

CLOSURE OPERATORS AND CONSEQUENCE RELATIONS

Z. Šikić, Zagreb

I We consider the multiple consequence relation as defined in [S]. The definition is there prompted by the following line of argument: To say that a set of conclusions follows from a given set of premisses is to say that at least one of the conclusions must be true if the premisses are all true. That means that each possible state of affairs in which all the premisses are true is one in which some of the conclusions are true. Assuming the formulae of our language \mathcal{L} to be capable of truth and untruth, each relevant state of affairs is represented by the partition (T,U) of formulae of \mathcal{L} such that the formulae of T are true in this state of affairs, while the formulae of U are untrue in it. If \mathcal{M} is the set of all partitions which correspond to the possible states of affairs, it is plausible to define the consequence relation with regard to \mathcal{M} as follows.

Definition 1. Let X and Y be sets of formulae of \mathcal{L} i.e. $X \subset \mathcal{L}$ and $Y \subset \mathcal{L}$. Y is a consequence of X with regard to \mathcal{M} i.e.

$$X \Vdash_{\mathcal{M}} Y$$

iff there is no $(T,U) \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $X \subset T$ and $Y \subset U$. It is also said that the set of partitions \mathcal{M} generates the consequence relation $\Vdash_{\mathcal{M}}$.

If we presuppose nothing about the internal structure of the formulae of \mathcal{L} , and about their semantical interconnections, we have to be prepared to allow any set of partitions of formulae

to play the role of \mathcal{M} . So, we are led to the general definition of the multiple consequence relation proposed in [S].

Definition 2. A relation \models on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ is a consequence relation iff there is a set of partitions \mathcal{M} such that $\models = \models_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Remark: Each set of partitions \mathcal{M} determines, and is completely determined, by $\mathcal{T} = \{T : (\exists U)(T, U) \in \mathcal{M}\}$ which will be called its true set, or by $\mathcal{U} = \{U : (\exists T)(T, U) \in \mathcal{M}\}$ which will be called its untrue set. So, we will talk about consequence with regard to \mathcal{U} , or with regard to \mathcal{T} , or with regard to \mathcal{M} , synonymously and we will use the notations $\models_{\mathcal{M}}$, $\models_{\mathcal{T}}$, $\models_{\mathcal{U}}$ interchangeably.

We consider the three special cases (i.e. restrictions) of the consequence relation \models .

- (i) The most common single-conclusion relation which permits only one conclusion and which accordingly has instances of the form

$$X \Vdash B \quad X \subset \mathcal{L}, \quad B \in \mathcal{L}.$$

- (ii) The single-premiss relation which permits only one premiss and which accordingly has instances of the form

$$A \Vdash Y \quad A \in \mathcal{L}, \quad Y \subset \mathcal{L}.$$

- (iii) The singular relation which permits only one premiss and only one conclusion, and which accordingly has instances of the form

$$A \vdash B \quad A \in \mathcal{L}, \quad B \in \mathcal{L}.$$

It is evident that these restrictions satisfy

$$(1) \quad \vdash = \Vdash \cap \Vdash$$

The characterization theorem, proved in [S] p.16, states that a single-conclusion relation is a consequence relation iff it is closed under

| | |
|--------------|--|
| overlap | $B \in X \rightarrow X \Vdash B$ |
| dilution | $X' \Vdash B \ \& \ X' \subset X \rightarrow X \Vdash B$, and |
| cut for sets | $X, Z \Vdash B \ \& \ (\forall A \in Z) X \Vdash A \rightarrow X \Vdash B$. |

Results on counterparts, in ch. 5 of [S] (p.72-74.), may be understood as proving that different sets of partitions may generate one and the same single-conclusion consequence relation.

Considering single-conclusion (single-premiss) consequence relations as closure operators, in a Tarskian way, we will find simple conditions that must be satisfied by different sets of partitions in order to generate the same consequence relation. Incidentally the characterization theorem for single-conclusion (single-premiss) consequence relations will turn out to be an immediate corollary to the characterization theorem for closure operators.

II A single-conclusion relation \Vdash , with instances of the form $X \Vdash B$ ($X \subset \mathcal{L}$, $B \in \mathcal{L}$), determines and is completely determined by the corresponding consequence-operator

$$\Vdash: \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \text{ defined by } \Vdash X = \{B : X \Vdash B\}.$$

A consequence-operator $\Vdash_{\mathcal{T}}$, which corresponds to $\Vdash_{\mathcal{T}}$, may be characterized referring directly to the true set \mathcal{T} . This is the content of the following lemma.

Lemma 1. A consequence-operator $\vdash^{\mathcal{T}}$ corresponds to the single-conclusion consequence relation $\Vdash_{\mathcal{T}}$ iff $\vdash^{\mathcal{T}} X = \bigcap \{T : X \subset T \text{ \& } T \in \mathcal{T}\}$.

Proof: $A \in \vdash^{\mathcal{T}} X$ iff $X \Vdash_{\mathcal{T}} A$ iff $(\forall T)(X \subset T \text{ \& } T \in \mathcal{T} \rightarrow A \in T)$ iff $A \in \bigcap \{T : X \subset T \text{ \& } T \in \mathcal{T}\}$.

Hence, the consequence-operator $\vdash^{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ is a closure operator on \mathcal{L} , in the sense of the following definition.

Definition 3. Let \mathcal{L} be any set and let \mathcal{T} be any set of subsets of \mathcal{L} , i.e. $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$. The closure operator generated by \mathcal{T} is a function $\bar{\ }^{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$, such that

$$\bar{X}^{\mathcal{T}} = \bigcap \{T : X \subset T \text{ \& } T \in \mathcal{T}\}.$$

A function $\bar{\ } : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ is a closure operator on \mathcal{L} iff there exists $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\bar{\ } = \bar{\ }^{\mathcal{T}}$.

Note that we impose no condition on \mathcal{T} (such as the intersection property or something else). \mathcal{T} may be any subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$.

It is quite easy to prove the following lemmas on closure operators.

Lemma 2. Any closure operator $\bar{\ }$ has the following properties:

1. $X \subset \bar{X}$,
2. $Y \subset X \rightarrow \bar{Y} \subset \bar{X}$ and
3. $\bar{\bar{X}} = \bar{X}$.

Lemma 3. A function $\bar{\ } : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ with properties 1, 2, and 3. (from lemma 2.) is a closure operator on \mathcal{L} .

Proof: It is easy to check that $\bar{\ } = \bar{\ }^{\mathcal{T}}$ for $\mathcal{T} = \{T : T \subset \mathcal{L} \text{ \& } T = \bar{T}\}$.

Definition 4. The canonical extension of $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{L}$ is the set $\overline{\mathcal{T}} = \{T: T \subset \mathcal{L} \text{ \& } T = \overline{T^{\mathcal{T}}}\}$.

Lemma 4.

$$(i) \quad \mathcal{T} \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\overline{\mathcal{T}}} = \overline{\mathcal{T}}.$$

$$(ii) \quad \overline{-\mathcal{T}} = -\overline{\mathcal{T}} \quad (\text{cf. lemma 3.}).$$

$$(iii) \quad \overline{-\mathcal{T}_1} = -\overline{\mathcal{T}_2} \quad \text{iff} \quad \overline{\mathcal{T}_1} = \overline{\mathcal{T}_2} \quad (\text{cf. lemma 3.}).$$

Lemma 5. $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ is the largest generator of $-\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 6. The canonical extension of $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{L}$ is the intersection extension i.e. $\overline{\mathcal{T}} = \{X: (\exists \mathcal{A})(\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{T} \text{ \& } X = \bigcap \mathcal{A})\}$.

Proof: If $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{T} \text{ \& } X = \bigcap \mathcal{A}$ then

$$\overline{X^{\mathcal{T}}} = \bigcap \{T: X \subset T \text{ \& } T \in \mathcal{T}\} \subset \bigcap \{T: X \subset T \text{ \& } T \in \mathcal{A}\} = \bigcap \{T: T \in \mathcal{A}\} = X$$

i.e. $\overline{X^{\mathcal{T}}} \subset X$. Hence, $\overline{X^{\mathcal{T}}} = X$. So we have proved that

$\{X: (\exists \mathcal{A})(\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{T} \text{ \& } X = \bigcap \mathcal{A})\} \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}}$. On the other hand from $\overline{X^{\mathcal{T}}} = X$

it follows that $X = \bigcap \{T: X \subset T \text{ \& } T \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}\}$ i.e. $X = \bigcap \mathcal{A}$ for

$\mathcal{A} = \{T: X \subset T \text{ \& } T \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}\} \subset \mathcal{T}$. Hence,

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}} = \{X: X \subset \mathcal{L} \text{ \& } X = \overline{X^{\mathcal{T}}}\} \subset \{X: (\exists \mathcal{A})(\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{T} \text{ \& } X = \bigcap \mathcal{A})\}.$$

Taking into account that a consequence-operator is a closure operator, the characterization theorem and the equivalent generators theorem follow at once.

Characterization theorem 1. An operator $\overline{}: \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ is a consequence-operator iff 1. $X \subset \overline{X}$, 2. $Y \subset X \rightarrow \overline{Y} \subset \overline{X}$ and 3. $\overline{\overline{X}} = \overline{X}$.

Equivalent generators theorem 1. True (untrue) sets generate one and the same consequence-operator iff their intersection (union)

extension is the same. The completion is the largest generator of the consequence-operator.

Taking into account the simple and natural connection between consequence-operators and single-conclusion consequence relations, we derive the characterization theorem of $[S]$, and the sought for characterization of equivalent generators, as simple corrolaries.

Corrolary 1. A single-conclusion relation is a consequence relation iff it is closed under overlap, dilution and cut for sets.

Proof: It is quite easy to see that 1, 2. and 3. of the characterization theorem are equivalent to overlap, dilution and cut for sets. Namely, $B \in X \rightarrow X \Vdash B$ i.e. $(\forall B \in X) X \Vdash B$ iff $(\forall B \in X) B \in \bar{X}$ i.e. $X \subset \bar{X}$. Hence, overlap is equivalent to 1. Similarly, $X' \Vdash B$ & $X' \subset X \rightarrow X \Vdash B$ iff $X' \subset X \rightarrow (B \in \bar{X}' \rightarrow B \in \bar{X})$ i.e. $X' \subset X \rightarrow \bar{X}' \subset \bar{X}$. Hence, dilution is equivalent to 2. Finally, $X, Z \Vdash B$ & $(\forall A \in Z) X \Vdash A \rightarrow X \Vdash B$ iff $Z \subset X \rightarrow (B \in \overline{X \cup Z} \rightarrow B \in \bar{X})$ i.e. $Z \subset \bar{X} \rightarrow \overline{X \cup Z} \subset \bar{X}$. Hence, cut is equivalent to $Z \subset \bar{X} \rightarrow \overline{X \cup Z} \subset \bar{X}$. Substituting \bar{X} for Z we see that 3. follows from overlap, dilution and cut. On the other hand, presupposing $Z \subset \bar{X}$ it follows from 1. that $X \cup Z \subset \bar{X}$, and then from 2. that $\overline{X \cup Z} \subset \bar{X}$, and then from 3. that $\overline{X \cup Z} \subset \bar{X}$. Hence, cut follows from 1, 2. and 3.

Corrolary 2. True (untrue) sets generate one and the same single-conclusion consequence relation iff their intersection (union) extension is the same. The extension is the largest generator of the single-conclusion consequence relation.

III A single-premiss relation \models , with instances of the form $A \models Y$ ($A \in \mathcal{L}$, $Y \subset \mathcal{L}$), determines and is completely determined by the corresponding assumption-operator $\bar{\quad} : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ defined by

$$\bar{Y} = \{A : A \models Y\}.$$

An assumption operator \models^u , which corresponds to \models_u , may be characterized referring directly to the untrue set \mathcal{U} .

Lemma 7. An assumption-operator \models^u corresponds to the single-premiss consequence relation \models_u iff $\bar{Y}^u = \bigcap \{U : Y \subset U \text{ \& } U \in \mathcal{U}\}$.

Proof: Analogous to that of lemma 1.

Hence, the assumption-operator $\models^u : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ is a closure operator on \mathcal{L} , and the characterization theorem, as well as the equivalent generators theorem, are as before.

Characterization theorem 2. An operator $\bar{\quad} : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ is an assumption-operator iff 1. $X \subset \bar{X}$, 2. $Y \subset X \rightarrow \bar{Y} \subset \bar{X}$ and 3. $\bar{\bar{X}} = \bar{X}$.

Equivalent generators theorem 2. Untrue (true) sets generate one and the same assumption-operator iff their intersection (union) extension is the same. The extension is the greatest generator of the assumption-operator.

Taking into account the simple and natural connection between assumption-operators and single-premiss consequence relations we easily derive the corrolaries:

Corrolary 3. A single-premiss relation is a consequence relation iff it is closed under

| | |
|--------------|--|
| overlap | $A \in Y \longrightarrow A \models Y,$ |
| dilution | $A \models Y' \ \& \ Y' \subset Y \longrightarrow A \models Y \quad \text{and}$ |
| cut for sets | $A \models Y, Z \ \& \ (\forall B \in Z) B \models Y \longrightarrow A \models Y.$ |

Corrolary 4. Untrue (true) sets generate one and the same single-premiss consequence relation iff their intersection (union) extension is the same. The extension is the largest generator of the single-premiss consequence relation.

Let \mathcal{M} be a set of partitions of \mathcal{L} , $\mathcal{T} = \{T : (\exists U)(T, U) \in \mathcal{M}\}$ its true set and $\mathcal{U} = \{U : (\exists T)(T, U) \in \mathcal{M}\}$ its untrue set. From

(1) follows

$$(2) \quad \models_{\mathcal{M}} = \parallel_{\mathcal{T}} \cap \models_{\mathcal{U}}.$$

Taking into account (2), corrolaries 1. and 3. imply

Corrolary 5. A singular relation \vdash is a consequence relation iff it is closed under

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| overlap | $A \vdash A$ | and |
| dilution | $A \vdash B \ \& \ B \vdash C \longrightarrow A \vdash C.$ | |

Corrolary 6. is a simple consequence of corrolaries 2. and 4.

Corrolary 6. True (untrue) sets generate one and the same singular consequence relation iff their intersection-union extension is the same. The extension is the largest generator of the singular consequence relation (i.e. the largest generator, true and untrue, is closed under unions and intersections).

Remark: Corrolaries 5. and 6. may be seen as abstract algebraic results on pre-ordered sets. Corrolary 5. asserts

that each $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$ induces a pre-order on S defined by $a \leq b := \neg(\exists T \in \mathcal{T})(a \in T \& b \notin T)$, and conversely, that each pre-order on S is induced by such a subset of $\mathcal{P}(S)$. Corrolary 6. asserts that subsets of $\mathcal{P}(S)$ induce the same pre-order on S iff they have the same intersection-union completion and that this completion is the largest generator of the pre-order.

[S] Shoesmith, D.J. & Smiley, T.J, Multiple-conclusion Logic, Cambridge University Press, 1978.

FAKULTET STROJARSTVA
I BRODOGRADNJE
SVEUCILISTA U ZAGREBU
41000 ZAGREB, ĐURE SALAJA 5

Yugoslavia