

Equivalence of finite non-deterministic logical matrices is undecidable*

Carlos Caleiro, Pedro Filipe, Sérgio Marcelino
 SQIG - Instituto de Telecomunicações
 Dep. Matemática - Instituto Superior Técnico
 Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

Abstract

The notion of a non-deterministic logical matrix (where connectives are interpreted as multi-functions) extends the traditional semantics for propositional logics based on logical matrices (where connectives are interpreted as functions). This extension allows for finitely characterizing a much wider class of logics, and has proven decisive in a myriad of recent compositionality results. In this paper we show that the added expressivity brought by non-determinism also has its drawbacks, and in particular that the problem of determining whether two given finite non-deterministic matrices are equivalent, in the sense that they induce the same logic, becomes undecidable. We also discuss some workable sufficient conditions and particular cases, namely regarding rexpansion homomorphisms and bridges to calculi.

1 Introduction

Logical matrices are arguably the most widespread semantic structures used to characterize propositional logics [23, 12]. After Łukasiewicz, a logical matrix consists of an underlying algebra, functionally interpreting logical connectives over a set of truth-values, together with a designated set of truth-values. The logical models (valuations) are obtained by considering homomorphisms from the free-algebra in the matrix similarity type into the underlying algebra of the matrix, and formulas that hold in the model are the ones that take designated values.

However, in recent years, it has become clear that there are advantages in departing from semantics based on logical matrices, by adopting a non-deterministic generalization of the standard notion where logical connectives are interpreted by multi-functions instead of functions. Valuations are still defined homomorphically from the free-algebra, but now the valuation of a formula with a certain head connective can be picked non-deterministically from the set of possible values permitted by the multi-function interpreting the connective, instead of being completely determined by the values assigned to its immediate subformulas. The systematic study of non-deterministic logical matrices (Nmatrices) and their applications was initiated in the beginning of this century by Avron and his collaborators [3, 2]. Logical semantics based on Nmatrices are very malleable, allowing not only for finite characterizations of logics that do not admit finite-valued semantics based on logical matrices, but also permitting general recipes for various practical problems in logic,

*This work was supported by FCT - Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P. by project reference UIDB/50008/2020, and DOI identifier <https://doi.org/10.54499/UIDB/50008/2020>. The second author acknowledges the grant PD/BD/135513/2018 by FCT, under the LisMath PhD programme.

an in particular compositionality [15, 6, 1]. Still, as noticed by Avron himself, and quoting Zohar [25] in his PhD thesis:

“An interesting direction for further research is to find a necessary and sufficient criterion for two Nmatrices to induce the same logic ...”

The pertinence of this question is better understood in contrast to the deterministic case. Indeed, the problem of determining whether two given finite logical matrices are equivalent, in the sense that they induce the same logic, is decidable. Although such a decision procedure cannot be immediately found in the literature, to the best of our knowledge, the result is somewhat folklore and a relatively straightforward corollary of well known properties of logical matrices. However, these results do not extend to the non-deterministic case, as argued also in [8].

The present paper is a natural extension of preliminary results presented in [17, 11], where we prove the undecidability of two relevant computational problems associated with finite Nmatrices: given a finite Nmatrix, the problem of determining whether its logic has any theorem whatsoever, and the problem of determining whether the Nmatrix is *monadic*¹. Expectedly, these undecidability results were obtained using reductions from other known undecidable problems, namely the universality problem for term-dag automata [10], and the halting problem for Minsky’s counter machines [18].

Our main result in the present paper is precisely the undecidability of the equivalence problem in the presence of non-determinism, and its proof relies on a reduction from the above mentioned theorem existence problem. The reduction uses an interesting and surprisingly simple trick allowed by the non-deterministic environment, which bears similarities with results about infectious semantics such as [7]. For the sake of self-containment, but also due to the key role it plays and the deep illustration it provides about the power of non-determinism, we shall also carefully revisit the undecidability result for the theorem existence problem and its reduction from the halting problem for counter machines.

Our result helps explain some of the difficulties posed by studying logics characterized by finite Nmatrices. In concrete cases, showing whether two such logics coincide, or not, may be quite challenging. Still, we shall overview a few useful techniques and sufficient criteria that can be used in practice to deal with such problems.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall the essential notions of Tarskian logic, logical matrices and Nmatrices, introduce the above mentioned computational problems, and recall the decidability of the equivalence problem for finite logical matrices. In Section 3, we revisit Minsky’s counter machines and the undecidability of the theorem existence problem for Nmatrices, obtained via a computable reduction from the halting problem for counter machines. Section 4 establishes our main results, a useful construction on Nmatrices permitted by non-determinism that allows isolating theoremhood from a given Nmatrix, and ultimately the undecidability of the equivalence problem for Nmatrices via a dual reduction from the theorem existence problem. Finally, Section 5 is devoted to over-viewing a number of sufficient conditions for equivalence, and an analysis of some concrete examples. We conclude, in Section 6, with a discussion of the results obtained and the challenges they pose to a systematic algebraic-like study of non-deterministic logical matrices.

¹Monadicity is an expressiveness requirement that plays an essential role in the synthesis of analytic calculi for the logic (see [16]).

2 Basic notions and results

In this section we introduce the relevant notions regarding (propositional-based) logics, as well as logical matrices and Nmatrices, the computational problems we will look into, and their decidability with respect to finite matrices.

2.1 Logics

A *signature* Σ is a family of sets of *connectives* indexed by their arity, $\Sigma = \{\Sigma^{(k)} : k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. We will say that Σ is a *finite signature* if it comprises only finitely many connectives, that is, $\Sigma^{(k)}$ is finite for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \Sigma^{(k)} \neq \emptyset\}$ is also finite. Let P be a set of *propositional variables*, we denote by $L_\Sigma(P)$ the *set of formulas* based on P built from the connectives in Σ . Unless specified otherwise, we assume $P = \{p_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by P_n the set $P = \{p_i : i \leq n\}$. In general, we use roman letters (A, B, \dots) to represent formulas and capital greek letters (Γ, Δ, \dots) to represent sets of formulas. For every $A \in L_\Sigma(P)$, we denote by $\text{sub}(A)$ and $\text{var}(A)$, respectively, the *set of subformulas* and the *set of variables* of A . As usual, we say that A is a *closed formula* if $\text{var}(A) = \emptyset$. A *substitution* is a function $\sigma : P \rightarrow L_\Sigma(P)$, uniquely extendable to an endomorphism $\sigma : L_\Sigma(P) \rightarrow L_\Sigma(P)$ (for simplicity, we use the same denomination for both). For every $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$ and every substitution σ , we use A^σ to denote the formula $\sigma(A)$, and Γ^σ to denote the set $\{A^\sigma : A \in \Gamma\}$.

A (*Tarskian*) *consequence relation*, also called a *logic*, is a pair $\langle \Sigma, \vdash \rangle$ where Σ is a signature and $\vdash \subseteq \mathbf{2}^{L_\Sigma(P)} \times L_\Sigma(P)$ is a relation such that the following properties hold, for all $\Gamma \cup \Delta \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$:

- if $A \in \Gamma$ then $\Gamma \vdash A$ (*reflexivity*),
- if $\Gamma \vdash A$ and $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta$ then $\Delta \vdash A$ (*monotonicity*),
- if $\Gamma \vdash A$ and $\Delta \vdash B$, for all $B \in \Gamma$, then $\Delta \vdash A$ (*transitivity*),
- if $\Gamma \vdash A$ then $\Gamma^\sigma \vdash A^\sigma$, for every substitution σ (*substitution-invariance*).

Additionally, a consequence relation $\langle \Sigma, \vdash \rangle$ is said to be *compact* if the following property also holds:

- if $\Gamma \vdash A$ then there is finite $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$ such that $\Delta \vdash A$ (*finitariness*).

A formula $A \in L_\Sigma(P)$ is said to be a *theorem* of $\langle \Sigma, \vdash \rangle$ if $\emptyset \vdash A$, and we denote by $\text{Thm}(\Sigma, \vdash)$ the set of all its theorems.

A consequence relation $\langle \Sigma, \vdash \rangle$ is said to be *n-determined* for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if for all $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$, whenever $\Gamma \not\vdash A$ then there exists a substitution $\sigma : P \rightarrow P_n$ such that $\Gamma^\sigma \not\vdash A^\sigma$. We say that $\langle \Sigma, \vdash \rangle$ is *finitely-determined* when it is *n-determined* for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Further, $\langle \Sigma, \vdash \rangle$ is said to be *locally tabular* if, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $L_\Sigma(P_n)$ is partitioned into finitely many equivalence classes by the Frege interderivability relation, that is, there exists a finite set $\Delta_n \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$ such that for each $A \in L_\Sigma(P_n)$ there exists $A^* \in \Delta_n$ such that $A \dashv\vdash A^*$, i.e., $\{A\} \vdash A^*$ and $\{A^*\} \vdash A$.

2.2 Matrices and Nmatrices

A *non-deterministic matrix* (*Nmatrix*) over signature Σ is a triple $\mathbb{M} = \langle V, D, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$, where V is a non-empty set of *truth-values*, $D \subseteq V$ is a set of *designated* truth-values and, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\odot \in \Sigma^{(k)}$, $\odot_{\mathbb{M}} : V^k \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^V \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ is the *interpretation* of \odot in \mathbb{M} . A truth-value is said to be *undesignated* if it belongs to $V \setminus D$. We refer to the pair $\langle V, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$ as the *underlying multialgebra* of \mathbb{M} , and usually dub \mathbb{M} a

Σ -Nmatrix. We will say that \mathbb{M} is *finite-valued* provided that V is a finite set, and further say that \mathbb{M} is *finite* if Σ is also a finite signature.

\mathbb{M} is said to be *deterministic, or simply a Σ -matrix* if, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\odot \in \Sigma^{(k)}$ and $x_1, \dots, x_k \in V$, we have that $\odot_{\mathbb{M}}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is a singleton. In that case, the underlying multialgebra $\langle V, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$ can indeed be understood as an algebra with each $\odot_{\mathbb{M}}$ as a function of type $V^k \rightarrow V$.

A *valuation* of \mathbb{M} is a function $v : L_{\Sigma}(P) \rightarrow V$ such that, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\odot \in \Sigma^{(k)}$ and $A_1, \dots, A_k \in L_{\Sigma}(P)$ it is the case that

$$v(\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k)) \in \odot_{\mathbb{M}}(v(A_1), \dots, v(A_k)). \quad (1)$$

The *set of all valuations* of \mathbb{M} is denoted by $\text{Val}(\mathbb{M})$. As is well known, if \mathbb{M} is a matrix then every function $v : Q \rightarrow V$, where $Q \subseteq P$, can be extended to a valuation of \mathbb{M} , and the extension is unique for formulas in $L_{\Sigma}(Q)$. When building a valuation for some Nmatrix \mathbb{M} , however, one needs to choose values for complex formulas as well. Still, in general, a useful form of locality for valuations in Nmatrices still holds. Namely, any function $v : \Gamma \rightarrow V$, where $\text{sub}(\Gamma) \subseteq \Gamma \subseteq L_{\Sigma}(P)$, can be extended to a valuation of \mathbb{M} , provided that condition (1) holds for every formula in $\Gamma \setminus P$, in which case v is dubbed a *prevaluation*.

Every Σ -Nmatrix $\mathbb{M} = \langle V, D, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$ defines a logic $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$ in the following standard way: for every $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_{\Sigma}(P)$, let $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{M}} A$ if and only if, for every $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M})$, $v(A) \in D$ whenever $v(\Gamma) \subseteq D$. When \mathbb{M} is finite-valued it is well known that $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$ is always compact [2, Theorem 3.15].

In what follows, we will say that Σ -Nmatrices $\mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_2$ are *equivalent* provided that $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} = \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2}$.

Fixed a Σ -Nmatrix $\mathbb{M} = \langle V, D, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$, a formula $A \in L_{\Sigma}(P_n)$ induces a multi-function $[A]_{\mathbb{M}} : V^n \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^V \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, where for $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in V^n$ one has:

$$[A]_{\mathbb{M}}(\vec{x}) = \{v(A) : v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M}) \text{ such that } v(p_i) = x_i, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

The multi-function $[A]_{\mathbb{M}}$ is said to be *expressed* by the formula A in \mathbb{M} , and thus *expressible* in \mathbb{M} . Note that, whenever \mathbb{M} is deterministic, the set $[A]_{\mathbb{M}}(\vec{x})$ is always a singleton and, therefore, we can understand $[A]_{\mathbb{M}}$ as a function of type $V^n \rightarrow V$. Indeed, if we do that, given $\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k) \in L_{\Sigma}(P_n)$, we have that $v(\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k)) = \odot_{\mathbb{M}}(v(A_1), \dots, v(A_k))$ for any $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M})$, and therefore also

$$[\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k)]_{\mathbb{M}}(\vec{x}) = \odot_{\mathbb{M}}([A_1]_{\mathbb{M}}(\vec{x}), \dots, [A_k]_{\mathbb{M}}(\vec{x})). \quad (2)$$

These facts explain the following property, that we recall from [9].

Proposition 1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\mathbb{M} = \langle V, D, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$ is a finite-valued Σ -matrix then $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$ is locally tabular and n -determined if $n \geq |V|$.*

Proof. We start with local tabularity. Since there are finitely many functions of type $V^n \rightarrow V$ (exactly $|V|^{|V|^n}$) it follows that the set $\{[A]_{\mathbb{M}} : A \in L_{\Sigma}(P_n)\}$ is finite. Further, assuming that for formulas $A, B \in L_{\Sigma}(P_n)$ one has $[A]_{\mathbb{M}} = [B]_{\mathbb{M}}$ then it follows that $A \dashv\vdash_{\mathbb{M}} B$. Namely, given $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M})$, if $v(p_1) = x_1, \dots, v(p_n) = x_n$ one has $v(A) = [A]_{\mathbb{M}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = [B]_{\mathbb{M}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = v(B)$ and thus $v(A) \in D$ if and only if $v(B) \in D$. Local tabularity follows by letting $\Delta_n \subseteq L_{\Sigma}(P_n)$ contain exactly one representative formula for each of the finitely many n -place functions expressible in \mathbb{M} .

Concerning n -determinedness, now, let $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ with $n \geq m$, and assume that $\Gamma \not\vdash_{\mathbb{M}} A$ for some $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_{\Sigma}$. By definition, we know that there

exists $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M})$ such that $v(\Gamma) \subseteq D$ and $v(A) \notin D$. Consider the substitution $\sigma : P \rightarrow P_n$ defined, for each $p \in P$, by $\sigma(p) = p_i$ if and only if $v(p) = x_i$. We claim that $\Gamma^\sigma \not\vdash_{\mathbb{M}} A^\sigma$. To see this, just let $v' \in \text{Val}(M)$ be any valuation such that $v'(p_i) = x_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. A straightforward induction on $B \in L_\Sigma(P)$ shows that $v'(B^\sigma) = v(B)$. Thus, we conclude that $v'(\Gamma^\sigma) = v(\Gamma) \subseteq D$, $v'(A^\sigma) = v(A) \notin D$, and it follows that $\Gamma^\sigma \not\vdash_{\mathbb{M}} A^\sigma$. \square

A compositionality property such as (2) is not necessarily true for Nmatrices. One still has that $[\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k)]_{\mathbb{M}}(\vec{x}) \subseteq \bigcup_{y_1 \in [A_1]_{\mathbb{M}}(\vec{x}), \dots, y_k \in [A_k]_{\mathbb{M}}(\vec{x})} \odot_{\mathbb{M}}(y_1, \dots, y_k)$ but equality does not hold in general (just suppose that $A_i = A_j = A$ with $i \neq j$ and that $[A]_{\mathbb{M}}(\vec{x})$ has more than one element, and note that necessarily $v(A_i) = v(A_j)$ for every $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M})$). Further, a finite-valued Nmatrix may well fail to be finitely-determined, or locally tabular, as illustrated in the examples below.

Example 2. (*Unconstrained Nmatrices*)

Given signature Σ , the unconstrained Σ -Nmatrix is $\mathbb{U}_\Sigma = \langle \{0, 1\}, \{1\}, \cdot_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma} \rangle$ where $\odot_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}(\vec{x}) = \{0, 1\}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\odot \in \Sigma^{(k)}$ and $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

It is clear that $\text{Val}(\mathbb{U}_\Sigma) = \{0, 1\}^{L_\Sigma(P)}$ and thus that the Nmatrix defines the discrete logic such that $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma} A$ if and only if $A \in \Gamma$, for $\{A\} \cup \Gamma \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$.

As long as Σ is non-empty, such a discrete logic cannot be defined by a finite-valued Σ -matrix, as shown in [2]. Further, when Σ is non-empty it is also worth noting that $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma} \rangle$ fails to be locally tabular. Indeed, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A \in L_\Sigma(P_n) \setminus P_n$ it is immediate that $[A]_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}(\vec{x}) = \{0, 1\}$ for all \vec{x} . This actually means that any two formulas with at least one connective each express the same multi-function. However, as we have already seen, if $B \in L_\Sigma(P_n) \setminus P_n$ is such that $B \neq A$ then $A \not\vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma} B$ (and $B \not\vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma} A$). \triangle

Example 3. (*A single 1-place connective*)

Let Σ be a signature with a single 1-place connective, i.e., $\Sigma^{(1)} = \{b\}$ and $\Sigma^{(k)} = \emptyset$ if $k \neq 1$. Consider the two-valued Σ -Nmatrix \mathbb{U}_Σ , and its possible refinements $\mathbb{M}_i = (\{0, 1\}, \{1\}, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}_i})$ with $i = 1, \dots, 8$ given by:

	$b_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}$	$b_{\mathbb{M}_1}$	$b_{\mathbb{M}_2}$	$b_{\mathbb{M}_3}$	$b_{\mathbb{M}_4}$	$b_{\mathbb{M}_5}$	$b_{\mathbb{M}_6}$	$b_{\mathbb{M}_7}$	$b_{\mathbb{M}_8}$
0	0, 1	0, 1	0, 1	0	0	0	1	1	1
1	0, 1	0	1	0, 1	0	1	0, 1	0	1

These nine distinct Nmatrices define eight distinct logics. For instance, one has $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} \neq \vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}$ as can be easily noted from the fact that $\{A, bA\} \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} B$ for all $A, B \in L_\Sigma(P)$. A thorough analysis of why most of these logics are distinct, and in particular to identifying which pair of these Nmatrices are equivalent, are postponed to the examples in Section 5. \triangle

Example 4. (*Kearns modal semantics without possible worlds*)

Let Σ be a signature with two 1-place connectives \neg and \Box , and two 2-place connectives \vee and \rightarrow , i.e., $\Sigma^{(1)} = \{\neg, \Box\}$, $\Sigma^{(2)} = \{\vee, \rightarrow\}$ and $\Sigma^{(k)} = \emptyset$ if $k \neq 2$, and consider the 4-valued Σ -Nmatrix $\mathbb{K} = \langle \{F, f, t, T\}, \{t, T\}, \cdot_{\mathbb{K}} \rangle$ introduced by Kearns [13]:

$\vee_{\mathbb{K}}$	F	f	t	T	$\rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}}$	F	f	t	T	$\neg_{\mathbb{K}}$	$\Box_{\mathbb{K}}$
F	F	f	t	T	F	T	T	T	T	F	F, f
f	f	f	t, T	T	f	t	t, T	t, T	T	f	F, f
t	t	t, T	t, T	T	t	f	f	t, T	T	t	F, f
T	T	T	T	T	T	F	f	t	T	T	t, T

Note that $[p \rightarrow q]_{\mathbb{K}} = [\neg p \vee q]_{\mathbb{K}}$. First, we illustrate the fact that the multi-function induced by a formula cannot be reduced to the composition of the multi-functions

of immediate subformulas. Let $A = p \vee \neg p$ and $B = \neg p \vee p$. The truth-table of $\vee_{\mathbb{K}}$ is symmetric and thus $[A]_{\mathbb{K}} = [B]_{\mathbb{K}}$. However, $[\Box A \rightarrow \Box A]_{\mathbb{K}} \neq [\Box A \rightarrow \Box B]_{\mathbb{K}}$. Looking at the diagonal of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}}$ we conclude that $[\Box A \rightarrow \Box A]_{\mathbb{K}}(x) \subseteq \{t, T\}$ for every $x \in \{F, f, t, T\}$. However, for instance picking $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{K})$ extending

	p	$\neg p$	A	B	$\Box A$	$\Box B$	$\Box A \rightarrow \Box A$	$\Box A \rightarrow \Box B$
v	t	f	T	t	T	F	T	F

which is a prevaluation since $f \in \neg_{\mathbb{K}}(t)$, $t, T \in (t \vee_{\mathbb{K}} f) = (f \vee_{\mathbb{K}} t)$, $T \in \neg_{\mathbb{K}}(T)$, $F \in \neg_{\mathbb{K}}(t)$, $T \in (T \rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}} T)$, and $T \in (T \rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}} F)$. Hence, $F \in [\Box A \rightarrow \Box B]_{\mathbb{K}}(t)$, and thus $[\Box A \rightarrow \Box A]_{\mathbb{K}} \neq [\Box A \rightarrow \Box B]_{\mathbb{K}}$.

We can also check that the logic defined by \mathbb{K} fails to be finitely-determined. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A_n = p_1 \rightarrow (p_2 \rightarrow \dots (p_{n-1} \rightarrow p_n) \dots)$, and Subst_n collect every substitution $\tau : P_n \rightarrow P_{n+1}$. Consider $\Gamma_n = \{A_n^\tau : \tau \in \text{Subst}_n\} \setminus \{A_n\}$. We have that $\Box \Gamma_n \not\vdash_{\mathbb{K}} \Box A_n$, as witnessed by the prevaluation defined by $v_n(B) = t$ for $B \in (\text{sub}(\Gamma_n) \setminus \Gamma_n) \cup (\text{sub}(A_n) \setminus \{A_n\})$, $v_n(B) = v_n(\Box B) = T$ for $B \in \Gamma_n$, $v(A_n) = t$ and $v(\Box A_n) = F$. Clearly, $v_n(\Box \Gamma_n) = \{T\} \subseteq \{t, T\}$ and $v_n(\Box A_n) = F \notin \{t, T\}$.

On the other hand, for every $\sigma : P_{n+1} \rightarrow P_n$ we have that $\Box \Gamma_n^\sigma \triangleright_{\mathbb{K}} \Box A_n^\sigma$, simply because $A_n^\sigma \in \Gamma_n^\sigma$. Indeed, given $\sigma : P_{n+1} \rightarrow P_n$, it suffices to show that there is $\tau \in \text{Subst}_n$ such that $\tau(p_i) \neq p_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $(A_n)^{\sigma \circ \tau} = A_n^\sigma$, that is, that $\sigma \circ \tau = \sigma$. By the pigeonhole principle we know that for any $\sigma : P_{n+1} \rightarrow P_n$ we must have that $\sigma(p_i) = \sigma(p_j)$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq n+1$.

Consider

$$\tau(p_\ell) = \begin{cases} p_\ell & \text{if } \ell \neq i \\ p_j & \text{if } \ell = i \end{cases}$$

Note that $\tau(p_i) \neq p_i$. Further, $\tau(p_\ell) = p_\ell$ for $\ell \neq i$. Thus, $\sigma(p_\ell) = \sigma(\tau(p_\ell))$ for $\ell \neq i$. Finally, by assumption we have that $\tau(p_i) = p_j$, and since $\sigma(p_i) = \sigma(p_j)$ we conclude also that $\sigma(p_i) = \sigma(\tau(p_i))$. \triangle

2.3 Computational problems

Given a class \mathcal{M} of finite Nmatrices, we are interested in the following computational problems.

- $\text{Csq}(\mathcal{M})$: given a finite signature Σ , a finite Σ -Nmatrix $\mathbb{M} \in \mathcal{M}$ and a finite set $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$ determine whether $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{M}} A$;
- $\exists \text{Thm}(\mathcal{M})$: given a finite signature Σ and a finite Σ -Nmatrix $\mathbb{M} \in \mathcal{M}$ determine whether $\text{Thm}(\Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}}) \neq \emptyset$;
- $\text{Eqv}(\mathcal{M})$: given a finite signature Σ and finite Σ -Nmatrices $\mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ determine whether $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} = \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2}$.

We dub $\text{Csq}(\mathcal{M})$ the *consequence problem for class \mathcal{M}* , $\exists \text{Thm}(\mathcal{M})$ the *theorem existence problem for class \mathcal{M}* , and $\text{Eqv}(\mathcal{M})$ the *equivalence problem for class \mathcal{M}* . Despite the generality, we will typically consider the cases when $\mathcal{M} = \text{NMatr}$ is the class of all finite Nmatrices, or when $\mathcal{M} = \text{Matr}$ is the class of all finite matrices. As usual, the dual of a computational problem is the computational problem obtained by negating the envisaged condition. Given a computational problem P we will denote its dual by $\overline{\text{P}}$. For instance, $\overline{\text{Eqv}(\mathcal{M})}$ is the problem of determining whether $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} \neq \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2}$, given a finite signature Σ and finite Σ -Nmatrices $\mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_2 \in \mathcal{M}$.

A problem is *decidable* if there is an algorithm that on each suitable input answers yes/no depending on whether the envisaged condition holds. Similarly, a problem is *semidecidable* (also known as *recursively enumerable*) if there is an algorithm that answers yes precisely on inputs for which the condition holds.

Of course, if any of the above problems is (semi)decidable with respect to a class \mathcal{M} then it is also (semi)decidable with respect to any class $\mathcal{M}' \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. Recall also from any basic textbook on computability theory (e.g, [22]) that a problem P is decidable if and only if \overline{P} is decidable if and only if both P and \overline{P} are semidecidable, as well as the notion of *computable reduction* (or many-one reduction) between problems, denoted by \leq , and the fact that if $P \leq Q$ and problem Q is (semi)decidable then also P is (semi)decidable.

The problem $\text{Csq}(\text{Matr})$ is known to be decidable (and in coNP), namely via the method of truth-tables. A result of [5] shows that the problem $\text{Csq}(\text{NMatr})$ is also decidable (and still in coNP). Taking these facts into account, as well as the compactness, finite-determinedness and local tabularity of the logic of any given finite-valued matrix, one gets close to understanding why the problem $\text{Eqv}(\text{Matr})$ is decidable. Consider the following very simple useful property of Tarskian logics.

Proposition 5. *Let Σ be a signature, $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_1 \rangle$ a compact logic, and $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_2 \rangle$ a n -determined logic for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assuming $\Theta \subseteq L_\Sigma(P_n)$ is such that for each $A \in L_\Sigma(P_n)$ there exists $A^* \in \Theta$ with $A \dashv\vdash_1 A^*$ and $A \dashv\vdash_2 A^*$, then*

$$\vdash_1 \subseteq \vdash_2$$

if and only if

$$\Gamma \vdash_1 A \text{ implies } \Gamma \vdash_2 A \text{ for all finite } \Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq \Theta.$$

Proof. If $\vdash_1 \subseteq \vdash_2$ then $\Gamma \vdash_1 A$ implies $\Gamma \vdash_2 A$ for all $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$. We prove the converse implication, assuming that $\Gamma \vdash_1 A$ implies $\Gamma \vdash_2 A$ for all finite $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq \Theta$, and also that for some $\Delta \cup \{B\} \subseteq L_\Sigma$ we have $\Delta \vdash_1 B$. From the compactness of $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_1 \rangle$, there exists finite $\Delta_0 \subseteq \Delta$ such that $\Delta_0 \vdash_1 B$. Using substitution-invariance, then, for every substitution $\sigma : P \rightarrow P_n$ it follows that $\Delta_0^\sigma \vdash_1 B^\sigma$. Hence, given that $\Delta_0^\sigma \cup \{B^\sigma\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P_n)$ is finite, it follows that $(\Delta_0^\sigma)^* \cup \{(B^\sigma)^*\} \subseteq \Theta$ is also finite, and using the assumptions as well as monotonicity and transitivity, we have that $(\Delta_0^\sigma)^* \vdash_1 (B^\sigma)^*$, and so $(\Delta_0^\sigma)^* \vdash_2 (B^\sigma)^*$, and finally also $\Delta_0^\sigma \vdash_2 B^\sigma$ for every $\sigma : P \rightarrow L_\Sigma(P_n)$. Therefore, since $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_2 \rangle$ is n -determined, it follows that $\Delta_0 \vdash_2 B$, and using monotonicity, it is also the case that $\Delta \vdash_2 B$. \square

Take two Σ -matrices \mathbb{M}_1 and \mathbb{M}_2 . Clearly, $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} = \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2}$ if and only if $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} \subseteq \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2}$ and $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} \subseteq \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1}$. At the light of Propositions 1 and 5, one could verify the inclusion of each of the logics in the other by testing only formulas in the set $\Theta \subseteq L_\Sigma(P_n)$ where n is an upper bound on the numbers of truth-values in each of the matrices. To make this procedure effective, we just need to show that there exists a finite set Θ with the desired property, which can be easily achieved using jointly the local tabularity of the logics of both Nmatrices .

Proposition 6. *Let Σ be a signature, $\mathbb{M}_1 = \langle V_1, D_1, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}_1} \rangle$ and $\mathbb{M}_2 = \langle V_2, D_2, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}_2} \rangle$ finite Σ -matrices. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|V_1|, |V_2| \leq n$ it is possible to compute a finite set $\Theta \subseteq L_\Sigma(P_n)$ such that for each $A \in L_\Sigma(P_n)$ there exists $A^* \in \Theta$ with $A \dashv\vdash_1 A^*$ and $A \dashv\vdash_2 A^*$.*

Proof. According to Proposition 1, both $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} \rangle$ and $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} \rangle$ are n -determined, and thus there are finite sets $\Delta_{1,n}, \Delta_{2,n} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P_n)$ such that for every $A \in L_\Sigma(P_n)$ there exist $A^{*1} \in \Delta_{1,n}$ and $A^{*2} \in \Delta_{2,n}$ with $A \dashv\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} A^{*1}$ and $A \dashv\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} A^{*2}$. However, it may well happen that $A^{*1} \neq A^{*2}$ and $A \not\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} A^{*1}$, or $A \not\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} A^{*2}$, or both.

To overcome this difficulty, we note that $\{([A]_{\mathbb{M}_1}, [A]_{\mathbb{M}_2}) : A \in L_\Sigma(P_n)\}$ is also a finite set, and that if $[A]_{\mathbb{M}_1} = [B]_{\mathbb{M}_1}$ and $[A]_{\mathbb{M}_2} = [B]_{\mathbb{M}_2}$ then it is immediate that

$A \dashv\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} B$ and $A \dashv\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} B$. Thus, we need to compute Θ in such a way that it contains one representative formula for each of the finitely many pairs of n -place functions expressible in \mathbb{M}_1 and \mathbb{M}_2 . For the purpose, let $\Delta^{\mathcal{F}} = \{([A]_{\mathbb{M}_1}, [A]_{\mathbb{M}_2}) : A \in \Delta\}$ for any given set $\Delta \subseteq L_{\Sigma}(P_n)$, and define $\Theta_0 = P_n$, $\Theta_{i+1} = \Theta_i \cup \{\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k) : k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \odot \in \Sigma^{(k)}, A_1, \dots, A_k \in \Theta_i, ([\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k)]_{\mathbb{M}_1}, [\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k)]_{\mathbb{M}_2}) \notin \Theta_i^{\mathcal{F}}\}$. Just let Θ be the fixedpoint that the construction necessarily reaches in finite time. \square

Corollary 7. *The problem $\text{Eqv}(\text{Matr})$ is decidable.*

We shall not go into the details here, but is clear that a similar (even simpler) line of thought allows us to conclude that $\exists\text{Thm}(\text{Matr})$ is also decidable. Due to substitution-invariance, it is clear that if a logic has a theorem then it has a theorem with (at most) a single variable. Thus, one can iteratively build a finite set of formulas representing each of the finitely many 1-place functions expressible in the matrix, as above, while checking at each step whether any of the obtained formulas is a theorem.

It is worth noting at this point that the ideas underlying these decidability results simply do not extend to proper Nmatrices, as noted also in [8]. Namely, as illustrated in Examples 2 and 4, despite the fact that the logics of finite Nmatrices are still known to be compact (see [2]), in general they may fail to be finitely-determined and locally tabular, and in particular formulas expressing the same multi-function are typically not interderivable.

3 Undecidability of $\exists\text{Thm}(\text{NMatr})$

We recall the undecidability of the theorem existence problem for Nmatrices. The proof consists of a computable reduction from a well known undecidable problem related to counter machines. We refer the reader to [11], where the construction was first presented, for any additional details.

Recall from [18] that a *counter-machine* is a tuple $\mathcal{C} = \langle n, Q, q_{\text{init}}, \delta \rangle$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of *counters*, Q is a finite set of *states*, $q_{\text{init}} \in Q$ is the *initial state*, and $\delta : Q \rightarrow (\{\text{inc}(i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \times Q) \cup (\{\text{dec}(i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \times Q^2)$ is a partial *transition function*. The set of *halting states* of \mathcal{C} is $\text{H}\mathcal{C} = \{q \in Q : \delta(q) \text{ undefined}\}$. The set of *configurations* of \mathcal{C} is defined as $\text{Config}_{\mathcal{C}} = Q \times \mathbb{N}_0^n$, whereas configurations in $\{q_{\text{init}}\} \times \mathbb{N}_0^n$ are dubbed *initial*, and configurations in $\text{HConfig}_{\mathcal{C}} = \text{H}\mathcal{C} \times \mathbb{N}_0^n$ are dubbed *halting*.

Counter-machines compute deterministically, from a given initial configuration until, possibly, a halting configuration is reached, according to the progress function $\text{nxt}_{\mathcal{C}} : (\text{Config}_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \text{HConfig}_{\mathcal{C}}) \rightarrow \text{Config}_{\mathcal{C}}$ defined below, where $\vec{e}_i = (e_{i,1}, \dots, e_{i,n}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ is such that $e_{i,i} = 1$, and $e_{i,j} = 0$ for $j \neq i$, $q, q', q'' \in Q$ and $\vec{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$.

$$\text{nxt}_{\mathcal{C}}(q, \vec{a}) = \begin{cases} \langle q', \vec{a} + \vec{e}_i \rangle & \text{if } \delta(q) = (\text{inc}(i), q'), \\ \langle q', \vec{a} - \vec{e}_i \rangle & \text{if } \delta(q) = (\text{dec}(i), q', q'') \text{ and } a_i \neq 0, \\ \langle q'', \vec{a} \rangle & \text{if } \delta(q) = (\text{dec}(i), q', q'') \text{ and } a_i = 0, \end{cases}$$

Computations of \mathcal{C} are thus non-empty finite, or infinite, sequences of configurations $\langle C_0, C_1, \dots, C_k, \dots \rangle$ such that C_0 is initial, and for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ either C_k is halting and is precisely the last configuration of the (finite) sequence, or else $C_{k+1} = \text{nxt}_{\mathcal{C}}(C_k)$ is the next configuration of the sequence. Henceforth, if $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ determines the initial values of the counters, we denote by $\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{a})$ the (finite or infinite) computation of \mathcal{C} starting at $C_0 = \langle q_{\text{init}}, \vec{a} \rangle$. It is well known from [18]

that assuming all counters are initially set to zero does not hinder the Turing-completeness of the model, and so that the following problem is undecidable.

- **HALT**: given a counter machine \mathcal{C} , determine whether \mathcal{C} halts when all counters are initially set to zero, i.e., whether $\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0})$ is finite.

The following construction, and results, were originally presented in [11], where the reader may find further details.

Definition 8. Let $\mathcal{C} = \langle n, Q, q_{\text{init}}, \delta \rangle$ be a counter-machine.

The *signature induced by \mathcal{C}* is $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$, defined by $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}^{(0)} = \{\text{zero}, \epsilon\}$, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} = \{\text{succ}\}$, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}^{(n+1)} = \{\text{step}^q : q \in Q\}$, and $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}^{(j)} = \emptyset$ for $j \notin \{0, 1, n+1\}$.

The $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ -*Nmatrix induced by \mathcal{C}* is $\mathbb{C} = \langle V_{\mathbb{C}}, D_{\mathbb{C}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{C}} \rangle$ defined by

- $V_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbf{Num} \cup \mathbf{Conf} \cup \{\text{init}, \text{error}\}$,
- $D_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbf{HConf}$, and
- for all $q, q', s \in Q$, $x \in V_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\vec{y}, \vec{z} \in V_{\mathbb{C}}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{zero}_{\mathbb{C}} &= \{r_{=0}, r_{\geq 0}\} \\ \epsilon_{\mathbb{C}} &= \{\text{init}\} \\ \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(x) &= \begin{cases} \{r_{\geq 1}\} & \text{if } x = r_{=0}, \\ \{r_{\geq 0}, r_{\geq 1}\} & \text{if } x = r_{\geq 0}, \\ \{r_{\geq 2}\} & \text{if } x \in \{r_{\geq 1}, r_{\geq 2}\}, \\ \{\text{error}\} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \text{step}_{\mathbb{C}}^q(x, \vec{z}) &= \begin{cases} \{\text{conf}_{q, \vec{z}}\} & \text{if } x = \text{init}, q = q_{\text{init}} \\ & \text{and } \vec{z} \in \{r_{=0}\}^n \cup \{r_{\geq 0}\}^n, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } x = \text{conf}_{q', \vec{y}}, \vec{z} \in \mathbf{Num}^n, \text{ and} \\ & \delta(q') = (\text{inc}(i), q), z_i \in \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(y_i) \\ & \text{and } z_\ell = y_\ell \text{ for } \ell \neq i, \text{ or} \\ & \delta(q') = (\text{dec}(i), q, s), y_i \in \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(z_i) \\ & \text{and } z_\ell = y_\ell \text{ for } \ell \neq i, \text{ or} \\ & \delta(q') = (\text{dec}(i), s, q), y_i \in \text{zero}_{\mathbb{C}} \\ & \text{and } \vec{z} = \vec{y}, \\ \{\text{error}\} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Num} = \{r_{=0}, r_{\geq 0}, r_{\geq 1}, r_{\geq 2}\}$, $\mathbf{Conf} = \{\text{conf}_{q, \vec{r}} : q \in Q, \vec{r} \in \mathbf{Num}^n\}$ and $\mathbf{HConf} = \{\text{conf}_{q, \vec{r}} \in \mathbf{Conf} : q \in \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{C}}\}$. \triangle

Note that $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a finite signature and \mathbb{C} is finite-valued, given any counter machine \mathcal{C} . $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ is conceived for encoding finite sequences of configurations of \mathcal{C} as closed formulas. Natural numbers are encoded via $\text{enc} : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow L_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}}(\emptyset)$ defined by $\text{enc}(0) = \text{zero}$, and $\text{enc}(a) = \text{succ}(\text{enc}(a-1))$ for $a > 0$. Given $\vec{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, we will write $\text{enc}(\vec{a})$ to denote $(\text{enc}(a_1), \dots, \text{enc}(a_n))$. Finite sequences of configurations are encoded via $\text{seq} : \text{Config}_{\mathcal{C}}^* \rightarrow L_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}}(\emptyset)$ defined by $\text{seq}(\langle \rangle) = \epsilon$, and $\text{seq}(\langle C_0, \dots, C_k, \langle q, \vec{a} \rangle \rangle) = \text{step}^q(\text{seq}(\langle C_0, \dots, C_k \rangle), \text{enc}(\vec{a}))$.

\mathbb{C} is conceived for closely mimicking the computation of \mathcal{C} when all counters are initially set to zero, despite the ‘abstract’ interpretation given to natural numbers. Technically, the value $\text{error} \notin D_{\mathbb{C}}$ is absorbing, that is, if $A \in L_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}}(P)$, $B \in \text{sub}(A)$ and $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$ is such that $v(B) = \text{error}$ then also $v(A) = \text{error}$. This fact immediately implies that any theorem of $\langle \Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}, \vdash_{\mathbb{C}} \rangle$ must necessarily be a closed formula. The definition of \mathbb{C} further guarantees that if $\text{var}(A) = \emptyset$, if $v(A) \in \mathbf{Conf}$ then it must be the case that $A = \text{seq}(\vec{C})$ for some finite non-empty sequence $\vec{C} = \langle C_0, \dots, C_k \rangle$ of configurations. Easily, also, if $v(A) \in \mathbf{HConf}$ then it must be the case that C_k is a halting configuration.

Given that the non-determinism in \mathbb{C} is confined to $\text{zero}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}$, $v(A)$ is completely determined by $v(\text{enc}(\mathbb{N}_0))$ for every $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$ and every closed $A \in L_{\Sigma_{\mathbb{C}}}(\emptyset)$. The following lemma allows us to navigate the different possibilities, and their consequences.

Lemma 9. *Let \mathcal{C} be a counter machine and $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$. The restriction of v to $\text{enc}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ is such that $v|_{\text{enc}(\mathbb{N}_0)} \in \{v_{=}, v_{\omega}\} \cup \{v_k : k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ where*

- $v_{=}$ ($\text{enc}(0)$) = $r_{=0}$, $v_{=}$ ($\text{enc}(1)$) = $r_{\geq 1}$, and $v_{=}$ ($\text{enc}(a)$) = $r_{\geq 2}$ for all $a > 1$,
- v_{ω} ($\text{enc}(a)$) = $r_{\geq 0}$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and
- v_k ($\text{enc}(a)$) = $r_{\geq 0}$ for all $a \leq k$, v_k ($\text{enc}(k+1)$) = $r_{\geq 1}$, and v_k ($\text{enc}(a)$) = $r_{\geq 2}$ for all $a > k+1$.

Further, for $a, b \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the following properties hold.

- (i) If $a \neq b+1$ then there is $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$ such that $v(\text{enc}(a)) \notin \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(v(\text{enc}(b)))$.
- (ii) If $a \neq b$ then there is $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$ such that $v(\text{enc}(a)) \neq v(\text{enc}(b))$.

Proof. If $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$ is such that $v(\text{enc}(0)) = v(\text{zero}) = r_{=0}$ then $v(\text{enc}(1)) = r_{\geq 1}$, and $v(\text{enc}(a)) = r_{\geq 2}$ for all $a > 1$, which makes $v|_{\text{enc}(\mathbb{N}_0)} = v_{=}$. Otherwise, $v(\text{enc}(0)) = r_{\geq 0}$ and $\text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(r_{\geq 0}) = \{r_{\geq 0}, r_{\geq 1}\}$. Thus, either $v(\text{enc}(a)) = r_{\geq 0}$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$, in which case $v|_{\text{enc}(\mathbb{N}_0)} = v_{\omega}$, or else for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have $v(\text{enc}(a)) = r_{\geq 0}$ for all $n \leq k$, and then $v(\text{enc}(k+1)) = r_{\geq 1}$ and $v(\text{enc}(a)) = r_{\geq 2}$ for all $a > k+1$, in which case $v|_{\text{enc}(\mathbb{N}_0)} = v_k$.

- (i) If $a < b$ take v_a , if $a = b = 0$ take $v_{=}$, if $a = b \neq 0$ take v_{a-1} , and if $a > b+1$ take v_b . In any case, extend the obtained prevaluation to $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$.
- (ii) Assuming, without loss of generality, that $a < b = (b-1) + 1$, we have from case (i) that there exists v such that $v(\text{enc}(a)) \notin \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(v(\text{enc}(b-1)))$. Thus, $v(\text{enc}(a)) \neq v(\text{enc}(b)) \in \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(v(\text{enc}(b-1)))$. \square

We now show that the logic of \mathbb{C} has at most one theorem, which is precisely the encoding of the computation of \mathcal{C} when all counters are initially set to zero, in case it is halting. Said another way, $\langle \Sigma_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{C} \rangle$ has no theorems if $\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0})$ is infinite, and otherwise has exactly one theorem which is precisely $\text{seq}(\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0}))$.

Proposition 10. *Let \mathcal{C} be a counter machine. For every $A \in L_{\Sigma_{\mathbb{C}}}(P)$, we have*

$\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0})$ is finite and $A = \text{seq}(\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0}))$ if and only if $A \in \text{Thm}(\Sigma_{\mathbb{C}}, \vdash_{\mathbb{C}})$.

Proof. Easily, by induction, one shows that for every finite non-empty prefix $\vec{C} = \langle C_0, \dots, C_k \rangle$ of $\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0})$, if $C_k = \langle q, \vec{x} \rangle$ then we have $v(\text{seq}(\vec{C})) = \text{conf}_{q, v(\text{enc}(\vec{x}))}$ for every $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$.

Assume that $\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0})$ is finite and let $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$. Since the last configuration of $\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0})$ is halting it follows that $v(\text{seq}(\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0}))) \in \mathbf{HConf} = D_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Reciprocally, if $A \in \text{Thm}(\Sigma_{\mathbb{C}}, \vdash_{\mathbb{C}})$, we know that $A = \text{seq}(\vec{C})$ for some finite non-empty sequence $\vec{C} = \langle C_0, \dots, C_k \rangle$ of configurations, with C_k halting. Thus, in order to show that $\vec{C} = \text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0})$ it suffices to prove that \vec{C} is a prefix of $\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0})$. We show, by induction on $j \leq k$, that $\langle C_0, \dots, C_j \rangle$ is a prefix of $\text{comp}(\mathcal{C}, \vec{0})$.

- If $C_0 = \langle q, \vec{a} \rangle$ and for $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$ we have $v(\text{seq}(\langle C_0 \rangle)) \neq \text{error}$ then, necessarily, $v(\text{seq}(\langle C_0 \rangle)) = \text{step}_{\mathbb{C}}^q(\text{init}, v(\text{enc}(\vec{a}))) = \text{conf}_{q, v(\text{enc}(\vec{a}))}$, and thus $q = q_{\text{init}}$ and $v(\text{enc}(\vec{a})) \in \{r_{=0}\}^n \cup \{r_{\geq 0}\}^n$; when v extends $v_{=}$, in particular, it follows that $v(\text{enc}(\vec{a})) \in \{r_{=0}\}^n$ and therefore $\vec{a} = \vec{0}$; we conclude that $C_0 = \langle q_{\text{init}}, \vec{0} \rangle$.

- If $j > 0$, $C_{j-1} = \langle q, \vec{a} \rangle$ is halting and $C_j = \langle q', \vec{b} \rangle$ then, for $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$, given that $v(\text{seq}(\langle C_0, \dots, C_j \rangle)) \neq \text{error}$ then, necessarily, $v(\text{seq}(\langle C_0, \dots, C_j \rangle)) = \text{seq}_{\mathbb{C}}^{q'}(\text{conf}_{q, v(\text{enc}(\vec{a}))}, v(\text{enc}(\vec{b}))) = \text{conf}_{q', v(\text{enc}(\vec{b}))}$; this implies that $\delta(q)$ is defined and $q \notin \text{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and we are left with showing that $C_j = \text{nxt}_{\mathbb{C}}(C_{j-1})$; we need to consider three cases.
 - If $\delta(q) = (\text{inc}(i), q'')$, it follows that $q' = q''$, and for all $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$ we have $v(b_i) \in \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(v(a_i))$ and $v(b_\ell) = v(a_\ell)$ for $\ell \neq i$, and using Lemma 9(i-ii) we conclude that $\vec{b} = \vec{a} + \vec{e}_i$.
 - If $\delta(q) = (\text{dec}(i), q'', q''')$ and $a_i \neq 0$, one has $v_{=}(\text{enc}(a_i)) \notin \text{zero}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and thus $q' = q''$; even if $q'' = q'''$, if for v extending v_ω , or extending some v_c for $c \in \mathbb{N}_0$, one has $v(\text{enc}(a_i)) \in \text{zero}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $v(\text{enc}(\vec{a})) = v(\text{enc}(\vec{b}))$, then $v(\text{enc}(a_i)) = v(\text{enc}(b_i)) = r_{\geq 0}$, and since $r_{\geq 0} \in \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(r_{\geq 0})$ it is also the case that $v(a_i) \in \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(v(b_i))$; it follows that for all $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$ we have $v(a_i) \in \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(v(b_i))$, and $v(b_\ell) = v(a_\ell)$ for $\ell \neq i$, and using Lemma 9(i-ii) we conclude that $\vec{b} = \vec{a} - \vec{e}_i$.
 - If $\delta(q) = (\text{dec}(i), q'', q''')$ and $a_i = 0$, one has $v_{=}(\text{enc}(a_i)) = r_{=0} \notin \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(v_{=}(\text{enc}(b_i)))$ and thus $q' = q'''$; even if $q'' = q'''$, if for v extending v_ω , or extending some v_c for $c \in \mathbb{N}_0$, one has $v(\text{enc}(a_i)) = r_{\geq 0} \in \text{succ}_{\mathbb{C}}(v(\text{enc}(b_i)))$, then $v(\text{enc}(a_i)) = v(\text{enc}(b_i)) = r_{\geq 0} \in \text{zero}_{\mathbb{C}}$; it follows that for all $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{C})$ we have $v(a_i) \in \text{zero}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $v(\vec{b}) = v(\vec{a})$, and using Lemma 9(ii) we conclude that $\vec{b} = \vec{a}$.

In all three cases we conclude that $C_j = \text{nxt}_{\mathbb{C}}(C_{j-1})$, and \vec{C} is a prefix of $\text{comp}(\mathbb{C}, \vec{0})$. Since C_k is halting it follows that $\vec{C} = \text{comp}(\mathbb{C}, \vec{0})$. \square

The following is a straightforward corollary of Proposition 10.

Corollary 11. *A counter machine \mathcal{C} halts when all counters are initially set to zero if and only if $\text{Thm}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}, \vdash_{\mathcal{C}}) \neq \emptyset$.*

As it is clear that one can compute $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ and \mathbb{C} directly from \mathcal{C} , the construction provides the following computable reduction.

Corollary 12. $\text{HALT} \leq \exists \text{Thm}(\text{NMatr})$.

Our main result now follows, as a direct consequence of the undecidability of HALT [18] and Corollary 12.

Theorem 13. $\exists \text{Thm}(\text{NMatr})$ is undecidable.

4 Undecidability of Eqv(NMatr)

In this section we present our main result, the undecidability of the equivalence problem for Nmatrices. The proof shall consist of a computable reduction from the theorem existence problem. The reduction is based on a surprisingly simple construction on Nmatrices, which bears similarities to results on *infected* Nmatrices such as those presented in [7]. The construction essentially consists in adding to a given Nmatrix a designated copy of each of its undesignated truth-values.

Definition 14. Let Σ be a signature and $\mathbb{M} = \langle V, D, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$ a Σ -Nmatrix. The *tilded* Nmatrix $\tilde{\mathbb{M}} = \langle \tilde{V}, \cdot, \tilde{D}, \cdot_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} \rangle$ is defined by

- $\tilde{V} = V \cup \{\tilde{x} : x \in V \setminus D\}$,
- $\tilde{D} = D \cup \{\tilde{x} : x \in V \setminus D\}$, and

- for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\odot \in \Sigma^{(k)}$ and $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \tilde{V}$,

$$\odot_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}}^{\sim}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = u^{-1}(\odot_{\mathbb{M}}(u(x_1), \dots, u(x_k))),$$

where $u : \tilde{V} \rightarrow V$ is the *tilde-forgetful* function with $u(x) = u(\tilde{x}) = x$ for $x \in V$. \triangle

Note that $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}$ is finite-valued precisely when \mathbb{M} is finite-valued. Despite its simplicity, this innocent looking *tildeing* construction has an interesting meaning, as illustrated by the following examples.

Example 15. (*Tilded Nmatrices*)

- Let Σ be the signature with a single 1-place connective \flat of Example 3. Recall also the Σ -matrix $\mathbb{M}_7 = (\{0, 1\}, \{1\}, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}_7})$, as well as its tilded version, the three-valued Σ -Nmatrix $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_7 = (\{0, \tilde{0}, 1\}, \{\tilde{0}, 1\}, \cdot_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_7})$, as defined below.

$$\begin{array}{c|c} & \flat_{\mathbb{M}_7} \\ \hline 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c|c} & \flat_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_7} \\ \hline 0 & 1 \\ \tilde{0} & 1 \\ 1 & 0, \tilde{0} \end{array}$$

It is clear that $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_7} \rangle$ is the negation-only fragment of classical logic, and can be axiomatized by the following schematic rules (see [19]).

$$\frac{p}{\flat \flat p} \qquad \frac{\flat \flat p}{p} \qquad \frac{p, \flat p}{q}$$

In particular $\text{Thm}(\Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_7}) = \emptyset$, and thus, as we will show below in Proposition 17, $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_7$ is equivalent to \mathbb{U}_Σ . For instance, $\{A\} \not\vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_7} \flat \flat A$, as can be witnessed by any valuation $\tilde{v} \in \text{Val}(\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_7)$ such that $\tilde{v}(A) = \tilde{0}$, $\tilde{v}(\flat A) = 1$, and $\tilde{v}(\flat \flat A) = 0$.

- Now, let Σ_{\Rightarrow} be the signature with a single 2-place connective \Rightarrow , and consider the Σ_{\Rightarrow} -matrix $\mathbb{I} = (\{0, 1\}, \{1\}, \cdot_{\mathbb{I}})$, as well as its tilded version, the three-valued Σ_{\Rightarrow} -Nmatrix $\tilde{\mathbb{I}} = (\{0, \tilde{0}, 1\}, \{\tilde{0}, 1\}, \cdot_{\tilde{\mathbb{I}}})$, as defined below.

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c} \Rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}} & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c|c|c|c} \Rightarrow_{\tilde{\mathbb{I}}} & 0 & \tilde{0} & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \tilde{0} & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0, \tilde{0} & 0, \tilde{0} & 1 \end{array}$$

It is clear that $\langle \Sigma_{\Rightarrow}, \vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \rangle$ is the implication-only fragment of classical logic, and can be axiomatized by the following schematic rules, or actually three familiar axioms and one proper rule, *modus ponens* (see [19]).

$$\frac{}{A \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow A)} \qquad \frac{}{(A \Rightarrow (B \Rightarrow C)) \Rightarrow ((A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow C))}$$

$$\frac{}{((A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow A) \Rightarrow A} \qquad \frac{A, A \Rightarrow B}{B}$$

$\text{Thm}(\Sigma_{\Rightarrow}, \vdash_{\mathbb{I}}) \neq \emptyset$, and thus, as we will show below in Proposition 17, the *tildeing* construction retains all the theorems (not just the axioms). For instance, we have $(A \Rightarrow A) \in \text{Thm}(\Sigma_{\Rightarrow}, \vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{I}}})$, as for every $\tilde{v} \in \text{Val}(\tilde{\mathbb{I}})$ we have that $(\tilde{v}(A) \Rightarrow_{\tilde{\mathbb{I}}} \tilde{v}(A)) = 1$. Still, other consequences are lost. Namely, *modus ponens* no longer holds, i.e., $\{A, A \Rightarrow B\} \not\vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{I}}} B$, as can be witnessed by any valuation $\tilde{v} \in \text{Val}(\tilde{\mathbb{I}})$ such that $\tilde{v}(A) = 1$, $\tilde{v}(B) = 0$, and $\tilde{v}(A \Rightarrow B) = \tilde{0}$. \triangle

We now show that the tilde construction indeed has the properties suggested by the previous examples. The construction always yields a Nmatrix whose logic is closely related with the logics of unconstrained Nmatrices, as defined in Example 2. Namely, the logic of $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}$ is *quasi-unconstrained*, the exception being the theorems (if any) of the logic of the original Nmatrix \mathbb{M} . We start by proving a useful lemma.

Lemma 16. *Let Σ be a signature and $\mathbb{M} = \langle V, D, \cdot_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$ a Σ -Nmatrix. For every function $\tilde{v} : L_{\Sigma}(P) \rightarrow \tilde{V}$, $\tilde{v} \in \text{Val}(\tilde{\mathbb{M}})$ if and only if $u \circ \tilde{v} \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M})$, where $u : \tilde{V} \rightarrow V$ is the tilde-forgetful function of Definition 14.*

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v} \in \text{Val}(\tilde{\mathbb{M}}) \text{ iff} \\ \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \odot \in \Sigma^{(k)} \text{ and } A_1, \dots, A_k \in L_{\Sigma}(P) \\ \tilde{v}(\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k)) \in \odot_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}}(\tilde{v}(A_1), \dots, \tilde{v}(A_k)) \text{ iff} \\ \tilde{v}(\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k)) \in u^{-1}(\odot_{\mathbb{M}}(u(\tilde{v}(A_1)), \dots, u(\tilde{v}(A_k)))) \text{ iff} \\ u(\tilde{v}(\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k))) \in \odot_{\mathbb{M}}(u(\tilde{v}(A_1)), \dots, u(\tilde{v}(A_k))) \text{ iff} \\ (u \circ \tilde{v})(\odot(A_1, \dots, A_k)) \in \odot_{\mathbb{M}}((u \circ \tilde{v})(A_1), \dots, (u \circ \tilde{v})(A_k)) \text{ iff} \\ u \circ \tilde{v} \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M}). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 17. *Let Σ be a signature and \mathbb{M} a Σ -Nmatrix. For every $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_{\Sigma}(P)$, we have*

$$\Gamma \vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} A \text{ if and only if } A \in \Gamma \text{ or } A \in \text{Thm}(\Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}}).$$

Proof. Suppose that $\Gamma \vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} A$, with $A \notin \Gamma$, and let $v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M})$. Consider the function $\tilde{v} : L_{\Sigma}(P) \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ defined as follows for each formula $B \in L_{\Sigma}(P)$.

$$\tilde{v}(B) = \begin{cases} v(B) & \text{if } B = A \\ x & \text{if } B \neq A \text{ and } v(B) = x \in D \\ \tilde{x} & \text{if } B \neq A \text{ and } v(B) = x \notin D \end{cases}$$

It is immediate from this definition that $u \circ \tilde{v} = v$, and so $\tilde{v} \in \text{Val}(\tilde{\mathbb{M}})$ according to Lemma 16. It is also straightforward to check that $\tilde{v}(B) \in \tilde{D}$ for every formula $B \in L_{\Sigma} \setminus \{A\}$, and thus $\tilde{v}(\Gamma) \subseteq \tilde{D}$. Given that $\Gamma \vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} A$ it must also be the case that $\tilde{v}(A) = v(A) \in \tilde{D}$. However, $v(A) \in V$ so $v(A) \in \tilde{D} \cap V = D$, and we can conclude that $A \in \text{Thm}(\Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}})$.

Reciprocally, as $\vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}}$ always satisfies reflexivity, we need only consider the case when $A \in \text{Thm}(\Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}})$. If $v \in \text{Val}(\tilde{\mathbb{M}})$ then Lemma 16 guarantees $u \circ v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M})$, and thus it must be the case that $u(v(A)) \in D$. Therefore, we have that $v(A) \in u^{-1}(D) = D \subseteq \tilde{D}$, and we can conclude that $\emptyset \vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} A$, and by monotonicity $\Gamma \vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} A$ for every $\Gamma \subseteq L_{\Sigma}(P)$. \square

The following is a straightforward corollary of Proposition 17 and the characterization of the logic of unconstrained Nmatrices, as introduced in Example 2.

Corollary 18. *Let Σ be a signature and \mathbb{M} a Σ -Nmatrix. We have $\text{Thm}(\Sigma, \vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}}) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}$ and \mathbb{U}_{Σ} are not equivalent.*

When we are working with a finite signature Σ and a finite-valued Σ -Nmatrix \mathbb{M} , it is clear that one can compute \mathbb{U}_{Σ} from Σ , and $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}$ from \mathbb{M} , which therefore provide the following computable reduction.

Corollary 19. $\exists \text{Thm}(\text{NMatr}) \leq \overline{\text{Eqv}(\text{NMatr})}$.

Our main result now follows, as a direct consequence of Theorem 13, Corollary 19, and the fact that a problem is as decidable as its dual.

Theorem 20. *Eqv(NMatr) is undecidable.*

5 Nmatrix equivalence in practice

We have established that Eqv(NMatr) is undecidable. Nevertheless, it is clear that $\overline{\text{Eqv}}(\text{NMatr})$ is semidecidable. Indeed, if two given finite Σ -Nmatrices are not equivalent, we can always use brute-force to search for a finite set $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$ such that either $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} A$ and $\Gamma \not\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} A$, or $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} A$ and $\Gamma \not\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} A$. This means that, in practice, showing that two Nmatrices define distinct logics can always be attained by computing/exhibiting an appropriate counterexample, as we did already in Examples 3 and 15.

In the following subsections, we illustrate various techniques that can be used in order to prove that two finite Nmatrices define the same logic, despite the general undecidability of the problem.

5.1 Axiomatizable logics

The problem of determining whether two given Nmatrices are equivalent is considerably simplified when we have access to finite axiomatizations for the logics they define. As usual, a set of *rules* $R = \{\frac{\Gamma_i}{A_i} : i \in I\}$ where each $\Gamma_i \cup \{A_i\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$ *axiomatizes* the logic $\langle \Sigma, \vdash \rangle$ where \vdash is the least consequence relation such that $\Gamma_i \vdash A_i$ for each $i \in I$. Further, R is said to be a *finite axiomatization* when I is a finite set, as well as every Γ_i .

Proposition 21. *Let Σ be a signature, and $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_1 \rangle, \langle \Sigma, \vdash_2 \rangle$ be logics. If $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_1 \rangle$ is axiomatized by $R = \{\frac{\Gamma_i}{A_i} : i \in I\}$ then*

$$\vdash_1 \subseteq \vdash_2 \text{ if and only if } \Gamma_i \vdash_2 A_i \text{ for every } i \in I.$$

Proof. Just note that $\Gamma_i \vdash_2 A_i$ for every $i \in I$ is precisely equivalent to $\vdash_1 \subseteq \vdash_2$ since, by assumption, \vdash_1 is the least such logic. \square

We should be careful here, as the logic defined by a given Nmatrix may well fail to be finitely axiomatizable (see, for instance, [24]). Further, even if the logic is finitely axiomatizable, obtaining a concrete axiomatization may be very difficult (see, for instance, [19]). Still, if the axiomatizations are given, or obtainable with some ingenuity (as is often the case), one can easily test the equivalence of the given Nmatrices by checking that each rule of one axiomatization holds for the other Nmatrix².

Corollary 22. *Let $\mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_2$ be finite Σ -Nmatrices. Given finite axiomatizations of both $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} \rangle, \langle \Sigma, \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} \rangle$ it is decidable whether $\mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_2$ are equivalent.*

Let us provide some illustrations of this criterion at work.

Example 23. *(Eight distinct logics)*

Let Σ be the signature with a single 1-place connective \flat of Example 3, and the Nmatrices introduced there. It is not difficult, for instance with the aide of techniques such as [21, 16, 14], to produce the following axiomatizations $R_{\mathbb{M}}$ for the logics defined by each $\mathbb{M} \in \{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma, \mathbb{M}_1, \dots, \mathbb{M}_8\} \setminus \{\mathbb{M}_6\}$: $R_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma} = \emptyset$, $R_{\mathbb{M}_1} = \{r_1\}$, $R_{\mathbb{M}_2} = \{r_2\}$,

²Note that, in this case, it is not relevant whether the two logics were defined by Nmatrices, but simply that their corresponding consequence problems are decidable.

$R_{\mathbb{M}_3} = \{r_3\}$, $R_{\mathbb{M}_4} = \{r_4\}$, $R_{\mathbb{M}_5} = \{r_2, r_3\}$, $R_{\mathbb{M}_7} = \{r_1, r_5, r_6\}$, $R_{\mathbb{M}_8} = \{r_7\}$, where the various rules are given below.

$$\frac{p, bp}{q} r_1 \quad \frac{p}{bp} r_2 \quad \frac{bp}{p} r_3 \quad \frac{bp}{q} r_4 \quad \frac{p}{bbp} r_5 \quad \frac{bbp}{p} r_6 \quad \frac{}{bp} r_7$$

Using Corollary 22 it is easy to conclude that all these logics are distinct. Indeed, using Proposition 21 one can even assess their relationship more properly, as pictured in Figure 1 below.

We have purposefully left Nmatrix \mathbb{M}_6 out of this analysis. We did it for two reasons: first, the techniques mentioned above do not readily provide us with a corresponding axiomatization; and second, it actually turns out that its logic coincides with one of the others. To prove this we will need to proceed differently. \triangle

5.2 Semantical approaches

It is clear that the logic defined by a Σ -Nmatrix \mathbb{M} is completely determined by its valuations $\text{Val}(\mathbb{M})$ and its set of designated values. Thus, ultimately, we can always try to assess whether given Nmatrices are equivalent by analyzing their valuations. Let us look at one example.

Example 24. (Another discrete logic)

Let Σ be the signature with a single 1-place connective b of Example 3, and the Nmatrices introduced there. We will show that \mathbb{M}_6 is actually equivalent to \mathbb{U}_Σ , both defining the discrete logic on the corresponding language. Since we know from Example 2 that $\vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}$ is discrete, it is immediate that $\vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma} \subseteq \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_6}$. To prove equality we need to show that given $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$, if $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_6} A$ then $A \in \Gamma$.

Fixed $A \in L_\Sigma(P)$, consider $v_A : L_\Sigma(P) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as defined below.

$$v_A(B) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } B = A \\ 1 & \text{if } B \neq A \end{cases}$$

It is simple to check that $v_A \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_6)$. Just note that if $v_A(B) = 0$ then $B = A$, and thus $v_A(bB) = v_A(bA) = 1$ as $bA \neq A$. Therefore, if $A \notin \Gamma$ then $v_A(\Gamma) \subseteq \{1\}$ and $v_A(A) = 0$, which shows that $\Gamma \not\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_6} A$. \triangle

This example shows that semantic methods can be relatively *ad hoc*, depending crucially on the concrete Nmatrices given and our ability to understand them. Still, there are some interesting structural criteria that can sometimes be used.

5.2.1 Rexpansion homomorphisms

Nmatrices can be related by an interesting notion of homomorphism stemming from the notion of *rexpansion* [4].

Let $\mathbb{M}_1 = \langle V_1, \cdot_1, D_1 \rangle$ and $\mathbb{M}_2 = \langle V_2, \cdot_2, D_2 \rangle$ be Σ -Nmatrices. A *strict homomorphism* $h : \mathbb{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_2$ consists of a function $h : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ such that $D_1 = h^{-1}(D_2)$ and, $h(\odot_{\mathbb{M}_1}(x_1, \dots, x_k)) \subseteq \odot_{\mathbb{M}_2}(h(x_1), \dots, h(x_k))$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\odot \in \Sigma^{(k)}$, and $x_1, \dots, x_k \in V_1$.

Further, when h is surjective, a strict homomorphism is said to be *strongly-preserving* if $h(\odot_{\mathbb{M}_1}(x_1, \dots, x_k)) = \odot_{\mathbb{M}_2}(h(x_1), \dots, h(x_k))$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\odot \in \Sigma^{(k)}$, and $x_1, \dots, x_k \in V_1$. We recall here Theorem 3.8 in [4].

Theorem 25. *If $h : \mathbb{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_2$ is a strict homomorphism then $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} \subseteq \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1}$. Further, if the homomorphism is strongly-preserving then $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} = \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2}$.*

Paper [4] contains several interesting applications of this result. We shall provide a few more, along also with an illustration of its limitations.

Example 26. (*Revisiting inclusions*)

We revisit the Nmatrices of Example 3. Let $h : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the identity function. It is easy to see that h defines strict homomorphisms $h : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ for all pairs $(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{M}')$ in

$$\{\langle \mathbb{M}_i, \mathbb{U}_\Sigma \rangle : i \in \{1, \dots, 8\}\} \cup \{\langle \mathbb{M}_i, \mathbb{M}_j \rangle : (i, j) \in \{(7, 1), (8, 2), (5, 2), (5, 3), (4, 3)\}\},$$

simply because $b_{\mathbb{M}}(x) \subseteq b_{\mathbb{M}'}(x)$ for every $x \in \{0, 1\}$. Thus, Theorem 25 explains by itself all the inclusion arrows depicted in Figure 1 (which we had already justified in Example 23).

Note, however, that $h : \mathbb{M}_6 \rightarrow \mathbb{U}_\Sigma$ is not strongly preserving, and that h does not even constitute a strict homomorphism from \mathbb{U}_Σ to \mathbb{M}_6 (in both cases, simply because $0 \notin b_{\mathbb{M}_6}(0) = \{1\}$), and therefore Theorem 25 cannot be used to establish the equivalence of these two Nmatrices. \triangle

Example 27. (*Tilded inclusions and equivalences*)

We extend Example 15, by considering the tilded versions, according to Definition 14, of all the Nmatrices of Example 3. Note that in all cases the tilded Nmatrices have both $1, \tilde{0}$ as designated values. The corresponding truth-tables are given below.

	$b_{\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_\Sigma}$	$b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_1}$	$b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_2}$	$b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_3}$	$b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_4}$	$b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_5}$	$b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_6}$	$b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_7}$	$b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_8}$
0	0, $\tilde{0}$, 1	0, $\tilde{0}$, 1	0, $\tilde{0}$, 1	0, $\tilde{0}$	0, $\tilde{0}$	0, $\tilde{0}$	1	1	1
$\tilde{0}$	0, $\tilde{0}$, 1	0, $\tilde{0}$, 1	0, $\tilde{0}$, 1	0, $\tilde{0}$	0, $\tilde{0}$	0, $\tilde{0}$	1	1	1
1	0, $\tilde{0}$, 1	0, $\tilde{0}$	1	0, $\tilde{0}$, 1	0, $\tilde{0}$	1	0, $\tilde{0}$, 1	0, $\tilde{0}$	1

Consider the functions $h : \{0, \tilde{0}, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, and $f, g : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, \tilde{0}, 1\}$ defined as follows.

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in \{\tilde{0}, 1\} \end{cases} \quad f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ \tilde{0} & \text{if } x = 1 \end{cases} \quad g(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } x = 1 \end{cases}$$

For any $\mathbb{M} \in \{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma, \mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_3, \mathbb{M}_4\}$, $h : \tilde{\mathbb{M}} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}_\Sigma$ is a strongly-preserving strict homomorphism (because, for all $x \in \{0, \tilde{0}, 1\}$, $b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}}(x)$ contains both designated and undesigned values). Consequently, by Theorem 25, we conclude that $\vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} = \vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}$.

For any $\mathbb{M} \in \{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma, \mathbb{M}_1, \dots, \mathbb{M}_5\}$, $f : \mathbb{U}_\Sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{M}}$ is a strict homomorphism (because, for all $x \in \{0, \tilde{0}\}$, $b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}}(x)$ contains both designated and undesigned values). By Theorem 25, we conclude that $\vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} \subseteq \vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}$, and since $\vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}$ is the smallest logic over Σ they must coincide, that is, $\vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} = \vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}$.

For $\mathbb{M} \in \{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma, \mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_6, \mathbb{M}_7\}$, $g : \mathbb{M}_7 \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{M}}$ is a strict homomorphism (because $1 \in b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}}(0)$ and $0 \in b_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}}(1)$). Theorem 25 thus implies that $\vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} \subseteq \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_7}$. Since $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_7}$ corresponds to the negation fragment of classical logic, which has no theorems, it follows from Proposition 17 that $\vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}}$ also has no theorems, and $\vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} = \vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}$.

It is actually possible to conclude, simply by inspection of the axiomatizations provided in Example 23, or also semantically, that none of the logics defined by the given Nmatrices have theorems, with the exception of \mathbb{M}_8 . Thus, according to Proposition 17, their tilded versions must all be equivalent to \mathbb{U}_Σ . We conclude that for all $\mathbb{M} \in \{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma, \mathbb{M}_1, \dots, \mathbb{M}_7\}$, we have $\vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}} = \vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma} \neq \vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_8}$, and also that if $\mathbb{M} \neq \mathbb{U}_\Sigma$ then $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \neq \vdash_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}}$. It is important to note that Proposition 17 was essential

here, as Theorem 25 could not be directly applied to show that $\vdash_{\widetilde{\mathbb{M}}_7} = \vdash_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}$ (because $0 \in \mathfrak{b}_{\mathbb{U}_\Sigma}(0)$ but $0 \notin \mathfrak{b}_{\mathbb{M}_7}(0)$).

Finally, $h : \widetilde{\mathbb{M}}_8 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_8$ is a strongly-preserving strict homomorphism. According to Theorem 25, we conclude that $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_8} = \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathbb{M}}_8}$.

The overall picture of the relationships between all these logics is depicted in Figure 1. \triangle

These examples are, of course, very simple. Still, the variety of possibilities comes as no surprise, since we have shown that $\text{Eqv}(\text{Nmatr})$ is undecidable, while checking the existence of suitable homomorphisms between finite Nmatrices is decidable.




Figure 1: Equivalences (\equiv) and inclusions (\longrightarrow) among the eight logics defined by the eighteen Nmatrices of Examples 3 and 27.

5.2.2 Bivaluations

We conclude with a very general semantical criterion, rooted in bivaluations, that is necessary and sufficient to prove or disprove the equality of two logics. Although this criterion does not yield a direct procedure, it provides a faithful conceptual framework for understanding the problem.

Fixed a signature Σ , bivaluations are functions $\mathfrak{b} : L_\Sigma(P) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Any Nmatrix induces a set of bivaluations $\text{BVal}(\mathbb{M}) = \{\mathfrak{b}_v : v \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M})\}$ where, for each formula A ,

$$b_v(A) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v(A) \in D \\ 0 & \text{if } v(A) \notin D \end{cases}.$$

Given $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{L_\Sigma(P)}$, let its *meet-closure* be the set $\mathfrak{B}^\square = \{\sqcap \mathfrak{B}' : \mathfrak{B}' \subseteq \mathfrak{B}\}$ with each *meet* $\sqcap \mathfrak{B}'$ being the bivaluation such that $\sqcap \mathfrak{B}'(A) = 1$ precisely if $b(A) = 1$ for every $b \in \mathfrak{B}'$, for each $A \in L_\Sigma(P)$.

The following is a well-known simple result about theories of a logic, rephrased here as bivaluations (given $b \in \text{BVal}(\mathbb{M})$, it is straightforward to check that $\Omega_b = b^{-1}(1) = \{A \in L_\Sigma(P) : b(A) = 1\}$ is a theory of $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}}$, i.e., if $\Omega_b \vdash_{\mathbb{M}} A$ then $A \in \Omega_b$).

Proposition 28. *Given Σ -Nmatrices \mathbb{M}_1 and \mathbb{M}_2 , we have that*

$$\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} \subseteq \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} \text{ if and only if } \text{BVal}(\mathbb{M}_2) \subseteq \text{BVal}(\mathbb{M}_1)^\square.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbb{M}_1 = \langle V_1, \cdot_1, D_1 \rangle$ and $\mathbb{M}_2 = \langle V_2, \cdot_2, D_2 \rangle$.

Assume that $\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} \subseteq \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2}$, and take $b \in \text{BVal}(\mathbb{M}_2)$. If $\Omega_b \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} A$ then $\Omega_b \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} A$, and thus $A \in \Omega_b$. Thus, for each $A \notin \Omega_b$ it must be the case that $\Omega_b \not\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} A$, and thus there exists $v_A \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_1)$ such that $v_A(\Omega_b) \subseteq D_1$ and $v_A(A) \notin D_1$. Denoting each b_{v_A} simply by b_A , note that $b_A(\Omega_b) \subseteq \{1\}$ and $b_A(A) = 0$. We just need to

check that $b = \cap \{b_A : A \notin \Omega_b\}$. Indeed, for any formula B , $b(B) = 1$ iff $B \in \Omega_b$ iff $b_A(B) = 1$ for all $A \in \Omega_b$.

Reciprocally, assume that $B\text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_2) \subseteq B\text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_1)^\square$, take $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$ such that $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} A$, and let $v_2 \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_2)$ be such that $v_2(\Gamma) \subseteq D_2$. Clearly, $b_{v_2}(\Gamma) \subseteq \{1\}$ and $b_{v_2} = \cap \mathbf{B}$ for some set $\mathbf{B} \subseteq B\text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_1)$. This means that there exists $\mathbf{V} \subseteq \text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_1)$ such that $\mathbf{B} = \{b_{v_1} : v_1 \in \mathbf{V}\}$, and for any formula B we have that $v_2(B) \in D_2$ iff $b_{v_2}(B) = 1$ iff $b_{v_1}(B) = 1$ for all $v_1 \in \mathbf{V}$ iff $v_1(B) \in D_1$ for all $v_1 \in \mathbf{V}$. Since $v_2(\Gamma) \subseteq D_2$, it follows that $v_1(\Gamma) \subseteq D_1$ for all $v_1 \in \mathbf{V}$. Therefore, given that $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} A$ we conclude that $v_1(A) \in D_1$ for all $v_1 \in \mathbf{V}$. Consequently $v_2(A) \in D_2$, and it follows that $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} A$. \square

Corollary 29. *Given Σ -Nmatrices \mathbb{M}_1 and \mathbb{M}_2 , we have that*

$$\vdash_{\mathbb{M}_1} = \vdash_{\mathbb{M}_2} \text{ if and only if } B\text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_1)^\square = B\text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_2)^\square.$$

This characterization gives us a necessary and sufficient criterion, which can be used as a ultimate resource.

Example 30. (\mathbb{M}_6 revisited)

Let us revisit Example 24. An alternative proof of the fact that \mathbb{M}_6 and \mathbb{U}_Σ are equivalent would be to use Corollary 29. Since both Nmatrices are two-valued, their valuations coincide with their bivaluations. Clearly, $\text{Val}(\mathbb{U}_\Sigma) = \text{Val}(\mathbb{U}_\Sigma)^\square = \{0, 1\}^{L_\Sigma(P)}$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $\{0, 1\}^{L_\Sigma(P)} \subseteq \text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_6)^\square$.

Let $v : L_\Sigma(P) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be an arbitrary (bi)valuation. Consider the set of (bi)valuations $\mathbf{B} = \{v_A : A \in v^{-1}(0)\}$, where each $v_A \in \text{Val}(\mathbb{M}_6)$ is defined as in Example 24 and satisfies, for any formula B , $v_A(B) = 1$ iff $B \neq A$. Note that $v(B) = 1$ iff $B \notin v^{-1}(0)$ iff $v_A(B) = 1$ for all $v_A \in \mathbf{B}$, i.e., $v = \cap \mathbf{B}$. \triangle

6 Conclusion

We have shown that the price to pay for the expressive gain allowed by non-deterministic logical matrices includes the loss of the ability to decide logical equivalence. This undecidability result implies that looking for counterexamples to the logical equivalence of two given finite Nmatrices can be very difficult in practice, let alone proving their logical equivalence, if that is the case.

These results do not hinder the usefulness of Nmatrices, but do require additional expertise in dealing with their equivalence problem. We have briefly surveyed some possible pathways to deal with these problems, but further research is needed. Namely, it will be very useful to identify subclasses $\text{Matr} \subseteq \mathcal{M} \subseteq \text{NMatr}$ for which the problem $\text{Eqv}(\text{NMatr})$ is still decidable. Also, alternative sufficient conditions for logical equivalence may result from a deeper study of the algebraic structure of Nmatrices and their homomorphisms, namely in the lines of [8]. Further, the scope of the idea underlying the equivalence criterion of Corollary 22 and used above in Example 23 seems to be extensible to richer notions of axiomatizability.

For instance, we know that every finite logical matrix [21], and also all every *monadic* finite Nmatrix [16] admits a finite multiple-conclusion axiomatization. We have shown in [11] that determining whether a given finite Nmatrix is monadic is undecidable, but given formulas witnessing its monadicity we know how to algorithmically produce a corresponding multiple-conclusion axiomatization. Furthermore, under certain conditions, finite multiple-conclusion axiomatizations can be converted into finite single-conclusion axiomatizations. For instance, [21, Theorem 5.37] shows that this is possible when the underlying logic expresses a *disjunction-like* connective. Even if there is no disjunction, we have that by [21, Theorem 5.16] we

have that if $R = \{\frac{\Gamma_i}{\Delta_i} : i \in I\}$ is a multiple-conclusion axiomatization of $\langle \Sigma, \vdash_1 \rangle$ then $\vdash_1 \subseteq \vdash_2$ if, and only if, for every $\Theta \cup \{A\} \subseteq L_\Sigma(P)$, $i \in I$ and $\sigma : P \rightarrow L_\Sigma(P)$ we have that

$$\Theta, B^\sigma \vdash_1 A \text{ for every } B \in \Delta_i \text{ implies } \Theta, \Gamma_i^\sigma \vdash_2 A.$$

Similar ideas may be workable, using with other notions of axiomatizability, for instance using sequent or tableaux calculi, as long as there is a way to convert them into tests to the Nmatrix logics.

Finally, it is worth noting that if we adopt a non-Tarskian multiple-conclusion notion of logic, as proposed in [20, 21], the work developed here is inconclusive. Indeed, the problem of determining whether two given finite Nmatrices characterize the same multiple-conclusion logic (which does not seem simpler) remains open, as one can easily note that the Nmatrix \mathbb{C} obtained from a given counter machine \mathcal{C} in Section 3 is not saturated (in the sense of [6]), and it is unclear how to replace the construction in a suitable way.

References

- [1] A. Avron, O. Arieli, and A. Zamansky. *Theory of Effective Propositional Paraconsistent Logics*, volume 75 of *Studies in Logic*. College Publications, London, 2018.
- [2] A. Avron and I. Lev. Non-deterministic multiple-valued structures. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 15(3):241–261, 2005.
- [3] A. Avron and A. Zamansky. Non-deterministic semantics for logical systems (a survey). In D. Gabbay and F. Guenther, editors, *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*, volume 16, pages 227–304. Kluwer, 2nd edition, 2011.
- [4] A. Avron and Y. Zohar. Expansions of non-deterministic matrices and their applications in non-classical logics. *Review of Symbolic Logic*, 12(1):173–200, 2019.
- [5] M. Baaz, O. Lahav, and A. Zamansky. Finite-valued semantics for canonical labelled calculi. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 51(4):401–430, 2013.
- [6] C. Caleiro and S. Marcelino. Modular many-valued semantics for combined logics. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 89(2):583–636, 2023.
- [7] C. Caleiro, S. Marcelino, and P. Filipe. Infectious semantics and analytic calculi for even more inclusion logics. In *2020 IEEE 50th International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic*, pages 224–229, 2020.
- [8] C. Caleiro, S. Marcelino, and U. Riviuccio. Some more theorems on structural entailment relations and non-deterministic semantics. In J. Malinowski and R. Palczewski, editors, *Janusz Czelakowski on Logical Consequence*, volume 27 of *Outstanding Contributions to Logic*, pages 345–375. Springer, 2011.
- [9] C. Caleiro, S. Marcelino, and U. Riviuccio. Characterizing finite-valuedness. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 345:113–125, 2018.
- [10] W. Charatonik. Automata on DAG Representations of Finite Trees. Technical Report MPI-I-1999-2-001, Max-Planck-Institut für Informatik, Saarbrücken, Germany, 1999.
- [11] P. Filipe, C. Caleiro, and S. Marcelino. Monadicity of non-deterministic logical matrices is undecidable. In *Non-Classical Logics, Theory and Applications (NCL’22), Łódź, Poland*, pages 55–67. Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science, 2022.

- [12] J. Font. *Abstract Algebraic Logic*, volume 60 of *Mathematical Logic and Foundations*. College Publications, 2016.
- [13] J. Kearns. Modal semantics without possible worlds. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 46(1):77–86, 1981.
- [14] S. Marcelino. An unexpected Boolean connective. *Logica Universalis*, 16:85–103, 2022.
- [15] S. Marcelino and C. Caleiro. Disjoint fibring of non-deterministic matrices. In J. Kennedy and R. de Queiroz, editors, *Logic, Language, Information, and Computation (WoLLIC 2017)*, volume 10388 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 242–255. Springer, 2017.
- [16] S. Marcelino and C. Caleiro. Axiomatizing non-deterministic many-valued generalized consequence relations. *Synthese*, 198(22):5373–5390, 2021.
- [17] S. Marcelino, C. Caleiro, and P. Filipe. Computational properties of finite PNmatrices. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 23(8):1694–1719, 2022.
- [18] M. Minsky. *Computation: Finite and Infinite Machines*. Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- [19] W. Rautenberg. 2-element matrices. *Studia Logica*, 40(4):315–353, 1981.
- [20] D. Scott. Completeness and axiomatizability in many-valued logic. In *Proceedings of the Tarski Symposium (Vol. XXV of Sympos. Pure Math., UC Berkeley, 1971)*, pages 411–435. American Mathematical Society, 1974.
- [21] D. Shoesmith and T. Smiley. *Multiple-Conclusion Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- [22] M. Sipser. *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*. Cengage Learning, 3rd edition, 2013.
- [23] R. Wójcicki. *Theory of Logical Calculi*. Kluwer, 1988.
- [24] A. Wroński. A three element matrix whose consequence operation is not finitely based. *Bulletin of the Section of Logic*, 2(8):68–70, 1979.
- [25] Y. Zohar. *Gentzen-type proof systems for non-classical logics*. PhD in Computer Science, Tel Aviv University, Israel, 2018.