Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic Volume XI, Number 3, July 1970

## LOCATING VERTICES OF TREES

## MARTIN M. ZUCKERMAN

Let X be a nonempty set and let R and S be binary relations on X. Let  $x, y, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2$  be arbitrary elements of X, then, where R(R) is the range of R and  $\omega$  is the set of nonnegative integers,  $\langle X, R, S \rangle$  is called a (dyadic ordered) tree if the following hold:

- (1) If  $x_1Ry$  and  $x_2Ry$ , then  $x_1 = x_2$ .
- (2) For each  $x \in X$ , xRy for at most two y.
- (3) X R(R) is a unit set,  $\{x_0\}$ .
- (4)  $y_1 Sy_2$  iff (a)  $y_1 \neq y_2$ , (b)  $y_2 \not Sy_1$ , and (c) for some  $x \in X$ , both  $xRy_1$  and  $xRy_2$ .
- (5) There exists a function  $l: X \to \omega$  with the properties: (a)  $l(x_0) = 0$  and (b) if xRy, then l(y) = l(x) + 1.

This definition, with minor modifications, is essentially the one given in [1].

If  $\langle X, R, S \rangle$  is a tree, then the elements of X are called *points* or *vertices*. If *xRy* holds for a unique  $y \in X, x$  is called a *simple point*; if *xRy* holds for two distinct y, x is called a *junction point*. Whenever *xRy* then y is said to be an *immediate successor of x*. The relation S, in effect, selects one of the two immediate successors of a junction point. Thus if  $xRy_1, xRy_2$  and  $y_1Sy_2$ , we say that  $y_1$  is the *left successor* and  $y_2$  the *right successor of x*.

l(x) is called the *level of* x.  $l_n$  will denote the set of vertices of level  $n, n \in \omega$ . Each  $l_n$  has at most  $2^n$  vertices; hence for any tree  $\langle X, R, S \rangle, X$  must be countable. Note that  $\langle X, R, S \rangle$  has no junction points iff l is one-one iff  $S = \emptyset$ .

A path of a tree  $\langle X, R, S \rangle$  is a finite sequence  $[a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n]$  or a denumerable sequence  $[a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n, \ldots]$  with the properties:

- (1) for each  $a_k$  appearing in the sequence,  $a_k \in X$  and
- (2) if  $a_{k+1}$  also appears in the sequence, then  $a_{k+1}$  is an immediate successor of  $a_k$ .

Received May 7, 1969

The path  $[a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n]$  is called a *path from*  $a_0$  to  $a_n$ . For any distinct  $x_i, x_j \in X$ , we say  $x_i$  precedes  $x_j$  if there is a path from  $x_i$  to  $x_j$ .

Theorem 1. (Induction Principle for Trees) Let  $\langle X | R, S \rangle$  be a tree. Let A be a subset of X which satisfies: (1)  $l_0 \subseteq A$  and, (2) whenever  $l_n \subseteq A$ , then  $l_{n+} \subseteq A$ , then A = X.

Theorem 2. Let P be the set of positive integers. Let  $\langle X, R, S \rangle$  be a tree. Then there is a unique function  $L: X \to P$  such that (1)  $L(x_0) = 1$  and such that (2) whenever  $y \in R(R)$  and xRy, then (a) L(y) = 2L(x) if either x is a simple point or y is the left successor of x, or (b) L(y) = 2L(y) + 1 if y is the right successor of x.

*Proof.* For each  $x \in X$ , let A(x) be the set of all  $a \in x$  such that a is a right successor (of some junction point) and either a = x or a precedes x. Let

$$L(x) = 2^{l(x)} + \sum_{a \in A(x)} 2^{l(x)-l(a)}$$

We have

$$L(x_0) = 2^{l(x_0)} + \sum_{a \in \emptyset} 2^{l(x) - l(a)} = 1.$$

Let xRy and suppose that either x is a simple point or else y is the left successor of x. Then A(y) = A(x), whereas,

(1) 
$$l(y) = l(x) + 1.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{split} L(y) &= 2^{l(y)} + \sum_{a \in A(y)} 2^{l(y) - l(a)} \\ &= 2^{l(x) + 1} + \sum_{a \in A(x)} 2^{l(x) + 1 - l(a)} \\ &= 2\left(2^{l(x)} + \sum_{a \in A(x)} 2^{l(x) - l(a)}\right) \\ &= 2L(x) \;. \end{split}$$

Now suppose that y is the right successor of x. Then  $A(y) = A(x) \cup \{y\}$ ; again, (1) holds.

This time

$$L(y) = 2^{l(y)} + \sum_{a \in A(y)} 2^{l(y)-l(a)}$$
  
=  $2^{l(x)+1} + \sum_{a \in A(x)} 2^{l(x)+1-l(a)} + 2$   
=  $2L(x) + 1.$ 

If  $L^*: X \to \omega$  is any function satisfying conditions (1) and (2) of the present theorem, then by the Principle of Induction for trees it follows that  $L^* = L$ . For let  $B = \{x \in X: L^*(x) = L(x)\}$ . Then  $l_0 \subseteq L$  because by (1),  $L^*(x_0) = L(x_0) = 1$ . Suppose  $l_n \subseteq B$ . If  $l_{n+} = \emptyset$ , then surely  $l_{n+} \subseteq B$ . Otherwise, let  $y \in l_{n+}$  and let x be the unique vertex satisfying xRy. We have

 $x \in L_n \subseteq B$ ; hence  $L^*(x) = L(x)$ . If x is a simple point or if y is the left successor of x, then

$$L^{*}(y) = 2L^{*}(x) = 2L(x) = L(y)$$
.

In case y is the right successor of x, then

$$L^{*}(y) = 2L^{*}(x) + 1 = 2L(x) + 1 = L(y)$$
.

Thus  $l_{n+} \subseteq B$  and by theorem 1, B = X.

Corollary.  $2^{l(x)} \leq L(x) < 2^{l(x)+1}$  for all  $x \in X$ .

By means of L we can locate elements of the tree; thus we call L the *location function* of the tree. L is especially useful in trees whose vertices are (occurrences of) (1) subformulas of a given formula or (2) probability events. In particular, in the case of an analytic tableau for a formula P (see [1]), various subformulas of P are repeated again and again. It might be convenient to index the subformulas of the tableau by their locations. Thus if Q is a subformula of P which occurs in the tableau, we replace each occurrence of Q by  $Q_n$ —so that  $L(Q_n) = n$ . Moreover, L can be used to specify the relations R and S (in the definition of "tree") in the following sense.

Theorem 3. Let X be a countable set. Let  $L: X \to P$  be any one-one function satisfying (a)  $1 \in R(L)$  and (b) for any  $n \ge 1$ , whenever  $2n + 1 \in R(L)$ , then  $2n \in R(L)$  and whenever  $2n \in R(L)$ , then  $n \in R(L)$ . Then there is a unique tree  $\langle X, R, S \rangle$  for which

- (i) xRy iff either L(y) = 2L(x) or L(y) = 2L(x) + 1, and
- (ii)  $y_1 Sy_2$  iff  $L(y_1)$  is even and  $L(y_2) = L(y_1) + 1$ .

*Proof.* Suppose R and S are binary relations on X defined by (i) and (ii) of theorem 3. In order to show that  $\langle X, R, S \rangle$  is a tree we must show that clauses (1)-(5) of the definition of "tree" hold.

(1) Suppose  $x_1 Ry$  and  $x_2 Ry$ . Then for  $i = 1, 2, L(y) = 2L(x_i)$  or  $L(y) = 2L(x_i) + 1$ . Parity considerations assure that either  $L(y) = 2L(x_1) = 2L(x_2)$  or else  $L(y) = 2L(x_1) + 1 = 2L(x_2) + 1$ . Thus  $x_1 = x_2$  because L is one-one.

(2) follows from (i).

(3) According to (a),  $1 \in \mathbb{R}(L)$ ; since L is one-one, there is a unique element  $x_0$  in X such that  $L(x_0) = 1$ .  $1 \notin \mathbb{R}(R)$ , by (i). Suppose  $x \in X - \{x_0\}$ . Then L(x) > 1; hence for some  $n \ge 1$ , L(x) = 2n or L(x) = 2n+1. Thus  $\{n, L(x)\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}(L)$  by (b), and by (i),  $L^{-1}(n)Rx$ . Consequently,  $X - \mathbb{R}(R) = \{x_0\}$ .

(4) Suppose  $y_1 Sy_2$ . Then  $L(y_2) = L(y_1) + 1$ . Since L is a function,  $y_1 \neq y_2$ . Were  $y_2 Sy_1$  as well as  $y_1 Sy_2$  to hold, then  $L(y_1) = L(y_2) + 1 = L(y_1) + 2$ . Contradiction! Finally, let  $L(y_1) = 2n$ . Then  $n \in \mathbb{R}(L)$  and  $L^{-1}(n)$  is unique.  $L(y_1) = 2L(L^{-1}(n))$  and  $L(y_2) = 2L(L^{-1}(n)) + 1$ ; hence  $L^{-1}(n)Ry_1$  and  $L^{-1}(n)Ry_2$ .

Now suppose that (a), (b), and (c) of (4) hold, and let x be as in (c). Then for  $i = 1, 2, xRy_i$ ; hence by (i),  $L(y_i) = 2L(x)$  or  $L(y_i) = 2L(x) + 1$ . Since L is one-one and  $y_1 \neq y_2$ , we have either  $L(y_1) = 2L(x)$  and  $L(y_2) =$  2L(x) + 1, or else  $L(y_2) = 2L(x)$  and  $L(y_1) = 2L(x) + 1$ . In the latter case, by (ii), we would have  $y_2Sy_1$ , contradicting (b) of (4). Thus the former case holds and  $y_1Sy_2$ .

(5) Define  $l: X \to \omega$  by l(x) = m if  $2^m \le L(x) \le 2^{m+1}$ . Then  $l(x_0) = 0$ because  $L(x_0) = 2$ . Let xRy. First suppose L(y) = 2L(x). Then  $2^m \le L(x) \le 2^{m+1}$  iff  $2^{m+1} \le L(y) \le 2^{m+2}$ . Now suppose L(y) = 2L(x) + 1. Then  $2^m \le L(x) \le 2^{m+1}$  iff  $2^{m+1} \le L(y) - 1 \le 2^{m+2}$  iff

(2) 
$$2^{m+1} < L(y) < 2^{m+2} + 1$$
.

Since L(y) is odd, (2) holds iff

$$2^{m+1} \leq L(y) < 2^{m+2}$$
.

Thus in either case for L(y), we have L(y) = l(x) + 1.

The uniqueness of the tree  $\langle X, R, S \rangle$  follows from the fact that the relations R and S are completely determined in terms of the given function L.

## REFERENCE

[1] Smullyan, R. M., First order logic, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1968.

City College of the City University of New York New York, New York