Logic, Algebra, Relativity - 2002
Conference Dedicated to the Work of István Németi

November 4–8, 2002

Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics

Budapest, Hungary

Organizing commettee:
Miklós Ferenczi, Ági Kurucz, Gábor Sági, Ildikó Sain (chair)

Acknowledgement: We received financial aid from the Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics in two ways: the Institute provides us with free lecture rooms, rooms for discussion and e-mail facilities for the participants; and, as a Center of Excellence, contributes to the expenses of some invited participants.

iTA/554

CONTENTS

LOGIC, ALGEBRA, RELATIVITY - 2002
CONFERENCE DEDICATED TO THE WORK OF ISTVÁN NÉMETI

November 4 - 8, 2002
Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Budapest, Hungary

Programme

The 14:00-15:45 talks on Thursday, November 7 are in the room 'Kutyás'.
All other talks are in the Main Lecture Hall of the Institute.

MONDAY, November 4

13:00-13:40 REGISTRATION

13:45 Opening

István Juhász

14:00-15:00 A new concept of computability

Mark Hogarth

COFFEE BREAK

15:30-16:15 Reformulation of the strong cosmic censor conjecture based on computability

Gábor Etesi

16:15-16:50 Operator algebras and quantum logic

Miklós Rédei

16:50-17:25 Ontology of logic

László E. Szabó

TUESDAY, November 5

13:00-14:00 REGISTRATION

14:00-14:35 A roadmap of István Németi's journey from a design of power stations to the theory of cylindric algebras (and beyond)

Bálint Dömölki

14:35-15:20 Many-dimensional modal logics

Ági Kurucz

COFFEE BREAK

15:35-16:10 Subdirect irreducibility (a frame perspective)

Yde Venema

16:10-16:55 Strongly representable atom structures

Robin Hirsch

16:55-17:40 Aspects of the finite base/model property

Ian Hodkinson

WEDNESDAY, November 6

14:00-15:00 Quasivarieties of heterogeneous partial algebras

Peter Burmeister

15:00-15:45 Some results of Novi Sad school inspired by Andréka and Németi

Sinisa Crvenkovic, Rozália Madarász

COFFEE BREAK

16:00-16:35 On neat embeddability of cylindric algebras

Miklós Ferenczi

16:35-17:10 Neat reducts, interpolation and omitting types

Tarek Sayed Ahmed

17:10-17:55 Axiomatizability of reducts of RRA

Szabolcs Mikulás

BREAK

18:15-20:00 BIRTHDAY PARTY

THURSDAY, November 7

14:00-14:35 Understanding relativity theory through logic

Jesse Alama

14:35-15:10 Twin paradox in model theoretic terms

Gergely Székely

15:10-15:45 Undecidability of relativity theories

Sándor Vályi

COFFEE BREAK

16:00-16:45 Algebraic and topological methods in Lambda Calculus

Antonino Salibra

16:45-17:30 The finiteness principle of database theory

Csaba Henk

FRIDAY, November 8

14:00-14:35 Pictures, analogies, dualities

Gábor Sági

14:35-15:10 Relativity and quantum black holes

Amr Sayed Ahmed

COFFEE BREAK

15:25-16:25 Relativity and algebraic logic

Hajnal Andréka, Judit Madarász

	MONDAY 4
13:00-13:40	REGISTRATION
13:45	OPENING (I.Juhasz)
14:00-15:00	Hogarth
15:00-15:30	COFFEE
15:30-16:15	Etesi
16:15-16:50	Redei
16:50-17:25	Szabo

	TUESDAY 5
13:00-14:00	REGISTRATION
14:00-14:35	Domolki
14:35-15:20	Kurucz
15:20-15:35	COFFEE
15:35-16:10	Venema
16:10-16:55	Hirsch
16:55-17:40	Hodkinson

	WEDNESDAY 6
14:00-15:00	Burmeister
15:00-15:45	Crvenkovic et al
15:45-16:00	COFFEE
16:00-16:35	Ferenczi
16:35-17:10	T.SayedAhmed
17:10-17:55	Mikulas
17:55-18:15	BREAK
18:15-20:00	PARTY

	THURSDAY 7
14:00-14:35	Alama
14:35-15:10	Szekely
15:10-15:45	Valyi
15:45-16:00	COFFEE
16:00-16:45	Salibra
16:45-17:30	Henk

	FRIDAY 8
14:00-14:35	Sagi
14:35-15:10	A.SayedAhmed
15:10-15:25	COFFEE
15:25-16:25	Andreka et al

Logic, Algebra, Relativity - 2002

Conference Dedicated to the Work of István Németi

November 4–8, 2002
Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics
Budapest, Hungary

List of participants

Jesse Alama	jesse1@axelero.hu
Attila Andai	andaia@math.bme.hu
Hajnal Andréka	andreka@renyi.hu
Johan van Benthem	johan@science.uva.nl
Peter Burmeister	burmeister@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de
Sinisa Crvenkovic	sima@eunet.yu
Sndor Csizmazia	sandor.csizmazia@ahbrt.hu
Bálint Dömölki	domolki@iqsoft.hu
Gábor Etesi	etesi@renyi.hu
Márta Fehér	feherm@phil.philos.bme.hu
Miklós Ferenczi	ferenczi@math.bme.hu
Robert Goldblatt	Rob.Goldblatt@vuw.ac.nz
Csaba Henk	ekho@renyi.hu
Robin Hirsch	R.Hirsch@cs.ucl.ac.uk
Ian Hodkinson	imh@doc.ic.ac.uk
Mark Hogarth	mh10026@hotmail.com
László Kálmán	kalman@mindmaker.hu
Ági Kurucz	kuag@dcs.kcl.ac.uk
Judit Madarász	madarasz@renyi.hu
Rozália Madarász	rozi@eunet.yu
András Máté	mate@ludens.elte.hu
Szabolcs Mikulás	szabolcs@dcs.bbk.ac.uk
Don Monk	monkd@euclid.colorado.edu
Miklós Rédei	redei@hps.elte.hu
Gábor Sági	sagi@renyi.hu
Ildikó Sain	sain@renyi.hu
Antonino Salibra	salibra@dsi.unive.it
Amr Sayed Ahmed	rutahmed@rusys.eg.net
Tarek Sayed Ahmed	rutahmed@rusys.eg.net
György Serény	sereny@math.bme.hu
András Simon	andras@renyi.hu
László E. Szabó	leszabo@hps.elte.hu
Gergely Székely	turms@primposta.com
Csaba Tőke	tcs@mailbox.hu
Sándor Vályi	valyis@math.klte.hu
Péter Ván	vpet@phyndi.fke.bme.hu
Yde Venema	yde@science.uva.nl

Logic, Algebra, Relativity - 2002

Conference Dedicated to the Work of István Németi

November 4–8, 2002

Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics

Budapest, Hungary

ABSTRACTS OF TALKS

S.Crvenkovic, I.Dolinka, R.Madarasz:

Some results of Novi Sad school
inspired by Andreka and Nemeti

Some of the recent results of Novi Sad algebraic school, which are directly connected to the mathematics we have learned from Andreka and Nemeti, will be presented. This includes results on Relation Algebras, Algebras of Complexes, Kleene Algebras, Dynamic Algebras, Decidability, Formal Languages.

Gabor Etesi:

Reformulation of the strong cosmic censor conjecture
based on computability

In this lecture we provide a refomulation of the strong cosmic censor conjecture taking into account recent results on Malament--Hogarth space-times.

We claim that the strong version of the cosmic censor conjecture can be reformulated by postulating that a physically relevant space-time is either globally hyperbolic or possesses the Malament--Hogarth property. But it is known that a Malament--Hogarth space-time in principle is capable for performing non-Turing computations such as checking the consistency of ZFC set theory.

In this way we get an intimate conjectured link between the cosmic censorship scenario and computability theory.

Csaba Henk:

The finiteness principle of database theory

A paradigm of computer science that data must be stored by finite means. There are many such data storing schemes. However, database theory uses the simplest kind of data structrure: it is a paradigm (of database theory) that data are stored in tables. This paradigm has a deep impact on the range of the possible queries: only those queries are admissible which preserve finiteness, since a relation can be stored in a finite table iff it is finite. Hence I call this paradigm "the finiteness principle of database theory". But not only finite relations can be stored by finite means: e.g., the graph of a polynomial can be stored by the polyomial itself.

The talk aims two questions:

* Which sub-languages of the first order language do preserve finiteness?
* How could we relax the finiteness princile?

Ian Hodkinson:

Aspects of the finite base/model property

Since Nemeti proved in 1987 that WA has the finite algebra property, several more results for related classes of algebras and fragments of first-order logic have been proved, including by Andreka and Nemeti. A combinatorial theorem of Herwig has been central to recent progress, and recently this theorem has been strengthened. I will describe some of the ideas and history of this area of research.

Szabolcs Mikulas:

Axiomatizability of reducts of RRA

The aim of this talk is to give an overview of the axiomatizability problem of algebras of binary relations. We will focus on the finite axiomatizability of several fragments of Tarski's class of representable relation algebras. Finite axiomatizability results can be established by using the step-by-step method, while ultraproduct constructions yield non-finite axiomatizability. We will conclude with some open problems that could be tackled using either of the above methods.

Yde Venema:

Subdirect irreducibility (a frame perspective)

We give a characterization of the simple, and of the subdirectly irreducible boolean algebras with operators (including modal algebras), in terms of the dual descriptive general frame.
These characterizations involve a special binary *quasi-reachability* relation on the dual structure; we call a point a quasi-root of the dual structure if every ultrafilter is quasi-reachable from it.

We prove that a boolean algebra with operators is simple iff every point in the dual structure is a quasi-root; and that it is subdirectly irreducible iff the collection of quasi-roots has measure nonzero in the Stone topology on the dual structure.

On neat embeddability of cylindric algebras

Miklos Ferenczi

I would like to say thanks for Istvan Nemeti for calling my attention to the class relativized cylindric set algebras (Crs_α's) and to many other interesting areas of algebraic logic. He helped me much to prepare my first paper on Crs algebras. The result below is a part of my activity on this area.

As is well-known, the classical representation theorem of the theory of cylindric algebras is: $\mathcal{A} \in \mathrm{IGws}_\alpha$ if and only if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathrm{SNr}_\alpha\mathrm{CA}_{\alpha+\varepsilon}$, where $\varepsilon \geq \omega$, ε is a fixed ordinal, Gws_α is the class of generalized cylindric set algebras of dimension α, CA_α is the class of cylindric algebras of dimension α and $\mathrm{SNr}_\alpha\mathrm{CA}_{\alpha+\varepsilon}$ is the class of CA_α's that have the neat embedding property.

The following questions arise:

Is it possible to enlarge the class CA in $\mathrm{SNr}_\alpha\mathrm{CA}_{\alpha+\varepsilon}$ so that the theorem still be true?

Is it possible to generalize the theorem from the class Gws_α to the class D_α e.g.(D_α is a subclass of Crs_α for which $C_i D_{ij} = V$ where V is the unit of the algebra), and is it possible to replace the class CA in the hypothesis "$\mathcal{A} \in \mathrm{SNr}_\alpha\mathrm{CA}_{\alpha+\varepsilon}$" by a suitable class for this case?

We define a class M^α_β desired ($\alpha \leq \beta$) : M^α_β is the class for which

$$\mathrm{M}^\alpha_\beta \models \{\mathrm{C}_0, \mathrm{C}_1, \mathrm{C}_2, \mathrm{C}_3, \mathrm{C}_5, \mathrm{C}_7, {}_-\mathrm{C}_4, {}_-\mathrm{C}_6\}$$

where C_0 denotes the conjuction of the usual Boolean axioms, C_1,C_2,C_3,C_5 and C_7 are the usual cylindric axioms, ${}_-\mathrm{C}_4$ and ${}_-\mathrm{C}_6$ are definite weakenings of the usual cylindric axioms C_4 and C_6. The following theorem is true:

Theorem $\mathcal{A} \in \mathrm{ID}_\alpha$ if and only if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathrm{SNr}_\alpha\mathrm{M}^\alpha_{\alpha+\varepsilon}$.

Here we need the class F_α where $\mathrm{F}_\alpha \models \{\mathrm{C}_0,\mathrm{C}_1,\mathrm{C}_2,\mathrm{C}_3,\hat{\mathrm{C}_4},\mathrm{C}_5,\mathrm{C}_6,\mathrm{C}_7\}$ and $\hat{\mathrm{C}_4}$ is the property $c_i d_{in} c_j d_{jm} x = c_j d_{jm} c_i d_{in} x$.

e-mail: ferenczi@math.bme.hu
Techn. University of Budapest,
Department of Algebra

Quasivarieties of Heterogeneous Partial Algebras

Peter Burmeister
Department of Mathematics
Darmstadt University of Technology
e-mail: burmeister@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

Abstract: The work of István Németi together with his collaborators Hajnal Andréka and Ildikó Sain has had a great influence on my work in particular in the late seventies and the early eighties of the 20th century. Mainly their results in [AN83], of which a preprint had already appeared in 1977, and in particular the papers [AN82] and [NSa82] formed a basis for the central part of my book [B86], in which I could show that their "Meta Birkhoff Theorem" leads to a wealth of different closure operators for the description of quasivarieties definable by special kinds of quasi-identities. It contains explicitly about 30 "simple" closure operators and in addition at least 18 usually infinite families of such operators (special forms of the "Meta Birkhoff Theorem" for homogeneous partial algebras have also been discussed in the survey articles [B92] and [B93]). Besides a review of these results and on some new results on special quasivarieties, the relative behaviour of existence varieties, primitive classes and independence classes in the case of heterogenous partial algebras (cf. [B02]) will be discussed.

References

[ABN81] H.Andréka, P.Burmeister, I.Németi. *Quasivarieties of partial algebras — A unifying approach towards a two-valued model theory for partial algebras.* Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. 16, 1981, pp. 325–372.

[AN82] H. Andréka, I. Németi. *A general axiomatizability theorem formulated in terms of cone-injective subcategories.* In: Universal Algebra (Proc. Coll. Esztergom 1977), Colloq. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai, Vol. 29, North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam, 1982, pp. 13–35.

[AN83] H. Andréka, I. Németi. *Generalization of the concept of variety and quasivariety to partial algebras through category theory.* Dissertationes Mathematicae (Rozprawy Mat.) No. 204, Warszawa, 1983.

[B70] P.Burmeister. *Free partial algebras.* J. reine und angewandte Math. 241, 1970, pp. 75–86.

[B86] P.Burmeister. *A Model Theoretic Oriented Approach to Partial Algebras. Introduction to Theory and Application of Partial Algebras – Part I.* Mathematical Research Vol. 32, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.
A "not yet debugged LaTeX-translation" can be found as pdf-file in the internet at
http://www.mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de/~burmeister/

[B92] P.Burmeister. *Tools for a Theory of Partial Algebras.* In: General Algebra and Applications (Eds.: K.Denecke and H.-J.Vogel), Research and Exposition in Mathematics, Vol. 20, Heldermann Verlag Berlin, 1993, pp. 12–32.

[B93] P.Burmeister. *Partial Algebras — An Introductory Survey.* In: Algebras and Orders (Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute and Séminaire de mathématiques supérieures on algebras and orders, Montréal, Canada, July 29 – August 9,1991; Eds.: I.G.Rosenberg and G. Sabidussi), NATO ASI Series C, Vol. 389, Kluver Academic Publ., Dordrecht, London, 1993, pp. 1–70.

[B02] P.Burmeister. *Algebraic theory of quasivarieties of heterogeneous partial algebras.* Typescript at the Darmstadt University of Technology, 2002, submitted to Studia Logica.

[NSa82] I.Németi, I.Sain. *Cone-implicational subcategories and some Birkhoff-type theorems.* Universal Algebra (Proc. Coll. Esztergom 1977), Colloq. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai, Vol. 29, North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam, 1982, pp. 535–578.

Strongly representable atom structures

Robin Hirsch and Ian Hodkinson

Abstract. A relation algebra atom structure α is said to be strongly representable if all relation algebras with that atom structure are representable. This is equivalent to saying that the complex algebra $\mathit{Cm}\,\alpha$ is a representable relation algebra. We show that the class of all strongly representable relation algebra atoms structures is not closed under ultraproducts and is therefore not elementary. Our proof uses graphs Γ_r, discovered by Erdős, that cannot be coloured with any finite number of colours but where all of their 'small' induced subgraphs can be coloured with just two colours. From these graphs we build 'rainbow atom structures' $\alpha(\Gamma_r)$. The fact that Γ_r cannot be coloured finitely is enough to prove that $\alpha(\Gamma_r)$ is strongly representable and the fact that 'small induced subgraphs' of each Γ_r can be two-coloured is enough to prove that a non-principal ultraproduct $\Pi_D\,\Gamma_r$ can be two-coloured and this suffices to show that $\Pi_D\,\alpha(\Gamma_r)$ is not strongly representable. Thus the class of strongly representable atom structures is not closed under ultraproducts.

This article appears in Proc. AMS, vol. 130, pp. 1819–1831.

Pictures, Analogies, Dualities

Gábor Sági
Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Budapest, H-1053, Reáltanoda u. 13-15.
e-mail: sagi@renyi.hu

Abstract. We will present some recently obtained connections between topological and model theoretical properties of ultraproducts. Applications to finite model theory will also be discussed. Our approach will be illustrated by pictures intended to help to visualise the notions involved. Starting points of a duality theory between topology and model theory will also be illustrated by these pictures.

Relativity and Quantum Black Holes

Amr Sayed Ahmed
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science,
Cairo University, Giza, Egypt.

Abstract .
Black holes take the hitherto established laws of physics (governing both relativity and quantum mechanics) to the limit in many different respects of which we select two, the first due to Gödel and the second due to Hawking. In the context of classical general relativity, Gödel found an exotic space-time goemetry consistent with Einstein's relativity equations. In this model of Einstein's general relativity, the universe rotates so that spacetime can curve in ways that permits short cuts in spacetime allowing you to beat a light beam and journey back into the past. In Godel's (hypothetical) universe, rotation - unlike the (real) expanding universe - seems to allow time travel. Also the rotation phenemona takes place on a smaller scale in black holes. In the process of unification theories, Hawking imposes the uncertainty principle on the laws of general relativity. From this he concludes that black holes radiate light so that they are not too black after all. The above two examples, among many others not addressed herein, suggest that black holes should play a crucial role as far as unification theories are concerned. In our talk we discuss further the above ideas and other related concepts. Also we pose some questions.

Neat reducts, interpolation and omitting types

Tarek Sayed Ahmed
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science,
Cairo University, Giza, Egypt.

Abstract . Neat reducts is an old venerable notion in algebraic logic. But it often happens that unexpected viewpoints give new insights. Indeed the repercussions of the (apparently) very innocent looking fact that the class of neat reducts is not closed under forming subalgebras turns out to be enormous. In this talk we discuss some of these repercussions in connection to definability, interpolation and omitting types for variants of first order logics.

Ontology of Logic

László E. Szabó
Theoretical Physics Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Department of History and Philosophy of Science
Eötvös University, Budapest
E-mail: leszabo@hps.elte.hu

Abstract

According to the formalist doctrine mathematical objects have no meanings; we have symbols and rules governing how these symbols can be combined. That's all.

This paper goes further by formulating a more radical thesis: The signs of a formal system of mathematics should be considered as physical objects, and the formal operations as physical processes. The rules of the formal operations are (or can be, in principle) expressed in terms of the laws of physics, governing these processes. In accordance with the physicalist understanding of mind, this is true even if the operations in question are executed in head. A truth obtained through (mathematical) reasoning is, therefore, an observed outcome of a neuro-physiological (or other physical) experiment. Consequently, deduction is nothing but a particular case of induction; the certainty available in inductive generalization is the best of all possible certainties.

Undecidability of relativity theories

Sándor Vályi

Department of Computer Science
University of Debrecen, Hungary
valyis@math.klte.hu

In the last years, Andréka, Madarász and Németi developed a first-order model theory for the special relativity theory. Their theories formalise the basic principles of the common approach to the relativistic kinematics.

In this talk we demonstrate that most of the resulting theories are undecidable - even the coordinatizing field has a decidable first-order theory. This fact shows that the mentioned theories capture more from the relativity theory than the first-order theory of Minkowskian geometry which is shown to be decidable e.g. by Rob Goldblatt. The main reason for the undecidability is that these theories allow to exist objects living on a space-time trajectory no coinciding with any geodetics of the Minkowskian geometry (e.g. periodically moving bodies). Utilizing such an object we can execute a Gödel-like reasoning to find a sentence speaking about its own truth - and it gives hereditaly undecidability of these theories.

On the other hand, if we restrict the expressive power of the possible models by cutting out such objects (+ adding some natural symmetry axioms and requiring that the coordinatizing field is real-closed) then we can create a decidable extension which has enough expressive power to deal with the common classroom treatise of the special relativity.

Logic, Algebra, Relativity - 2002

Conference Dedicated to the work of István Németi

November 4–8, 2002

Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics

Budapest, Hungary

LETTERS TO ISTVÁN NÉMETI

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui

October 18, 2002

Dear Istvan,

Happy 60th Birthday !

I congratulate you on achieving this large cardinal of years. May you have uncountably many more.

I am sorry that I am not able to attend the celebrations and talk with you about the many pleasurable interactions I have had over the years with yourself, Hajnal and Ildiko.

I recall particularly my visits to Hungary in 1992 (the conference at Vesprem), and in 1995. On the second occasion I had a most interesting time staying in an apartment in the hills of Budapest, traveling round the city in a world in which my linguistic intersection with the local population was a set of measure zero.

I especially enjoyed the stimulating discussions about BAO's we held, resulting in our joint paper in the Journal of Symbolic Logic.

The Algebraic Logic Department in Budapest has made a magnificent contribution to the development of the subject, one of which you can be justly proud. Long may it continue.

With very best wishes,

Rob Goldblatt

Centre for Logic, Language and Computation
`http://www.cllc.vuw.ac.nz`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTING SCIENCES
P.O. Box 600, Wellington, New Zealand, Telephone +64 4 463 5341, Facsimile +64 4 463 5045
office@mcs.vuw.ac.nz

My contacts with Istvan Nemeti began roughly in 1978. About then I began to write a lengthy article on cylindric set algebras, based on earlier work of mine and of Leon Henkin (a joint article of Henkin and Monk appeared in 1974). Soon it was clear that Andreka and Nemeti had obtained so many results relevant to that article that something should be done about it. The solution was a joint monograph in the Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics series, with our article (Henkin, Monk, Tarski), followed by a parallel article by Andreka and Nemeti, in which they developed our ideas further and solved many of the problems which had arisen. This period of time, up to the publication of the monograph in 1981, was the time when my contacts with Istvan and friends was closest. A little bit later we again had some correspondence back and forth as the volume II of the cylindric algebra monographs of Henkin, Monk, Tarski was being prepared; this monograph appeared in 1985. Since that time, despite the efforts of Istvan and his associates, I have worked mainly on Boolean algebras, with just a little activity concerning cylindric algebras; when that little activity took place, it was associated with the Andreka, Nemeti group. So, I have enjoyed several visits to Budapest, and regret that I am unable to attend Istvan's birthday celebration.

Don Monk

Boulder, September 2002

My collaboration with István Németi and his collaborators Hajnal Andréka and Ildikó Sain started somewhat after 1977. As far as I remember, we first met on conferences at Szeged, at least in 1975. But not before his student from that time, Ana Pásztor, came to me to Darmstadt and showed me a preprint of [AN83] – this had appeared already in 1977 – I got acquainted with the work of this group and realized how it extended my ideas from [B70] and [B71]. Mainly their results in [AN82] and [NSa82], of which already preprints were around at that time, too, formed a basis for our joint paper [ABN81] and also for the central part of my book [B86], in which I could provide a lot of examples for their "Meta Birkhoff Theorem". In particular, I could show there that it leads to a wealth of different closure operators for the description of quasivarieties definable by special kinds of quasi-identities. The book contains explicitly about 30 "simple" closure operators and in addition at least 18 usually infinite families of such operators (depending on the signature). Some more have been realized in the meantime and very likely it is only the "top of an iceberg".

Unfortunately our interests developed into different directions after that time.

I wish István all the best for his future, good health, good ideas, and all the necessary strength for successful work and his private life,

Darmstadt, October 2002

Peter Burmeister

References

[ABN81] H.Andréka, P.Burmeister, I.Németi. *Quasivarieties of partial algebras — A unifying approach towards a two-valued model theory for partial algebras.* Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. 16, 1981, pp. 325–372.

[AN82] H. Andréka, I. Németi. *A general axiomatizability theorem formulated in terms of cone-injective subcategories.* In: Universal Algebra (Proc. Coll. Esztergom 1977), Colloq. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai, Vol. 29, North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam, 1982, pp. 13–35.

[AN83] H. Andréka, I. Németi. *Generalization of the concept of variety and quasivariety to partial algebras through category theory.* Dissertationes Mathematicae (Rozprawy Mat.) No. 204, Warszawa, 1983.

[B70] P.Burmeister. *Free partial algebras.* J. reine und angewandte Math. 241, 1970, pp. 75–86.

[B71] P.Burmeister. *Primitive Klassen partieller Algebren.* Habilitation thesis, University of Bonn, 1971.

[B86] P.Burmeister. *A Model Theoretic Oriented Approach to Partial Algebras. Introduction to Theory and Application of Partial Algebras – Part I.* Mathematical Research Vol. 32, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.
A "not yet debugged LaTeX-translation" can be found as pdf-file in the internet at
http://www.mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de/~burmeister/

[NSa82] I.Németi, I.Sain. *Cone-implicational subcategories and some Birkhoff-type theorems.* Universal Algebra (Proc. Coll. Esztergom 1977), Colloq. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai, Vol. 29, North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam, 1982, pp. 535–578.

Logic, Algebra, Relativity - 2002

Conference Dedicated to the Work of István Németi

November 4–8, 2002

Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics

Budapest, Hungary

PAPERS DEDICATED TO ISTVÁN NÉMETI

Algebraic and Topological Methods in Lambda Calculus

Antonino Salibra

Dipartimento di Informatica, Università Ca'Foscari di Venezia
Via Torino 155, 30172 Venezia, Italy
salibra@dsi.unive.it

Dedicated to Istvan Németi
The author wishes to thank Istvan for his teachings over these years

Abstract. The untyped lambda calculus was introduced around 1930 by Church as part of an investigation in the formal foundations of mathematics and logic. Although lambda calculus is a very basic language, it is sufficient to express all the computable functions. The process of application and evaluation reflects the computational behaviour of many modern functional programming languages, which explains the interest in the lambda calculus among computer scientists.
In this paper we give an outline of the theory of lambda abstraction algebras (LAA's). These algebras constitute an equational class and were introduced by Pigozzi and Salibra to provide an algebraic version of the untyped lambda calculus, in the same way cylindric and polyadic algebras algebraize the first-order predicate logic. Questions related to the functional representation of various subclasses of lambda abstraction algebras were investigated by Pigozzi and Salibra in a series of papers. The problem of representability for LAA's was solved by Goldblatt and Salibra by showing that every LAA is isomorphic to a representable one. Algebraic methods were also applied by Lusin and Salibra to study the structure of the lattice of lambda theories (i.e., extensions of lambda calculus that are closed under derivation) and by Salibra to study the structure of the lattice of the subvarieties of LAA. For every variety of LAA's there exists a lambda theory whose term algebra generates the variety. In particular, the variety LAA is generated by the term algebra of the minimal lambda theory. Finally, algebraic and topological methods were applied by Salibra to study the incompleteness of the semantics of lambda calculus.

1 Introduction

The untyped lambda calculus was introduced by Church [5] as a foundation for logic. Although the appearance of paradoxes caused the program to fail, a consistent part of the theory turned out to be successful as a theory of "functions as rules" (formalized as terms of the lambda calculus) that stresses the computational process of going from the argument to the value. Every object in the lambda calculus is at the same time a function and an argument; in particular a function can be applied to itself. Although lambda calculus is a very basic language, it is sufficient to express all the computable functions.

The process of application and evaluation reflects the computational behaviour of many modern programming languages, which explains the interest in the lambda calculus among computer scientists.

The two primitive notions of the lambda calculus are application, the operation of applying a function to an argument (expressed as juxtaposition of terms), and lambda (functional) abstraction, the process of forming a function from the "rule" that defines it. Then the set Λ_I of λ-terms of lambda calculus over an infinite set I of variables is constructed by induction as usual: every variable x is a λ-term, while, if M and N are λ-terms, then so are (MN) and $(\lambda x.M)$ for each variable $x \in I$.

The axioms of the untyped lambda calculus are defined by the schemes of (β)- and (α)-conversion. The first one expresses the way of calculating a function $(\lambda x.M)$ on an argument N, while the second one says that the name of bound variables does not matter. The variable-binding properties of lambda abstraction prevent variables in lambda calculus from operating as real algebraic variables. Indeed, the equations are not always preserved when arbitrary λ-terms are substituted for variables. The rules for deriving equations from instances of (α) and (β)-conversion are the usual ones from equational calculus asserting that equality is a congruence for application and abstraction. More precisely, consider the absolutely free algebra of λ-terms:

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_I := (\Lambda_I, \cdot^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I}, \lambda x^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I}, x^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I})_{x \in I}, \tag{1}$$

where, for all $s, t \in \Lambda_I$,

$$s \cdot^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I} t = (st); \quad \lambda x^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I}(t) = (\lambda x.t); \quad x^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I} = x.$$

The lambda theory $\lambda\beta$ is the least congruence over $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I$ including (α) and (β)-conversion. The term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\lambda\beta}$ of $\lambda\beta$ is the quotient of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I$ by the congruence $\lambda\beta$. The variety (= equational class) generated by the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\lambda\beta}$ is the starting point for studying the lambda calculus by universal algebraic methods.

In [30] Salibra has shown that the variety generated by the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\lambda\beta}$ is axiomatized by the finite schema of identities characterizing *lambda abstraction algebras* (LAA's). The equational theory of lambda abstraction algebras, introduced by Pigozzi and Salibra in [21] and [24], constitutes a purely algebraic theory of the untyped lambda calculus in the same spirit that Boolean algebras constitute an algebraic theory of classical propositional logic and, more to the point, cylindric and polyadic (Boolean) algebras of the first-order predicate logic. The equational theory of lambda abstraction algebras is intended as an alternative to combinatory logic (see Curry-Feys [9]) since it is a first-order algebraic description of lambda calculus, which allows to keep the lambda notation and hence all the functional intuitions. Among the seven identities characterizing LAAs, the first six constitute a recursive definition of the abstract substitution operator; they express precisely the metamathematical content of β-conversion. The last axiom is an algebraic translation of α-conversion.

The most natural LAA's are algebras of functions, called functional LAA's, which arise as "expansions" of suitable combinatory algebras (i.e., models of lambda calculus) by the variables of lambda calculus in a natural way. The situation in algebraic logic is analogous. The most natural cylindric (and polyadic) algebras are algebras of functions that are obtained by coordinatizing models of classical first-order logic. The smallest variety that includes all the functional algebras that are most closely connected with models of first-order logic constitutes the class of representable cylindric algebras. It is a proper subvariety of the class of all cylindric algebras, hence non-representable cylindric algebras exist. Much of the work in algebraic logic has been directed at finding wider classes of representable cylindric algebras with natural intrinsic characterizations. The main references for cilindric algebras are [14] [15]; for polyadic algebras it is [13]. We also mention here [20]. It contains an extensive survey of the various algebraic versions of quantifier logics. Questions related to the functional representation of various subclasses of lambda abstraction algebras were investigated by Pigozzi and Salibra in a series of papers [21], [22], [23], [24], [25]. Goldblatt [10] and Salibra-Goldblatt [31] have solved the problem of representability for LAA's, by showing that every LAA is isomorphic to a functional LAA and that the class of isomorphic images of functional lambda abstraction algebras constitutes a variety of algebras axiomatized by the finite schema of identities characterizing LAA's.

Algebraic methods were also applied in [29] [18] to study the structure of the lattice of lambda theories. We recall that lambda theories are extensions of the untyped lambda calculus (including (α) and (β)-conversion) that are closed under derivation. They correspond to different operational semantics of lambda calculus (see e.g. [1]) The set of all lambda theories is naturally equipped with a structure of complete lattice (see [1, Chapter 4]), with meet defined as set theoretical intersection. The bottom element of this lattice is the minimal lambda theory $\lambda\beta$, while the top element is the inconsistent lambda theory. The lattice of lambda theories, hereafter denoted by λT, has a continuum of elements and it is a very rich and complex structure. For example, every countable partially ordered set embeds into λT by an order-preserving map, and every interval of λT, whose bounds are recursively enumerable lambda theories, has a continuum of elements (see Visser [35]). The lattice of lambda theories is naturally isomorphic to the congruence lattice of the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\lambda\beta}$, the quotient of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I$ by $\lambda\beta$. This is the starting point for studying the structure of the lattice of lambda theories by universal algebraic methods.

In [18] Lusin and Salibra have shown that the lattice λT of lambda theories satisfies nontrivial quasi-identities in the language of lattices. Other quasi-identities, such as the ET-condition and the Zipper condition (see [17]), are satisfied by λT as a consequence of the dual isomorphism, described in [30], between λT and the lattice of subvarieties of LAA. An identity in the language of lattices (a lattice identity, for short) is trivial if it holds in every lattice and nontrivial otherwise. We conjecture that the lattice λT does not satisfy any nontrivial lattice identity. However, for every nontrivial lattice identity e, there exists a natural number n such that e fails in the lattice of lambda theories in a language of λ-terms with n constants (see [18]). In a more general result, it was shown that the variety LAA satisfies a lattice identity e (i.e., the congruence lattices of all LAA's satisfy e) if, and only if, e is trivial. In other words, for every nontrivial lattice identity e, there exists a lambda abstraction algebra (not necessarily equal to the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\lambda\beta}$) whose congruence lattice does not satisfy e. However, there exists a sublattice of λT satisfying nice lattice properties. In fact, in [18] it was defined a lambda theory $\mathcal{J}$ such that the lattice of all lambda theories extending $\mathcal{J}$ is shown to satisfy a restricted form of distributivity, called meet semidistributivity, and a nontrivial congruence identity (i.e., an identity in the language of lattices enriched by the relative product of binary relations).

Applications of topological and algebraic methods to the semantics of lambda calculus were obtained by the author in [26] [27] [28]. After Scott, mathematical models of the untyped lambda calculus are defined by order theoretic methods and classified into semantics according to the nature of their representable functions. Continuous semantics is given in the category of complete partial orders and Scott continuous functions, while stable and strongly stable semantics are strengthenings of the continuous semantics (see e.g. [1], [4]). A model of the untyped lambda calculus univocally induces a lambda theory through the kernel congruence relation of the interpretation function. A semantics of lambda calculus is called (equationally) incomplete if there exists a lambda theory which is not induced by any model in the semantics. The first incompleteness result was obtained by Honsell and Ronchi della Rocca [16] for the continuous semantics, while Gouy [12] proved the incompleteness of the stable semantics. The author has introduced a new technique, based on topological algebras, to prove in a uniform way the incompleteness of all denotational semantics of lambda calculus which have been proposed so far, including the strongly stable one, whose incompleteness had been conjectured. This technique was applied to prove the incompleteness of any semantics of lambda calculus given in terms of either partially ordered models with finitely many connected components (= minimal upward and downward closed sets), or topological models whose topology satisfies a suitable property of connectedness. In particular, it follows that any semantics of lambda calculus given in terms of partially ordered models which are semilattices, lattices, complete partial orderings, or which have a top or a bottom element, is incomplete.

2 Lambda Abstraction Algebras: Basic Notions and Notation

To keep this article self-contained, we summarize some definitions and results that we need in the subsequent part of the paper. Our main references will be [30] and [25] for lambda abstraction algebras and Barendregt's book [1] for lambda calculus.

2.1 Lambda calculus

The two primitive notions of the lambda calculus are *application*, the operation of applying a function to an argument (expressed as juxtaposition of terms), and *lambda (functional) abstraction*, the process of forming a function from the "rule" that defines it.

The set $\Lambda_I(C)$ of ordinary terms of lambda calculus over an infinite set I of variables and a set C of constants is constructed as usual [1]:

1. every variable $x \in I$ and every constant $c \in C$ is a λ-term;
2. if M and N are λ-terms, then so are (MN) and $(\lambda x.M)$ for each variable $x \in I$.

We will write Λ_I for $\Lambda_I(\emptyset)$, the set of λ-terms without constants.

The symbol $\equiv$ denotes syntactic equality.

The following are some well-known λ-terms:

$$\mathbf{i} \equiv \lambda x.x; \quad \mathbf{s} \equiv \lambda xyz.xz(yz); \quad \mathbf{k} \equiv \lambda xy.x; \quad \mathbf{1} \equiv \lambda xy.xy; \quad \Omega \equiv (\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx).$$

An occurrence of a variable x in a λ-term is *bound* if it lies within the scope of a lambda abstraction λx; otherwise it is *free*. $FV(M)$ is the set of free variables of a λ-term M. A λ-term without free variables is said to be *closed*. $\Lambda_I^0(C)$ is the set of closed λ-terms of $\Lambda_I(C)$. A λ-term N is *free for* x in M if no free occurrence of x in M lies within the scope of a lambda abstraction with respect to a variable that occurs free in N. $M[N/x]$ is the result of substituting N for all free occurrences of x in M subject to the usual provisos about renaming bound variables in M to avoid capture of free variables in N. The above proviso is empty if N is free for x in M.

The axioms of the $\lambda\beta$-calculus are as follows: M and N are arbitrary λ-terms and x, y variables.

(α) $\lambda x.M = \lambda y.M[y/x]$ for any variable y that does not occur free in M;

(β) $(\lambda x.M)N = M[N/x]$ for any N free for x in M.

(β)-conversion expresses the way of calculating a function $(\lambda x.M)$ on an argument N, while (α)-conversion says that the name of bound variables does not matter. The rules for deriving equations from instances of (α) and (β) are the usual ones from equational calculus asserting that equality is a congruence for application and abstraction.

A λ-term $M \in \Lambda_I^0(C)$ is *solvable* if there exist an integer n and $N_1, \dots, N_n \in \Lambda_I(C)$ such that $MN_1 \dots N_n = \mathbf{i}$. $M \in \Lambda_I(C)$ is *solvable* if the closure of M, that is $\lambda x_1 \dots x_n.M$ with $\{x_1 \dots x_n\} = FV(M)$, is solvable. $M \in \Lambda_I(C)$ is *unsolvable* if it is not solvable. Unsolvable λ-terms represent "indefinite" computational processes.

A *compatible λ-relation* $\mathcal{T}$ is any set of equations between λ-terms that is closed under the following rules, for all λ-terms M, N and P:

- $M = N \in \mathcal{T} \Longrightarrow \lambda x.M = \lambda x.N \in \mathcal{T}$;
- $M = N \in \mathcal{T} \Longrightarrow MP = NP \in \mathcal{T}$;
- $M = N \in \mathcal{T} \Longrightarrow PM = PN \in \mathcal{T}$.

We will write on occasion $\mathcal{T} \vdash M = N$ (or $M =_{\mathcal{T}} N$) for $M = N \in \mathcal{T}$.

A *lambda theory* $\mathcal{T}$ is any compatible λ-relation which is an equivalence relation and includes (α) and (β) conversion. The set of all lambda theories is naturally equipped with a structure of complete lattice with meet defined as set theoretical intersection. The join of two lambda theories $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ is the least equivalence relation including $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{S}$. The least lambda theory including a set $\mathcal{W}$ of equations will be denoted by $\mathcal{W}^+$.

$\lambda\beta$ is the least lambda theory, while $\lambda\eta$ is the least extensional lambda theory (axiomatized by $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{1}$). $\mathcal{H}$ is the lambda theory generated by equating all the unsolvable λ-term (i.e., $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0^+$ where $\mathcal{H}_0 = \{M = N \mid M, N$ closed and unsolvable$\}$), while $\mathcal{H}^*$ is the unique maximal consistent extension of $\mathcal{H}$ (see [1]).

A lambda theory $\mathcal{T}$ is *sensible* if $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$. $\mathcal{T}$ is *semisensible* if $\mathcal{T}$ does not equate a solvable and an unsolvable.

2.2 Lambda abstraction algebras

Let I be a nonempty set. The similarity type of *lambda abstraction algebras of dimension I* is constituted by a binary operation symbol "$\cdot$" formalizing application, a unary operation symbol "λx" for every $x \in I$, and a constant symbol (i.e., nullary operation symbol) "x" for every $x \in I$. The elements of I are the variables of lambda calculus although in their algebraic transformation they no longer play the role of variables in the usual sense. In the remaining part of the paper we will refer to them as *λ-variables*. The actual variables of the similarity type of lambda abstraction algebras are referred to as *context variables* and denoted by the Greek letters ξ, ν, and μ possibly with subscripts.

The terms of the similarity type of lambda abstraction algebras are called *λ-contexts*. They are constructed in the usual way: every λ-variable x and context variable ξ is a λ-context; if t and s are λ-contexts, then so are $t \cdot s$ and $\lambda x(t)$.

Because of their similarity to the terms of the lambda calculus we use the standard notational conventions of the latter. The application operation symbol "$\cdot$" is normally omitted, and the application of t and s is written as juxtaposition ts. When parentheses are omitted, association to the left is assumed. The left parenthesis delimiting the scope of a lambda abstraction is replaced with a period and the right parenthesis is omitted. For example, $\lambda x(ts)$ is written $\lambda x.ts$. Successive λ-abstractions $\lambda x \lambda y \lambda z \dots$ are written $\lambda xyz \dots$.

An occurrence of a λ-variable x in a λ-context is *bound* if it falls within the scope of the operation symbol λx; otherwise it is *free*. The *free λ-variables* of a λ-context are the λ-variables that have at least one free occurrence. A λ-context without free λ-variables is said to be *closed*. Note that λ-contexts without any context variables coincide with ordinary terms of the lambda calculus without constants.

Our notion of a λ-context coincides with the notion of *context* defined in Barendregt ([1], Def.14.4.1); our context variables correspond to Barendregt's notion of a 'hole'. The main difference between Barendregt's notation and our's is that 'holes' are denoted here by Greek letters $\xi, \mu, \dots$, while in Barendregt's book by $[\,], [\,]_1, \dots$. The essential feature of a λ-context is that a free λ-variable in a λ-term may become bound when we substitute it for a 'hole' within the context. For example, if $t(\xi) = \lambda x.x(\lambda y.\xi)$ is a λ-context, in Barendregt's notation: $t([\,]) = \lambda x.x(\lambda y.[\,])$, and $M = xy$ is a λ-term, then $t(M) = \lambda x.x(\lambda y.xy)$.

A lambda theory has a natural algebraic interpretation. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a lambda theory over the language $\Lambda_I(C)$ and let $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)$ be the absolutely free algebra in the similarity type of lambda abstraction algebras (of dimension I) over the set C of generators:

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C) := \langle \Lambda_I(C), \cdot^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)}, \lambda x^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)}, x^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)} \rangle_{x \in I} \tag{2}$$

where for $M, N \in \Lambda_I(C)$:

$$M \cdot^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)} N = (MN); \quad \lambda x^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)}(M) = (\lambda x.M); \quad x^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)} = x.$$

We will write $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I$ for $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(\emptyset)$. The lambda theory $\mathcal{T}$ is a congruence (i.e. a compatible equivalence relation) on $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)$. We denote by $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{T}}(C)$ the quotient of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)$ by $\mathcal{T}$ and call it the *term algebra* of the lambda theory $\mathcal{T}$.

We say that $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies an identity between contexts $t(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n) = u(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n)$ if the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{T}}(C)$ of $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies it; i.e., if all the instances of the above identity, obtained by substituting λ-terms for context variables in it, fall within the lambda theory: $\mathcal{T} \vdash t(M_1, \cdots, M_n) = u(M_1, \cdots, M_n)$, for all λ-terms $M_1, \cdots, M_n \in \Lambda_I(C)$. For example, every lambda theory satisfies the identity $(\lambda x.x)\xi = \xi$ because $\lambda\beta \vdash (\lambda x.x)M = M$ for every λ-term M.

Lambda abstraction algebras are meant to axiomatize those identities between contexts that are valid for the lambda calculus.

We now give the formal definition of a lambda abstraction algebra (see [22], [23], [25], [29], [30]).

Definition 1. *By a* **lambda abstraction algebra of dimension** I *we mean an algebraic structure of the form:*

$$\mathbf{A} := \langle A, \cdot^{\mathbf{A}}, \lambda x^{\mathbf{A}}, x^{\mathbf{A}} \rangle_{x \in I}$$

satisfying the following identities between λ-contexts, for all $x, y, z \in I$:

(β_1) $(\lambda x.x)\xi = \xi;$

(β_2) $(\lambda x.y)\xi = y, \quad x \neq y;$

(β_3) $(\lambda x.\xi)x = \xi;$

(β_4) $(\lambda xx.\xi)\mu = \lambda x.\xi;$

(β_5) $(\lambda x.\xi\mu)\nu = (\lambda x.\xi)\nu((\lambda x.\mu)\nu);$

(β_6) $(\lambda xy.\mu)((\lambda y.\xi)z) = \lambda y.(\lambda x.\mu)((\lambda y.\xi)z), \quad x \neq y, z \neq y;$

(α) $\lambda x.(\lambda y.\xi)z = \lambda y.(\lambda x.(\lambda y.\xi)z)y, \quad z \neq y.$

I is called the **dimension set** *of* $\mathbf{A}$. $\cdot^{\mathbf{A}}$ *is called* **application** *and* $\lambda x^{\mathbf{A}}$ *is called* λ-**abstraction** *with respect to* x.

The class of lambda abstraction algebras of dimension I is denoted by LAA_I and the class of all lambda abstraction algebras of any dimension by LAA. We also use LAA_I as shorthand for the phrase "lambda abstraction algebra of dimension I", and similar for LAA. An LAA_I is *infinite dimensional* if I is infinite.

LAA_I is a variety (= equational class) for every dimension set I, and therefore it is closed under the formation of subalgebras, homomorphic (in particular isomorphic) images, and Cartesian products.

In [25] it is shown the following result.

Proposition 1. ([25]) *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a lambda theory over the language $\Lambda_I(C)$. Then the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{T}}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ is an* LAA_I.

We note here one very useful immediate consequence of the axioms $(\beta_1) - (\beta_6)$ and (α): in any LAA_I $\mathbf{A}$ the functions λx are always one-one, i.e., for all $x \in I$,

$$\lambda x.a = \lambda x.b \quad \text{iff} \quad a = b, \quad \text{for all} \quad a, b \in A.$$

In fact, if $\lambda x.a = \lambda x.b$, then by (β_3), $a = (\lambda x.a)x = (\lambda x.b)x = b$.

An LAA with only one element is said to be *trivial*. It is interesting that any nontrivial LAA_I $\mathbf{A}$ of positive dimension is infinite, since the one-one map λx is not onto. To see this, assume by way of contradiction that x is in the range of λx; then $x = \lambda x.b$ for some element $b \in A$. Since $\mathbf{A}$ is nontrivial, there exists an element $a \in A$ such that $a \neq x$. Then a contradiction results from (β_1) and (β_4):

$$a = (\lambda x.x)a = (\lambda x.\lambda x.b)a = \lambda x.b = x.$$

Definition 2. ([24]; Def. 1.3) *Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *be an* LAA_I*. Let* $a \in A$ *and* $x \in I$*.* a *is said to be* **algebraically dependent on** x **(over A)** *if* $(\lambda x.a)z \neq a$ *for some* $z \in I$*; otherwise* a *is* **algebraically independent of** x **(over A)***. The set of all* $x \in I$ *such that* a *is algebraically dependent on* x *over* $\mathbf{A}$ *is called the* **dimension set** *of* a *and is denoted by* Δa*; thus:*

$$\Delta a = \{x \in I : (\lambda x.a)z \neq a \quad \text{for some} \quad z \in I\}.$$

a *is* **finite (infinite) dimensional** *if* Δa *is finite (infinite). An element* a *is called* **zero-dimensional** *if* $\Delta a = \emptyset$*. We denote the set of zero-dimensional elements by* Zd $\mathbf{A}$.

For example, if $a = xy$ then a is algebraically dependent on x because $(\lambda x.xy)z = zy \neq xy$ for every $z \in I \setminus \{x, y\}$.

Proposition 2. ([24]; Prop. 1.7) *Let* $\mathbf{A} \in \mathsf{LAA}_I$*,* $a, b \in A$*, and* $x \in I$*.*

1. $\Delta(ab) \subseteq \Delta a \cup \Delta b$.
2. $\Delta(\lambda x.a) = \Delta a \setminus \{x\}$.
3. $\Delta x \subseteq \{x\}$*, with equality holding if* $\mathbf{A}$ *is nontrivial.*

If M is a λ-term without constants and $\mathbf{A}$ is an LAA_I, then $M^{\mathbf{A}}$ will denote the value of M in $\mathbf{A}$ when each λ-variable x occurring in M is interpreted as $x^{\mathbf{A}}$. By Prop. 2 the dimension set of $M^{\mathbf{A}}$ is a subset of the set of free λ-variables of M.

Suitable reducts of arbitrary LAA's turn out to be combinatory algebras. Recall that a combinatory algebra is an algebra $\mathbf{C} = \langle C, \cdot^{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{k}^{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{C}} \rangle$, where $\cdot^{\mathbf{C}}$ is a binary operation and $\mathbf{k}^{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{C}}$ are constants, satisfying the following identities: (as usual the symbol $\cdot$ and the superscript $^{\mathbf{C}}$ are omitted, and association is to the left)

$$\mathbf{k}xy = x; \qquad \mathbf{s}xyz = xz(yz).$$

Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an LAA_I. By the *combinatory reduct* of $\mathbf{A}$ we mean the algebra

$$\mathrm{Cr}\,\mathbf{A} = \langle A, \cdot^{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{k}^{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{A}} \rangle$$

where

$$\mathbf{k}^{\mathbf{A}} = (\lambda xy.x)^{\mathbf{A}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{A}} = (\lambda xyz.xz(yz))^{\mathbf{A}}.$$

$\mathrm{Cr}\,\mathbf{A}$ is a combinatory algebra [31]. A subalgebra of the combinatory reduct of an LAA_I $\mathbf{A}$ (i.e., a subset of $\mathbf{A}$ containing $\mathbf{k}^{\mathbf{A}}$ and $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{A}}$ and closed under $\cdot^{\mathbf{A}}$) is called a *combinatory subreduct* of $\mathbf{A}$. The *zero-dimensional subreduct* of $\mathbf{A}$ is the combinatory subreduct

$$\mathbf{Zd}\,\mathbf{A} = \langle \mathrm{Zd}\,\mathbf{A}, \cdot^{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{k}^{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{A}} \rangle,$$

where $\mathrm{Zd}\,\mathbf{A} = \{\, a \in A : \Delta a = \emptyset \,\}$, the set of zero-dimensional elements of $\mathbf{A}$.

The *open term model* of a lambda theory $\mathcal{T}$, as defined in Barendregt's book [1], is the combinatory reduct $\mathrm{Cr}\,\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{T}}(C)$ of the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{T}}(C)$, while the *closed term model* of $\mathcal{T}$ is its zero-dimensional subreduct $\mathbf{Zd}\,\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{T}}(C)$.

2.3 Locally finite LAA's

There is a strong connection between the lambda theories and the subclass of LAA's whose elements are finite dimensional.

Definition 3. ([24]; Def. 2.1) *A lambda abstraction algebra* $\mathbf{A}$ *is* **locally finite** *if it is of infinite dimension (i.e.,* I *is infinite) and every* $a \in A$ *is of finite dimension (i.e.,* $|\Delta a| < \aleph_0$*).*

The class of locally finite LAA_I's is denoted by LFA_I, which is also used as shorthand for the phrase "locally finite lambda abstraction algebra of dimension I".

For every infinite I the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{T}}$ of a lambda theory $\mathcal{T}$ is locally finite. This is a direct consequence of the trivial fact that every λ-term is a finite string of symbols and hence contains only finitely many λ-variables.

The following result characterizes those congruences on the algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)$ (defined in Section 2.2) that are lambda theories.

Lemma 1. ([30]; Lemma. 8) *Let* I *be an infinite set. A congruence* θ *on* $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)$ *is a lambda theory over the language* $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)$ *if, and only if, the following two conditions are satisfied:*

1. *The quotient algebra* $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)/\theta$ *is an* LAA_I*;*
2. $(\lambda x.c)y\ \theta\ c$ *for all* $c \in C$ *and all* $x, y \in I$*, i.e., the equivalence class* c/θ *of every element* $c \in C$ *is a zero-dimensional element of* $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I(C)/\theta$*.*

Proposition 3. ([25]; Prop. 2.4) *Let* I *be an infinite set. An algebra* $\mathbf{A}$ *in the similarity type of lambda abstraction algebras of dimension* I *is (isomorphic to) the term algebra of a lambda theory if, and only if, it is an* LFA_I*.*

Recall that the LAA_I-free algebra over an empty set of generators is the quotient of the absolutely free algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda_I}$ of λ-terms by the smallest congruence θ making $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I/\theta$ an LAA_I.

The following proposition provides an algebraic characterization of the term algebra of $\lambda\beta$.

Proposition 4. ([30]; Prop. 10) *Let* I *be an infinite set. The term algebra* $\mathbf{\Lambda_I^{\lambda\beta}}$ *of the minimal lambda theory* $\lambda\beta$ *is the* LAA_I*-free algebra over an empty set of generators.*

Proposition 5. ([30]; Prop. 11) *Let* I *be an infinite set. For all* λ*-terms* $t, u \in \Lambda_I$*,* $\mathsf{LAA}_I \models t = u$ *iff* $\lambda\beta \vdash t = u$*.*

3 Subvarieties of LAA's and Lambda Theories

In this Section we briefly survey the main results connecting lambda abstraction algebras, lambda theories and functional (i.e., representable) lambda abstraction algebras.

In [30] it was shown that the complete lattice of the subvarieties of LAA_I is isomorphic to the complete lattice of the lambda theories over the language Λ_I. It follows that every variety of lambda abstraction algebras is generated by the term algebra of a suitable lambda theory over the language Λ_I (with an empty set of constants). In particular, the term algebra of the least lambda theory $\lambda\beta$ generates the variety LAA_I. Hence the explicit finite equational axiomatization for the variety of lambda abstraction algebras provides also an explicit axiomatization of the identities between contexts satisfied by the term algebra of $\lambda\beta$. Note that the lattice of all lambda theories is naturally isomorphic to the lattice of all congruences of the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\lambda\beta}$. We would like to explicitly mention at this point that the equational theory of lambda abstraction algebras (axiomatized by $(\beta_1) - (\beta_6)$ and (α)) is a conservative extension of lambda beta-calculus: for any two λ-terms M and N, the identity $M = N$ between λ-terms is a logical consequence of $(\beta_1) - (\beta_6)$ and (α) (in symbols, $LAA_I \models M = N$) if, and only if, $M = N$ is derivable in the lambda beta-calculus. This can be immediately inferred from the fact that LAA_I is generated as a variety by the term algebra of the lambda theory $\lambda\beta$ (see Thm. 2 below and Prop. 5 above).

In Thm. 1 below it is shown that the satisfiability of an identity between contexts is equivalent to the satisfiability of a suitable identity between λ-terms. This result is applied in the proof of Thm. 2 below (see [30]).

Let $t(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ be a λ-context over $\overline{x}$ (i.e., $\overline{x} = x_1 \dots x_k$ is the finite sequence of λ-variables which contains all the λ-variables occurring in t either as constants x_i or as λ-abstractions λx_i). Let $\overline{y} = y_1 \dots y_n$ be an n-tuple of λ-variables such that $\overline{y} \cap \overline{x} = \emptyset$. Define

$$t(y_1 x_1 \dots x_k, \dots, y_n x_1 \dots x_k)$$

as the λ-term obtained from the λ-context t by substituting the λ-term $y_i x_1 \dots x_k$ for all the occurrences of the context variable ξ_i in t ($i = 1, \dots, n$). (Recall that $y_i x_1 \dots x_k$ means $(\dots((y_i x_1)x_2)\dots)x_k)$.)

If $\overline{y} = y_1 \dots y_n$ is a sequence of λ-variables and $\overline{\xi} = \xi_1 \dots \xi_n$ is a sequence of context variables, we will write $\lambda\overline{y}$ for $\lambda y_1 \dots y_n$; $t(\overline{\xi})$ for $t(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$; and $t(y_1\overline{x}, \dots, y_n\overline{x})$ for $t(y_1 x_1 \dots x_k, \dots, y_n x_1 \dots x_k)$. We always assume that $\overline{\xi}$ and $\overline{y}$ have the same length.

Theorem 1. ([30]) *Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *be an infinite dimensional* LAA_I. *Let* $t(\overline{\xi}), u(\overline{\xi})$ *be* λ*-contexts over* $\overline{x} = x_1 \dots x_k$ *and let* $\overline{y} = y_1 \dots y_n$ *such that* $\overline{y} \cap \overline{x} = \emptyset$. *Then,*

$$\mathbf{A} \models t(\overline{\xi}) = u(\overline{\xi}) \textit{ if and only if } \mathbf{A} \models t(y_1\overline{x}, \dots, y_n\overline{x}) = u(y_1\overline{x}, \dots, y_n\overline{x}).$$

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be an arbitrary variety of algebras and $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$. Then $\mathbf{A}$ is said to be *generic* in $\mathcal{V}$ if an identity holds in $\mathbf{A}$ iff it holds in $\mathcal{V}$; equivalently, $\mathbf{A}$ is generic iff it generates $\mathcal{V}$ as a variety.

Recall from Section 1 that, if $\mathcal{T}$ is a lambda theory we denote by $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{T}}$ the term algebra of the lambda theory $\mathcal{T}$. So, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\lambda\beta}$ is the term algebra of the minimal lambda theory $\lambda\beta$.

Theorem 2. ([30]) *For any infinite set I, the variety generated by the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\lambda\beta}$ of the minimal lambda theory $\lambda\beta$ is the variety of LAA_I's, in symbols,*

$$\mathsf{LAA}_I = \mathbf{H}\ \mathbf{S}\ \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\lambda\beta}).$$

It follows that the set of identities between λ-contexts true in the term algebra of $\lambda\beta$ is axiomatized by the identities (β_1)-(β_6) and (α) characterizing the variety of lambda abstraction algebras.

The class FLA of (isomorphic images of) functional LAA's is defined, for example, in [24]. There is a strong relationship between the class FLA and the class of models of lambda calculus (see [24] [25]). We recall that, although lambda calculus has been the subject of research by logicians since the early 1930's, its model theory developed only much later, following the pioneering model construction made by Dana Scott. There exists an intrinsic characterization of what might be meant by mathematical model of the untyped lambda calculus, as an elementary class of combinatory algebras called λ-*models* ([1, Def. 5.2.7]). They were first axiomatized by Meyer [19] and independently by Scott [32]; the axiomatization, while elegant, is not equational. The functional representation theorem (Thm. 3 below) connects lambda abstraction algebras and models of lambda calculus. Indeed, every lambda abstraction algebra is isomorphic to a functional lambda abstraction algebra arising from a suitable λ-model.

The proof that FLA is a variety was given by Goldblatt [10], while the proof that $\mathsf{FLA} = \mathsf{LAA}$ was obtained in Salibra-Goldblatt [31] with a very technical and difficult proof. One of the consequences of Thm. 2 is a simplification of the proof of the general representation theorem for lambda abstraction algebras (see [30]).

Theorem 3. ([10] [31]) *For any infinite set I,*

$$\mathsf{LAA}_I = \mathsf{FLA}_I.$$

There exists a one-to-one correspondence between the set of lambda theories over the set Λ_I of λ-terms (without constants) and the set of congruences over the term algebra of the minimal lambda theory $\lambda\beta$. So, the set of lambda theories over Λ_I constitutes a complete lattice.

We now characterize the lattice of subvarieties of the variety LAA_I. The variety generated by the term algebra of a lambda theory $\mathcal{T}$ will be denoted by $\mathsf{LAA}_I^{\mathcal{T}}$.

Theorem 4. ([30]) *Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a subvariety of the variety LAA_I. Then there exists exactly one lambda theory $\mathcal{T}$ over Λ_I such that the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{T}}$ is generic in $\mathcal{V}$:*

$$\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{H}\ \mathbf{S}\ \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{T}}) = \mathsf{LAA}_I^{\mathcal{T}}.$$

The following theorem is now immediate.

Theorem 5. ([30]) *There is a complete lattice dual isomorphism between the lattice of subvarieties of LAA_I and the lattice of lambda theories over Λ_I (or the lattice of congruences over the term algebra of the minimal lambda theory $\lambda\beta$).*

The above theorem has important consequences for the structure of the lattice of lambda theories as it will be explained in the next Section.

4 The Structure of the Lattice of Lambda Theories

Techniques of universal algebra were applied in [18] to study the properties of the lattice λT of lambda theories. As a consequence of the dual isomorphism between λT and the lattice of subvarieties of LAA (see Thm. 5), some nontrivial quasi-identities, such as the ET condition and the Zipper condition (see [17]), hold in λT. Moreover, the following other results hold:

(i) A lattice identity e holds in LAA if, and only if, it is trivial;
(ii) For every nontrivial lattice identity e, there exists a natural number n such that e fails in the lattice of lambda theories in a language of λ-terms with n constants.
(iii) There exists a sublattice of λT satisfying good lattice properties.

The language of bounded lattices is constituted by two binary operators, "·" (meet) and "+" (join), and two constants "0" (bottom) and "1" (top). If q is an identity or a quasi-identity in the language of bounded lattices and λT is the lattice of lambda theories, we write $\lambda T \models q$ if the (quasi-)identity q holds in the lattice λT.

The lattice λT satisfies nontrivial quasi-identities.

Theorem 6. ([18]) *Let $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{S}_k$ $(k \in K)$ be lambda theories. Then*

$$\lambda T \models \sqcup_{k\in K}\mathcal{S}_k = 1,\ \mathcal{T} \geq \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S}_k + \mathcal{T}\mathcal{G})\ (k \in K)\ \Rightarrow\ \mathcal{G} \leq \mathcal{T}.$$

The ET condition and the Zipper condition defined below hold in every lattice dually isomorphic to the lattice of subvarieties of a variety (see [17]). Then the following two corollaries follows from Thm. 5 above.

Corollary 1. (ET Condition) *Let $(\mathcal{S}_k : k \in K)$ be a family of lambda theories. If*

$$\sqcup_{k\in K}\mathcal{S}_k = 1_{\lambda T}$$

then there is a finite sequence $\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$ with $\mathcal{S}_j \in \{\mathcal{S}_k : k \in K\}$ for $j \leq n$ such that:

$$(((\dots(((\mathcal{S}_0\mathcal{G}) + \mathcal{S}_1)\mathcal{G}) + \mathcal{S}_2)\mathcal{G}) + \dots + \mathcal{S}_n)\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G} \tag{3}$$

for every lambda theory $\mathcal{G}$.

Corollary 2. (Zipper Condition) *Let $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{G}$ and $(\mathcal{S}_k : k \in K)$ be lambda theories. Then,*

$$\lambda T \models \sqcup_{k\in K}\mathcal{S}_k = 1,\ \mathcal{S}_k\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{T}\ (k \in K)\ \Rightarrow\ \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{T}.$$

Corollary 3. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ be two lambda theories. If $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{T} = 1_{\lambda T}$ and $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{T}\mathcal{G}$ then $\mathcal{G} \leq \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{G} \leq \mathcal{T}$.*

Two well-known lattices cannot be sublattices of λT.

Corollary 4. *Let M_k be the lattice having k atoms, a zero and one, and no other elements. M_k cannot be a sublattice of λT, provided the top element is the inconsistent lambda theory $1_{\lambda T}$.*

In every lattice L the modularity law is equivalent to the requirement that L has no sublattice isomorphic to the "pentagon" $\mathbf{N}_5$. The pentagon $\mathbf{N}_5$ is constituted by five distinct elements $0, a, b, c, 1$ such that $a \leq c$, $1 = c + b = a + b$ and $0 = ab = cb$. In [29] it was shown the following result. Recall from Section 2.1 the definitions of the lambda terms $\mathbf{i}$, Ω and of the lambda theories $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}^*$.

Theorem 7. ([29]) *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the lambda theory generated by the equation $\Omega = \mathbf{i}$. The lattice λT is not modular because the pentagon $\mathbf{N}_5$, defined by*

$$0 \equiv \mathcal{T}\mathcal{H}^*; \quad 1 \equiv 1_{\lambda T}; \quad b \equiv \mathcal{T}; \quad a \equiv \mathcal{H} + (\mathcal{T}\mathcal{H}^*); \quad c \equiv \mathcal{H}^*,$$

is a sublattice of λT.

An identity in the binary symbols $\{\cdot, +, \circ\}$ is called a *congruence identity*, while an identity in the language $\{\cdot, +\}$ of lattices is called a *lattice identity*. We interpret the variables of a congruence (lattice) identity as congruence relations, and for arbitrary binary relations γ and δ we interpret $\gamma + \delta$ as the congruence relation generated by the union of the two relations, $\gamma \cdot \delta$ as the intersection and $\gamma \circ \delta$ as the composition of the two relations (as usual, we will write $\gamma\delta$ for $\gamma \cdot \delta$). We say that a variety $\mathcal{V}$ *satisfies a congruence (lattice) identity* if it holds in all congruence lattices of members of $\mathcal{V}$. A congruence identity is *trivial* if it holds in the congruence lattice of any algebra, while a lattice identity is *trivial* if it holds in every lattice. Varieties are often characterized in terms of congruence identities.

The following theorem is a consequence of the sequentiality theorem of lambda calculus (see [1, Thm. 14.4.8]). It has no immediate consequence for the lattice of lambda theories.

Theorem 8. ([18]) *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a semisensible lambda theory. Then the variety $\mathsf{LAA}_I^{\mathcal{T}}$ generated by the term algebra of $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies a congruence identity e if, and only if, e is trivial.*

Notoce that there exists a continuum of semisensible lambda theories and that all the most important lambda theories, such as $\lambda\beta$, $\lambda\eta$, $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H}^*$ etc., are semisensible.

As a consequence of the above theorem, for every nontrivial lattice identity e, there exists an LAA_I $\mathbf{A}$ whose congruence lattice does not satisfy e. In the following theorem we show that $\mathbf{A}$ can be chosen a term algebra if we modify the language of lambda calculus with a finite number of constants.

As a matter of notation, $\Lambda_I(n)$ is the set of lambda terms constructed from an infinite set I of λ-variables and a finite set of constants of cardinality n.

Theorem 9. ([18]) *Let e be a nontrivial lattice identity. Then there exists a natural number n such that the identity e fails in the lattice of the lambda theories over the language $\Lambda_I(n)$.*

There exists a sublattice of λT satisfying good lattice properties. First we introduce a lambda theory $\mathcal{J}$, whose consistency is obtained in [18] by using intersection types for defining a filter model for it (see [2], [8]). Then the equations defining $\mathcal{J}$ are used to define a semilattice term operation on the term algebra $\mathbf{\Lambda}_I^{\mathcal{J}}$. It follows from this result that the lattice of all lambda theories including $\mathcal{J}$ has the lattice properties described in Thm. 12 below.

Theorem 10. ([18]) *The lambda theory $\mathcal{J}$, axiomatized by*

$$\Omega xx = x; \quad \Omega xy = \Omega yx; \quad \Omega x(\Omega yz) = \Omega(\Omega xy)z, \tag{4}$$

is consistent.

Theorem 11. ([18]) *The variety* $\mathsf{LAA}_I^{\mathcal{J}}$ *generated by the term algebra of the lambda theory $\mathcal{J}$ satisfies a nontrivial congruence identity.*

Theorem 12. ([18]) *The interval sublattice* $[\mathcal{J}) = \{\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{T}\}$ *of the lattice of lambda theories satisfies the following properties:*

(i) *The finite lattice* $\mathbf{M}_3$ *is not a sublattice of* $[\mathcal{J})$.
(ii) $[\mathcal{J})$ *satisfies a nontrivial congruence identity.*
(iii) $[\mathcal{J})$ *is congruence meet semidistributive, i.e. the following implication holds for all lambda theories* $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{G} \in [\mathcal{J})$.

$$\mathcal{S}\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{S}\mathcal{G} \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T} + \mathcal{G}).$$

5 Order incompleteness and topological incompleteness

In this Section we survey some results of incompleteness for the semantics of lambda calculus (see [26] [27] [28]).

A model of the untyped lambda calculus univocally induces a lambda theory (i.e., a congruence relation on λ-terms closed under α- and β-conversion) through the kernel congruence relation of the interpretation function. A semantics of lambda calculus is called *(equationally) incomplete* if there exists a lambda theory which is not induced by any model in the semantics.

One of the most interesting open problems of lambda calculus is whether every lambda theory arises as the equational theory of a non-trivially ordered model (in other words, whether the semantics of lambda calculus given in terms of non-trivially ordered models is complete). Selinger [33] gave a syntactical characterization, in terms of so-called generalized Mal'cev operators, of the order-incomplete lambda theories (i.e., the theories not induced by any non-trivially ordered model). A lambda theory $\mathcal{T}$ is order-incomplete if, and only if, there exist a natural number $n \geq 1$ and a sequence $M_1, \ldots, M_n$ of closed λ-terms such that the following Mal'cev conditions are satisfied:

$$x =_\mathcal{T} M_1xyy; \; M_ixxy =_\mathcal{T} M_{i+1}xyy; \; M_nxxy =_\mathcal{T} y \; (1 \leq i < n).$$

In other words, $\mathcal{T}$ is order-incomplete if, and only if, the variety of LAA's generated by the term algebra of $\mathcal{T}$ is $(n+1)$-permutable for some $n \geq 1$. Plotkin and Simpson (see [33]) have shown that the above Mal'cev conditions are inconsistent with lambda calculus for $n = 1$, while Plotkin and Selinger (see [33]) obtained the same result for $n = 2$. It is an open problem whether n can be greater than or equal to 3.

We may relax the order-incompleteness problem by considering semantics of lambda calculus given in terms of partially ordered models satisfying suitable conditions. For example, we have shown in [26] [27] the incompleteness of any semantics of lambda calculus given in terms of partially ordered models which are semilattices, lattices, complete partial orderings, or which have a top or a bottom element. Moreover, we have obtained the incompleteness of any semantics of lambda calculus, given in terms of topological models satisfying a suitable property of connectedness called *closed-open-connectedness*. The proof is based on a general theorem of separation for topological algebras.

We begin the technical part of this Section by introducing the notion of a semisubtractive algebra. These algebras satisfy a very weak form of subtractivity. We recall that the notion of subtractivity in Universal Algebra was introduced by Ursini [34]: an algebra is *subtractive* if it satisfies the identities

$$s(x, x) = 0; \quad s(x, 0) = x \tag{5}$$

for some binary term s and constant 0. Subtractive algebras abound in classical algebras and in algebraic logic.

Definition 4. *An algebra* $\mathbf{A}$ *is* **semisubtractive** *if there exist a binary term* $s(x, y)$ *and a constant* 0 *in the similarity type of* $\mathbf{A}$ *such that*

$$s(x, x) = 0.$$

A *partially ordered algebra* is a pair $(\mathbf{A}, \leq)$, where $\mathbf{A}$ is an algebra and $\leq$ is a compatible (i.e., the basic operations are monotone) partial order on A.

A semisubtractive algebra is *trivial* if $s(x, y) = 0$ for all x and y. A semisubtractive algebra is trivial if it admits a compatible partial order with a bottom element and a top element.

As a matter of notation, ω denotes the first infinite ordinal, i.e., the set of natural numbers.

Definition 5. *Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *be a semisubtractive algebra. The* **subtraction sequence** (c_n) *of a pair* $(a, b) \in A^2$ *is defined by induction as follows:*

$$c_1 = s(a, b); \quad c_{n+1} = s(c_n, 0). \tag{6}$$

We say that (a, b) **has order** $k \in \omega$ *if* $c_k \neq 0$*, while* (a, b) **has order** ω *if* $c_k \neq 0$ *for all* $k \in \omega$.

Notice that, if a pair (a, b) has order k, then $a \neq b$ and (a, b) has order n for all $n \leq k$.

The *inequality graph* of a partially ordered algebra $(\mathbf{A}, \leq)$ has the elements of A as nodes, while an edge connects two distinct nodes a and b if either $a < b$ or $b < a$. Two nodes are in the same connected component if they are either not distinct or joined by a path. The equivalence classes of the relation "to be in the same connected component" define the partition of the inequality graph into *connected components*. A connected component can be also characterized as a minimal subset of A which is both upward closed and downward closed.

Lemma 2. *Let* $(\mathbf{A}, \leq)$ *be a semisubtractive partially ordered algebra. If a pair* $(a, b) \in A^2$ *has order* ω*, then* a *and* b *are in distinct connected components (in the inequality graph of* A*).*

Theorem 13. ([27], [28]) *Any semantics of the untyped lambda calculus, given in terms of partially ordered models which have only finitely many connected components (in the inequality graph), is incomplete.*

Corollary 5. *Any semantics of lambda calculus given in terms of partially ordered models which are semilattices, lattices, complete partial orderings, or which have a top or a bottom element, is incomplete.*

A topological algebra is a pair $(\mathbf{A}, \tau)$, where $\mathbf{A}$ is an algebra and τ is a topology on A making the basic operations of $\mathbf{A}$ continuous.

We recall that separation axioms in topology stipulate the degree to which distinct points may be separated by open sets or by closed neighbourhoods of open sets. In Thm. 14 below we prove that in every semisubtractive T_0-topological algebra every pair of elements of order 3 is $T_{2_{1/2}}$-separable. We recall that a and b are $T_{2_{1/2}}$-separable if there exists two open sets U and V such that $a \in U$, $b \in V$ and the closures of U and V have empty intersection.

We were inspired with Bentz [3] and Coleman [6] [7] for the idea of this theorem and for the techniques used in its proof.

Theorem 14. ([26], [28]) *If $(\mathbf{A}, \tau)$ is a semisubtractive T_0-topological algebra, then every pair $(a, b) \in A^2$ of order 3 is $T_{2_{1/2}}$-separable.*

Connectedness axioms in topology examine the structure of a topological space in an orthogonal way with respect to separation axioms. They deny the existence of certain subsets of a topological space with properties of separation. We introduce a strong property of connectedness, called closed-open-connectedness, which is orthogonal to the property of $T_{2_{1/2}}$-separability, and it is satisfied by a topological space if there exist no $T_{2_{1/2}}$-separable elements.

Definition 6. *We say that a space is* **closed-open-connected** *if it has no disjoint closures of open sets. In other words, if, for all open sets U and V, we have that the closures of U and V have empty intersection.*

The following proposition provides a wide class of topological spaces whose topology is closed-open-connected.

Proposition 6. *Let (X, τ) be a T_0-topological space, whose specialization order $\leq_\tau$, defined by*

$$a \leq_\tau b \text{ iff } a \text{ belongs to the closure of set } \{b\},$$

satisfies the following property: every pair of nodes of the inequality graph of $(X, \leq_\tau)$ is joined by a path of length less or equal to 3. Then (X, τ) is closed-open-connected.

Corollary 6. *Every T_0-topological space (X, τ), whose specialization order either admits a bottom (top) element or makes X an upward (downward) direct set, is closed-open-connected.*

In particular complete partial orderings with the Scott topology (see [1]) are closed-open-connected.

As a consequence of Thm. 14 of separation, we get the topological incompleteness theorem.

A topological model of the lambda calculus is a topological algebra $(\mathbf{C}, \tau)$, where C is a model of lambda calculus.

Theorem 15. ([26], [28]) *Any semantics of the lambda calculus given in terms of closed-open-connected T_0-topological models is incomplete.*

A topological model, whose topology is T_0 but not T_1, has a non-trivial specialization order. This means that there exists at least two elements a and b such that a belongs to the closure of set $\{b\}$. Then from Thm. 13 and from Thm. 15 it follows the incompleteness of any semantics of lambda calculus given in terms of T_0-topological models, whose topology is either closed-open-connected or admits a specialization order with a finite number of connected components.

References

1. Barendregt, H.P., "The lambda calculus: Its syntax and semantics", Revised edition, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 103, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1985.
2. H.P. Barendregt, M. Coppo and M. Dezani-Ciancaglini, *A filter lambda model and the completeness of type assignment*, J. Symbolic Logic, **48** (1984), 931–940.
3. W. Bentz, "Topological implications in varieties", *Algebra Universalis*, **42** (1999), pp. 9-16
4. C. Berline, "From computation to foundations via functions and application: The λ-calculus and its webbed models", *Theoretical Computer Science* **249** (2000), pp. 81-161
5. Church, A. "The calculi of lambda conversion", Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1941.
6. J.P. Coleman, "Separation in topological algebras", *Algebra Universalis*, **35** (1996), pp. 72-84
7. J.P. Coleman, "Topological equivalents to n-permutability", *Algebra Universalis*, **38** (1997), pp. 200-209
8. M. Coppo, M. Dezani-Ciancaglini, F. Honsell and G. Longo, *Extended type structures and filter lambda models*, Logic colloquium '82 (Florence, 1982), North-Holland, Amsterdam (1984) 241–262.
9. Curry, H. B. and R. Feys, "Combinatory Logic, Vol. I", North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1958.
10. Goldblatt, R., "The functional lambda abstraction algebras form a variety", DMTCS'96, Springer Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, Springer-Verlag, Singapore (1997), pp. 226–243.
11. Goldblatt, R., "Enlargements of functional algebras for the lambda calculus" *Theoretical Computer Science* vol 198 (1998), pp. 177–200.
12. X. Gouy, *Etude des théories équationnelles et des propriétés algébriques des modéles stables du λ-calcul*, Thèse, Université de Paris 7 (1995)
13. Halmos, P. "Algebraic Logic", Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, 1962.
14. Henkin, L., J.D. Monk and A. Tarski, "Cylindric algebras, Parts I and II", North-Holland Publishing Co, Amsterdam, 1971, 1985.
15. Henkin, L., J.D. Monk, A. Tarski, H. Andréka, and I. Németi, "Cylindric set algebras", Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 883, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1981.

16. Honsell, F., S. Ronchi della Rocca, "An Approximation Theorem for Topological Incompleteness of Lambda Calculus", *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 45 (1992), pp. 49-75.
17. W. A. Lampe, *Further properties of lattices of equational theories*, Algebra Universalis, **28** (1991), 459-486.
18. Lusin, S., and A. Salibra "The Lattice of Lambda Theories", Technical Report CS-2002-01, Dipartimento di Informatica, Universita' Ca'Foscari di Venezia, 2002. (to appear)
19. Meyer, A.R., "What is a model of the lambda calculus?", *Information and Control*, vol. 52 (1982), pp. 87-122.
20. Németi, I., "Algebraizations of quantifier logics. An introductory overview", *Studia Logica* vol. 50 (1991), pp. 485–569
21. Pigozzi, D., and A. Salibra, "An introduction to lambda abstraction algebras", *Notas de Logica Matematica*, Universidad Nacional del Sur, Bahia Blanca, Argentina, vol. 38 (1993), pp. 93-112.
22. Pigozzi, D., and A. Salibra, "Dimension-complemented lambda abstraction algebras", *Workshops in Computing, Springer-Verlag*, London (1994), pp. 131-138.
23. Pigozzi, D., and A. Salibra, "A representation theorem for lambda abstraction algebras", *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 711, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993, pp.629-639.
24. Pigozzi, D., and A. Salibra, "Lambda abstraction algebras: representation theorems", *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 140 (1995), pp. 5-52.
25. Pigozzi, D., and A. Salibra, "Lambda abstraction algebras: coordinatizing models of lambda calculus", *Fundamenta Informaticae*, vol. 33 (1998), pp. 149-200.
26. Salibra, A., "A continuum of theories of lambda calculus without semantics", LICS'01, 16th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (2001), Boston, USA.
27. Salibra, A., "Towards lambda calculus order-incompleteness", in: J. Lévy (ed.), Workshop on Böhm theorem: applications to Computer Science Theory (BOTH 2001) Electronics Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. 50 No.2 (2001), pp. 147-160
28. Salibra, A, "Topological incompleteness and order incompleteness of lambda calculus", Technical Report CS-2001, Dipartimento di Informatica, Universita' Ca'Foscari di Venezia, 2001. (to appear)
29. Salibra A., "Nonmodularity results for lambda calculus", *Fundamenta Informaticae*, vol. 45 (2001), pp.379-392.
30. Salibra, A., "On the algebraic models of lambda calculus", *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 249 (2000), pp.197-240.
31. Salibra, A., and R. Goldblatt, "A finite equational axiomatization of the functional algebras for the lambda calculus", *Information and Computation*, vol. 148 (1999), pp.71-130.
32. Scott, D.S., "Lambda calculus: some models, some philosophy", The Kleene Symposium, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980.
33. Selinger, P., "Order-incompleteness and finite lambda models", Eleventh Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (1996).
34. A. Ursini, "On subtractive varieties, I", *Algebra Universalis*, **31** (1994), pp. 204-222
35. A. Visser, "Numerations, λ-calculus and arithmetic", To H.B. Curry: Essays on Combinatory Logic, Lambda-Calculus and Formalism (J.R. Hindley and J.P. Seldin eds.), Academic Press, New York (1980), pp. 259-284

A SIMPLIFIED FINITE AXIOMATIZATION FOR THE SAIN TYPE ALGEBRAIZATION OF THE FIRST ORDER LOGIC

SÁNDOR CSIZMAZIA

ABSTRACT. The problem of finding a finite axiomatization to the algebraic counterpart of the first order logic was solved by Ildikó Sain. She gave a finite scheme of axioms, however she stated as an open problem the task of giving amore simple one. In this work we give a small elegant system of axioms, solving the above mentioned problem. I would like to thank Ildikó Sain and István Németi to inspire this work.

This paper is a continuation of the work was initiated earlier together with Ildikó Sain and announced in [I.Sain 87] I. Thm 1. (p.3.).

The problem of finding a "finite scheme" algebraization of the first order logic goes back to [J.D.Monk 70] and [L.Henkin,J.D.Monk 74] and was recalled by [I.Sain 87]:

"*Devise an algebraic version of predicate logic in which the class of representable algebras forms a finitely based equational class*"

An equational class is finitely based if it is axiomatizable by a finite amount of equations. An algebra is called representable if it is isomorphic to a subdirect product of set algebras. According to [A.Tarski 66] we add the requirement that the operations should be logical. An operation is called logical iff it is invariant under permutation of the base of the algebra. By [I.Sain 93] (p.2.) the logical counterpart of this requirement is that isomorphic models satisfy the same formulas. Sain found the following solution to the above stated problem. We shall use the notation of [HMT I] and [HMT II].

$[i,j] \in \omega^\omega$ is the permutation of i and j, $[i/j] \in \omega^\omega$ is the replacement of i by j (i.e. $[i/j](i) = j$ and $[i/j](k) = k$ if $k \neq i$). Let f $\in \omega^\omega$ and $i, j \in \omega$, then let $f(i/j) \in \omega^\omega$ according to the definition $f(i/j)(i) = f(j)$ and $f(i/j)(n) = f(n)$ if $n \neq i$. $Sb(X)$ is the class of all subsets of X.

Definition 1.:([Sain 87.] I. Def.1. p.3.)

By a Sgws we understand a subalgebra:

$\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \langle Sb({}^\omega U), \cup, \cap, \tilde{V}, \emptyset, V, \mathbf{S}_{suc}, \mathbf{S}_{pred}, \mathbf{S}^i_j, \mathbf{c}_i\rangle_{i,j\in\omega}$

where: $\mathbf{S}_\tau(x) = \mathbf{S}^V_\tau(x) = \{q \in V \mid q \circ \tau \in x\}$ for every $\tau \in \omega^\omega$ and $x \subseteq V$,

$\mathbf{S}^i_j = \mathbf{S}_{[i/j]}$, and $suc \in \omega^\omega$ is the usual successor, and $pred \in \omega^\omega$ is its inverse with $pred(0) = 0$,

$V \subseteq {}^\omega U$ let Gws$_\omega$–unit in the sense of [HMT II.] Def.3.1.1. (5.o.) definition and let $\mathbf{S}_{suc}(V) = \mathbf{S}_{pred}(V) = \mathbf{S}^i_j(V) = \mathbf{c}_i(V) = V$

■

Remark 2.: It is clear from the definition that Sgws algebras do not contain the constants of the cylindric algebras $d_{ij}, i, j < \omega$. The logical counterpart of this is that Sgws algebras are related to the first order logic without equality.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

Theorem 3.:([Sain 87.] I. Thm.1. (Sain & student), p.3.)

ISgws is a variety axiomatizable by a finite scheme of equations.

■

A detailed introduction to the history of the problem solved above and an overview of the results can be found in [I.Németi 91]. During the last years many results were published in this area.
The negative results are: in [B.Biró 87] the non-finitizability of logic with equality, the strengthening of Biró's result in [I.Németi 91] and [H.Andréka 91]. In [I.Sain, R.J.Thompson 91] there is a non-finitizability result for quasi-polyadic algebras. In [Sági 95] and [Sági,Németi 95] there are a non-finitizability results for polyadic algebras.
The positive results are: in [I.Sain 93] there are results on adding $d_{i,j}, i, j < \omega$ constants to Sgws. In [I.Sain, V.Gyuris 95] there are finitizability results for first order logic with equality too. Also in [Sági 95] it was shown that Sgws can be replaced by Cs-style algebras i.e. by such Sgws's the geatest elements of which are (full) Cartesian spaces. Strong positive results in non-well-founded set theories are in [Németi Tit1],[Németi Tit2] and in [Simon-Németi 95].

Our main theorem originated in [I.Sain 87] II. p.38. Claim (under Remark 10.1.) as an open problem. The [I.Sain 87] preprint introduced the class of Sgws-like algebras. She gave a finite axiom scheme [I.Sain 87] II. p.37. (Remark 10.1) axiomatizing the class of Sgws algebras. However she left the task of finding simpler and more elegant axiomatization(s) as an open problem. We list the original system of axioms and we will give a simplified version of it as stated in [S.Csizmazia 92], [S.Csizmazia 95]. The presently reported research was conducted with guidance from I.Sain and R.J.Thompson during the period 1987-1992 (though some corrections were made later). During 1993-1995 strongly related and sometimes slightly overlapping results were found by I.Sain and V.Gyuris of [I.Sain, V.Gyuris 95].

We will denote the variable symbols of the language of Sgws algebras with x, y.

The function symbols of the type t_{Sgws} are the following ones:

$0 : <: d>$, the "least element" constant symbol
$1 : <: d>$, the "greatest element" constant symbol
$- : < d : d >$, the symbol of the complementation
$+ : < d, d : d >$, the symbol of the join
$\cdot : < d, d : d >$, the symbol of the meet
$\mathbf{c}_i : < d : d >$, the symbols of the cilindrifications $(i < \omega)$
$\mathbf{S}^i_j : < d : d >$, the symbols of the replacements $(i, j < \omega)$
$\mathbf{S}_{suc} : < d : d >$, the symbol of the successor
$\mathbf{S}_{pred} : < d : d >$, the symbol of the predecessor

Let us denote with L_{Sgws} the t_{Sgws} type first order language.

We will introduce the following defined symbols:

$\mathbf{P}^i_j : < d : d >$, the symbols of the interchange (where $i, j < \omega$)

$$\mathbf{P}^i_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}$$

First we will detail the **AX** system of axioms according to [I.Sain 87] II. (in the [I.Sain 87] II. Proof of Theorem 1. 34-38.o.), after this we will give its simplified version as **PAX**.

The **AX** system of axioms contains the following schemes:

With arbitrary $i, j, k, l < \omega$:

(S0) The usual axioms of the Boolean algebras

(S1) The $\mathbf{S}_{pred}, \mathbf{S}_{suc}, \mathbf{S}^i_j$ are Boolean endomorphisms

With arbitrary $\mathrm{S} \in \{\mathbf{S}_{pred}, \mathbf{S}_{suc}, \mathbf{S}^i_j\}$:

$\mathrm{S(x + y) = Sx + Sy}$

$\mathrm{S(x \cdot y) = Sx \cdot Sy}$

$\mathrm{S0 = 0}$

$\mathrm{S1 = 1}$

(S2) The connections of $\mathbf{S}_{pred}, \mathbf{S}_{suc}$ with each other and with $\mathbf{S}^i_j$:

(1.1) $\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x = x$

(1.2) $\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}x = \mathbf{S}^0_1 x$

(1.3) $\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^i_j x = \mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$ if $i \neq j$

(1.4) $\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x = \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}x$ if $i \neq 0$ and $i \neq j$

(1.5) $\mathbf{S}^0_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x = \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^1_{j+1}x$ if $j \neq 0$

(1.6) Jónsson's seven schemes about the connections of the $\mathbf{S}^i_j$-s and the $\mathbf{P}^i_j$-s (see [HMT II.] (p.68.)):

(1.6.1) $\mathbf{P}^i_j x = \mathbf{P}^j_i x$

(1.6.2) $\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{P}^j_i x = x$

(1.6.3) $\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{P}^i_k x = \mathbf{P}^j_k\mathbf{P}^i_j x$ if $j \neq k, i \neq k, i \neq j$

(1.6.4) $\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{S}^k_i x = \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_j x$ if $j \neq k, i \neq k$

(1.6.5) $\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_i x = \mathbf{S}^i_j x$ if $i \neq j$

(1.6.6) $\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^k_l x = \mathbf{S}^k_l\mathbf{S}^i_j x$ if $k \neq j, i \neq k, l$

(1.6.7) $\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^i_k x = \mathbf{S}^i_k x$ if $i \neq k$

(S3) The $q_1 - q_9$ axiom schemes of Pinter [73]:

(q_1) $\mathbf{S}^i_j(-x) = -\mathbf{S}^i_j x$

(q_2) $\mathbf{S}^i_j(x + y) = \mathbf{S}^i_j x + \mathbf{S}^i_j y$

(q_3) $\mathbf{S}^i_i x = x$

(q_4) $\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^k_i x = \mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^k_j x$

(q_5) $\mathbf{c}_i(x + y) = \mathbf{c}_i x + \mathbf{c}_i y$

(q_6) $x \leq \mathbf{c}_i x$

(q_7) $\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{c}_i x = \mathbf{c}_i x$

(q_8) $\mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{S}^i_j x = \mathbf{S}^i_j x$ if $i \neq j$

(q_9) $\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{c}_k x = \mathbf{c}_k\mathbf{S}^i_j x$ if $k \neq i, j$

■

We give the simplified version as **PAX**:

Let **PAX** be the following finite amount of axiom schemes with arbitrary $i, j, k, l < \omega$:

(**S0**) The usual axioms of the Boolean algebras

(**S1**) The $\mathbf{S}_{pred}, \mathbf{S}_{suc}, \mathbf{S}^i_j$ are Boolean endomorphisms:

with arbitrary $\mathrm{S} \in \{\mathbf{S}_{pred}, \mathbf{S}_{suc}, \mathbf{S}^i_j\}$:

(0.1) $\mathrm{S(x + y) = Sx + Sy}$

(0.2) $\mathrm{S(-x) = - Sx}$

(**S2**) The connections of $\mathbf{S}_{pred}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{suc}$ with each other and with $\mathbf{S}^i_j$:

(1.1) $\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x = x$

(1.2) $\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}x = \mathbf{S}^0_1 x$

(1.3) $\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^i_j x = \mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$ if $i \neq j$

(**S3**) The connections of $\mathbf{c}_i$-s and $\mathbf{S}^i_j$-s:

(p_1) $\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{c}_i x = \mathbf{c}_i x$

(p_2) $\mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{S}^i_j x = \mathbf{S}^i_j x$ if $i \neq j$

(p_3) $\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{c}_k x = \mathbf{c}_k\mathbf{S}^i_j x$ if $k \neq i, j$

The properties of the $\mathbf{S}^i_j$-s:

(p_4) $\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^k_i x = \mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^k_j x$

(p_5) $\mathbf{S}^i_i x = x$

The properties of the $\mathbf{c}_i$-s:

(p_6) $\mathbf{c}_i x \geq x$

(p_7) $\mathbf{c}_i(x + y) = \mathbf{c}_i x + \mathbf{c}_i y$

■

PAX fully describes Sgws:

<u>Theorem 4.</u>: **I**Sgws = Mod(**PAX**)

■

The proof uses significantly [I.Sain 87] I. Lemma 1. (p.6.): **I**Sgws = Mod(**AX**). As it will be proved in Lemma 5.: **AX** and **PAX** are equivalent, thus Mod(**PAX**) = Mod(**AX**). Out of this we conclude **I**Sgws = Mod(**PAX**).

<u>Lemma 5.</u>: **AX** $\models$ **PAX** and **PAX** $\models$ **AX**

<u>Proof 5.</u>:
1. The part **AX** $\models$ **PAX** is obvious, because every axiom and axiom scheme of **PAX** except of (**S1**)(0.2) are part of **AX**. The axiom (**S1**)(0.2) is a consequence of **AX**(**S0**), (**S1**):
$1 = S(1) = S(x + -x) = S(x) + S(-x)$

$0 = S(0) = S(x \cdot -x) = S(x) \cdot S(-x)$

and because of the existence of the unique complementer in the Boolean algebras: $-S(x) = S(-x)$.

2. We have to prepare some lemmas as evidence to the other part: $\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{AX}$

As a proof we will use the results of [C.C.Pinter 73]. Because **PAX** contains every axiom and scheme of [C.C.Pinter 73] we will not repeat the proofs of these results. The results are the following ones, where $i, j, k, l < \omega$ are arbitrary:

(i) [C.C.Pinter 73] Lemma 2.2 (i) p.363.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{c}_i 0 = 0$

(ii) [C.C.Pinter 73] Lemma 2.2 (ii) p.363.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{c}_i(x \cdot \mathbf{c}_i y) = \mathbf{c}_i x \cdot \mathbf{c}_i y$

(iii) [C.C.Pinter 73] Lemma 2.2 (iii) p.363.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{c}_i \mathbf{c}_j x = \mathbf{c}_j \mathbf{c}_i x$

(iv) [C.C.Pinter 73] Lemma 2.2 (iv) p.363.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{S}^i_j \mathbf{S}^i_k x = \mathbf{S}^i_k x$ if $i \neq k$

(v) [C.C.Pinter 73] Lemma 2.2 (v) p.363.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{S}^i_j \mathbf{S}^k_l x = \mathbf{S}^k_l \mathbf{S}^i_j x$ if $i \neq k, l$ and $k \neq j$

(vi) [C.C.Pinter 73] Lemma 5 Proof (4) p.363.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{c}_i x = min\{y \mid y \geq x \text{ and } y = S^i_j z \text{ for some } z\}$ if $i \neq j$

<u>Lemma 6.</u>: $\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{S}^i_j \mathbf{S}^k_i x = \mathbf{S}^k_j x$, if $\mathbf{c}_i x = x$

<u>Proof 6.</u>:

Let us assume that $\mathbf{c}_i x = x$

If i = j then

$$\mathbf{S}^i_i \mathbf{S}^k_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_5)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_i x$$

If i = k then

$$\mathbf{S}^i_j \mathbf{S}^k_k x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_5)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^i_j x$$

We can assume that $i \neq j, k$

(3) $$x = \mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_1)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^i_j \mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{c}_i x = x}}{=} \mathbf{S}^i_j x$$

Then if $j \neq k$

$$\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^k_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_4)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^k_j x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ (v) \\ \text{because } i \neq j,k \text{ and } j \neq k}}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{S}^i_j x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ (3)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j x$$

If $j = k$

$$\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^k_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_4)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_j x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_5)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^j_j x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ (3)}}{=} x$$

■

Lemma 7.:

Let $\mathrm{S} \in \{\mathbf{S}_{pred}, \mathbf{S}_{suc}, \mathbf{S}^i_j\}$ be arbitrary. Then the following statements are consequences of **PAX**:

$\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{x} \cdot \mathrm{y}) = \mathrm{S}(\mathrm{x}) \cdot \mathrm{S}(\mathrm{y})$

$\mathrm{S}(0) = 0$

$\mathrm{S}(1) = 1$

Proof 7.:

$$-S(x \cdot y) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S1})(0.2)}}{=} S(-(x \cdot y)) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S0})}}{=} S(-x + -y) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S1})(0.1)}}{=} S(-x) + S(-y) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S1})(0.2)}}{=} -S(x) + -S(y) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S0})}}{=} -(S(x) \cdot S(y))$$

Then according to (**S0**):
$S(x \cdot y) = S(x) \cdot S(y)$ follows.

(4) $$S(1) = S(x + -x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S1})(0.1)}}{=} S(x) + S(-x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S1})(0.2)}}{=} S(x) + -S(x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S0})}}{=} 1$$

$$S(0) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S0})}}{=} S(-1) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S1})(0.2)}}{=} -S(1) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ (4)}}{=} -1 \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S0})}}{=} 0$$

■

Lemma 8.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{S}^j_i x = \mathbf{c}_j\mathbf{S}^i_j x$

Proof 8.:

	$\mathbf{S}^i_j x$	$\leq \mathbf{c}_i x$	$\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_6), (\mathbf{S3})/(p_1), (\mathbf{S1})(0.1)$
(5)	$\mathbf{c}_j\mathbf{S}^i_j x$	$\leq \mathbf{c}_j\mathbf{c}_i x$	$\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_7)$

a. $(i \neq j)$ case:

$$\mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{S}^j_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{c}_j\mathbf{S}^j_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{c}_j\mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{S}^j_i x \underset{\uparrow}{\geq} \mathbf{c}_j\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{c}_j\mathbf{S}^i_j x$$

$\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/p_2$, $i \neq j$ — (iii), $i \neq j$ — (5)-ben with $x \doteq \mathbf{S}^j_i x$ — $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_4),(p_5)$

The direction "$\leq$" is verifiable interchanging the role of the i and j.

b. $(i = j)$ case: obvious.

■

Lemma 9.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x = \mathbf{S}_{suc}x$

Proof 9.:

$$\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^0_1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}^0_1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$$

$\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S2})(1.1)$ — $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S2})/(1.2)$ — $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_2)$ — $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S2})(1.2),(1.1)$

■

Lemma 10.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models$ if $x = \mathbf{S}^i_j y$ for some y and $i \neq j$, then $\mathbf{S}^i_j x = x$

Proof 10.:

$$\mathbf{S}^i_j x = \mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^i_j y \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^i_j y \underset{\uparrow}{=} x$$

(iv) (because $i \neq j$) — (because $x = \mathbf{S}^i_j y$)

■

The following lemma have been already published in [I. Sain, V. Gyuris 94] (p.17.) from the author.

Lemma 11.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{c}_1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x = \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_0 x$

Proof 11.:

We remark that the minimums exist in this proof is due to the celebrated Jónsson-Tarski theorem: every Mod($\mathbf{PAX}$) algebra is embeddable into a complete algebra ([HMT I.] Thm. 10.5.(i) (p.412.)), where the positive equations (our system of axioms essentially looks like) are preserved. Because of the completness the minimums exist in the extended algebra, as well as in it's subalgebra, in Mod($\mathbf{PAX}$).

because of (vi): $\mathbf{c}_1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x = min\underbrace{\{y \mid y \geq \mathbf{S}_{suc}x \text{ and } y = \mathbf{S}^1_2 z \text{ for some } z\}}_{B_1}$ (1)

because of (vi): $\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_0 x = \mathbf{S}_{suc} min \underbrace{\{y \mid y \geq x \text{ and } y = \mathbf{S}_1^0 z \text{ for some } z\}}_{B_2}$ (2)

In the next step we will verify that (1) = (2). Starting with (1) we will get (2) applying some transformations.

a.) The following identity is valid:

$$min \underbrace{\{y \mid y \geq \mathbf{S}_{suc}x \text{ and } y = \mathbf{S}_2^1 z \text{ for some } z\}}_{B_1}$$

$$= min \underbrace{\{y \mid y \geq \mathbf{S}_{suc}x \text{ and } \overbrace{y = \mathbf{S}_2^1 z_1 \text{ for some } z_1}^{(3)} \text{ and } y = \mathbf{S}_1^0 z_2 \text{ for some } z_2\}}_{A_1}$$

The identity above is true because of $A_1 \subseteq B_1$ and for every $y \in B_1$ there is less $y' \in A_1$, especially $y' \stackrel{def}{=} -\mathbf{c}_0(-y)$ will be available as we shall see later.
Let $y \in B_1$.
a.1.)
Because of **PAX(S3)**/(p_6): $\mathbf{c}_0(-y) \geq -y \Rightarrow -\mathbf{c}_0(-y) \leq y \Rightarrow y' \leq y$
a.2.)
$y' \geq \mathbf{S}_{suc}x$ because if $y \geq \mathbf{S}_{suc}x$, then

$$y' = -\mathbf{c}_0(-y) \underset{\uparrow}{\geq} -\mathbf{c}_0(-\mathbf{S}_{suc}x) \underset{\uparrow}{=} -\mathbf{S}_{suc}(-x) \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{suc}x$$

P*AX*(**S3**)/(p_7) Lemma 9. **PAX**(**S1**)(0.2)
P*AX*(**S1**)(0.2)

a.3.)

$$\mathbf{S}_2^1 y' = \mathbf{S}_2^1(-\mathbf{c}_0(-y)) \underset{\uparrow}{=} -\mathbf{c}_0(-\mathbf{S}_2^1 y) \underset{\uparrow}{=} -\mathbf{c}_0(-y) = y'$$

PAX(**S3**)/(p_3), (**S1**)(0.2) (3) and Lemma 10.

and

$$\mathbf{S}_1^0 y' = \mathbf{S}_1^0(-\mathbf{c}_0(-y)) \underset{\uparrow}{=} -\mathbf{c}_0(-y) = y'$$

PAX(**S1**)(0.2), (**S3**)/(p_1)

Thus because of **a.2.**) and **a.3.**) it is true that $y' \in A_1$
b.) It is valid that

$$min \underbrace{\{y \mid y \geq \mathbf{S}_{suc}x \text{ and } y = \mathbf{S}_2^1 z_1 \text{ for some } z_1 \text{ and } \overbrace{y = \mathbf{S}_1^0 z_2 \text{ for some } z_2}^{(4)}\}}_{A_1} =$$

$$min \underbrace{\{\mathbf{S}_{suc}y \mid y \geq x \text{ and } \overbrace{y = \mathbf{S}_1^0 z \text{ for some } z}^{(5)}\}}_{A_2} \text{ because } A_1 = A_2.$$

b.1.) In the identity above first we shall proof the direction $A_1 \subseteq A_2$:
Let $y \in A_1$.

$$y \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_1^0 y \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}y$$

Lemma 10. **PAX**(**S2**)(1.2)

$$y \geq \mathbf{S}_{suc}x \Rightarrow \mathbf{S}_{pred}y \underset{\uparrow}{\geq} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} x$$

PAX(**S1**)(0.1) **PAX**(**S2**)(1.1)

$$y \underset{\text{Lemma 10}}{=} \mathbf{S}_1^0 y \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.2)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}y \text{ and } y \geq \mathbf{S}_{suc}x \Rightarrow \mathbf{S}_{pred}y \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S1)(0.1)}}{\geq} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.1)}}{=} x$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_1^0\mathbf{S}_{pred}y \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.1)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_1^0\mathbf{S}_{pred}y \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.3)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_2^1\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}x \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.2)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_2^1\mathbf{S}_1^0 y \underset{y \in A_1}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}y$$

Thus it is true that $y \in A_2$.
b.2.) After this we shall proof the direction $A_2 \subseteq A_1$:
Let $y \in A_2$. Then $y = \mathbf{S}_{suc}y'$ for some $y' \geq x$, and for which (5) is valid too.
Because of **PAX**(**S**1) if $y' \geq x \Rightarrow y = \mathbf{S}_{suc}y' \geq \mathbf{S}_{suc}x$.

$$\mathbf{S}_1^0 y = \mathbf{S}_1^0\mathbf{S}_{suc}y' \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.2)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}y' \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.1)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{suc}y' = y$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_2^1 y = \mathbf{S}_2^1\mathbf{S}_{suc}y' \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.3)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_1^0 y' \underset{\text{(5) and Lemma 10}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{suc}y' = y$$

verifies that $y \in A_1$.
c.) The following identity is valid:

$$min\underbrace{\{\mathbf{S}_{suc}y \mid y \geq x \text{ and } y = \mathbf{S}_1^0 z \text{ for some } z\}}_{A_2} = \mathbf{S}_{suc}min\underbrace{\{y \mid y \geq x \text{ and } y = \mathbf{S}_1^0 z \text{ for some } z\}}_{B_2}$$

Because $y \in B_2 \leftrightarrow \mathbf{S}_{suc}y \in A_2$ thus according to **PAX**(**S**1)(0.1) the identity above is true and this verifies the lemma.

■

Remark 12.:

Similarly with arbitrary $i < \omega$: **PAX** $\models \mathbf{c}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x = \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x$.

Lemma 13.:

PAX $\models \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_0 x = \mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_0^1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$

Proof 13.:

(1)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_0^1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S3)}/(p_1)}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_1^0\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_0^1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\text{Lemma 8}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_1^0\mathbf{c}_1\mathbf{S}_1^0\mathbf{S}_{suc} \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.2)}}{=}$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{c}_1\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.1)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{c}_1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\text{Lemma 10.}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_0 x \underset{\mathbf{PAX(S2)(1.1)}}{=} \mathbf{c}_0 x$$

from (1):

$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_0^1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x = \mathbf{c}_0 x$ applying $\mathbf{S}_{suc}$

$\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_0^1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x = \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_0 x$ because of **PAX**(**S**2)/(1.2) and **PAX**(**S**3)/($p1$)

$\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_0^1\mathbf{S}_{suc}x = \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_0 x$

We will give the deduction of the system of axioms **AX** from the system of axioms **PAX**

AX(S0) exactly **PAX**(S0).

AX(S1) is provable from **PAX**(S1) because of the Lemma 7.

AX(S2)(1.1)-(1.3) exactly **PAX**(S2)(1.1)-(1.3).

AX(S2)(1.4): **PAX** $\models \mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x = \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}x$ if $i \neq 0$ and $i \neq j$ proof:

Let $i \neq j$ and $i \neq 0$, then because of **PAX**(S2)(1.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}x && \textbf{PAX}(\text{S2})(1.2)\\
\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^0_1x\\
\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^0_1x && \textbf{PAX}(\text{S2})(1.1)\\
\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^0_1x && (\text{v})(\text{because } i \neq 0)\\
\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_1\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}x && \textbf{PAX}(\text{S2})(1.2)\\
\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}x && \textbf{PAX}(\text{S2})(1.1)\\
\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}x
\end{aligned}$$

AX(S2)(1.5): **PAX** $\models \mathbf{S}^0_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x = \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^1_{j+1}x$ if $j \neq 0$ proof:

Let $j \neq 0$. Because of **PAX**(S2)(1.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{S}^0_jx &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^0_jx && \textbf{PAX}(\text{S2})(1.3)\ (\text{because } j \neq 0)\\
\mathbf{S}^0_jx &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^1_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x && \text{Lemma 6 (by Lemma 9.: } 0 \notin \Delta(\mathbf{S}_{suc}x))\\
\mathbf{S}^0_jx &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^1_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x && \textbf{PAX}(\text{S2})(1.2)\\
\mathbf{S}^0_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^1_0\mathbf{S}^0_1x && \textbf{PAX}(\text{S3})/(p_4)\\
\mathbf{S}^0_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^1_0\mathbf{S}^0_0x && \textbf{PAX}(\text{S3})/(p_5)\\
\mathbf{S}^0_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^1_0x && \textbf{PAX}(\text{S3})/(p_4)\\
\mathbf{S}^0_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}x &= \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^1_{j+1}x
\end{aligned}$$

We will not proof Jónsson schemes in their original sequence from **PAX**, because some of the schemes will be used later to prove the other ones.

AX(S2)(1.6.6): **PAX** $\models \mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^k_lx = \mathbf{S}^k_l\mathbf{S}^i_jx$ if $(k \neq j, i \neq k, l)$ proof:

Similar as (v).

AX(S2)(1.6.7): **PAX** $\models \mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^i_kx = \mathbf{S}^i_kx$ if $(i \neq k)$ proof:

Similar as (iv).

$\mathbf{AX(S2)(1.6.5)}$: $\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{P}^i_j \mathbf{S}^j_i x = \mathbf{S}^i_j x$ if $(i \neq j)$ proof:

Let $i \neq j$. Then:

$$\mathbf{P}^i_j \mathbf{S}^j_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^j_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

($\mathbf{P}^i_j$ definition; $\mathbf{PAX}$(S2)(1.3.) (because $i \neq j$); $\mathbf{PAX}$ (S3)/(p_4))

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

((v) (because $i \neq j$); $\mathbf{PAX}$(S3)/(p_4))

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^i_j x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

($\mathbf{PAX}$(S2)(1.3) (because $i \neq j$); (iv))

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^i_j x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^i_j x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

(Lemma 6. (because $0 \notin \Delta(\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^i_j x)$:Lemma 9.); $\mathbf{PAX}$(S3)/p_5)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^i_j x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^i_j x$$

($\mathbf{PAX}$(S2)(1.1))

$\mathbf{AX(S2)(1.6.4)}$: $\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{P}^i_j \mathbf{S}^k_i x = \mathbf{S}^k_j \mathbf{P}^i_j x$ if $(j \neq k, i \neq k)$ proof:

a. Let $k \neq 0$ and $k \neq i, j$

$$\mathbf{P}^i_j \mathbf{S}^k_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^k_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

($\mathbf{P}^i_j$definition; $\mathbf{PAX}$(S2)(1.3.) (because $i \neq k$); $\mathbf{PAX}$ (S3)/(p_4))

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_0\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

((v) (because $i \neq k$); (v) (because $j, i \neq k$))

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_0\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

($\mathbf{PAX}$(S3)/(p_4); (v) (because $k \neq j$))

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_j$$

($\mathbf{AX}$(S2)(1.4.) (because $k \neq j, k \neq 0$); $\mathbf{P}^i_j$ definition)

b. Let $k = 0$ and $k \neq i, j$

Because $k \neq j, i$, then $j, i \neq 0$

$$\mathbf{P}^i_j \mathbf{S}^0_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}^0_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}^1_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

$\mathbf{P}^i_j$definition; $\mathbf{PAX}$(S2)(1.3.) (because $i \neq 0$); $\mathbf{PAX}$ (S3)/(p_4)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}^1_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^1_0\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

(v) (because $i \neq 0$); (v) (because $j, i \neq 0$)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^1_0\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^1_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

(iv), $\mathbf{PAX}$(S3)/(p_4), (v) (because $j \neq 0$); $\mathbf{AX}$(S2)(1.5) (because $0 \neq j$)

$$\mathbf{S}^0_j\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^0_j\mathbf{P}^i_j$$

$\mathbf{P}^i_j$ definition

$\mathbf{AX}$(S2)(1.6.2): $\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{P}^j_i x = x$ proof:

a. Let $i \neq j$

$$\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{P}^j_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

$\mathbf{P}^i_j$definition

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

$\mathbf{PAX}$(S2)(1.2)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}^0_1\mathbf{S}^0_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

(iv)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}^0_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

$\mathbf{PAX}$(S3)/(p_4)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}^0_0\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

$\mathbf{PAX}$(S3)/(p_5), (iv) (because $i \neq j$)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

$\mathbf{PAX}$(S3)/(p_4), (p_5); (iv)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} x$$

Lemma 6. (because $0 \notin \Delta(\mathbf{S}_{suc}x)$:Lemma 9.); $\mathbf{PAX}$(S3)/(p_5); $\mathbf{PAX}$ (S2)(1.1)

b. Let $i = j$

$$\mathbf{P}_i^i\mathbf{P}_i^i x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$
$\mathbf{P}_i^i$definition

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^0\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_0^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^0\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_0^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$
PAX(S2)(1.2)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^0\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_0^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_1^0\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^0\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_0^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$
(iv)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^0\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_0^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^0\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_0^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$
Lemma 6.
because $i+1 \notin \Delta(\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_0^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x)$

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^0\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_0^0\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_0^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$
PAX(S3)/(p_5)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^0\mathbf{S}_0^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{i+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=} x$$
Lemma 6. (because $0 \notin \Delta(\mathbf{S}_{suc}x)$:Lemma 9.) — **PAX**(S3)/(p_5) — **PAX** (S2)(1.1)

Lemma 14.:[I.Sain,R.J.Thompson 88] (p.553.)

PAX $\models \mathbf{S}_i^k\mathbf{S}_j^i\mathbf{S}_k^j\mathbf{S}_j^k\mathbf{S}_i^j\mathbf{S}_k^i x = \mathbf{S}_i^k x$ if $i \neq j, k$

Proof 14.:

Let $i \neq j, k$. Then:

$$\mathbf{S}_i^k\mathbf{S}_j^i\mathbf{S}_k^j\mathbf{S}_j^k\mathbf{S}_i^j\mathbf{S}_k^i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_i^k\mathbf{S}_j^i\mathbf{S}_k^j\mathbf{S}_i^j\mathbf{S}_k^i x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_i^k\mathbf{S}_j^i\mathbf{S}_i^j\mathbf{S}_k^i x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$
PAX(S3)/(p_4), (p_5) — (iv) (because $i \neq j$) — **PAX**(S3)/(p_4), (p_5)

$$\mathbf{S}_i^k\mathbf{S}_j^i\mathbf{S}_k^i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_i^k\mathbf{S}_k^i x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_i^k x$$
(iv) (because $i \neq k$) — **PAX**(S3)/(p_4), (p_5)

■

Lemma 15.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{c}_i x = \mathbf{c}_i x$ if $i \neq j, k$

Proof 15.:

Let $j \neq i$. Then:

$$\mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{c}_i x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{c}_i x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{c}_i x$$

$\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_1)$ — $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_2)$ (because $i \neq j$) — $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_1)$

Lemma 16.:

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{S}^k_i\mathbf{c}_i x = \mathbf{P}^i_k\mathbf{c}_i x$ if $k \neq i$

Proof 16.:

a. Let $k \neq 0$ and $k \neq i$

$$\mathbf{S}^k_i\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_i\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

$\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S2})(1.1)$ — Lemma 9. $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S2})(1.4)$(because $k \neq 0, k \neq i$)$(\mathbf{S3})/(p_3)$ — PAX

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{k+1}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{k+1}\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

$\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_1)$ — Lemma 9. $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_3)$ — Remark 11.

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{k+1}\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{c}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{k+1}\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{c}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \quad \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

$\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S3})/(p_1)$ — Remark 12.

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{k+1}\mathbf{S}^{k+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{P}^i_k\mathbf{c}_i x$$

$\mathbf{P}^i_k$definition

b. Let $k = 0$ and $k \neq i$

Because $k \neq i$, then $i \neq 0$

$$\mathbf{S}^0_i\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}2)(1.1)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^0_i\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \text{Lemma 9.} \\ \mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}2)(1.5)(\text{because } 0 \neq i)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^1_{i+1}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ (v) \\ (\text{because } i \neq 0)}}{=}$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^1_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^0_{i+1}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_1)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^1_{i+1}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \text{Lemma 9., 15.} \\ \text{Remark 12.}}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^1_{i+1}\mathbf{c}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX} \\ (\mathbf{S}3)/(p_1)}}{=}$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^1_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{c}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \text{Remark 12,15}}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^1_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}2)(1.1)}}{=}$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^1_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}2)(1.2)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_1\mathbf{S}^1_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{c}_i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{P}^i_0\text{definition}}}{=} \mathbf{P}^i_0\mathbf{c}_i x$$

■

<u>Lemma 17.</u>:[I.Sain,R.J.Thompson 88] (p.553.) :

$\mathbf{PAX} \models \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_j x = \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{S}^j_i\mathbf{S}^i_k x$ if i, j, k are distinct.

<u>Proof 17.</u>:

Let i, j, k be distinct. Then:

$$\mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_j(x \cdot -\mathbf{S}^i_k x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_6)}}{\leq} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{c}_j(x \cdot -\mathbf{S}^i_k x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_1)}}{=}$$

$$\mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_i\mathbf{c}_j(x \cdot -\mathbf{S}^i_k x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{AX}(1.6.5.) \\ (\text{because } i \neq j)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{c}_j(x \cdot -\mathbf{S}^i_k x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_4)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{S}^i_k\mathbf{c}_j(x \cdot -\mathbf{S}^i_k x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_3) \\ (\text{because } j \neq i, k)}}{=}$$

$$\mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{c}_j\mathbf{S}^i_k(x \cdot -\mathbf{S}^i_k x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}1)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{c}_j(\mathbf{S}^i_k x \cdot \mathbf{S}^i_k(-\mathbf{S}^i_k x)) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}1)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{c}_j(\mathbf{S}^i_k x \cdot -\mathbf{S}^i_k\mathbf{S}^i_k x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_1),(p_2) \\ (\text{because } i \neq k)}}{=}$$

$$\mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{c}_j(\mathbf{S}^i_k x \cdot -\mathbf{S}^i_k x) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}0)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{c}_j(0) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ (i)}}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j(0) \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}1)}}{=} 0$$

Thus $\mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_j x \cdot -\mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{S}^i_k x = 0$ because of $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}1)$.

Then:

(1) $\mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_jx \underset{\uparrow}{\leq} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{S}^i_kx$ (PAX(S0)) $\underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{S}^i_kx$ (PAX(S3)/(p_2) (because $i \neq k$)) $\underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{S}^j_i\mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{S}^i_kx$ (Lemma 16. (because $i \neq j$)) $\underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{S}^j_i\mathbf{S}^i_kx$ (PAX(S3)/(p_2) (because $i \neq k$))

(2) $\mathbf{S}^k_ix \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_i\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_k\mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{S}^j_i\mathbf{S}^i_kx$ (Lemma 14. (because $i \neq k, j$)) $\underset{\uparrow}{\geq} \mathbf{S}^k_i\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_k\mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_jx$ ((1) (because $i \neq k, j$) and PAX(S1)(0.1)) $\underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_i\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_k\mathbf{P}^i_jx$ (PAX(S3)/(p_4), (p_5))

Thus:

$$\mathbf{S}^k_i\mathbf{P}^j_ix \underset{\uparrow}{\geq} \mathbf{S}^k_i\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_k\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{P}^j_ix \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^k_i\mathbf{S}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_kx$$

((2) – ből; AX(1.6.2.))

Interchanging the role of i and j we will get: (3) $\mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{P}^i_jx \geq \mathbf{S}^k_j\mathbf{S}^j_i\mathbf{S}^i_k$

The statement follows from (1) and (3).

■

Lemma 18.:

PAX $\models \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{P}^i_jx = \mathbf{P}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$ if $i \neq j$

Proof 18.:

Let $i \neq j$

$\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{P}^i_jx \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$ ($\mathbf{P}^i_j$definition) $\underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^0_1\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$ (PAX(S2)/(1.2)) $\underset{\uparrow}{=}$ (iv)

$\mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^{j+1}_{i+1}\mathbf{S}^{i+1}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^0_{j+1}\mathbf{P}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$ (Lemma 17. (because $i \neq j$)) $\underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{P}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^0_{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$ (AX(1.6.4)) $\underset{\uparrow}{=}$ (Lemma 9.)

$\mathbf{P}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}^0_{i+1}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{P}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$ (PAX(S3)/(p_1)) $\underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{P}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc}x$ (Lemma 9.)

■

Lemma 19.:

PAX $\models \mathbf{S}^k_i\mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{S}^i_0\mathbf{c}_0x = \mathbf{P}^i_k\mathbf{P}^0_i\mathbf{c}_0x$ if $i \neq 0, k \neq i$

Proof 19.:

Let $i \neq 0, k \neq i$. Then:

$$\mathbf{S}_i^k \mathbf{c}_i \mathbf{S}_0^i \mathbf{c}_0 x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{c}_i \mathbf{S}_0^i \mathbf{c}_0 x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_0^i \mathbf{c}_0 x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{P}_i^0 \mathbf{c}_0 x$$

Lemma 16. (because $k \neq i$) — **PAX**(S3)/(p_2) (because $0 \neq i$) — Lemma 16. (because $i \neq 0$)

■

AX(S2)(1.6.3): **PAX** $\models \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{P}_k^i x = \mathbf{P}_k^j \mathbf{P}_j^i x$ if $j \neq k, i \neq k, i \neq j$ proof:

We will prove it in two steps. In the step a. we will prove the statement for "x" where $\mathbf{c}_0 x = x$. In the step b. the case $\mathbf{c}_0 x \neq x$ will be attributed to the application of step a.

Let i, j, k be distinct.

a. Let $\mathbf{c}_0 x = x$

Starting from **PAX**(S3)/(p_4) we can deduce:

$$\mathbf{S}_k^j \mathbf{S}_j^i x = \mathbf{S}_k^j \mathbf{S}_k^i x$$
$$\mathbf{P}_k^j \mathbf{S}_j^k \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j x = \mathbf{S}_k^j \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^k x \quad \mathbf{AX}(S3)(1.6.5) \text{ (because } i \neq j, j \neq k, i \neq k)$$
$$\mathbf{P}_k^j \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^k \mathbf{S}_i^j x = \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x \quad \mathbf{AX}(S3)(1.6.4) \text{ (because } i \neq j, j \neq k, i \neq k)$$
$$\mathbf{P}_k^j \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x = \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x \quad \text{(v) (because } i \neq j, j \neq k, i \neq k) \tag{3}$$

Starting from (iv) we conclude the following, because $i \neq k$:

$$\mathbf{S}_j^i \mathbf{S}_k^i x = \mathbf{S}_k^i x$$
$$\mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^k x = \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^k x \quad AX(S3)(1.6.5) \text{ (because } i \neq j, i \neq k)$$
$$\mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^k \mathbf{S}_i^j x = \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^k \mathbf{S}_i^j x \quad \text{replacing x by } \mathbf{S}_i^j(x)$$
$$\mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x = \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x \quad \text{(v) (because } i \neq j, j \neq k, i \neq k) \tag{4}$$

According to (3) and (4) starting from the following identity:

$$\mathbf{P}_k^j \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x = \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x$$
$$\mathbf{P}_k^j \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x = \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_k^j \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^k x \quad \mathbf{AX}(S3)(1.6.4) \text{ (because } i \neq j, i \neq k)$$
$$\mathbf{P}_k^j \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x = \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_k^j \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^k x \quad \text{(iv) (because } j \neq k)$$
$$\mathbf{P}_k^j \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x = \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k x \quad \mathbf{AX}(S3)(1.6.4) \text{ (because } i \neq j, j \neq k) \tag{5}$$
$$\mathbf{P}_k^j \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k \mathbf{c}_i \mathbf{S}_0^i \mathbf{c}_0 x = \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{S}_i^k \mathbf{c}_i \mathbf{S}_0^i \mathbf{c}_0 x \quad \text{replacing } x \text{ by } \mathbf{c}_i \mathbf{S}_0^i \mathbf{c}_0 x$$

$\mathbf{P}_k^j \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{P}_i^0 \mathbf{c}_0 x = \mathbf{P}_j^i \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{S}_i^j \mathbf{P}_k^i \mathbf{P}_i^0 \mathbf{c}_0 x$ because of Lemma 19.

(6) $\mathbf{P}^j_k\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_i\mathbf{P}^i_k\mathbf{P}^0_i x = \mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{P}^i_k\mathbf{S}^j_i\mathbf{P}^i_k\mathbf{P}^0_i x$ because $\mathbf{c}_0 x = x$

We can transform the identity (6) with help of **AX**(S2)(1.6.2) for the following form, when the "x" is replaced by $\mathbf{P}^i_0 x$ and $\mathbf{P}^k_i x$:

(7) $\mathbf{P}^j_k\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{S}^j_i x = \mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{P}^i_k\mathbf{S}^j_i x$

The method eliminating the $\mathbf{S}^k_i$-s from (5) is called "Method of the elimination of replacements"

Let us repeat the "Method of the elemination of replacements" in the identity (7) for the $\mathbf{S}^j_i$. We shall get the following identity.

(8) $\mathbf{P}^j_k\mathbf{P}^i_j x = \mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{P}^i_k x$, thus we have proved (1.6.3), if $\mathbf{c}_0 x = x$.

b. Let $\mathbf{c}_0 x \neq x$

$$\mathbf{P}^j_k\mathbf{P}^i_j x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{P}^j_k\mathbf{P}^i_j x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{P}^{j+1}_{k+1}\mathbf{P}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=}$$

PAX(S2)(1.1) — Lemma 18. (because $j \neq k, i \neq j$) — step a. of the deduction ($\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_{sux} x = \mathbf{S}_{suc} x$:Lemma 9.)

$$\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{P}^{i+1}_{j+1}\mathbf{P}^{i+1}_{k+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{P}^i_k x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{P}^i_j\mathbf{P}^i_k x$$

Lemma 18. (because $i \neq k, i \neq j$ — **PAX**(S2)(1.1)

Thus we have completed the proof of the identity (1.6.3).

AX(S2)(1.6.1): **PAX** $\models \mathbf{P}^i_j x = \mathbf{P}^j_i x$ proof:

If $i = j$ then $P^i_i x = P^i_i x$ is obvious. Thus we can assume that $i \neq j$.

Let $i \neq j$.

a. Let $\mathbf{c}_0 x = x$

Let $k \neq i, j$. Then:

(1) $$\mathbf{S}^j_k\mathbf{S}^i_j x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^j_k\mathbf{S}^i_k x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^i_k\mathbf{S}^j_k x \underset{\uparrow}{=} \mathbf{S}^i_k\mathbf{S}^j_i x$$

PAX(S3)/(p_4) — (v) (because $j \neq i, k$ and $k \neq i$) — **PAX**(S3)/(p_4)

Let us start with the identity (1):

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{S}_k^j\mathbf{S}_j^i x = \mathbf{S}_k^i\mathbf{S}_i^j x & \\
\mathbf{P}_k^j\mathbf{S}_j^k\mathbf{P}_j^i\mathbf{S}_i^j x = \mathbf{P}_k^i\mathbf{S}_i^k\mathbf{P}_i^j\mathbf{S}_j^i x & \mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}2)(1.6.5)\ \text{(because } j \neq i, k \text{ and } k \neq i) \\
\mathbf{P}_k^j\mathbf{P}_j^i\mathbf{S}_i^k\mathbf{S}_i^j x = \mathbf{P}_k^i\mathbf{P}_i^j\mathbf{S}_j^k\mathbf{S}_j^i x & \mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}2)(1.6.4)\ \text{(because } j \neq k \text{ and } k \neq i) \\
\mathbf{P}_j^i\mathbf{P}_k^i\mathbf{S}_i^k\mathbf{S}_i^j x = \mathbf{P}_i^j\mathbf{P}_k^j\mathbf{S}_j^k\mathbf{S}_j^i x & \mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}2)(1.6.3)\ \text{(because } j \neq i, k \text{ and } k \neq i) \\
\mathbf{P}_j^i\mathbf{S}_k^i\mathbf{S}_i^j x = \mathbf{P}_i^j\mathbf{S}_k^j\mathbf{S}_j^i x & \mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}2)(1.6.5)\ \text{(because } j \neq k \text{ and } k \neq i) \\
\mathbf{P}_j^i\mathbf{S}_k^i\mathbf{S}_k^j x = \mathbf{P}_i^j\mathbf{S}_k^j\mathbf{S}_k^i x & \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_4) \\
\mathbf{P}_j^i\mathbf{S}_k^i\mathbf{S}_k^j x = \mathbf{P}_i^j\mathbf{S}_k^i\mathbf{S}_k^j x & \text{(v) (because } j \neq i, k \text{ and } k \neq i)
\end{array}
$$

In the last identity we can apply the "Method of the elimination of replacements" to the $\mathbf{S}_k^j$ and $\mathbf{S}_k^i$. We will get the following identity:

$\mathbf{P}_j^i x = \mathbf{P}_i^j x$ (if $j \neq i$ and $c_0 x = x$) b. Let $\mathbf{c}_0 x \neq x$

$$
\mathbf{P}_i^j x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}2)(1.1)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{P}_i^j x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \text{Lemma 16.} \\ \text{(because } i \neq j)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{P}_{i+1}^{j+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \text{step a. in the deduction} \\ (\mathbf{c}_0\mathbf{S}_{sux}x = \mathbf{S}_{suc}x\text{:Lemma 9.})}}{=}
$$

$$
\mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{P}_{j+1}^{i+1}\mathbf{S}_{suc} x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \text{Lemma 16.} \\ \text{(because } i \neq j)}}{=} \mathbf{S}_{pred}\mathbf{S}_{suc}\mathbf{P}_j^i x \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}2)(1.1)}}{=} \mathbf{P}_j^i x
$$

Thus we have completed the proof of the identity (1.6.1).

$\mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(q_1)$ exactly $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}1)(0.2.)$ if we shall choose as S the $\mathbf{S}_j^i$.

$\mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(q_2)$ exactly $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}1)(0.1.)$ if we shall choose as S the $\mathbf{S}_j^i$.

$\mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(q_3)$ exactly $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_5)$.

$\mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(q_4)$ exactly $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_4)$.

$\mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(q_5)$ exactly $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_4)$.

$\mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(q_6)$ exactly $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_5)$.

$\mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(q_7)$ exactly $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_1)$.

$\mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(q_8)$ exactly $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_2)$.

$\mathbf{AX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(q_9)$ exactly $\mathbf{PAX}(\mathbf{S}3)/(p_3)$.

Thus we have completed the proof of the Lemma 5. as well as the Theorem 4.

■

REFERENCES

[Andréka,H. 91] *Complexity of the Equations Valid in Algebras of Relations*, PhD thesis,Hun.Ac.Sci., also Ann. Pure Appl. Logic, to appear, Budapest, 1991 (Thesis for D.Sc - a post-habilitation degree)..

[Bíró,B. 87] *Non-finite-axiomatizability results in algebraic logic*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **75** (1992), no. 2.

[Csizmazia,S. 92] *Database Logic Founded by a General Datamodell*, PhD dissertation Hun.Ac.Sci., Budapest, 1992, p. 132.

[Csizmazia,S. 95] *Additions to "Databases and Cylindric Algebras"*, PhD dissertation Hun.Ac.Sci., Budapest, 1995, p. 70.

[Henkin,L. Monk,J.D. 74] *Cylindric Algebras and Related Structures*, Proc. Tarski Symp., Amer. Match. Soc., **25** (1974), 105–121.

[HMT I] Henkin,L. Monk,J.D. Tarski,A., *Cylindric Algebras Part I*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1971, p. 508.

[HMT II] Henkin,L. Monk,J.D. Tarski,A., *Cylindric Algebras Part II*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985, p. 302.

[Monk,J.D. 70] *On an Algebra of Sets of Finite Sequences*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **35** (1970), 19–28.

[Németi,I. 91] *Algebraization of Quantifier Logics: An Introductory Overview*, shortened version in Studia Logica **L 3/4** (1991), no. (a special devoted to Algebraic Logic), 485–569.

[Németi,I. Tit1] *Strong Representability of Fork Algebras, a Set Theoretic foundation*, Journal of the IGPL (to appear).

[Németi,I. Tit2] *Ontology can turn negative results to positive (an overview of recent results)*, Bulletin of the Section of Logic, Univ. of Lodz **25** (1996), no. 1, 29-40.

[Pinter,C.C. 73] *A Simple Algebra of First Order Logic*, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic **XIV** (1973), no. 3, 361–366.

[Sági,G. 95] *A non-effectiveness in the standard axiomatozation of polyadic algebras*, MKI Preprint (1995, december), Budapest.

[Sági,G. Németi,I. 95] *Non-schematizability of the equational theory of representable polyadic-equality algebras*, MKI Preprint (1995, december), Budapest.

[Sain,I. 87] *On the Search for a Finitizable (with respect to the representable) Algebraization of First Order Logic I., II.*, Preprints Math. Inst. Hungar. Acad. Sci. (1987), no. 53, Budapest, 78.

[Sain,I. 93] *On the Search for a Finitizable Algebraization of First Order Logic (Shortened Version A)*, Preprint of Math. Inst. Hungar. Acad. Sci. (1988), no. revised in April 1993, Budapest, 72.

[Sain,I. Gyuris,V. 94] *Finite Schematizable Algebraic Logic*, Algebraic Logic and the Methodology of Applying it (Tempus Summer School) (July,1994), Budapest, 29.

[Sain,I. Gyuris,V. 95] *Finite Schematizable Algebraic Logic*, Journ. IGPL (February,95), Budapest, 56.

[Sain,I. Thompson,R.J. 88] *Strictly Finite Schema Axiomatization of Quasi-poliadic Algebras*, Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bólyai (Algebraic Logic) **54** (1988), Budapest, 539–571.

[Simon A. Németi,I.] *Weakly Higher Order Cylindric Algebras and Finite Axiomatization of the Representables*, MAKI prepint, Budapest, 1995.

[Tarski,A. 66] *What are Logical Notions, Lecture at Bedford College, London, 1966*, History and Philosophy of Logic (ed J.Corcoran), available also in A.Tarski: Collected Papers, Birkhouser, 1986. **7** (1986), 143–154.