqW : Trace → Trace
| (Trace.eqW a b) =>

```

```

let na := nf a; let nb := nf b;
match structuralCompare na nb with
| .same => Trace.void
| .diff => Trace.integrate (Trace.merge na nb)
| t => t

-- recΔ evaluation hooks into main nf:
| (Trace.recΔ b s Trace.void) => nf b
| (Trace.recΔ b s (Trace.delta n)) =>
let r := nf (Trace.recΔ b s n)
nf (Trace.app (nf s) r)

```

(You'll fold this into existing normalization pipeline.)

## 15. “Breakthrough” Narrative You Can Truthfully Use *After* Implementation

*“The only augmentation beyond the four original geometric constructors is a primitive  $\delta$ -chain recursor and a structural equality witness. This pair subsumes all meta enumeration, arithmetization, and Boolean branching into the object calculus itself, yielding a closed, axiom-free normalization geometry that **constructively synthesizes** arithmetic, equality, provability, and self-reference without an external logical substrate.”*