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Abstract
In this paper synthetic tableaux for Łukasiewicz’s calculus Ł3 are presented in detail. Basic properties of synthetic tableaux are described as well as a systematic procedure for constructing a tableau for any given formula of Ł3.

1. Synthetic tableaux

Synthetic tableaux method (STM) is a semantically-motivated proof method based on direct reasoning\(^1\). The main idea underlying STM is to solve \textit{via} a tableau the following problem: which (compound) formulas are “synthetizable” (can be derived from the simpler ones) on the basis of certain sets of (atomic) formulas. In the case of Ł3 a synthetic tableau for a formula \(A\) is defined as a set of derivations (\textit{synthetic inferences}) of certain expressions, describing truth-functional features of \(A\), on the basis of consistent sets of expressions, describing truth-functional features of propositional variables of \(A\). These expressions, describing the truth-functional features of formulas, will be obtained by the application of the so-called \textit{truth-signs} and will be called \textit{signed formulas} (see section 3).

One of the most distinctive features of STM is that this proof method is well grounded in the logic of questions. Synthetic tableaux were originally developed as so-called declarative parts of erotetic search scenarios (see [8] and [9] for more details), thus they can be interpreted as formal representations of systematic procedures aimed at searching for possible answers to certain kinds of questions.

\(^{*}\) The author was supported by Foundation for Polish Science. The research for this paper also benefited from a bilateral scientific exchange project funded by the Ministry of the Flemish Community (project B101/80) and the Polish State Committee for Scientific Research.

\(^{1}\) For an extended presentation of the STM-method see [6]. The present paper is based on chapter 3 of [6], but is not a mere translation of it.
2. Basics

Ł3 is a well-known three-valued propositional calculus, developed by Łukasiewicz (cf. [4] for details). The vocabulary of Ł3 consists of propositional variables \((p, q, r, \ldots, p_1, p_2, \ldots\) and so on), implication \((\rightarrow)\) and negation \((\neg)\) as the only primitive connectives, and brackets as technical symbols (which were originally avoided by Łukasiewicz by using so called Polish notation). Ł3 is not truth-functionally complete, but other standard connectives (as conjunction and disjunction) can be defined in it. The notion of a well-formed formula of Ł3 is defined in the standard way. For conciseness, instead of the expression ‘well-formed formula of Ł3’ we will use the term ‘formula’ or simply ‘wff’. We will use the letters \(\varphi, \phi, \ldots\) (possibly with subscripts) as metavariables for propositional variables, and the letters \(A, B, \ldots\) as metavariables for formulas of Ł3.

The meanings of Ł3 implication and negation are described by the following matrices (in case of implication the first column represents the value of an antecedent, the first row — the value of a consequent):

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
A & \neg A & \\
\hline
1 & 0 & \\
\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \\
0 & 1 & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
\rightarrow & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \\
\hline
1 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \\
\frac{1}{2} & 1 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \\
\end{array}
\]

The sign ‘1’ stands for Truth whereas the sign ‘0’ stands for Falsehood. The symbol ‘\(\frac{1}{2}\)’ stands for undefinedness or undeterminacy (the introduction of the third logical value was strongly connected with Łukasiewicz’s indeterministic philosophical account).

A valuation is defined as a distribution of the truth-values over the propositional variables. Valuations will be referred to as \(w, u, \ldots\) (possibly with subscripts). As 1 is the designated truth value, a Ł3-valid formula is a formula which is true under every valuation. The notions of satisfiability of a set of wffs and of a formula are defined in the usual way.
3. Signed formulas

Synthetic tableaux for Ł3 will be presented in subsequent sections using so-called signed formulas. This concept was introduced by Smullyan (see: [5]) and showed itself as extremely useful in constructing Smullyan-like tableaux. There are two main reasons for that. First, it enables a very concise formulation of inferential rules and a considerable shortening of proofs of metatheorems. The second reason is that for some logics it is impossible to construct a Smullyan-like tableaux without application of signed formulas (see [2] for more details). The same hold for synthetic tableaux.

We will use T, F, N as the truth-signs: if A is a formula, then each of the following: TA, FA, NA is a signed formula. We will use &, #, % as variables for truth-signs.

Truth-signs do not belong to the vocabulary of Ł3, so the truth values of signed formulas are not determined by valuations and matrices for connectives. Nevertheless, the truth value of a signed formula #A (where # is any of T, F, N) is dependent upon the truth value of the formula A under a certain valuation, so we will speak of the truth value of a formula #A with respect to that valuation. The definition of this notion is given by the following table (in the leftmost column there is indicated the truth value of a formula A under a valuation in question):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the truth value of a formula TA with respect to a certain valuation is the same as the truth value of A under this valuation. The same holds for FA and ¬A. In the third case, that of NA, the situation is slightly different.

In case of Smullyan’s analytic tableaux for CPC it is extremely easy to obtain an unsigned version of a tableau from a signed one: it suffices to omit all T's and to transform all F's into ‘¬’. The same holds in the opposite direction and the same holds for synthetic tableaux for CPC. But this is not the general feature of tableaux: as we have mentioned above, in some cases the truth signs are indispensable. This is also the case here: there is no simple method of elimination of the truth signs in case of synthetic tableaux for Ł3 (at least if one is not going to introduce into the vocabulary of Ł3 some uncommon connectives).
4. Further syntax

In what follows we will make use of the notions of a subformula of a formula \( A \) and of a degree of complexity of a formula.

If \( A \) is a formula of the form \( \neg B \) (or of the form \( (B \rightarrow C) \), respectively), then \( B \) is (or both \( B, C \) are) a proper subformula(s) of \( A \) and, at the same moment, the only immediate subformula(s) of \( A \). If \( A \) is a propositional variable, then it has no proper subformulas at all. A formula \( B \) is a subformula of a formula \( A \) iff (if and only if) \( B \) is a proper subformula of \( A \) or \( A = B \). It follows that if \( C \) is a subformula of some subformula of \( A \), then \( C \) is a subformula of \( A \). The set of all subformulas of \( A \) will be referred to as \( \text{Sub}(A) \).

The notion of a degree of complexity of a formula \( A \) (symbolically: \( \text{deg}(A) \)) is defined here as the measure of the number of arguments of the connectives occurring in \( A \):

(i) if \( A \) is a propositional variable, then \( \text{deg}(A) \) is 0;
(ii) \( \text{deg}(\neg A) \) is \( \text{deg}(A) + 1 \);
(iii) \( \text{deg}(A \rightarrow B) \) is \( \text{deg}(A) + \text{deg}(B) + 2 \).

Since the truth-signs \( T, F, N \) are not symbols of the vocabulary of \( \mathcal{L}3 \), the notions of a subformula and of a degree of complexity of signed formulas are defined in the same way as for their unsigned counterparts:

\[
\text{Sub}(A) = \text{Sub}(TA) = \text{Sub}(FA) = \text{Sub}(NA) \\
\text{deg}(A) = \text{deg}(TA) = \text{deg}(FA) = \text{deg}(NA)
\]

In the construction of the synthetic tableaux for \( \mathcal{L}3 \) the following rules will be applied (we will call them \( \mathcal{L}3 \)-rules):

- **CT-rule:**
  \[
  \frac{FA | TB | NA, NB}{T(A \rightarrow B)}
  \]
- **CF-rule:**
  \[
  \frac{TA, FB}{F(A \rightarrow B)}
  \]
- **CN-rule:**
  \[
  \frac{NA, FB | TA, NB}{N(A \rightarrow B)}
  \]

- **NT-rule:**
  \[
  \frac{FA}{T \neg A}
  \]
- **NF-rule:**
  \[
  \frac{TA}{F \neg A}
  \]
- **NN-rule:**
  \[
  \frac{NA}{N \neg A}
  \]

The CT-rule allows one to derive \( T(A \rightarrow B) \) from any of \( FA, TB \) or from the pair \( NA, NB \). The other rules should be understood in an analogous way.

We shall call a formula \( A \) a \( \mathcal{L}3 \)-consequence of a set of wffs \( X \) iff there exists at least one derivation of \( A \) from \( X \) by means of the above rules.
In what follows we will omit brackets round arguments of the truth-signs, e.g. we will write \( \text{T}A \rightarrow B \) instead of \( \text{T}(A \rightarrow B) \). This convention will not lead to any misunderstanding as no signed formula can be a subformula of any wff.

5. Synthetic inferences

**Definition 1:** Let \#A be a signed formula.
A finite sequence \( S = s_1, \ldots, s_n \) of signed wffs is a synthetic inference of \#A if:

1. every term of \( S \) is a subformula of \( A \), preceded by a truth-sign;
2. \( s_1 \) is a signed propositional variable;
3. \( s_n \) is \#A;
4. for every \( s_g \) (where \( g = 1, \ldots, n \)) of \( S \) one of the following holds:
   a. if \( s_g \) is a signed propositional variable \#\( \varphi \), then none of \#\( \varphi \), \&\( \varphi \), \%\( \varphi \) (where \#, \&, \% are distinct truth-signs) occurs at any other place in \( S \);
   b. \( s_g \) is a \( \text{L3} \)-consequence of some earlier formula(s) of \( S \).

It is obvious that clauses 4a and 4b are disjoint.
Thus a synthetic inference of a signed formula \#A is a finite sequence of signed subformulas of it, which begins with some signed propositional variable and ends with \#A itself. Moreover, every (signed) propositional variable occurs as a term in \( S \) only once, no matter of truth-signs, and every formula which is not a (signed) propositional variable is derivable form some earlier formula(s) of \( S \) by means of \( \text{L3} \)-rules.
Let us consider two examples:

**Example 1**
A synthetic inference \( S_1 \) of a formula \( \text{T}(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)) \):
\[ S_1 = \text{T}p, \text{N}q, \text{N}p \rightarrow q, \text{N}p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q), \text{T}(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)) \]

**Example 2**
A synthetic inference \( S_2 \) of a formula \( \text{T}(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)) \):
\[ S_2 = \text{T}q, \text{T}p \rightarrow q, \text{T}p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q), \text{T}(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)) \]

It is easily seen that a synthetic inference of a formula \#A can be viewed as a derivation of \#A on the basis of certain set of signed propositional variables of \( A \) such that every propositional variable of \( A \) occurs in this set (in a signed form) at most once.
In the above examples the terms of the sequences \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) were ordered
according to their degrees of complexity. It is worthy noticing that such an
ordering is not an essential feature of synthetic inferences. As an example,
consider the following synthetic inference of the same formula (see also ex-
ample 6):

Example 3
A synthetic inference $s_3$ of a formula $T(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$:
$s_3 = Fp, Tp \rightarrow q, Nq, Tp \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q), T(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$

Example 3 shows also that synthetic inferences need not be “deductively
minimal”. That is, they may contain some inferential steps that are deduc-
tively superfluous (here this pertains to the formulas $Nq$ and $Tp \rightarrow q$).

6. Synthetic tableaux

We are now in a position to introduce the main concept of this paper, that is,
the notion of a synthetic tableau for a given wff of $L3$.

Definition 2: Let $A$ be an unsigned formula. A family $\Omega$ of finite sequences
of signed wffs is a synthetic tableau for $A$ if every element of $\Omega$ is a synthetic
inference of $TA$, or of $FA$, or of $NA$, there exists a propositional variable $\varphi$
such that the first element of every sequence in $\Omega$ is one of the $T\varphi$, $F\varphi$, $N\varphi$,
and for every sequence $s = s_1, \ldots, s_n$ in $\Omega$ the following holds ($\&, \#, \%$ are
supposed to represent distinct truth-signs):

(*) if $s_i$ (where $i = 1, \ldots, n$) is a signed propositional variable $\#\varphi$, then
(1) there exists in $\Omega$ a sequence $s^*$ such that its $i$-th element is $\%\varphi$
and, if $i > 1$, then $s$ and $s^*$ do not differ to the level of their
$i$ 1th terms;
(2) there exists in $\Omega$ a sequence $s^{**}$ such that its $i$-th element is $\&\varphi$
and, if $i > 1$, then $s$ and $s^{**}$ do not differ to the level of their
$i$ 1th terms;
(3) if $i > 1$, then for every sequence $s^*$ in $\Omega$ such that $s$ and $s^*$ do
not differ to the level of their $i$ 1th terms, the $i$-th term of $s^*$ is
one of the following: $T\varphi$, $F\varphi$, $N\varphi$.

Thus a synthetic tableau $\Omega$ for a formula $A$ is a set of interconnected syn-
thetic inferences of $TA$, or of $FA$, or of $NA$. Every element of $\Omega$ begins with
a fixed propositional variable, preceded with a truth-sign. If the $i$-th element
of a certain synthetic inference $s$ in $\Omega$ is a signed propositional variable $\#\varphi$,
then $\Omega$ contains synthetic inferences $s^*$, $s^{**}$ such that they do not differ from
$s$ to the level of their $i$ 1th terms and whose $i$-th terms are $\%\varphi$ and $\&\varphi$,
respectively. Moreover, if a synthetic inference \( S \) in \( \Omega \) has a signed propositional variable \( \#\phi \) as its \( i \)-th term \((i > 1)\), then each synthetic inference in \( \Omega \) which is identical with \( S \) to the level of their \( i \)-th terms has as its \( i \)-th term one of the following: \( T\phi \), \( F\phi \), \( N\phi \).

These are two examples of synthetic tableaux for the formulas of \( \mathcal{L}3 \). The first is very simple, the second is a bit more complicated.

**Example 4**
A synthetic tableau for the formula \((p \rightarrow \neg p) \rightarrow \neg p\):

\[
T_p \quad F_p \quad N_p \\
\neg F_p \quad T_{\neg p} \quad N_{\neg p} \\
F_p \rightarrow \neg p \quad T(p \rightarrow \neg p) \rightarrow \neg p \\
T(p \rightarrow \neg p) \rightarrow \neg p
\]

**Example 5**
A synthetic tableau for the formula \((p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow \neg p)\):

\[
\begin{align*}
T_p & \quad F_p \\
& \quad T_{\neg p} \\
& \quad T_{\neg q} \rightarrow \neg p \\
& \quad T(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow \neg p) \\
T_{\neg q} & \quad N_{\neg q} \\
& \quad F_p \\
& \quad F_{\neg q} \\
& \quad N_{\neg q} \\
& \quad T_{\neg q} \\
& \quad T_{\neg q} \rightarrow \neg p \\
& \quad T(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow \neg p) \\
T(q) & \quad F_q \\
& \quad F_{\neg q} \\
& \quad N_{\neg q} \\
& \quad T_{\neg q} \\
& \quad T_{\neg q} \rightarrow \neg p \\
& \quad T(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow \neg p) \\
T(p \rightarrow q) & \quad N_{\neg q} \\
& \quad T(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow \neg p) \\
& \quad T(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow \neg p)
\end{align*}
\]

Synthetic tableaux are defined as sets of sequences of wffs. Nevertheless, as in the above examples, we are going to represent them in a tree-like form, where every branch of a tree represents a certain synthetic inference of the tableau in question. The last formula of a synthetic inference is indicated by underlining.

For the purposes of simplicity we shall call the elements of a synthetic tableau \( \Omega \) paths of \( \Omega \). If the last element of a path \( S \) is \( \#A \) we shall say that \( S \) leads to \( \#A \). By \( T_s \) we will denote the set of all the (signed) formulas occurring at the path \( S \).
Just as in case of synthetic inferences, “deductive minimality” of synthetic tableaux is not warranted by definition. Consider the following example:

Example 6
A synthetic tableau for the formula ‘\( (p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\neg p \rightarrow \neg q) \)’:

Two inferences beginning with \( \neg p \), \( Tq \) (the fourth and the third one to the right, indicated by the double-line) are simply sequences that differ with respect to the ordering of their terms. A less trivial example is the following:

Example 7
A synthetic tableau for the formula ‘\( \neg p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q) \)’:

In this case the leftmost inference and the inference next to it represent two distinct derivations of the formula ‘\( \neg p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q) \)’ on the basis of the very same set of signed variables \( \{Tp, Tq\} \).
7. Minimal error points

In further metatheorems we will use the notion of a minimal error point\(^2\) of a synthetic inference.

**Lemma 1:** Let a sequence \(S = s_1, \ldots, s_n\) be a synthetic inference of a certain formula \(\#A\) and let \(w\) be a valuation such that \(w\) does not satisfy \(T_s\) (recall that \(T_s\) is the set of all the terms of \(S\)). Then there exists an index \(k(k = 1, \ldots, n)\) such that:

1. \(s_k\) is a signed propositional variable;
2. the truth value of \(s_k\) with respect to \(w\) is \(0\) or \(\frac{1}{2}\);
3. there is no \(j < k\) such that the truth value of \(s_j\) with respect to \(w\) is \(0\) or \(\frac{1}{2}\).

We call \(k\) the minimal error point of \(S\) with respect to \(w\).

The proof of Lemma 1, which we omit here, is an indirect one and is based on the fact that the \(\mathcal{L}3\)-rules are sound, so the first formula in \(S\) which is not true (if any) cannot be a \(\mathcal{L}3\)-consequence of any earlier formulas of \(S\) and thus it must be a (signed) propositional variable.

8. Metatheorems

In a series of theorems we shall present the basic properties of synthetic tableaux for \(\mathcal{L}3\).

**Lemma 2:** Let \(A\) be an unsigned formula and let \(w\) be a valuation such that \(A\) is true under \(w\). Let \(W\) be a set made up of all the propositional variables of \(A\) such that:

\[
(*) \text{ for every propositional variable } \varphi \text{ of } A:
\begin{align*}
&1. T\varphi \text{ belongs to } W \text{ iff } \varphi \text{ is true under } w; \\
&2. F\varphi \text{ belongs to } W \text{ iff } \varphi \text{ is false under } w; \\
&3. N\varphi \text{ belongs to } W \text{ iff } \varphi \text{ is undetermined under } w.
\end{align*}
\]

Then \(TA\) is a \(\mathcal{L}3\)-consequence of \(W\) and there exists a synthetic inference of \(TA\).

Proof

First we shall show that \(TA\) is a \(\mathcal{L}3\)-consequence of \(W\), that is, that there exists a derivation of \(TA\) from \(W\) by means of \(\mathcal{L}3\)-rules.

\(^2\)This notion is due to Wiśniewski (cf. [9]).
Let $P$ be the set of all the subformulas of $A$, preceded by a truth-sign. Let $P^*$
be the smallest subset of $P$ such that:

(1) $TC$ belongs to $P^*$ iff $C$ is true under $w$;
(2) $FC$ belongs to $P^*$ iff $C$ is false under $w$;
(3) $NC$ belongs to $P^*$ iff $C$ is undetermined under $w$.

It is obvious that $W$ is a subset of $P^*$ and that $TA$ belongs to $P^*$.

Now, build up a sequence $d = d_1, \ldots, d_s$ of the elements of $P^*$ ordered by
the increasing degree of their complexity in such a way that every formula
of degree $n$ should precede in $d$ any formula of degree $n + 1$. An exact order
of the formulas of the same degree does not matter, with two exceptions:

(i) signed propositional variables should be ordered alphabetically;
(ii) the last element of $d$ should be $TA$ (this clause is added for the purpose
of clarity only; in fact it is superfluous).

Moreover, $d$ should be a sequence without repetitions.

Thus, if $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_t$ are all the propositional variables of $A$, then the $t$ first
terms of $d$ are signed propositional variables and the degree of complexity
of any further term of $d$ is greater than 0. It can be shown by induction on
the degree of complexity of the terms of $d$ that for any $i (i = 1, \ldots, s)$, $d_i$ is
a $\mathcal{L}3$-consequence of $W$:

(I) If $\deg(d_i) = 0$, then $d_i$ is a signed propositional variable and, at the same moment, $d_i$ is in $W$;

(II) Suppose that $\deg(d_i) > 0$; moreover, suppose that for any $m < i$, $d_m$ is a $\mathcal{L}3$-consequence of $W$.

Obviously, if $\deg(d_i) > 0$, then there is a formula $G$ such that $d_i$ is
in either of the form $T\neg G$ or $F\neg G$ or $N\neg G$, or there are formulas $G$, $H$
such that $d_i$ is in either of the form $T G \rightarrow H$ or $F G \rightarrow H$ or
$N G \rightarrow H$.

(a) If $d_i$ is $T\neg G$, then, since $\neg G$ is a subformula of $A$, then $G$ is
a subformula of $A$ as well. As $T\neg G$ is member of $P^*$, $\neg G$ is
true under $w$ and $G$ is false under $w$. This means that $FG$ is in
$P^*$ and that there exists an index $f$ such that $d_f$ is $FG$. Since
$
\deg(FG) < \deg(T\neg G)$, then $f < i$. Thus, on the basis of inductive
assumption and by the $NT$-rule (and due to idempotency of
the consequence operator in question), $d_i$ is a $\mathcal{L}3$-consequence
of $W$.

The other cases can be proved in a similar way.

This ends the first part of the proof.

It is easily seen that the sequence $d$ is also a synthetic inference of the for-
formula $TA$. For observe the following:
(1) every term of \( \textbf{d} \) is a signed subformula of \( A \);
(2) the first term of \( \textbf{d} \) is a signed propositional variable;
(3) the last term of \( \textbf{d} \) is \( \text{T}A \);
(4) every term of \( \textbf{d} \) is either a signed propositional variable (and, due to
the conditions imposed on the set \( W \) and the sequence \( \textbf{d} \), clause 4a of
definition 1 is met) or is a \( \text{L3} \)-consequence of some earlier formula(s)
of \( \textbf{d} \).

The following two lemmas can be proved in an analogous way:

**Lemma 3:** Let \( A \) be an unsigned formula and let \( w \) be a valuation such that
\( A \) is false under \( w \). Let \( W \) be a set made up of all the propositional variables
of \( A \) such that:

\((*)\) for every propositional variable \( \varphi \) of \( A \):
(1) \( \text{T} \varphi \) belongs to \( W \) iff \( \varphi \) is true under \( w \);
(2) \( \text{F} \varphi \) belongs to \( W \) iff \( \varphi \) is false under \( w \);
(3) \( \text{N} \varphi \) belongs to \( W \) iff \( \varphi \) is undetermined under \( w \).

Then \( \text{F}A \) is a \( \text{L3} \)-consequence of \( W \) and there exists a synthetic inference of
\( \text{F}A \).

**Lemma 4:** Let \( A \) be an unsigned formula and let \( w \) be a valuation such that
\( A \) is undetermined under \( w \). Let \( W \) be a set made up of all the propositional variables
of \( A \) such that:

\((*)\) for every propositional variable \( \varphi \) of \( A \):
(1) \( \text{T} \varphi \) belongs to \( W \) iff \( \varphi \) is true under \( w \);
(2) \( \text{F} \varphi \) belongs to \( W \) iff \( \varphi \) is false under \( w \);
(3) \( \text{N} \varphi \) belongs to \( W \) iff \( \varphi \) is undetermined under \( w \).

Then \( \text{N}A \) is a \( \text{L3} \)-consequence of \( W \) and there exists a synthetic inference of
\( \text{N}A \).

The central theorems of the present paper are the following soundness and
completeness theorems:

**Theorem 1:** If a formula \( A \) is \( \text{L3} \)-valid, then there exists a synthetic tableau
\( \Omega \) for \( A \) such that every path of \( \Omega \) leads to \( \text{T}A \).

**Proof**
Let \( A \) be a certain valid formula of \( \text{L3} \). Let \( K \) be the set of all the proposi-
tional variables of \( A \). Let \( \varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_p \) be all the distinct members of \( K \),
ordered alphabetically. Thus there exist \( t = 3^p \) valuations, which differ with
respect to truth values assigned to the variables \( \varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_p \). Let's now assign
to every propositional variable \( \varphi_h (h = 1, \ldots, p) \) \( t \)-terms sequence \( u^h \) of the
truth values 1, \(1/2, 0\); the \(g\)-th (\(g = 1, \ldots, t\)) term of the sequence \(u^h\) is defined in the following way (\(\times\) stands here for the sign of multiplication):

\[
u^h_g = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } 1 \leq g \leq 3^{p-h} \\
0 & \text{if } 3^{p-h} < g \leq 2 \times 3^{p-h} \\
1/2 & \text{if } 2 \times 3^{p-h} < g \leq 3^{(p-h)+1} \\
u^h_{g-r} & \text{if } 3^{(p-h)+1} < g \leq 3^p, \text{ where } r = 3^{(p-h)+1}
\end{cases}
\]

Now, define \(t = 3^p\) \(p\)-terms sequences of truth values; the sequence \(v^z\) (where \(z = 1, \ldots, t\)) is given by the following formula:

\[
v^z = u^1_z, u^2_z, \ldots, u^p_z
\]

Every sequence \(v^z\) defines a certain class of valuations, namely, these under which the variable \(\varphi_h\) takes the value \(u^h_z\) for \(h = 1, \ldots, p\). Moreover, every valuation belongs to exactly one such a class. Valuations which belong to distinct classes (that is, defined by distinct sequences \(v^1, \ldots, v^t\)) do differ with respect to the truth values assigned to the variables of \(A\) (that is, \(\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_p\)). Let \(w^1, \ldots, w^t\) be valuations which belong to the classes determined by \(v^1, \ldots, v^t\), respectively.

Now for every valuation \(w^b\) (where \(b = 1, \ldots, t\)) we define a \(p\)-term sequence \(d^b = d^b_1, \ldots, d^b_p\) of signed propositional variables of \(A\). The \(j\)-th term of the sequence \(d^b\) is defined in the following way:

\[
d^b_j = \begin{cases} 
T \varphi_j & \text{if } \varphi_j \text{ is true under } w^b; \\
F \varphi_j & \text{if } \varphi_j \text{ is false under } w^b; \\
N \varphi_j & \text{if } \varphi_j \text{ is undetermined under } w^b
\end{cases}
\]

where \(j = 1, \ldots, p\).

Note, that \(d^b\) contains no repetitions.

---

3 Consider the following example. Let \(A = 'p \land q \rightarrow p'\). Thus all the distinct variables of \(A\) are \(p, q\) (ordered alphabetically). The sequence \(u^p\) of truth-values, assigned to the variable \(p\) will look as follows: \(u^p = 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1/2, 1/2, 1/2\) whereas to the variable \(q\) will be assigned the sequence \(u^q = 1, 0, 1/2, 1, 0, 1/2, 1, 0, 1/2\). The relevant \(v\)-sequences are: \(v^1 = 1, 1, v^2 = 1, 0, v^3 = 1, 1/2, v^4 = 0, 1, v^5 = 0, 0, v^6 = 0, 1/2, v^7 = 1/2, 1, v^8 = 1/2, 0, v^9 = 1/2, 1/2\). As for an example of \(d\)-sequences: the sequence determined by a valuation that is defined by the sequence \(v^3\) is the following: \(d^3 = Tp, Nq\).
Let \( W_b \) be the set of all the formulas of \( d^b \). The following condition is met by \( W_b \):

(*) for every propositional variable \( \varphi \) of \( A \):

1. \( T\varphi \) belongs to \( W_b \) if \( \varphi \) is true under \( w \);
2. \( F\varphi \) belongs to \( W_b \) if \( \varphi \) is false under \( w \);
3. \( N\varphi \) belongs to \( W_b \) if \( \varphi \) is undetermined under \( w \).

Since \( A \) is \( L_3 \)-valid, then it is true under every valuation, including \( w^1, \ldots, w^t \). Thus, by Lemma 2, for any of \( w^1, \ldots, w^t \) there exists a certain \( L_3 \)-derivation of \( TA \) on the basis of \( W_1, \ldots, W_t \), respectively. Now we assign to every of \( W_1, \ldots, W_t \) such a derivation, built up as in the proof of Lemma 2; the only restriction is that derivation \( D^b \) assigned to the set \( W_b \) begins with \( d^b \) as its starting sequence, that is, \( D^b_e = d^b_e \) for \( e = 1, \ldots, p \) (according to the definition of the sequence \( d^b \) signed propositional variables of \( A \) occur in it in the alphabetical order, determined by their unsigned counterparts).

By Lemma 2, any of the derivations \( D^1, \ldots, D^t \) is a synthetic inference of \( TA \) (and none of them are identical).

Let \( \Omega = \{D^1, \ldots, D^t\} \). We shall show that \( \Omega \) is a synthetic tableau for the formula \( A \).

1. Every sequence in \( \Omega \) is a synthetic inference of \( TA \).
2. The first term of every sequence in \( \Omega \) is the signed propositional variable \( \varphi_1 \) and at least one sequence in \( \Omega \) begins with \( T\varphi_1 \), at least one with \( F\varphi_1 \) and at least one with \( N\varphi_1 \).
3. The first \( p \) terms of every sequence in \( \Omega \) are signed propositional variables of \( A \), ordered alphabetically. Thus, if \( #, \& , \% \) are distinct truth-signs, then if \( \#\phi \) is the \( q \)-th term of the sequence \( D^s \) (where \( s = 1, \ldots, t \)), then \( \Omega \) contains sequences \( D^s, D^s' \) which do not differ from \( D^s \) up to the level of their \( q-1 \)th terms (if there are any) and are such that the \( q \)-th term of \( D^s \) is \( \&\phi \) while the \( q \)-th term of \( D^s' \) is \( \%\phi \). Moreover, if \( \#\phi \) is the \( q \)-th term of \( D^s \), then there is no term in \( D^s \) of any of the form: \( T\phi, F\phi, N\phi \) other than the \( q \)-th. Finally, if \( D^s \) and \( D^s' \) do not differ up to their \( q-1 \)th terms and \( D^s_q \) is \( \#\phi \), then \( D^s_q' \) is in one of the forms: \( T\phi, F\phi, N\phi \).

Thus \( \Omega \) is a synthetic tableau for \( A \) such that every path of it leads to \( TA \). ■

Theorem 2: If there exists a synthetic tableau \( \Omega \) for a formula \( A \) such that every path of \( \Omega \) leads to \( TA \), then \( A \) is \( L_3 \)-valid.
Proof

Suppose that there exists a synthetic tableau $\Omega$ for a formula $A$ such that every path of $\Omega$ leads to $TA$. Moreover, suppose (for an indirect proof) that $A$ is not $\mathcal{L}_3$-valid. Since all the terms of paths of $\Omega$ are signed subformulas of $A$, $\Omega$ is a finite set.

Since $A$ is not $\mathcal{L}_3$-valid, there exists a certain valuation $w$ such that $A$ is false under $w$ or $A$ is undetermined under $w$, that is, either $FA$ or $NA$ is true with respect to $w$. Since every path of $\Omega$ leads to $TA$, then $w$ does not satisfy any set of formulas of a path of $\Omega$. Therefore, by Lemma 1, for every path of $\Omega$ there exists a minimal error point with respect to the valuation $w$. Let $\omega$ be the set of all the minimal error points of the paths of $\Omega$ with respect to the valuation $w$ (so, $\omega$ is a set of indices, i.e. positive integers).

The set $\omega$ is finite and thus must have a maximal element, that is, there exists an index $k$ such that for any $j$ in $\omega$, $j \leq k$. Let $S$ be a path of $\Omega$ such that its minimal error point is the maximal one, that is, $k$. By Lemma 1, $s_k$ is a signed propositional variable, $s_k$ is false or is undetermined with respect to $w$ and either $s_k$ is the first term of $S$, or every term that precedes $s_k$ in $S$ is true with respect to $w$.

Let $\#, \&, \%$ be the distinct truth-signs. If $s_k$ is the first term of $S$, then there are paths $S^*$, $S^{**}$ of $\Omega$ such that, if $s_k = \# \phi$, then $s_k^* = \& \phi$ and $s_k^{**} = \% \phi$. Therefore, one of the $s_k^*$, $s_k^{**}$ is bound to be true with respect to $w$.

If $s_k$ is not the first term of $S$, then there exist paths $S^*$, $S^{**}$ of $\Omega$ such that for every $s_d$ which precedes $s_k$ in $S$, $s_d = s_d^* = s_d^{**}$ (remember that every term of $S$ which precedes $s_k$ is true with respect to the valuation $w$) and, if $s_k = \# \phi$, then $s_k^* = \& \phi$ and $s_k^{**} = \% \phi$. Therefore, one of the $s_k^*$, $s_k^{**}$ is bound to be true with respect to $w$.

By Lemma 1, for every path of $\Omega$ there exists a minimal error point with respect to the valuation $w$, so there exist also such minimal error points of the paths $s_k^*$ and $s_k^{**}$. According to what has been shown above, the minimal error point of one of them must be greater than the minimal error point of $S$.

This means that the minimal error point of either $S^*$ or $S^{**}$ is greater than the maximal element of $\omega$, so we arrive at a contradiction. Therefore the valuation $w$ satisfies the set of all the formulas of at least one path of $\Omega$. Since every path of $\Omega$ leads to $TA$, then $TA$ is true with respect to $w$ and thus $A$ itself is true under $w$.

By using similar ideas as in the proof of Theorem 1, one can prove the following:

---

This proof is based on the idea that comes from Wiśniewski’s [9].
Theorem 3: For every formula A of Ł3 there exists a synthetic tableau for A.

One can also prove the following:

Theorem 4: A formula A is Ł3-valid iff every synthetic tableau Ω for A is such that every path of Ω leads to ΤA.

Therefore, one can show that synthetic tableaux method is both an adequate proof method and an effective decision procedure for Ł3. Moreover, the situation is similar in the case of any propositional Łukasiewicz-like finite-valued calculus.

9. A systematic procedure

In the present subsection we describe a systematic, finite and effective procedure for constructing a synthetic tableau for any formula of Ł3 that is based on the proofs of lemmata 2–4 and of Theorem 1.

To this end we need to determine an alphabetical order of the formulas of Ł3. Suppose that propositional variables of Ł3 are made up of the symbols ϕ and |; e.g. the fourth variable becomes ϕ ||||. Thus the alphabet of Ł3 consists of the following six signs:

\[ \rightarrow \rightarrow ()\varphi \mid \]

We shall call this ordering alphabetical. An alphabetical order of the formulas of Ł3 with respect to the alphabetical ordering of the symbols of Ł3 is defined in the standard way.

Now we are in a position to describe a systematic procedure for constructing a synthetic tableau for any formula of Ł3.

Let \( \varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k \) be all the distinct propositional variables of a formula A of Ł3.

Task
Build a synthetic tableau for A.
Step 1
Determine all the valuations that differ with respect to the truth-values assigned to variables $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k$. Let $w_1, \ldots, w_r$ be all this distinct valuations.$^5$

Step 2
Perform the following substeps for $w_1$:

Substep 2a
Determine the truth value of $A$ under $w_1$.

Substep 2b
If $A$ is true under $w_1$, then build up a set $W_1$ of all the formulas that fulfil the following condition:

(*) for every propositional variable $\varphi_i$ of $A$ ($i = 1, \ldots, k$):
(1) $T \varphi_i \in W_1$ iff $\varphi_i$ is true under $w_1$,
(2) $F \varphi_i \in W_1$ iff $\varphi_i$ is false under $w_1$,
(3) $N \varphi_i \in W_1$ iff $\varphi_i$ is undetermined under $w_1$,
and then build a synthetic inference $s^1$ of $TA$ as in the proof of Lemma 2. If in $s^1$ there occur some formulas with equal degrees of complexity, they should be ordered alphabetically.

Substep 2c
If $A$ is false under $w_1$, then build up a set $W_1$ of all the formulas that fulfil the following condition:

(*) for every propositional variable $\varphi_i$ of $A$ ($i = 1, \ldots, k$):
(4) $T \varphi_i \in W_1$ iff $\varphi_i$ is true under $w_1$,
(5) $F \varphi_i \in W_1$ iff $\varphi_i$ is false under $w_1$,
(6) $N \varphi_i \in W_1$ iff $\varphi_i$ is undetermined under $w_1$,
and then build a synthetic inference $s^1$ of $FA$ as in the proof of Lemma 3. If in $s^1$ there occur some formulas with equal degrees of complexity, they should be ordered alphabetically.

$^5$To be precise, $w_1, \ldots, w_r$ represent distinct classes of valuations such that elements of the same class do not differ with respect to the truth-values assigned to variables $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k$. 
Substep 2d
If \( A \) is undetermined under \( w_1 \), then build up a set \( W_1 \) of all the formulas that fulfil the following condition:

(*) for every propositional variable \( \varphi_i \) of \( A \) \( (i = 1, \ldots, k) \):

1. \( T \varphi_i \in W_1 \) iff \( \varphi_i \) is true under \( w_1 \),
2. \( F \varphi_i \in W_1 \) iff \( \varphi_i \) is false under \( w_1 \),
3. \( N \varphi_i \in W_1 \) iff \( \varphi_i \) is undetermined under \( w_1 \),

and then build a synthetic inference \( s^1 \) of \( NA \) as in the proof of Lemma 4. If in \( s^1 \) there occur some formulas with equal degrees of complexity, they should be ordered alphabetically.

Step 3
Perform the substeps 2a–2d for the valuations \( w_2, \ldots, w_r \).

Step 4
Build up a set \( \Omega \) of the sequences \( s^1, \ldots, s^r \).

It can be easily checked that \( \Omega \) is a synthetic tableau for a formula \( A \).

10. Canonical synthetic tableaux

Synthetic tableaux built up according to the procedure described in section 9 will be called canonical. Let us compare two synthetic tableaux for the formula ‘\( p \rightarrow q \)’. The tableau of example 8 is a canonical one, whereas the tableau of example 9 is not:

Example 8
A canonical synthetic tableau for the formula ‘\( p \rightarrow q \)’:

Example 9
A (non-canonical) synthetic tableau for the formula ‘\( p \rightarrow q \)’:
It is easily seen that the tableau of example 8 contains some inferential steps that are "deductively superfluous": introduction of $T_q$, $F_q$, $N_q$ after $F_p$ is not needed in order to obtain $T_p \rightarrow q$. The procedure described in section 9 enables one to determine the maximal number of synthetic inferences that is sufficient to build up a synthetic tableau for a given formula $A$: it is equal to $3^k$, where $k$ is the number of distinct propositional variables, occurring in $A$. This procedure does not determine, however, the minimal number of synthetic inferences that are needed to this end. And the method of determining it (as well as the method of determining the minimal length of synthetic inferences) is at the moment the main open problem concerning STM. As can be observed on the basis of the examples 6–9 the problem of the minimal complexity of a synthetic tableau for a given formula should be dealt with in terms of "pragmatics" of a proof rather than in terms of purely structural conditions. Such a heuristics for STM certainly deserves further investigations$^6$.
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