

ON COMPACTNESS IN MANY-VALUED LOGIC. I

PETER W. WOODRUFF

Our purpose in this paper is to formulate and prove a rather general compactness property for finitely many-valued logics, from which more familiar forms of compactness are derivable. The proof employs a slight generalization of Robinson's Special Valuation Lemma [1], p. 13. Although other such results are available in the literature,¹ the present version shows in an interesting way the effect of many-valuedness on the compactness proof, and also avoids reliance on "high-powered" results such as Tychonoff's theorem. Finally, our version makes no assumptions about the expressive power or designated values of the system.

1 An *n-valued logic* L_n is a system $\langle A, O, M, D \rangle$ such that (i) A is a (finite or infinite) set of objects called the *atomic formulas* or *atoms* of L_n ; (ii) O is a finite set of objects, discrete from A , called *operations*, with each of which is associated an unique non-negative integer called its *degree*; (iii) M contains for each member of O of degree m an unique m -ary mapping of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into itself,² called the *matrix* of the operation; and (iv) D is $\{1, \dots, m\}$ for some $m < n$; the elements of D are called the *designated values* of L_n .

The set W of *well-formed formulas* (wffs) of L_n is the least set containing the atoms and such that if p_1, \dots, p_k are elements of W and \circ^k is an operation of degree k , then the concatenation $\circ^k p_1 \dots p_k$ is in W . If B is any set of atoms, W_B is the set of wffs formed from B as W is from A . If p is any wff, \bar{p} is the least set B of atoms such that $p \in W_B$; intuitively, \bar{p} comprises the atoms which have occurrences in p .

A mapping α of A into $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is called an *assignment of values* for L_n . Each assignment determines an unique *interpretation* I_α of W as

-
1. The most general results are those of [2]; a simplified version of these is available in [3]. A definition of compactness close to ours appears in [4].
 2. The choice of integers as truth-values is for convenience only; any n -element set would do.

Received October 13, 1972

follows: if p is atomic, $I_\alpha p = \alpha p$; otherwise, p is of the form $\mathbf{o}^k p_1 \dots p_k$ and we may suppose $I_\alpha p_i$ defined for $i \leq k$. Let f be the matrix of \mathbf{o}^k ; then $I_\alpha p = f(I_\alpha p_1, \dots, I_\alpha p_k)$. It is clear that I_α is locally determined, in the sense that if $\alpha|_{\bar{p}} = \beta|_{\bar{p}}$, then $I_\alpha p = I_\beta p$.

Two wffs are *equivalent* iff they have the same value on every assignment. As is well known, if B contains k atoms, then a subset of W_B can contain at most n^{nk} pairwise non-equivalent wffs.

An n -tuple $K = \langle K_1, \dots, K_n \rangle$ of subsets of W is *satisfied* by an assignment α iff for some $i \leq n$ and $p \in K_i$, $I_\alpha p = i$. K is *valid* iff satisfied by every assignment. K is finite iff each K_i is finite; $\mathcal{L} = \langle L_1, \dots, L_n \rangle$ is a sub- n -tuple of K iff each L_i is a subset of K_i .

Lemma 1.1 *K is valid iff it contains a valid sub- n -tuple \mathcal{L} with the following properties: (i) each $p \in K_i$ is equivalent to some $q \in L_i$; (ii) the elements of L_i are pairwise non-equivalent—for all $i \leq n$.*

Proof: Equivalence is clearly an equivalence relation on W . Let L_i consist of one representative from each equivalence class represented in K_i (using the axiom of choice if K_i contains infinitely many non-equivalent wffs). The lemma is now immediate.

2 By a *partial valuation* of a set S in a set U we mean any partial map from S to U ; a *total valuation* is one whose domain is all of S . We write as usual $D\phi$ for the domain of ϕ and $\phi|T$ for the restriction of ϕ to T . We shall require the following lemma, whose proof differs from that of Robinson's Special Valuation Lemma only in the minor detail that U may contain any finite number of elements, rather than just two. Details are left to the reader.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\{\phi_\nu\}$ be an indexed set of partial valuations of S in a finite set U , such that for any finite $T \subseteq S$, there is a ν such that $T \subseteq D$. Then there is a total valuation ψ such that for each finite T , there is a ν with $T \subseteq D\phi_\nu$ and $\psi|T = \phi_\nu|T$.*

3 We can now state and prove our main result.

General Compactness Theorem: *Every valid n -tuple of sets of wffs contains a valid finite sub- n -tuple.*

Proof: Suppose no finite sub- n -tuple of $K = \langle K_1, \dots, K_n \rangle$ is valid. By Lemma 1.1 we may assume without loss of generality that the elements of K_i are pairwise non-equivalent. Let ν be any finite set of atoms, and let $L_{\nu i} = W_\nu \cap K_i$ for each $i \leq n$. Then as previously noted, $L_{\nu i}$ must be finite. Hence $\mathcal{L}_\nu = \langle L_{\nu 1}, \dots, L_{\nu n} \rangle$ is a finite sub- n -tuple of K and therefore some assignment α fails to satisfy it (by hypothesis). Set $\phi_\nu = \alpha|_\nu$. Then $\{\phi_\nu\}$ is a set³ of partial valuations of A in $\{I, \dots, n\}$ which satisfies

3. There is a surreptitious but avoidable use of the axiom of choice at this point.

the antecedent of 2.1, hence there is a total valuation of A in $\{1, \dots, n\}$ (i.e., an assignment) α^* which coincides with some ϕ_ν on each finite subset of A . Let p be any element of K_i . \bar{p} is finite, so for some ν , $\bar{p} \subseteq D\phi_\nu = \nu$ and $\alpha^*|\bar{p} = \phi_\nu|\bar{p}$. By construction, $\phi_\nu = \alpha|\nu$ for some assignment α which fails to satisfy \mathcal{L}_ν . Since $\bar{p} \subseteq \nu$, we have $\alpha^*|\bar{p} = \phi_\nu|\bar{p} = \alpha|\bar{p}$, and hence by local determination, $I_{\alpha^*}p = I_\alpha p$. Furthermore, since $\bar{p} \subseteq \nu$, $p \in W_\nu$ and hence $p \in W_\nu \cap K_i = L_{\nu i}$, so since α does not satisfy \mathcal{L}_ν , $I_\alpha p \neq i$. It follows that α^* fails to satisfy K , so that K is not valid. The theorem now follows by contraposition.

4 A more usual notion of compactness involves a concept of satisfiability defined as follows: a set of wffs is *satisfiable_D* iff some assignment gives every element of the set a designated value. As a corollary to our general theorem we have the

Standard Compactness Theorem: *If every finite subset of K is satisfiable_D, then K is also.*

Proof: Suppose K is not satisfiable_D, and set $K = \langle K_1, \dots, K_n \rangle$, where if $i \in D$, $K_i = \emptyset$, and otherwise $K_i = K$. Then K is clearly valid, so contains a valid finite sub- n -tuple $\mathcal{L} = \langle L_1, \dots, L_n \rangle$. Let $L = \bigcup_{i \notin D} L_i$. Then L is a finite subset of K , and is not satisfiable_D, since any assignment which satisfied it would *ipso facto* fail to satisfy \mathcal{L} . The theorem follows by contraposition.

5 Extension of the above theorems to quantificational many-valued logics will be discussed in a sequel to this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Robinson, A., *Introduction to Model Theory and to the Metamathematics of Algebra*, Amsterdam (1965).
- [2] Chang, C. C., and H. J. Keisler, *Continuous Model Theory*, Princeton (1966).
- [3] Van Fraassen, B. C., *Formal Semantics and Logic*, New York (1971).
- [4] Rousseau, G., "Sequents in many-valued logic I," *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, vol. 60 (1967), pp 23-33.

University of California, Irvine
Irvine, California