

Abstract Algebraic Logic: Theory and Applications – Lesson 5

Petr Cintula¹ Carles Noguera²

¹Institute of Computer Science, Czech Academy of Sciences
Prague, Czech Republic

²Artificial Intelligence Research Institute (IIIA - CSIC)
Bellaterra, Catalonia

Completeness theorem for classical logic

- Suppose that $T \in \text{Th}(\text{CPC})$ and $\varphi \notin T$ ($T \not\vdash_{\text{CPC}} \varphi$). We want to show that $T \not\models \varphi$ in some meaningful semantics.
- $T \not\models_{\langle \mathbf{Fm}_{\mathcal{L}}, T \rangle} \varphi$. 1st completeness theorem
- $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in \Omega(T)$ iff $\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta \in T$ (congruence relation on $\mathbf{Fm}_{\mathcal{L}}$ compatible with T : if $\alpha \in T$ and $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in \Omega(T)$, then $\beta \in T$).
- Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra: $\mathbf{Fm}_{\mathcal{L}}/\Omega(T)$ is a Boolean algebra and $T \not\models_{\langle \mathbf{Fm}_{\mathcal{L}}/\Omega(T), T/\Omega(T) \rangle} \varphi$. 2nd completeness theorem
- Lindenbaum Lemma: If $\varphi \notin T$, then there is a maximal consistent $T' \in \text{Th}(\text{CPC})$ such that $T \subseteq T'$ and $\varphi \notin T'$.
- $\mathbf{Fm}_{\mathcal{L}}/\Omega(T') \cong \mathbf{2}$ (subdirectly irreducible Boolean algebra) and $T \not\models_{\langle \mathbf{2}, \{1\} \rangle} \varphi$. 3rd completeness theorem

The scope restriction for this lecture

Unless said otherwise, any logic L is **weakly implicative** in a language \mathcal{L} with an implication \rightarrow .

Order and Leibniz congruence

Recall

Let $\mathbf{A} = \langle \mathbf{A}, F \rangle$ be an L-matrix. We define:

- the **matrix preorder** $\leq_{\mathbf{A}}$ of \mathbf{A} as

$$a \leq_{\mathbf{A}} b \quad \text{iff} \quad a \rightarrow^{\mathbf{A}} b \in F$$

- the **Leibniz congruence** $\Omega_{\mathbf{A}}(F)$ of \mathbf{A} as

$$\langle a, b \rangle \in \Omega_{\mathbf{A}}(F) \quad \text{iff} \quad a \leq_{\mathbf{A}} b \text{ and } b \leq_{\mathbf{A}} a.$$

Observation

The Leibniz congruence of \mathbf{A} is the **identity** iff $\leq_{\mathbf{A}}$ is an order.

Thus all reduced matrices of L are ordered by $\leq_{\mathbf{A}}$.

Weakly implicative logics are the logics of ordered matrices.

Definition 5.1

Let $\mathbf{A} = \langle \mathbf{A}, F \rangle \in \mathbf{MOD}(\mathbf{L})$. Then

- F is *linear* if $\leq_{\mathbf{A}}$ is a total preorder, i.e. for every $a, b \in A$,
 $a \rightarrow^{\mathbf{A}} b \in F$ or $b \rightarrow^{\mathbf{A}} a \in F$
- \mathbf{A} is a *linearly ordered model* (or just a *linear model*) if $\leq_{\mathbf{A}}$ is a linear order (equivalently: F is linear and \mathbf{A} is reduced).

We denote the class of all linear models as $\mathbf{MOD}^{\ell}(\mathbf{L})$.

A theory T is *linear* in \mathbf{L} if $T \vdash_{\mathbf{L}} \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ or $T \vdash_{\mathbf{L}} \psi \rightarrow \varphi$, for all φ, ψ

Lemma 5.2

Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbf{MOD}(\mathbf{L})$. Then F is *linear* iff $\mathbf{A}^* \in \mathbf{MOD}^{\ell}(\mathbf{L})$. In particular: a theory T is *linear* iff $\mathbf{Lind}T_T \in \mathbf{MOD}^{\ell}(\mathbf{L})$

For proof just recall that: $[a]_F \leq_{\mathbf{A}^*} [b]_F$ iff $a \rightarrow^{\mathbf{A}} b \in F$.

Definition 5.3

We say that \rightarrow is *semilinear* if

$$\vdash_{\mathbf{L}} = \models_{\mathbf{MOD}^{\ell}(\mathbf{L})}.$$

We say that \mathbf{L} is *semilinear* if it has a semilinear implication.

(Weakly implicative) *semilinear* logics are the logics of *linearly* ordered matrices.

Characterization of semilinearity via the Linear Extension Property LEP

Definition 5.4

We say that a L has the *Linear Extension Property* **LEP** if linear theories form a base of $\text{Th}(L)$, i.e. for every theory $T \in \text{Th}(L)$ and every formula $\varphi \in \text{Fm}_{\mathcal{L}} \setminus T$, there is a linear theory $T' \supseteq T$ such that $\varphi \notin T'$.

Theorem 5.5

Let L be a weakly implicative logic. TFAE:

- 1 L is semilinear.
- 2 L has the LEP.

1 \rightarrow 2: If $T \not\leq_L \chi$, then there is a $\mathbf{B} = \langle \mathbf{A}, F \rangle \in \mathbf{MOD}^\ell(\mathbf{L})$ and a \mathbf{B} -evaluation e s.t. $e[T] \subseteq F$ and $e(\chi) \notin F$. We define $T' = e^{-1}[F]$: it is a theory (due to Lemma 1.5), $T \subseteq T'$, and $T' \not\leq_L \chi$. Take φ, ψ and assume w.l.o.g. that $e(\varphi) \leq_{\mathbf{B}} e(\psi)$, thus $e(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \in F$, i.e. $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in T'$.

2 \rightarrow 1: assume that $\Gamma \not\leq_L \varphi$ and set $T = \text{Th}_L(\Gamma)$. Then there is a linear theory $T' \supseteq T$ such that $T' \not\leq_L \varphi$.

Take Lindenbaum–Tarski matrix $\mathbf{LindT}_{T'}$ and note that $\mathbf{LindT}_{T'} \in \mathbf{MOD}^\ell(\mathbf{L})$ (due to Lemma 5.2). Then take evaluation $e(v) = [v]_{T'}$ and observe that $e[\Gamma] \subseteq e[T'] = [T']_{T'}$ and as $\varphi \notin T'$ we get $e(\varphi) \notin [T']_{T'}$ (due to Lemma 1.15).

Semilinearity Property SLP and its transfer

Definition 5.6

We say that a L has the *Semilinearity Property SLP* if the following meta-rule is valid:

$$\frac{\Gamma, \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash_L \chi \quad \Gamma, \psi \rightarrow \varphi \vdash_L \chi}{\Gamma \vdash_L \chi}.$$

Theorem 5.7

Assume that L satisfies the SLP. Then for each \mathcal{L} -algebra A and each set $X \cup \{a, b\} \subseteq A$ we have:

$$\text{Fi}(X, a \rightarrow b) \cap \text{Fi}(X, b \rightarrow a) = \text{Fi}(X).$$

To prove the non-trivial direction we show that for each $t \notin \text{Fi}(X)$ we have $t \notin \text{Fi}(X, a \rightarrow b)$ or $t \notin \text{Fi}(X, b \rightarrow a)$. We distinguish two cases:

1. proof of the transfer when A is countable.

Assume, w.l.o.g. that Var contains $\{v_z \mid z \in A\}$ and define:

$$\Gamma = \{v_z \mid z \in \text{Fi}(X)\} \cup \bigcup_{\langle c, n \rangle \in \mathcal{L}} \{c(v_{z_1}, \dots, v_{z_n}) \leftrightarrow v_{c^A(z_1, \dots, z_n)} \mid z_i \in A\}.$$

Clearly, $\Gamma \not\equiv_{\mathcal{L}} v_t$ (because for the A -evaluation $e(v_z) = z$: $e[\Gamma] \subseteq \text{Fi}(X)$ and $e(v_t) \notin \text{Fi}(X)$). Thus by the SLP (w.l.o.g.): $\Gamma, v_a \rightarrow v_b \not\equiv_{\mathcal{L}} v_t$. We define a theory $T' = \text{Th}_{\mathcal{L}}(\Gamma, v_a \rightarrow v_b)$ and a mapping $h: A \rightarrow \text{Fm}_{\mathcal{L}}/\Omega T'$ as $h(z) = [v_z]_{T'}$. We show that h is a homomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} h(c^A(z_1, \dots, z_n)) &= [v_{c^A(z_1, \dots, z_n)}]_{T'} = [c(v_{z_1}, \dots, v_{z_n})]_{T'} \\ &= c^{\text{Fm}_{\mathcal{L}}/\Omega T'}([v_{z_1}]_{T'}, \dots, [v_{z_n}]_{T'}) \\ &= c^{\text{Fm}_{\mathcal{L}}/\Omega T'}(h(z_1), \dots, h(z_n)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $F = h^{-1}([T']_{T'}) \in \mathcal{F}i_{\mathcal{L}}(A)$ (via Lemma 1.5) and $X \cup \{a \rightarrow b\} \subseteq F$ and $t \notin F$, i.e. $t \notin \text{Fi}(X, a \rightarrow b)$.

2. proof of the transfer when A is uncountable – 1

Set $Var' = \{v_z \mid z \in A\} \supseteq Var$; we define a logic L' in \mathcal{L}' with the same connectives as \mathcal{L} and variables from Var' . If we show that L' has the SLP we can repeat the constructions from the first part of this proof to complete the proof.

Let \mathcal{AS} be a presentation of L (note that each rule of \mathcal{AS} has countably many premises) and define:

$$\mathcal{AS}' = \{\sigma[X] \triangleright \sigma(\varphi) \mid X \triangleright \varphi \in \mathcal{AS} \text{ and } \sigma \text{ is an } \mathcal{L}'\text{-subst.}\} \quad L' = \vdash_{\mathcal{AS}'}$$

Observe that $\Gamma \vdash_L \varphi$ iff there is a countable set $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ st. $\Gamma' \vdash_L \varphi$ (clearly any proof in \mathcal{AS}' has countably many leaves, because all of its rules have countably many premises). Next observe that L' is a conservative expansion of L (consider the substitution σ sending all variables from Var to themselves and the rest to a fixed $p \in Var$, take any proof of φ from Γ in \mathcal{AS}' and observe that the same tree with labels ψ replaced by $\sigma\psi$ is a proof of φ from Γ in L).

2. proof of the transfer when A is uncountable – 2

Now we show that L' has the SLP: assume that $\Gamma, \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash_{L'} \chi$ and $\Gamma, \psi \rightarrow \varphi \vdash_{L'} \chi$.

Then there is a **countable** subset $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ st. $\Gamma', \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash_{L'} \chi$ and $\Gamma', \psi \rightarrow \varphi \vdash_{L'} \chi$. Let Var_0 be the variables occurring in $\Gamma' \cup \{\varphi, \psi, \chi\}$ and g a bijection on Var' st. $g[Var_0] \subseteq Var$

Let σ be the \mathcal{L}' -substitution induced by g and σ^{-1} its inverse. Note that: $\sigma[\Gamma'] \cup \{\sigma\varphi, \sigma\psi, \sigma\chi\} \subseteq Fm_{\mathcal{L}}$, $\sigma[\Gamma'], \sigma\varphi \rightarrow \sigma\psi \vdash_{L'} \sigma\chi$ and $\sigma[\Gamma'], \sigma\psi \rightarrow \sigma\varphi \vdash_{L'} \sigma\chi$.

As L' expands L conservatively, we have $\sigma[\Gamma'], \sigma\varphi \rightarrow \sigma\psi \vdash_L \sigma\chi$ and $\sigma[\Gamma'], \sigma\psi \rightarrow \sigma\varphi \vdash_L \sigma\chi$. Thus $\sigma[\Gamma'] \vdash_L \sigma\chi$ (by SLP of L).

Thus also $\sigma[\Gamma'] \vdash_{L'} \sigma\chi$; $\sigma^{-1}[\sigma[\Gamma']] \vdash_{L'} \sigma^{-1}(\sigma\chi)$ i.e., $\Gamma' \vdash_{L'} \chi$.

Properties of linear filters

Lemma 5.8

Let A an \mathcal{L} -algebra and F a linear filter. Then the set $[F, A] = \{G \in \mathcal{F}i_L(A) \mid F \subseteq G\}$ is linearly ordered by inclusion.

Proof.

Take $G_1, G_2 \in [F, A]$ and elements $a_1 \in G_1 \setminus G_2$ and $a_2 \in G_2 \setminus G_1$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $a_1 \leq_{\langle A, F \rangle} a_2$. Thus also $a_1 \rightarrow^A a_2 \in F \subseteq G_1$ and so by (MP) also $a_2 \in G_1$ —a contradiction. \square

Lemma 5.9

Linear filters are finitely \cap -irred. i.e. $\mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L) \subseteq \mathbf{MOD}^*(L)_{\text{RFSI}}$.

Proof.

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}i_L(A)$ be a linear filter and $F = G_1 \cap G_2$. Then $G_1, G_2 \in [F, A]$ which is linearly ordered by inclusion, therefore $F = G_1$ or $F = G_2$. The second claim follows from Theorem 2.6. \square

Theorem 5.10

Let L be a weakly implicative logic. TFAE:

- 1 L is semilinear.
- 2 L has the LEP.

If L is *finitary* the list can be expanded by:

- 3 L has the SLP.
- 4 L has the transferred SLP.
- 5 Linear filters coincide with finitely \cap -irreducible ones in each \mathcal{L} -algebra.
- 6 $\mathbf{MOD}^*(L)_{\text{RFSI}} = \mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L)$.
- 7 $\mathbf{MOD}^*(L)_{\text{RSI}} \subseteq \mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L)$.

(Every semilinear logic enjoys properties 3.–7.)

The proof

1 \leftrightarrow 2: Theorem 5.5

2 \rightarrow 3: assume that $T \not\vdash_L \chi$, let $T' \supseteq T$ be a linear theory s.t. $T' \not\vdash_L \chi$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $T' \vdash_L \varphi \rightarrow \psi$, then obviously $T, \varphi \rightarrow \psi \not\vdash_L \chi$.

3 \rightarrow 4: Theorem 5.7.

4 \rightarrow 5: let A be an \mathcal{L} -algebra. One direction is Lemma 5.9.

Converse one: assume that F is not linear, i.e., there are $a, b \in A$ st. $a \rightarrow b \notin F$ and $b \rightarrow a \notin F$. Thus $F \subsetneq \text{Fi}(F, a \rightarrow b)$ and $F \subsetneq \text{Fi}(F, b \rightarrow a)$ and so $\text{Fi}(F, a \rightarrow b) \cap \text{Fi}(F, b \rightarrow a) = \text{Fi}(F) = F$, i.e., F is finitely \cap -reducible.

5 \rightarrow 6: due to Theorem 2.6.

6 \rightarrow 7: trivial consequence.

7 \rightarrow 1: due to Theorem 2.8.

Note only here we need finitariness

Classes of semilinear logics

Corollary 5.11

Every regularly implicative semilinear logic is also Rasiowa-implicative.

Proof.

Trivially: $\varphi, \psi \rightarrow \varphi \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ and from regularity also: $\varphi, \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$. Thus, by the SLP, we derive $\varphi \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$. \square

Example 5.12

\mathbb{L}_3^{\leq} (the degree-preserving version of \mathbb{L}_3) is **is weakly implicative** semilinear logic but it is **not algebraically implicative**.

Example 5.13

Logic of linear residuated lattices **is algebraically implicative** **semilinear** logic but it is **not regularly implicative**.

Example 5.14

Intuitionistic logic is not semilinear w.r.t. any implication.

Corollary 5.15

All axiomatic extensions of a semilinear logic are semilinear too.

If L can be axiomatically extended to IPC, then it is not semilinear.

The least semilinear extension

Corollary 5.16

The intersection of a family of semilinear logics in the same language is a semilinear logic.

As Inc is trivially semilinear we can soundly define:

Definition 5.17 (Logic L^ℓ)

Given a weakly implicative logic L , we denote by L^ℓ the least semilinear logic extending L .

Proposition 5.18

If L is a finitary weakly implicative logic, then so is L^ℓ .

The least semilinear extension—semantics

Proposition 5.19

Let L be a weakly implicative logic. Then $L^\ell = \models_{\mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L)}$ and $\mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L^\ell) = \mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L)$.

Proof.

Let L' be any extension of L , then $\mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L') \subseteq \mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L)$. Thus in particular:

$$\mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L^\ell) \subseteq \mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L) \text{ and so } \models_{\mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L)} \subseteq \models_{\mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L^\ell)} = L^\ell$$

As $\models_{\mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L)}$ is clearly semilinear we have the first claim.

The second inclusion of the second claim is trivial

(as $\mathbb{K} \subseteq \mathbf{MOD}^*(\models_{\mathbb{K}})$)



The least semilinear extension—axiomatization

Theorem 5.20 (Axiomatization of L^ℓ)

Let L be a finitary *p-disjunctional* weakly implicative logic. Then L^ℓ is the extension of L with the axiom(s):

$$(P_{\nabla}) \quad \vdash_L (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \nabla (\psi \rightarrow \varphi).$$

Proof.

Using the previous proposition we know that $L^\ell = \models_{\mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L)}$. The proof is completed by Theorem 4.37; we only need to observe that a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbf{MOD}^\ell(L)$ iff $\mathbf{A} \models P$, where P is the positive clause $F(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \vee F(\psi \rightarrow \varphi)$. □

The axiom(s) (P_{∇}) is (are) called the *prelinearity axiom(s)*.

Semilinearity and (generalized) disjunction

How to proceed if we do not know any p-disjunction of L?

Idea: choose a *suitable* p-protodisjunction ∇ , extend L to L^∇ ,
and proceed as above.

Problem: what if $L^\nabla \not\subseteq L^\ell$? To overcome it, we define:

$$(\text{MP}_\nabla) \quad \varphi \rightarrow \psi, \varphi \nabla \psi \vdash_L \psi \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi \rightarrow \psi, \psi \nabla \varphi \vdash_L \psi.$$

Proposition 5.21

Let ∇ be a p-protodisjunction in L.

- 1 If L is p-disjunctive, then (MP_∇) is satisfied.
- 2 If L is semilinear, then (P_∇) is satisfied.

Proof.

1. Using PCP for $\varphi, \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \psi$ and $\psi, \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \psi$.
2. Using SLP for $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash_L (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \nabla (\psi \rightarrow \varphi)$ and $\psi \rightarrow \varphi \vdash_L (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \nabla (\psi \rightarrow \varphi)$. □

Lemma 5.22

Let ∇ be a p -protodisjunction and A an \mathcal{L} -algebra.

- 1 If L fulfils (MP_{∇}) , then each linear filter in A is ∇ -prime.
- 2 If L fulfils (P_{∇}) , then each ∇ -prime filter in A is linear.

Proof.

1. Assume that F is linear ($a \rightarrow^A b \in F$ or $b \rightarrow^A a \in F$) and $a \nabla^A b \subseteq F$. Thus from (MP_{∇}) we obtain: $b \in F$ or $a \in F$.

2. Assume that F is not linear, i.e. there are elements a, b st. $x = a \rightarrow^A b \notin F$ and $y = b \rightarrow^A a \notin F$. From (P_{∇}) we obtain $x \nabla^A y = (a \rightarrow^A b) \nabla^A (b \rightarrow^A a) \subseteq F$, i.e., F is not ∇ -prime. \square

Theorem 5.23 (Interplay of p -disjunctions and semilinearity)

Let L be a finitary and ∇ a p -protodisjunction. TFAE:

- 1 L is p -disjunctive and satisfies (P_{∇}) .
- 2 L is semilinear and satisfies (MP_{∇}) .

Thus in particular:

- If L satisfies (P_{∇}) and (MP_{∇}) : L is semilinear iff it is p -disjunctive.
- If L is p -disjunctive: L is semilinear iff L satisfies (P_{∇}) .
- If L is semilinear: L is p -disjunctive iff L satisfies (MP_{∇}) .

Proof.

(MP_{∇}) follows from Proposition 5.21. From (P_{∇}) we know that ∇ -prime theories are linear and as we have PEP, we get LEP. The converse direction is analogous. □

Corollary 5.24

Let L be a finitary logic and ∇ a p -protodisjunction satisfying (MP_{∇}) . Then L^{ℓ} is the extension of L^{∇} by (P_{∇}) .

Proof.

Since $L^{\nabla} + (P_{\nabla})$ is an axiomatic extension of L^{∇} , ∇ remains a p -disjunction there. Thus, by Theorem 5.23, it is a semilinear logic.

Let L' be a finitary semilinear extension of L . Clearly L' satisfies (MP_{∇}) as well and thus by Theorem 5.23 it is a p -disjunctional logic and satisfies (P_{∇}) . Thus $L^{\nabla} \subseteq L'$ and so

$$L^{\nabla} + (P_{\nabla}) \subseteq L' + (P_{\nabla}) = L'. \quad \square$$

Corollary 5.25

Let L_1 be a semilinear logic with a p -protodisjunction which satisfies (MP_{∇}) and L_2 its finitary weakly implicative expansion by a set of consecutions \mathcal{C} . TFAE:

- L_2 is semilinear.
- $\Gamma \nabla \chi \vdash_{L_2} \varphi \nabla \chi$ for each consecution $\Gamma \triangleright \varphi \in \mathcal{C}$.

Corollary 5.26

Let L be a semilinear logic with a p -protodisjunction which satisfies (MP_{∇}) . Then all its weakly implicative axiomatic expansions are semilinear as well.

Definition 5.27

We say that L with connective \vee in its language is *lattice-disjunctive* if \vee is a disjunction and:

$$(V1) \quad \vdash_L \varphi \rightarrow \varphi \vee \psi$$

$$(V2) \quad \vdash_L \psi \rightarrow \varphi \vee \psi$$

$$(V3) \quad \varphi \rightarrow \chi, \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash_L \varphi \vee \psi \rightarrow \chi.$$

Proposition 5.28

Let L be a finitary lattice-disjunctive logic. Then: L^ℓ is the extension of L^\vee by any of these axioms:

$$(P_V) \quad \vdash_L (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \vee (\psi \rightarrow \varphi)$$

$$(lin_V) \quad \vdash_L (\chi \rightarrow \varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow (\chi \rightarrow \varphi) \vee (\chi \rightarrow \psi).$$

Completeness w.r.t. densely ordered matrices

Definition 5.29 (Dense filter)

A filter F in \mathbf{A} is *dense* if it is linear and for every $a, b \in A$ if $a <_{\mathbf{A}} b$ there is $z \in A$ st. $a <_{\mathbf{A}} z$ and $z <_{\mathbf{A}} b$.

A matrix \mathbf{A} is *dense linear matrix*, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbf{MOD}^{\delta}(\mathbf{L})$, if it is reduced and F is dense (equivalently: if $\leq_{\mathbf{A}}$ is a dense order).

Definition 5.30 (Density Property)

Logic \mathbf{L} with has p-protodisjunction ∇ has

- *Density Property* DP w.r.t. ∇ if for any set of formulae $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi, \psi, \chi\}$ and any variable p not occurring them:
 $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{L}} (\varphi \rightarrow p) \nabla (p \rightarrow \psi) \nabla \chi$ implies $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbf{L}} (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \nabla \chi$.
- *Dense Extension Property* DEP if every set of formulae Γ st. $\Gamma \not\vdash_{\mathbf{L}} \varphi$ and there are infinitely many variables not occurring in Γ can be extended into a dense theory $T \supseteq \Gamma$ st. $T \not\vdash_{\mathbf{L}} \varphi$.

Characterization of dense completeness

Proposition 5.31

Any L with DEP:

- 1 *is semilinear and*
- 2 *enjoys DP for any p -protodisjunction ∇ satisfying (MP_{∇})*

Theorem 5.32 (Characterization of dense completeness)

Let L be a weakly implicative logic. TFAE

- 1 $\vdash_L = \models_{\mathbf{MOD}^{\delta}(L)}$.
- 2 L has the DEP.

If furthermore L is finitary semilinear disjunctive logic, then we can add:

- 3 L has the DP.

Completeness w.r.t. arbitrary class of chains

Convention

From now on assume that L is an algebraically implicative semilinear logic and \mathbb{K} a class of L -chains.

Definition 5.33 (Completeness properties)

We say that L has the property of:

- *Strong \mathbb{K} -completeness*, $S\mathbb{K}C$ for short, when for every set of formulae $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi\}$: $\Gamma \vdash_L \varphi$ iff $\Gamma \models_{\mathbb{K}} \varphi$.
- *Finite strong \mathbb{K} -completeness*, $FS\mathbb{K}C$ for short, when for every *finite* set of formulae $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi\}$: $\Gamma \vdash_L \varphi$ iff $\Gamma \models_{\mathbb{K}} \varphi$.
- *\mathbb{K} -completeness*, $\mathbb{K}C$ for short, when for every formula φ : $\vdash_L \varphi$ iff $\models_{\mathbb{K}} \varphi$.

Theorem 5.34

- 1 L has the $\mathbb{K}C$ if, and only if, $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)) = \mathbf{V}(\mathbb{K})$.
- 2 L has the $\mathbf{FS}\mathbb{K}C$ if, and only if, $\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)) = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{K})$.
- 3 L has the $\mathbf{S}\mathbb{K}C$ if, and only if, $\mathbf{ALG}^*(L) = \mathbf{ISP}_{\sigma-f}(\mathbb{K})$.

Proof.

1. \Rightarrow : take an arbitrary equation $\varphi \approx \psi$: then $\models_{\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)} \varphi \approx \psi$ iff $\vdash_L \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ iff $\models_{\mathbb{K}} \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ iff $\models_{\mathbb{K}} \varphi \approx \psi$. Therefore $\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)$ and \mathbb{K} satisfy the same equations and hence they generate the same variety.

\Leftarrow : $\vdash_L \varphi$ iff $\models_{\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)} \mu(\varphi) \approx \nu(\varphi)$ for each $\mu \approx \nu \in \mathcal{T}$ iff $\models_{\mathbb{K}} \mu(\varphi) \approx \nu(\varphi)$ for each $\mu \approx \nu \in \mathcal{T}$ iff $\models_{\mathbb{K}} \varphi$.



Theorem 5.34

- 1 L has the $\mathbb{K}C$ if, and only if, $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)) = \mathbf{V}(\mathbb{K})$.
- 2 L has the $\mathbf{FS}\mathbb{K}C$ if, and only if, $\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)) = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{K})$.
- 3 L has the $\mathbf{S}\mathbb{K}C$ if, and only if, $\mathbf{ALG}^*(L) = \mathbf{ISP}_{\sigma-f}(\mathbb{K})$.

Proof.

The remaining points are proved analogously using that quasi-varieties are characterized by quasiequations, and the classes closed under the operator $\mathbf{ISP}_{\sigma-f}$ are characterized by generalized quasiequations with countably many premises (we can omit this operator on the left side of the equation because that $\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)$ is closed under $\mathbf{ISP}_{\sigma-f}$).



Theorem 5.35 (Characterization of strong completeness)

Let L be a finitary lattice-disjunctive logic. TFAE:

- 1 L has the SKC.
- 2 Every non-trivial countable member of $\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)_{\text{RFSI}}$ is embeddable into some member of \mathbb{K} .
- 3 Every countable member of $\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)_{\text{RSI}}$ is embeddable into some member of \mathbb{K} .

Definition 5.36 (Directed set of formulae)

A set of formulae Ψ is *directed* if for each $\varphi, \psi \in \Psi$ there is $\chi \in \Psi$ such that both $\varphi \rightarrow \chi$ and $\psi \rightarrow \chi$ are provable in L (we call χ an *upper bound* of φ and ψ).

Lemma 5.37

Assume that L is finitary and has the SKC. Then for every set of formulae Γ and every directed set of formulae Ψ the following are equivalent:

- $\Gamma \not\vdash_L \psi$ for each $\psi \in \Psi$.
- There is a algebra $A \in \mathbb{K}$ and an A -evaluation e such that $e[\Gamma] \subseteq F$ and $e[\Psi] \cap F = \emptyset$.

Proof of $1 \rightarrow 2$

Take a countable $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbf{ALG}^*(\mathbf{L})_{\text{RFSI}}$ with filter F . Consider a set of variables $\{v_a \mid a \in A\}$ and sets of formulae:

$$\Gamma = \{c(v_{a_1}, \dots, v_{a_n}) \leftrightarrow v_{c^{\mathbf{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_n)} \mid \langle c, n \rangle \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } a_1, \dots, a_n \in A\},$$

$$\Psi = \{v_{a_1} \vee \dots \vee v_{a_n} \mid n \in \mathbf{N} \text{ and } a_1, \dots, a_n \in A \setminus F\}.$$

Ψ is directed and $\Gamma \not\vdash_{\mathbf{L}} \psi$ for each $\psi \in \Psi$ (set $e(v_a) = a$: clearly $e[\Gamma] \subseteq F$ and if $a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_n \in F$, then as F is prime we have: $a_i \in F$ for some i —a contradiction).

Using Lemma 5.37 we get an algebra $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{K}$ with filter G and a \mathbf{B} -evaluation e st. $e[\Gamma] \subseteq G$ and $e(\psi) \notin G$ for each $\psi \in \Psi$.

Define **homomorphism** $f: A \rightarrow B$ as $f(a) = e(v_a)$. We show it is one-one: take $a, b \in A$ st. $a \neq b$ and w.l.o.g. $a \rightarrow^{\mathbf{A}} b \notin F$. Thus $f(a) \rightarrow^{\mathbf{B}} f(b) = e(v_a) \rightarrow^{\mathbf{B}} e(v_b) = e(v_{a \rightarrow^{\mathbf{A}} b}) \notin G$, i.e. $f(a) \neq f(b)$.

Suppose that for some Γ and φ we have $\Gamma \not\vdash_{\mathbf{L}} \varphi$. Then, since \mathbf{L} is finitary, by Theorem 5.10, there are $\langle \mathbf{A}, F \rangle \in \mathbf{MOD}^*(\mathbf{L})_{\text{RSI}}$ and e such that $e[\Gamma] \subseteq F$ and $e(\varphi) \notin F$. Let \mathbf{B} be the countable subalgebra of \mathbf{A} generated by $e[Fm_{\mathcal{L}}]$. Consider the submatrix $\langle \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B} \cap F \rangle \in \mathbf{MOD}^{\ell}(\mathbf{L})$. \mathbf{B} is not necessarily subdirectly irreducible but it is representable as a subdirect product of a family of $\{\mathbf{C}_i \mid i \in I\} \subseteq \mathbf{ALG}^*(\mathbf{L})_{\text{RSI}}$; let G_i be their corresponding filters and let α be the representation homomorphism. It is clear that $e[\Gamma] \subseteq \mathbf{B} \cap F$ and $e(\varphi) \notin \mathbf{B} \cap F$. There is some $j \in I$ such that $(\pi_j \circ \alpha)(e(\varphi)) \notin G_j$. \mathbf{C}_j is a countable member of $\mathbf{ALG}^*(\mathbf{L})_{\text{RSI}}$, so by the assumption there is a matrix $\langle \mathbf{C}, G \rangle \in \mathbf{MOD}^{\ell}(\mathbf{L})$ with $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{K}$ and an embedding $f: \mathbf{C}_j \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$, and hence, using this model and the evaluation $f \circ \pi_j \circ \alpha \circ e$, we obtain $\Gamma \not\vdash_{\mathbb{K}} \varphi$.

Theorem 5.38 (Characterization of finite strong completeness)

If L is finitary, then the following are equivalent:

- 1 L satisfies the FSKC.
- 2 Every L -chain is embeddable into $\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbb{K})$.

Corollary 5.39

Assume that L is finitary and enjoys the FSKC. Then L has the $\mathbf{SP}_U(\mathbb{K})C$.

Characterization of finite strong completeness – 2

A finite subset X of an \mathcal{L} -algebra A is partially embeddable into an \mathcal{L} -algebra B if there is a one-to-one mapping $f: X \rightarrow B$ st. for each $\langle c, n \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$ and each $a_1, \dots, a_n \in X$ if $c^A(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in X$, then $f(c^A(a_1, \dots, a_n)) = c^B(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n))$.

A class \mathbb{K} is *partially embeddable into* \mathbb{K}' if every finite subset of every member of \mathbb{K} is partially embeddable into a member of \mathbb{K}'

Theorem 5.40

Let L be a finitary lattice-disjunctive logic with a finite language \mathcal{L} . Then the following are equivalent:

- 1 L has the FSKC.
- 2 Every non-trivial member of $\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)_{\text{RFSI}}$ is partially embeddable into \mathbb{K} .
- 3 Every countable member of $\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)_{\text{RSI}}$ is partially embeddable into \mathbb{K} .

The proof

Take a $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbf{ALG}^*(\mathbf{L})_{\text{RFSI}}$ with filter F and a finite set $B \subseteq A$ and define $B' = B \cup \{a \rightarrow^{\mathbf{A}} b \mid a, b \in B\}$.

Consider a set of variables $\{v_a \mid a \in B'\}$, a formula φ and set Γ :

$$\varphi = \bigvee_{a \in B' \setminus F} v_a$$

$$\Gamma = \{c(v_{a_1}, \dots, v_{a_n}) \leftrightarrow v_{c^{\mathbf{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_n)} \mid \langle c, n \rangle \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } a_1, \dots, a_n, c^{\mathbf{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in B'\}.$$

Observe that Γ is finite and $\Gamma \not\vdash_{\mathbf{L}} \varphi$.

Thus, by the FSKC, there is $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{K}$, with filter G , and a \mathbf{C} -evaluation e such that $e[\Gamma] \subseteq G$ and $e(\varphi) \notin G$.

Define a **partial homomorphism** $f: B \rightarrow C$ as $f(a) = e(v_a)$. We show it is **one-one** in the same way as before.

Proposition 5.41

Assume that L is finitary and lattice-disjunctive. TFAE:

- 1 L enjoys the SFC.
- 2 All L-chains are finite.
- 3 There is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. each L-chain has at most n elements.
- 4 There is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\vdash_L \bigvee_{i < n} (x_i \rightarrow x_{i+1})$.

Proof.

1 \rightarrow 2: From Theorem 5.35 we know that every countable L-chain is embeddable into some member of \mathcal{F} , thus there are no infinite countable L-chains and so by the downward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem there are no infinite chains.

2 \rightarrow 3: If all the algebras in $\mathbf{ALG}^*(L)$ are finite then there must a bound for their length, because otherwise by means of an ultraproduct we could build an infinite one. □

Completeness w.r.t. the class \mathcal{F} of all finite L-chains

Proposition 5.41

Assume that L is finitary and lattice-disjunctive. TFAE:

- 1 L enjoys the SFC.
- 2 All L-chains are finite.
- 3 There is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. each L-chain has at most n elements.
- 4 There is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\vdash_L \bigvee_{i < n} (x_i \rightarrow x_{i+1})$.

Proof.

3 \rightarrow 4: Take an arbitrary L-chain A , with filter F , and elements $a_0, \dots, a_n \in A$. Since A has at most n elements it is impossible that $a_0 > a_1 > \dots > a_n$, thus there is some k such that $a_k \leq a_{k+1}$, i.e. $a_k \rightarrow^A a_{k+1} \in F$, and hence it satisfies the formula.

4 \rightarrow 2: Take an L-chain A , with filter F and elements $a_0, \dots, a_n \in A$ st. $a_0 > a_1 > \dots > a_n$. Then $a_i \rightarrow^A a_{i+1} \notin F$, for every $i < n$, and as F is \vee -prime we get $\not\vdash_A \bigvee_{i < n} (x_i \rightarrow x_{i+1})$. \square

Proposition 5.41

Assume that L is finitary and lattice-disjunctive. TFAE:

- 1 L enjoys the SFC.
- 2 All L -chains are finite.
- 3 There is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. each L -chain has at most n elements.
- 4 There is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\vdash_L \bigvee_{i < n} (x_i \rightarrow x_{i+1})$.

Corollary 5.42

For a finitary lattice-disjunctive logic L and a natural number n , the axiomatic extension $L_{\leq n}$ obtained by adding the schema $\bigvee_{i < n} (x_i \rightarrow x_{i+1})$, is a semilinear logic which is strongly complete with respect the L -chains of length less than or equal to n .

Summary: Abstract Algebraic Logic

In this course we have tried to demonstrate that AAL provides powerful tools to:

- understand the several ways by which a logic can be given an algebraic semantics
- build a general and abstract theory of non-classical logics based on their relation to algebras
- understand the rôle of connectives in (non-)classical logics
- classify non-classical logics
- find general results connecting logical and algebraic properties (bridge theorems)
- generalize properties from syntax to semantics (transfer theorems)
- advance the study of particular (families of) non-classical logics by using the abstract notions and results