

A Homomorphism between Fine and Ferguson's Matrices for Angell's **AC**

Richard Zach

Abstract

Angell's logic of analytic containment **AC** has been shown to be characterized by a 9-valued matrix **NC** by Ferguson, and by a 16-valued matrix by Fine. We show that the former is a homomorphic image of the latter. The homomorphism was found with the help of MUltlog, which also provides a tableau calculus for **NC** extended by quantifiers that generalize conjunction and disjunction.

Ferguson (2016) and Fine (2016) have independently provided many-valued matrices which characterize the logic of analytic containment **AC** of Angell (1977, 1989). Ferguson's matrix **NC** has nine truth values, while Fine's **FDE** \times **AC**₂ has 16. Fine suggested that it would be of interest to compare the two semantics. We show below that **NC** is a homomorphic image of **FDE** \times **AC**₂.

Ferguson's **NC** is defined as follows. We start with weak Kleene logic, which has three truth values $K = \{f, u, t\}$. The truth tables for \wedge and \vee are familiar:

\wedge^{K_w}	f	u	t
f	f	u	f
u	u	u	u
t	f	u	t

\vee^{K_w}	f	u	t
f	f	u	t
u	u	u	u
t	t	u	t

NC has the truth values $NC = K \times K$, of which $NC^+ = \{t\} \times K$ are designated, with the truth functions defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \neg^{\mathbf{NC}}(\langle v_0, v_1 \rangle) &= \langle v_1, v_0 \rangle \\ \wedge^{\mathbf{NC}}(\langle v_0, v_1 \rangle, \langle v'_0, v'_1 \rangle) &= \langle \wedge^{K_w}(v_0, v'_0), \wedge^{K_w}(v_1, v'_1) \rangle \\ \vee^{\mathbf{NC}}(\langle v_0, v_1 \rangle, \langle v'_0, v'_1 \rangle) &= \langle \vee^{K_w}(v_0, v'_0), \vee^{K_w}(v_1, v'_1) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

That is, \wedge and \vee are defined component-wise (as in the direct product of two matrices), however, \neg is not the component-wise weak Kleene negation, but instead switches the truth values in a pair.

The Dunn-Belnap matrix for **FDE** has truth values $FDE = \{\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{N}\}$ with

designated values $FDE^+ = \{\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{T}\}$ and truth functions as follows:¹

$\neg^{\mathbf{FDE}}$		$\wedge^{\mathbf{FDE}}$	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{N}	$\vee^{\mathbf{FDE}}$	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{N}
\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{T}
\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{N}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{T}
\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{N}
\mathbf{N}	\mathbf{N}	\mathbf{N}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{N}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{N}	\mathbf{N}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{T}	\mathbf{N}	\mathbf{N}

Fine's matrix is the direct product of \mathbf{FDE} with another matrix \mathbf{AC}_2 . \mathbf{AC}_2 has four truth values $AC_2 = \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{n}\}$ with designated values $AC_2^+ = \{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{n}\}$ and truth functions as follows:²

$\neg^{\mathbf{AC}_2}$		$\wedge^{\mathbf{AC}_2}$	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{n}	$\vee^{\mathbf{AC}_2}$	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{n}
\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}
\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{t}
\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{f}
\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{n}

(so the truth functions for \wedge and \vee are identical).

The resulting matrix $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$ has sixteen truth values and four designated values, $\{\mathbf{Tn}, \mathbf{Bf}, \mathbf{Tf}, \mathbf{Bn}\}$.

A function $f: L \rightarrow L'$ from the truth values of a matrix \mathbf{L} to those of a matrix \mathbf{L}' is a *strong homomorphism* if it respects truth functions and designated values, that is,

1. $f(\square^{\mathbf{L}}(v_1, \dots, v_n)) = \square^{\mathbf{L}'}(f(v_1), \dots, f(v_n))$, and
2. $v \in L^+$ iff $f(v) \in L'^+$.

A bijective homomorphism is called an *isomorphism*.

The following facts are elementary results of universal algebra or can easily be verified (see, e.g., Grätzer 1968; Wójcicki 1988):

1. A homomorphism f induces a partition of L consisting of the sets $[v]_f = \{v' \mid f(v) = f(v')\}$.
2. The equivalence relation \equiv_f on L corresponding to the partition induced by a homomorphism f is a congruence of \mathbf{L} , that is:
 - (a) If $v_1 \equiv_f v'_1, \dots, v_n \equiv_f v'_n$ then $\square^{\mathbf{L}}(v_1, \dots, v_n) \equiv_f \square^{\mathbf{L}}(v'_1, \dots, v'_n)$, and
 - (b) if $v \equiv_f v'$ then $v \in L^+$ iff $v' \in L^+$.
3. If \equiv is a congruence on \mathbf{L} , then $f: L \rightarrow L/\equiv$ defined by $f(v) = [v]_\equiv$ is a homomorphism of \mathbf{L} to the factor matrix \mathbf{L}/\equiv .
4. Every homomorphism $h: \mathbf{L} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}'$ factors into a homomorphism $f: \mathbf{L} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}/\equiv_h$ and an isomorphism $g: \mathbf{L}/\equiv_h \rightarrow \mathbf{L}'$.

¹We use $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{N}$ instead of Fine's $\mathbf{TF}, \mathbf{Tf}, \mathbf{fT}, \mathbf{fF}$ to save space.

²Again, $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{n}$ correspond to Fine's $\mathbf{tf}, \mathbf{t\ell}, \mathbf{f\ell}, \mathbf{f\ell}$.

5. If $f: \mathbf{L} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}'$ is a homomorphism then the consequence relations (defined via preservation of designated values) agree.

In light of the above, to show that \mathbf{NC} is a homomorphic image of $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$, it suffices to find a congruence relation \equiv of $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$ and an isomorphism between $(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$ and \mathbf{NC} .

$\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$ has two non-trivial congruences, namely:

$$\mathbf{Bt, Ff, Fn, Ft, Nf, Nn, Nt, Bb} \equiv \mathbf{Fb} \equiv \mathbf{Nb} \equiv \mathbf{Tb, Tt, Bf, Bn, Tf, Tn}$$

$$\mathbf{Nn, Ff} \equiv \mathbf{Nf, Fn, Nt} \equiv \mathbf{Tt, Bb} \equiv \mathbf{Fb} \equiv \mathbf{Nb} \equiv \mathbf{Tb, Bt} \equiv \mathbf{Ft, Tn, Bf} \equiv \mathbf{Tf, Bn}$$

The latter has nine equivalence classes, of which three, viz., $\{\mathbf{Tn}\}$, $\{\mathbf{Bf, Tf}\}$, $\{\mathbf{Bn}\}$ are designated. And in fact, the following mapping is an isomorphism between \mathbf{NC} and $(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$:

$$g(v) \begin{array}{c} \left| \begin{array}{cccccccccc} \mathbf{ff} & \mathbf{fu} & \mathbf{ft} & \mathbf{uf} & \mathbf{uu} & \mathbf{ut} & \mathbf{tf} & \mathbf{tu} & \mathbf{tt} \\ \mathbf{Nn} & \mathbf{Ff, Nf} & \mathbf{Fn} & \mathbf{Nt, Tt} & \mathbf{Bb, Fb,} & \mathbf{Bt, Ft} & \mathbf{Tn} & \mathbf{Bf, Tf} & \mathbf{Bn} \\ & & & & \mathbf{Nb, Tb} & & & & \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

The verification of the facts that \equiv is a congruence on $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$ and that g is an isomorphism between \mathbf{NC} and $(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$ would be extremely tedious. We can make them immediately apparent, however, by displaying the truth tables for each logic in full, with truth values that are isomorphic or equivalent shown in the same color, and by arranging the truth values in corresponding order. For instance, the truth tables for \neg in \mathbf{NC} , $(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$ and $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$, respectively, are given in table 1. In the truth table for \neg in $(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$ (and in table 3), we've abbreviated the congruence classes $\mathbf{Ff} \equiv \mathbf{Nf}$, $\mathbf{Nt} \equiv \mathbf{Tt}$, $\mathbf{Bb} \equiv \mathbf{Fb} \equiv \mathbf{Nb} \equiv \mathbf{Tb}$, $\mathbf{Bt} \equiv \mathbf{Ft}$, $\mathbf{Bf} \equiv \mathbf{Tf}$ by \mathbf{FNf} , \mathbf{NTt} , $\mathbf{B-Nb}$, \mathbf{Bft} , \mathbf{BTf} , respectively. Reversed colors indicate the designated values. Compare the tables for \wedge in \mathbf{NC} and $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$ in table 2, and those for \vee in \mathbf{NC} and $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$ in table 3.

The questions of whether a matrix is a homomorphic image of another, and whether two matrices are isomorphic, are computationally non-trivial to answer. The number of different bijective mappings between two n -valued matrices equals the number of possible permutations of the n truth values, i.e., $n!$. However, since a potential isomorphism has to respect the designated truth values, the number of maps to be checked is actually “only” $k!(n-k)!$ where k is the number of designated values. In our case, this amounts to $3! \times 6! = 4,320$ potential isomorphisms; already too large to be checked manually by brute force. To find a candidate homomorphic image in the first place, an exhaustive search would have to enumerate all potential partitions and check if they are congruences. The number of partitions of a size k set is B_k , the k -th Bell number. Since congruences have to again respect the designated values, the number of potential congruences to be checked can be reduced to $B_k B_{n-k}$ (for an n -valued matrix with k designated values). In the case of $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$, there are $15 \times 4,213,597 = 63,203,955$ potential congruences. Thus, finding all homomorphic images of $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$, and verifying that \mathbf{NC} is one, is impossible to do by brute force without the help of a computer.

\neg NC		$\neg(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$		$\neg\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$	
ff	ff	Nn	Nn	Nn	Nn
fu	uf	FNf	NTt	Ff	Tt
ft	tf	Fn	Tn	Nf	Nt
uf	fu	NTt	FNf	Fn	Tn
uu	uu	B·Nb	B·Nb	Nt	Nf
ut	tu	BFt	BTf	Tt	Ff
tf	ft	Tn	Fn	Fb	Tb
tu	ut	BTf	BFt	Nb	Nb
tt	tt	Bn	Bn	Bb	Bb
				Tb	Fb
				Ft	Tf
				Bt	Bf
				Tn	Fn
				Bf	Bt
				Tf	Ft
				Bn	Bn

Table 1: \neg in **NC**, $(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$, and $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$

Note that the approach taken is already much better than the completely naive approach of checking every function from $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$ to \mathbf{NC} for whether it is a homomorphism. First of all, this would require the verification of many more candidate homomorphisms. The number of different functions from an n -element set to one of size m is m^n . Since any homomorphism must respect designated values, we can choose to restrict the possible values for designated and non-designated arguments. The total number of candidates in our case would be $6^{12} \times 3^4$, or over 176 billion. Our approach also provides more information: since $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$ has no congruence with fewer than 9 classes, there can be no smaller common factor of both **NC** and $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$. This cannot be ruled out a priori, and would have yielded an interesting result—a matrix with the same consequence relation as **NC** and $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$, but fewer truth values than either. Merely checking if a homomorphism from $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$ to **NC** exists would not have settled that question.

Finding the congruences of $\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2$, i.e., its potential factor matrices, and the verification that $(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$ is isomorphic to **NC**, was accomplished using the MULTlog system due to Salzer (1996).³ MULTlog was originally designed to compute optimized n -sided sequent calculus rules for arbitrary n -valued matrices using methods of Baaz et al. (1993) and Salzer (2000). As of version v1.5, MULTlog added interactive functionality, including: evaluating formulas in a matrix, testing for and finding tautologies of matrices, defining products and factors of matrices, finding congruences of matrices, and checking for isomorphism between matrices. Implementation of these features was

³Available at logic.at/multlog.

\wedge^{NC}	ff	fu	ft	uf	uu	ut	tf	tu	tt
ff	ff	fu	ft	uf	uu	ut	ff	fu	ft
fu	fu	fu	fu	uu	uu	uu	fu	fu	fu
ft	ft	fu	ft	ut	uu	ut	ft	fu	ft
uf	uf	uu	ut	uf	uu	ut	uf	uu	ut
uu	uu	uu	uu	uu	uu	uu	uu	uu	uu
ut	ut	uu	ut	ut	uu	ut	ut	uu	ut
tf	ff	fu	ft	uf	uu	ut	tf	tu	tt
tu	fu	fu	fu	uu	uu	uu	tu	tu	tu
tt	ft	fu	ft	ut	uu	ut	tt	tu	tt

$\wedge^{\text{FDE} \times \text{AC}_2}$	Nn	Ff Nf	Fn	Nt Tt	Fb Nb Bb Tb	Ft Bt	Tn	Bf Tf	Bn
Nn	Nn	Ff Nf	Fn	Nt Tt	Fb Nb Bb Nb	Ft Ft	Nn	Ff Nf	Fn
Ff	Ff	Ff Ff	Ff	Fb Fb	Fb Fb Fb Fb	Fb Fb	Ff	Ff Ff	Ff
Nf	Nf	Ff Nf	Ff	Nb Nb	Fb Nb Fb Nb	Fb Fb	Nf	Ff Nf	Ff
Fn	Fn	Ff Ff	Fn	Ft Ft	Fb Fb Fb Fb	Ft Ft	Fn	Ff Ff	Fn
Nt	Nt	Fb Nb	Ft	Nt Nt	Fb Nb Fb Nb	Ft Ft	Nt	Fb Nb	Ft
Tt	Nt	Fb Nb	Ft	Nt Tt	Fb Nb Bb Tb	Ft Bt	Tt	Bb Tb	Bt
Fb	Fb	Fb Fb	Fb	Fb Fb	Fb Fb Fb Fb	Fb Fb	Fb	Fb Fb	Fb
Nb	Nb	Fb Nb	Fb	Nb Nb	Fb Nb Fb Nb	Fb Fb	Nb	Fb Nb	Fb
Bb	Fb	Fb Fb	Fb	Fb Bb	Fb Fb Bb Bb	Fb Bb	Bb	Bb Bb	Bb
Tb	Nb	Fb Nb	Fb	Nb Tb	Fb Nb Bb Tb	Fb Bb	Tb	Bb Tb	Bb
Ft	Ft	Fb Fb	Ft	Ft Ft	Fb Fb Fb Fb	Ft Ft	Ft	Fb Fb	Ft
Bt	Ft	Fb Fb	Ft	Ft Bt	Fb Fb Bb Bb	Ft Bt	Bt	Bb Bb	Bt
Tn	Nn	Ff Nf	Fn	Nt Tt	Fb Nb Bb Tb	Ft Bt	Tn	Bf Tf	Bn
Bf	Ff	Ff Ff	Ff	Fb Bb	Fb Fb Bb Bb	Fb Bb	Bf	Bf Bf	Bf
Tf	Nf	Ff Nf	Ff	Nb Tb	Fb Nb Bb Tb	Fb Bb	Tf	Bf Tf	Bf
Bn	Fn	Ff Ff	Fn	Ft Bt	Fb Fb Bb Bb	Ft Bt	Bn	Bf Bf	Bn

Table 2: \wedge in **NC** and **FDE** \times **AC**₂. Values in any rectangle are equivalent and correspond to a single value in **NC**.

\vee^{NC}	ff	fu	ft	uf	uu	ut	tf	tu	tt
ff	ff	fu	ff	uf	uu	uf	tf	tu	tf
fu	fu	fu	fu	uu	uu	uu	tu	tu	tu
ft	ff	fu	ft	uf	uu	ut	tf	tu	tt
uf	uf	uu	uf	uf	uu	uf	uf	uu	uf
uu	uu	uu	uu	uu	uu	uu	uu	uu	uu
ut	uf	uu	ut	uf	uu	ut	uf	uu	ut
tf	tf	tu	tf	uf	uu	uf	tf	tu	tf
tu	tu	tu	tu	uu	uu	uu	tu	tu	tu
tt	tf	tu	tt	uf	uu	ut	tf	tu	tt

$\vee^{FDE \times AC_2}$	Nn	Ff	Nf	Fn	Nt	Tt	Fb	Nb	Bb	Tb	Ft	Bt	Tn	Bf	Tf	Bn
Nn	Nn	Nf	Nf	Nn	Nt	Tt	Nb	Nb	Tb	Tb	Nt	Tt	Tn	Tf	Tf	Tn
Ff	Nf	Ff	Nf	Ff	Nb	Tb	Fb	Nb	Bb	Tb	Fb	Bb	Tf	Bf	Tf	Bf
Nf	Nf	Nf	Nf	Nf	Nb	Tb	Nb	Nb	Tb	Tb	Nb	Tb	Tf	Tf	Tf	Tf
Fn	Nn	Ff	Nf	Fn	Nt	Tt	Fb	Nb	Bb	Tb	Ft	Bt	Tn	Bf	Tf	Bn
Nt	Nt	Nb	Nb	Nt	Nt	Tt	Nb	Nb	Tb	Tb	Nt	Tt	Tt	Tb	Tb	Tt
Tt	Tt	Tb	Tb	Tt	Tt	Tt	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tt	Tt	Tt	Tb	Tb	Tt
Fb	Nb	Fb	Nb	Fb	Nb	Tb	Fb	Nb	Bb	Tb	Fb	Bb	Tb	Bb	Tb	Bb
Nb	Nb	Nb	Nb	Nb	Nb	Tb	Nb	Nb	Tb	Tb	Nb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb
Bb	Tb	Bb	Tb	Bb	Tb	Tb	Bb	Tb	Bb	Tb	Bb	Bb	Tb	Bb	Tb	Bb
Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb
Ft	Nt	Fb	Nb	Ft	Nt	Tt	Fb	Nb	Bb	Tb	Ft	Bt	Tt	Bb	Tb	Bt
Bt	Tt	Bb	Tb	Bt	Tt	Tt	Bb	Tb	Bb	Tb	Bt	Bt	Tt	Bb	Tb	Bt
Tn	Tn	Tf	Tf	Tn	Tt	Tt	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tt	Tt	Tn	Tf	Tf	Tn
Bf	Tf	Bf	Tf	Bf	Tb	Tb	Bb	Tb	Bb	Tb	Bb	Bb	Tf	Bf	Tf	Bf
Tf	Tf	Tf	Tf	Tf	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tb	Tf	Tf	Tf	Tf
Bn	Tn	Bf	Tf	Bn	Tt	Tt	Bb	Tb	Bb	Tb	Bt	Bt	Tn	Bf	Tf	Bn

Table 3: \vee in NC and $FDE \times AC_2$

$\wedge(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$	Nn	FNf	Fn	NTt	B·Nb	BFt	Tn	BTf	Bn
Nn	Nn	FNf	Fn	NTt	B·Nb	BFt	Nn	FNf	Fn
FNf	FNf	FNf	FNf	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	FNf	FNf	FNf
Fn	Fn	FNf	Fn	BFt	B·Nb	BFt	Fn	FNf	Fn
NTt	NTt	B·Nb	BFt	NTt	B·Nb	BFt	NTt	B·Nb	BFt
B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb
BFt	BFt	B·Nb	BFt	BFt	B·Nb	BFt	BFt	B·Nb	BFt
Tn	Nn	FNf	Fn	NTt	B·Nb	BFt	Tn	BTf	Bn
BTf	FNf	FNf	FNf	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	BTf	BTf	BTf
Bn	Fn	FNf	Fn	BFt	B·Nb	BFt	Bn	BTf	Bn

$\vee(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$	Nn	FNf	Fn	NTt	B·Nb	BFt	Tn	BTf	Bn
Nn	Nn	FNf	Nn	NTt	B·Nb	NTt	Tn	BTf	Tn
FNf	FNf	FNf	FNf	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	BTf	BTf	BTf
Fn	Nn	FNf	Fn	NTt	B·Nb	BFt	Tn	BTf	Bn
NTt	NTt	B·Nb	NTt	NTt	B·Nb	NTt	NTt	B·Nb	NTt
B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb
BFt	NTt	B·Nb	BFt	NTt	B·Nb	BFt	NTt	B·Nb	BFt
Tn	Tn	BTf	Tn	NTt	B·Nb	NTt	Tn	BTf	Tn
BTf	BTf	BTf	BTf	B·Nb	B·Nb	B·Nb	BTf	BTf	BTf
Bn	Tn	BTf	Bn	NTt	B·Nb	BFt	Tn	BTf	Bn

Table 4: \wedge and \vee in $(\mathbf{FDE} \times \mathbf{AC}_2)/\equiv$

carried out, for the most part, by the present author. The solution of Fine’s question presented above was found by:

1. Specifying the matrices for **NC**, **FDE**, and **AC₂** in MULTlog’s format;⁴
2. Defining the product **FDE** × **AC₂**;
3. Finding all congruences of **FDE** × **AC₂**;
4. Defining (**FDE** × **AC₂**)/≡ on the basis of the congruence of size 9.
5. Finding the isomorphism between **NC** and (**FDE** × **AC₂**)/≡.

Only the specification of **NC** required substantive intervention. MULTlog provided the basis for the L^AT_EX code of the truth tables with matching orders of truth values and matching colors.⁵ Of course, the algorithms used are still extremely naive and slow. In fact, for just slightly larger matrices they would be hopeless. Much more efficient algorithms exist to solve questions like this, e.g., see Freese (2008) for a fast algorithm to find a minimal congruence of a finite algebra. The naive methods, however, have the advantage of being straightforwardly implemented in Prolog, and an extension of MULTlog provides a convenient way to operate on finite-valued matrices.

MULTlog’s original purpose, as mentioned, is to compute inference rules for n -valued logics. It does this not just for propositional operators but also for so-called distribution quantifiers. Any associative, commutative, idempotent binary operation induces such a quantifier. E.g., if in a given interpretation, the formula $A(x)$ takes all and only values in $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ then the induced quantifier $\forall x A(x)$ of, say, \wedge , takes the value $v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge \dots \wedge v_n$. Since **NC**’s \wedge and \vee are associative, commutative, and idempotent, **NC** has universal and existential quantifiers that generalize these connectives. Their truth tables are unwieldy, as they list the value of $\forall x A(x)$ for all potential distributions of $A(x)$, i.e., all $2^9 - 1 = 511$ possible non-empty subsets of NC .⁶ MULTlog nevertheless finds optimal inference rules in minutes. The tableaux calculus for **NC** generated by MULTlog can be found in appendix B.

References

- Angell, Richard Bradshaw, 1977. Three systems of first degree entailment (abstract). *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 42(1): 147. doi:10.2307/2272332.
- Angell, Richard Bradshaw, 1989. Deducibility, Entailment and Analytic Containment. In *Directions in Relevant Logic*, eds. Jean Norman and Richard

⁴See appendix A.

⁵Checking all potential congruences of **FDE** × **AC₂** took about 20 minutes; finding the isomorphism between **NC** and the candidate factor required less than a second. The computations were carried out on an Asus Zenbook 14 (Intel Core i7-8565U CPU, 16GB memory), running Ubuntu Linux 20.04 and SWI-Prolog 8.2.4.

⁶All but 113 of which result in the value uu.

- Sylvan, Reason and Argument, 119–143. Dordrecht: Kluwer. doi:10.1007/978-94-009-1005-8_8.
- Baaz, Matthias, Christian G. Fermüller, and Richard Zach, 1993. Elimination of cuts in first-order finite-valued logics. *Journal of Information Processing and Cybernetics EIK* 29(6): 333–355.
- Ferguson, Thomas Macaulay, 2016. Faulty Belnap computers and subsystems of FDE. *Journal of Logic and Computation* 26(5): 1617–1636. doi:10.1093/logcom/exu048.
- Fine, Kit, 2016. Angelic content. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 45(2): 199–226. doi:10.1007/s10992-015-9371-9.
- Freese, Ralph, 2008. Computing congruences efficiently. *Algebra universalis* 59(3): 337–343. doi:10.1007/s00012-008-2073-1.
- Grätzer, George, 1968. *Universal Algebra*. Princeton, NJ: van Nostrand.
- Hähnle, Reiner, 1993. *Automated Deduction in Multiple-Valued Logics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salzer, Gernot, 1996. MULTlog: An expert system for multiple-valued logics. In *Collegium Logicum*, Collegium Logicum, 50–55. Vienna: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-7091-9461-4_3.
- Salzer, Gernot, 2000. Optimal axiomatizations of finitely valued logics. *Information and Computation* 162(1-2): 185–205. doi:10.1006/inco.1999.2862.
- Wójcicki, Ryszard, 1988. *Theory of Logical Calculi: Basic Theory of Consequence Operations*. No. 147 in Synthese Library. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

A MULTlog specification files

Specification of NC

```
logic "NC".

truth_values { ff , fu , ft , uf , uu , ut , tf , tu , tt }.
designated_truth_values { tf , tu , tt }.

operator (neg/1, mapping {
    (ff) : ff,
    (fu) : uf,
    (ft) : tf,
    (uf) : fu,
    (uu) : uu,
    (ut) : tu,
    (tf) : ft,
    (tu) : ut,
```

```

        (tt) : tt
    }
).

operator(and/2, table [
    ff, fu, ft, uf, uu, ut, tf, tu, tt,
    ff, fu, ft, uf, uu, ut, ff, fu, ft,
    fu, fu, fu, fu, uu, uu, uu, fu, fu, fu,
    ft, ft, fu, ft, ut, uu, ut, ft, fu, ft,
    uf, uf, uu, ut, uf, uu, ut, uf, uu, ut,
    uu, uu, uu, uu, uu, uu, uu, uu, uu, uu,
    ut, ut, uu, ut, ut, uu, ut, ut, uu, ut,
    tf, ff, fu, ft, uf, uu, ut, tf, tu, tt,
    tu, fu, fu, fu, uu, uu, uu, tu, tu, tu,
    tt, ft, fu, ft, ut, uu, ut, tt, tu, tt
]
).

operator(or/2, table [
    ff, fu, ft, uf, uu, ut, tf, tu, tt,
    ff, fu, ff, uf, uu, uf, tf, tu, tf,
    fu, fu, fu, fu, uu, uu, uu, tu, tu, tu,
    ft, ff, fu, ft, uf, uu, ut, tf, tu, tt,
    uf, uf, uu, uf, uf, uu, uf, uf, uu, uf,
    uu, uu, uu, uu, uu, uu, uu, uu, uu, uu,
    ut, uf, uu, ut, uf, uu, ut, uf, uu, ut,
    tf, tf, tu, tf, uf, uu, uf, tf, tu, tf,
    tu, tu, tu, tu, uu, uu, uu, tu, tu, tu,
    tt, tf, tu, tt, uf, uu, ut, tf, tu, tt
]
).

quantifier(forall, induced_by and/2).
quantifier(exists, induced_by or/2).

```

Specification of FDE

```

logic "FDE".

truth_values { b, t, f, n }.
designated_truth_values { b, t }.

ordering(truth, "f < {n, b} < t").

operator(neg/1, mapping {
    (t) : f,
    (b) : b,
    (n) : n,
    (f) : t
}
).

operator(and/2, inf(truth)).
operator(or/2, sup(truth)).

```

Specification of AC₂

```

logic "AC2".

truth_values { b, t, f, n }.
designated_truth_values { n, f }.

operator(neg/1, mapping {
    (t) : f,
    (b) : b,
    (n) : n,
    (f) : t
})

operator(or/2, table [
    t, b, n, f,
    t, t, b, t, b,
    b, b, b, b, b,
    n, t, b, n, f,
    f, b, b, f, f
])

operator(and/2, table [
    t, b, n, f,
    t, t, b, t, b,
    b, b, b, b, b,
    n, t, b, n, f,
    f, b, b, f, f
])

```

B Tableaux for first-order NC

Definition 1. A *signed formula* is an expression of the form $v : A$ where $v \in NC$ and A is a formula.

Definition 2. A *tableau* for a set of signed formulas Δ is a downward rooted tree of signed formulas where each one is either an element of Δ or results from a signed formula in the branch above it by a branch expansion rule. A tableau is *closed* if every branch contains, for some formula A , the signed formulas $v : A$ for all $v \in NC$.

The branch expansion rules for connective \neg are given by

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
 \frac{ff: \neg A}{ff: A} & \frac{fu: \neg A}{uf: A} & \frac{ft: \neg A}{tf: A} & \frac{uf: \neg A}{fu: A} & \frac{uu: \neg A}{uu: A} & \frac{ut: \neg A}{tu: A} & \frac{tf: \neg A}{ft: A} \\
 & & & & & & \\
 & & & \frac{tu: \neg A}{ut: A} & \frac{tt: \neg A}{tt: A} & &
 \end{array}$$

The branch expansion rules for connective \wedge are given by

ff: $A \wedge B$			fu: $A \wedge B$			
ff: B	ff: A	ff: A	ff: B	ff: A	fu: A	ff: A
tf: B	ff: B	tf: A	fu: B	fu: A	tu: A	fu: A
			ft: B	ft: A	fu: B	ft: A
			tf: B	ff: B	tu: B	tf: A
			tu: B	fu: B		tu: A
			tt: B	ft: B		tt: A

ft: $A \wedge B$				uf: $A \wedge B$		
ff: B	ff: A	ft: A	ff: A	ff: B	uf: A	ff: A
ft: B	ft: A	tt: A	ft: A	uf: B	uf: B	uf: A
tf: B	ff: B	ft: B	tf: A	tf: B		tf: A
tt: B	ft: B	tt: B	tt: A			

uu: $A \wedge B$		ut: $A \wedge B$				tf: $A \wedge B$	
uf: A	fu: A	ff: B	uf: A	ft: A	ff: A	tf: B	tf: A
uu: A	uu: A	ft: B	ut: A	ut: A	ft: A		
ut: A	tu: A	uf: B	uf: B	tt: A	uf: A		
uf: B	fu: B	ut: B	ut: B	ft: B	ut: A		
uu: B	uu: B	tf: B		ut: B	tf: A		
ut: B	tu: B	tt: B		tt: B	tt: A		

tu: $A \wedge B$			tt: $A \wedge B$		
tf: B	tu: A	tf: A	tf: B	tt: A	tf: A
tu: B	tu: B	tu: A	tt: B	tt: B	tt: A
tt: B		tt: A			

The branch expansion rules for connective \vee are given by

ff: $A \vee B$			fu: $A \vee B$			ft: $A \vee B$	
ff: B	ff: A	ff: A	ff: B	fu: A	ff: A	ft: B	ft: A
ft: B	ff: B	ft: A	fu: B	fu: B	fu: A		
			ft: B		ft: A		

uf: $A \vee B$				uu: $A \vee B$	
ff: B	uf: A	ff: A	ff: A	uf: A	fu: A
ft: B	ut: A	uf: A	ft: A	uu: A	uu: A
uf: B	uf: B	tf: A	uf: A	ut: A	tu: A
ut: B	ut: B	ff: B	ut: A	uf: B	fu: B
tf: B		uf: B	tf: A	uu: B	uu: B
tt: B		tf: B	tt: A	ut: B	tu: B

ut: $A \vee B$			tf: $A \vee B$			
ft: B	ut: A	ft: A	ff: B	ff: A	tf: A	ff: A
ut: B	ut: B	ut: A	ft: B	tf: A	tt: A	ft: A
tt: B		tt: A	tf: B	ff: B	tf: B	tf: A
			tt: B	tf: B	tt: B	tt: A

tu: $A \vee B$				tt: $A \vee B$		
ff: B	fu: A	tf: A	ff: A	ft: B	tt: A	ft: A
fu: B	tu: A	tu: A	fu: A	tt: B	tt: B	tt: A
ft: B	fu: B	tt: A	ft: A			
tf: B	tu: B	tf: B	tf: A			
tu: B		tu: B	tu: A			
tt: B		tt: B	tt: A			

The branch expansion rules rules for quantifier \forall are given by

ff: $(\forall x)A(x)$		ff: $(\forall x)A(x)$		fu: $(\forall x)A(x)$	
ff: $A(\tau)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$	ff: $A(\tau_1)$	ff: $A(\tau_2)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$
	tf: $A(\alpha)$	ft: $A(\tau_1)$	tu: $A(\tau_2)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$
		fu: $A(\tau_1)$		fu: $A(\alpha)$	fu: $A(\alpha)$
				tf: $A(\alpha)$	tf: $A(\alpha)$
				tt: $A(\alpha)$	tt: $A(\alpha)$
				tu: $A(\alpha)$	tu: $A(\alpha)$
ft: $(\forall x)A(x)$			uf: $(\forall x)A(x)$		
ff: $A(\tau_1)$	ft: $A(\tau_2)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$	uf: $A(\tau)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$
ft: $A(\tau_1)$	tt: $A(\tau_2)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$		tf: $A(\alpha)$	tf: $A(\alpha)$
		tf: $A(\alpha)$		uf: $A(\alpha)$	uf: $A(\alpha)$
		tt: $A(\alpha)$			
uu: $(\forall x)A(x)$		ut: $(\forall x)A(x)$		ff: $(\forall x)A(x)$	
fu: $A(\tau_1)$	uf: $A(\tau_2)$	ft: $A(\tau_1)$	uf: $A(\tau_2)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$
tu: $A(\tau_1)$	ut: $A(\tau_2)$	tt: $A(\tau_1)$	ut: $A(\tau_2)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$
uu: $A(\tau_1)$	uu: $A(\tau_2)$	ut: $A(\tau_1)$		tf: $A(\alpha)$	tf: $A(\alpha)$
				tt: $A(\alpha)$	tt: $A(\alpha)$
				uf: $A(\alpha)$	uf: $A(\alpha)$
				ut: $A(\alpha)$	ut: $A(\alpha)$
tf: $(\forall x)A(x)$		tu: $(\forall x)A(x)$		tt: $(\forall x)A(x)$	
tf: $A(\alpha)$	tu: $A(\tau)$	tf: $A(\alpha)$	tt: $A(\tau)$	tf: $A(\alpha)$	tt: $A(\alpha)$
		tt: $A(\alpha)$		tt: $A(\alpha)$	tt: $A(\alpha)$
		tu: $A(\alpha)$			

The branch expansion rules rules for quantifier \exists are given by

ff: $(\exists x)A(x)$		fu: $(\exists x)A(x)$		ft: $(\exists x)A(x)$	
ff: $A(\tau)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$	fu: $A(\tau)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$
				ft: $A(\alpha)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$

uf: $(\exists x)A(x)$			uu: $(\exists x)A(x)$		
ff: $A(\tau_1)$	uf: $A(\tau_2)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$	fu: $A(\tau_1)$	uf: $A(\tau_2)$	fu: $A(\alpha)$
tf: $A(\tau_1)$	ut: $A(\tau_2)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$	tu: $A(\tau_1)$	ut: $A(\tau_2)$	tu: $A(\alpha)$
uf: $A(\tau_1)$		tf: $A(\alpha)$	uu: $A(\tau_1)$		uu: $A(\tau_2)$
		tt: $A(\alpha)$			
		uf: $A(\alpha)$			
		ut: $A(\alpha)$			
ut: $(\exists x)A(x)$			tf: $(\exists x)A(x)$		
ut: $A(\tau)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$	ff: $A(\tau_1)$	tf: $A(\tau_2)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$
	tt: $A(\alpha)$	tf: $A(\tau_1)$	tt: $A(\tau_2)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$
	ut: $A(\alpha)$			tf: $A(\alpha)$	tf: $A(\alpha)$
				tt: $A(\alpha)$	tt: $A(\alpha)$
tu: $(\exists x)A(x)$			tt: $(\exists x)A(x)$		
tf: $A(\tau_1)$	fu: $A(\tau_2)$	ff: $A(\alpha)$	tt: $A(\tau)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$
tt: $A(\tau_1)$	tu: $A(\tau_2)$	ft: $A(\alpha)$		tt: $A(\alpha)$	tt: $A(\alpha)$
tu: $A(\tau_1)$		fu: $A(\alpha)$			
		tf: $A(\alpha)$			
		tt: $A(\alpha)$			
		tu: $A(\alpha)$			

Definition 3. An interpretation \mathfrak{J} *satisfies* a signed formula $v: A$ iff $\text{val}_{\mathfrak{J}}(A) \neq v$. A set of signed formulas is *satisfiable* if some interpretation \mathfrak{J} satisfies all signed formulas in it.

Theorem 4. *A set of signed formulas is unsatisfiable iff it has a closed tableau.*

Proof. Apply Theorems 4.14 and 4.21 of Hähnle (1993); interpreting $v: A$ as $S \ A$ where $S = NC \setminus \{v\}$. \square

Corollary 5. *In \mathbf{NC} , $\Delta \models A$ iff $\{v: B \mid v \in NC \setminus NC^+, B \in \Delta\} \cup \{v: A \mid v \in NC^+\}$ has a closed tableau.*