

Constructive logic with strong negation is a substructural logic over FL_{ew}

M. Spinks

R. Veroff

U. Cagliari

U. New Mexico

Topological and Algebraic
Methods in Non-classical Logic
'07

A Hilbert-style presentation of *IPC*

$$p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow p)$$

$$(p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)) \rightarrow ((p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r))$$

$$p \wedge q \rightarrow p$$

$$p \wedge q \rightarrow q$$

$$(r \rightarrow p) \rightarrow ((r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (r \rightarrow (p \wedge q)))$$

$$p \rightarrow p \vee q$$

$$q \rightarrow p \vee q$$

$$(p \rightarrow r) \rightarrow ((q \rightarrow r) \rightarrow ((p \vee q) \rightarrow r))$$

$$\neg p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow \mathbf{0})$$

$$(p \rightarrow \mathbf{0}) \rightarrow \neg p$$

$$\mathbf{0} \rightarrow p$$

$$p \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$$

$$p, p \rightarrow q \vdash q.$$

Constructive logic with strong negation

- Constructive logic with strong negation, in symbols **CLSN**, is the axiomatic expansion of **IPC** by a unary connective \sim and axioms:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \sim(p \wedge q) \leftrightarrow (\sim p \vee \sim q) & \sim p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q) & \sim\neg p \leftrightarrow p \\ \sim(p \vee q) \leftrightarrow (\sim p \wedge \sim q) & \sim(p \rightarrow q) \leftrightarrow (p \wedge \sim q) & \sim\sim p \leftrightarrow p \end{array}$$

- The unary connective \sim is known as the **strong negation**.
- Milestones:
 - 1949 **CLSN** introduced by Nelson.
 - 1958 Algebraic semantics introduced by Rasiowa.
 - 1977 Counterexample semantics developed by Vakarelov.
 - 1990s Proof theoretic treatments of logics with strong negation.

CLSN is usually studied relative (in some sense) to **IPC**.

A Hilbert-style presentation of *CLSN*

$$p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow p)$$

$$(p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)) \rightarrow ((p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r))$$

$$p \wedge q \rightarrow p$$

$$p \wedge q \rightarrow q$$

$$(r \rightarrow p) \rightarrow ((r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (r \rightarrow (p \wedge q)))$$

$$p \rightarrow p \vee q$$

$$q \rightarrow p \vee q$$

$$(p \rightarrow r) \rightarrow ((q \rightarrow r) \rightarrow ((p \vee q) \rightarrow r))$$

$$\neg p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow \mathbf{0})$$

$$(p \rightarrow \mathbf{0}) \rightarrow \neg p$$

$$\mathbf{0} \rightarrow p$$

$$p \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$$

$$p, p \rightarrow q \vdash q$$

$$\neg p \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$$

$$\neg(p \rightarrow q) \leftrightarrow (p \wedge \neg q)$$

$$\neg(p \wedge q) \leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee \neg q)$$

$$\neg(p \vee q) \leftrightarrow (\neg p \wedge \neg q)$$

$$\neg\neg p \leftrightarrow p$$

$$\neg\neg\neg p \leftrightarrow \neg p$$

The algebraic counterpart of *CLSN*

- *CLSN* is **regularly algebraisable** in the sense of Blok and Pigozzi.
 - This means \exists a class of algebras **K** that is to *CLSN* as **BA** is to *CPC*.
- The **equivalent quasivariety** of *CLSN* is the class **N** of all Nelson algebras.
 - **N** is the algebraic counterpart of *CLSN* in the same way **BA** is the algebraic counterpart of *CPC*.

Nelson algebras are De Morgan algebras enriched
with a certain weak implication operation \rightarrow
generalising relative pseudocomplementation.

Nelson algebras

- A **Nelson algebra** is an algebra $\mathbf{A} := \langle A; \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \sim, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ of type $\langle 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 0 \rangle$ such that
 1. $\langle A; \wedge, \vee, \sim, 0, 1 \rangle$ is a De Morgan algebra with lattice order \leq .
 2. The relation \ll given by $a \ll b$ iff $a \rightarrow b = 1$ ($a, b \in A$) is a preorder on A .
 3. The relation $\Xi := \ll \cap \ll^{-1}$ is a congruence on $\mathbf{A}' := \langle A; \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$, and \mathbf{A}'/Ξ is a Heyting algebra.
 4. $\mathbf{A} \models \neg x \approx x \rightarrow 0$.
 5. $\forall a, b \in A$,
 1. $\neg(a \rightarrow b) \Xi a \wedge \sim b$
 2. $a \wedge \sim a \ll 0$
 3. $a \Rightarrow b = 1$ iff $a \leq b$.

Nelson algebras are a variety

- **Theorem** (Brignole, 1969). A Nelson algebra is an algebra $\mathbf{A} := \langle A; \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \sim, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ of type $\langle 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 0 \rangle$ where:

1. $\langle A; \wedge, \vee, \sim, 0, 1 \rangle$ is a De Morgan algebra.
2. \mathbf{A} satisfies the following identities:

$$(x \wedge \sim x) \wedge (y \vee \sim y) \approx x \wedge \sim x$$

$$x \rightarrow x \approx \mathbf{1}$$

$$(x \rightarrow y) \wedge (\sim x \vee y) \approx \sim x \vee y$$

$$x \wedge (\sim x \vee y) \approx x \wedge (x \rightarrow y)$$

$$(x \rightarrow y) \wedge (x \rightarrow z) \approx x \rightarrow (y \wedge z)$$

$$(x \wedge y) \rightarrow z \approx x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z)$$

$$\sim x \approx x \rightarrow \mathbf{0}.$$

Substructural logics over FL

- Informally, a **substructural logic** is a logic that lacks some or all of the structural rules when presented as a sequent system.
- Let FL denote the sequent system obtained from LJ by deleting the structural rules:

(e) Exchange, (c) Contraction, (w) Weakening

and by adding rules for the fusion connective $*$ and the residuals.
- Let FL denote the deductive system determined by FL .
- Let $FL_{e[c]w}$ denote the extension of FL by (e), [(c)], and (w).

The language type of $FL_{e[c]w}$ is $\{\wedge, \vee, *, \Rightarrow, 0, 1\}$.

Substructural logics over FL

- A deductive system \mathcal{S} is **non-Fregean** if \exists a theory T of \mathcal{S} for which the T -theory interderivability relation $-||-^T$ is not a congruence on the formula algebra.
- **Theorem** (S., Galatos, 2005). An extension of FL is Fregean iff it is an axiomatic extension of FL_{ecw} iff it is definitionally equivalent to an axiomatic extension of IPC .
- A **substructural logic over FL** is a deductive system \mathcal{S} that is definitionally equivalent to a non-Fregean extension of FL .
 - Thus IPC is *not* a substructural logic over FL .

We are interested in substructural logics over FL_{ecw} .

A Hilbert-style presentation of FL_{ew}

$$(p \Rightarrow q) \Rightarrow ((q \Rightarrow r) \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow r))$$

$$(p \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow r)) \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow r))$$

$$p \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow p)$$

$$p \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow (p * q))$$

$$(p \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow r)) \Rightarrow ((p * q) \Rightarrow r)$$

$$(p \wedge q) \Rightarrow p$$

$$(p \wedge q) \Rightarrow q$$

$$(p \Rightarrow q) \Rightarrow ((p \Rightarrow r) \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow (q \wedge r)))$$

$$p \Rightarrow (p \vee q)$$

$$q \Rightarrow (p \vee q)$$

$$(p \Rightarrow r) \Rightarrow ((q \Rightarrow r) \Rightarrow ((p \vee q) \Rightarrow r))$$

$$p \Rightarrow \mathbf{1}$$

$$\mathbf{0} \Rightarrow p$$

$$p, p \Rightarrow q \vdash q.$$

The algebraic counterpart of FL_{ew}

- FL_{ew} is regularly algebraisable in the sense of Blok and Pigozzi.
 - This means \exists a class of algebras \mathbf{K} that is to FL_{ew} as \mathbf{BA} is to \mathbf{CPC} .
- The equivalent quasivariety of FL_{ew} is the class \mathbf{FL}_{ew} of all FL_{ew} -algebras.
 - \mathbf{FL}_{ew} is the algebraic counterpart of FL_{ew} in the same way \mathbf{BA} is the algebraic counterpart of \mathbf{CPC} .

FL_{ew} -algebras are bounded, commutative,
integral residuated lattices.

FL_{ew} -algebras

- A **commutative, integral residuated lattice** is an algebra $\langle A; \wedge, \vee, *, \Rightarrow, 1 \rangle$ of type $\langle 2, 2, 2, 2, 0 \rangle$ where:
 1. $\langle A; \wedge, \vee \rangle$ is a lattice with lattice ordering \leq .
 2. $\langle A; *, 1 \rangle$ is a commutative monoid.
 3. $\forall a, b, c \in A, a * b \leq c$ iff $a \leq b \Rightarrow c$.
 4. $\forall a \in A, a \leq 1$.
- An **FL_{ew} -algebra** $\langle A; \wedge, \vee, *, \Rightarrow, 0, 1 \rangle$ is a commutative, integral residuated lattice with distinguished least element $0 \in A$.

The logic NFL_{ew}

- Let
 - $\sim p$ abbreviate $p \Rightarrow \mathbf{0}$.
 - $p \Rightarrow^2 q$ abbreviate $p \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow q)$.
 - $p \Rightarrow^3 q$ abbreviate $p \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow q))$.
- **Nelson FL_{ew} logic**, in symbols NFL_{ew} , is the axiomatic extension of FL_{ew} by the axioms:

$$\sim\sim p \Rightarrow p \quad \text{(Double negation)}$$

$$(p \wedge (q \vee r)) \Rightarrow ((p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)) \quad \text{(Distributivity)}$$

$$(p \Rightarrow^3 q) \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow^2 q) \quad \text{(3-potency)}$$

$$((p \Rightarrow^2 q) \wedge (\sim q \Rightarrow^2 \sim p)) \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow q). \quad \text{(Nelson)}$$

A Hilbert-style presentation of NFL_{ew}

$$(p \Rightarrow q) \Rightarrow ((q \Rightarrow r) \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow r))$$

$$(p \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow r)) \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow r))$$

$$p \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow p)$$

$$p \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow (p * q))$$

$$(p \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow r)) \Rightarrow ((p * q) \Rightarrow r)$$

$$(p \wedge q) \Rightarrow p$$

$$(p \wedge q) \Rightarrow q$$

$$(p \Rightarrow q) \Rightarrow ((p \Rightarrow r) \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow (q \wedge r)))$$

$$p \Rightarrow (p \vee q)$$

$$q \Rightarrow (p \vee q)$$

$$(p \Rightarrow r) \Rightarrow ((q \Rightarrow r) \Rightarrow ((p \vee q) \Rightarrow r))$$

$$p \Rightarrow \mathbf{1}$$

$$\mathbf{0} \Rightarrow p$$

$$p, p \Rightarrow q \vdash q$$

$$\sim\sim p \Rightarrow p$$

$$(p \wedge (q \vee r)) \Rightarrow ((p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r))$$

$$(p \Rightarrow^3 q) \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow^2 q)$$

$$((p \Rightarrow^2 q) \wedge (\sim q \Rightarrow^2 \sim p)) \Rightarrow (p \Rightarrow q).$$

Nelson FL_{ew} -algebras

- Let
 - $\sim x$ abbreviate $x \Rightarrow \mathbf{0}$.
 - $x \Rightarrow^2 y$ abbreviate $x \Rightarrow (x \Rightarrow y)$.
 - $x \Rightarrow^3 y$ abbreviate $x \Rightarrow (x \Rightarrow (x \Rightarrow y))$.
- An FL_{ew} -algebra \mathbf{A} is
 - **distributive** if $\langle A; \wedge, \vee \rangle$ is distributive.
 - **classical** if $\mathbf{A} \models \sim\sim x \approx x$.
 - **3-potent** if $\mathbf{A} \models x \Rightarrow^3 y \approx x \Rightarrow^2 y$.
- A **Nelson FL_{ew} -algebra** is a 3-potent, classical, distributive FL_{ew} -algebra that satisfies the **Nelson identity**:

$$(x \Rightarrow^2 y) \wedge (\sim y \Rightarrow^2 \sim x) \approx x \Rightarrow y.$$

A question of David Nelson

- **Question** (Nelson, 1969). Is the variety of Nelson algebras a class of residuated lattices?
- **Answer** (S., V., 2006). Yes!

An answer to Nelson's question

- **Theorem** (S., V., 2006).

(1) Let \mathbf{A} be a Nelson algebra. $\forall a, b \in A$, let

$$a * b := \sim(a \rightarrow \sim b) \vee \sim(b \rightarrow \sim a)$$

$$a \Rightarrow b := (a \rightarrow b) \wedge (\sim b \rightarrow \sim a).$$

– Then $\mathbf{A}^F := \langle A; \wedge, \vee, *, \Rightarrow, 0, 1 \rangle$ is a Nelson \mathbf{FL}_{ew} -algebra.

(2) Let \mathbf{B} be a Nelson \mathbf{FL}_{ew} -algebra. $\forall a, b \in B$, let

$$a \rightarrow b := a \Rightarrow (a \Rightarrow b)$$

$$\neg a := a \Rightarrow (a \Rightarrow 0)$$

$$\sim a := a \Rightarrow 0.$$

– Then $\mathbf{B}^N := \langle B; \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \sim, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ is a Nelson algebra.

(3) $\mathbf{A}^{FN} = \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}^{NF} = \mathbf{B}$.

Hence Nelson and Nelson \mathbf{FL}_{ew} -algebras are term equivalent.

CLSN and NFL_{ew} are definitionally equivalent

- **Theorem** (S., V., 2006). Let \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 be two regularly algebraisable deductive systems over language types Λ_1 and Λ_2 . Let \mathbf{K}_1 and \mathbf{K}_2 be the equivalent quasivarieties of \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 respectively. If \mathbf{K}_1 and \mathbf{K}_2 are term equivalent with interpretations $\alpha: \Lambda_1 \rightarrow \text{Fm}_{\Lambda_2}$ and $\beta: \Lambda_2 \rightarrow \text{Fm}_{\Lambda_1}$, then \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 are definitionally equivalent with the same mutually inverse interpretations.
- **Theorem** (S., V., 2006). The deductive systems **CLSN** and **NFL_{ew}** are definitionally equivalent.

An example: $L_3 \equiv N_3$

- 3-valued **CLSN** is determined by the matrix $\langle \mathbf{N}_3; \{1\} \rangle$, where \mathbf{N}_3 is

\wedge	0	a	1	\vee	0	a	1	\rightarrow	0	a	1	\neg		\sim	
0	0	0	0	0	0	a	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1
a	0	a	a	a	a	a	1	a	1	1	1	a	0	a	a
1	0	a	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	a	1	1	0	1	0

- L_3 is determined by the matrix $\langle \mathbf{L}_3; \{1\} \rangle$, where \mathbf{L}_3 is

\wedge	0	a	1	\vee	0	a	1	\Rightarrow	0	a	1	$*$	0	a	1	\sim	
0	0	0	0	0	0	a	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
a	0	a	a	a	a	a	1	a	a	1	1	a	a	1	1	a	a
1	0	a	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	a	1	1	0	a	1	1	0

- Theorem** (Vakarelov, 1977). $\langle \mathbf{N}_3; \{1\} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{L}_3; \{1\} \rangle$ are isomorphic.

Vakarelov's theorem is immediate by the term equivalence result.

Some insight into the proof (I)

- Let $\mathbf{A} := \langle A; \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \sim, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ be a Nelson algebra.

- $\forall a, b \in A$, define:

$$a \Rightarrow b := (a \rightarrow b) \wedge (\sim b \rightarrow \sim a).$$

- **Lemma** (Monteiro, 1963). $\mathbf{A} \models x \rightarrow y \approx x \Rightarrow (x \Rightarrow y)$.

- Monteiro's lemma suggests $\langle A; \Rightarrow, 1 \rangle$ is a 3-potent BCK-algebra, and this is indeed the case.

- The monoid operation can thus be recovered on setting

$$a * b := \sim(a \Rightarrow \sim b) = \sim(a \rightarrow \sim b) \vee \sim(b \rightarrow \sim a).$$

- Now it is easy to check that $\langle A; \wedge, \vee, *, \Rightarrow, 0, 1 \rangle$ is a Nelson \mathbf{FL}_{ew} -algebra.

Some insight into the proof (II)

- Let $\langle A; \wedge, \vee, *, \Rightarrow, 0, 1 \rangle$ be an n -potent \mathbf{FL}_{ew} -algebra.
- $\forall a, b \in A$, define:

$$a \rightarrow b := a \Rightarrow^n b$$

$$\sim a := a \Rightarrow \mathbf{0}$$

$$\neg a := a \rightarrow \mathbf{0}.$$

- Then $\langle A; \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \sim, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ is a "generalised" Nelson algebra.
 - This reflects the fact that any variety of n -potent \mathbf{FL}_{ew} algebras is a **WBSO variety** in the sense of Blok and Pigozzi.
- The Nelson identity $(x \Rightarrow^2 y) \wedge (\sim y \Rightarrow^2 \sim x) \approx x \Rightarrow y$ ensures that $\langle A; \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \sim, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ is a Nelson algebra.

... and some prospects for future work

- Apply the now well developed theories of
 - algebraisable logics (in the Blok-Pigozzi sense)
 - residuated lattices and \mathbf{FL}_{ew} -algebrasto answer further questions about **CLSN**.
- Extend the counterexample semantics of Vakarelov to varieties of n -potent \mathbf{FL}_{ew} -algebras.
- Explore varieties of n -potent \mathbf{FL}_{ew} -algebras satisfying the following n -potent analogue of the Nelson identity:

$$(x \Rightarrow^n y) \wedge (\sim y \Rightarrow^n \sim x) \approx x \Rightarrow y.$$

Ternary deductive terms

- $p(x, y, z)$ is a **ternary deductive** (TD) **term** on an algebra \mathbf{A} if
 - $p(a, b, z) \equiv z \pmod{\Theta^{\mathbf{A}}(a, b)}$
 - $\{p(a, b, z) : z \in A\}$ is a transversal of equivalence classes.
- $p(x, y, z)$ is **commutative** if $p(a, b, z)$ and $p(a', b', z)$ define the same transversal whenever $\Theta^{\mathbf{A}}(a, b) = \Theta^{\mathbf{A}}(a', b')$.
- $p(x, y, z)$ is **regular** if $\Theta^{\mathbf{A}}(p(x, y, z), \mathbf{1}^{\mathbf{A}}) = \Theta^{\mathbf{A}}(x, y)$ for some constant term $\mathbf{1}$.

These definitions extend in the obvious way to varieties.

A question about TD terms

- **Question** (Blok, Pigozzi, 1994). Does the variety of Nelson algebras have a commutative, regular TD term, or even a TD term?
- **Answer** (S., 2004). Yes!
Nelson algebras have a commutative TD term.
- **Answer** (S., V., 2006). Yes!
Nelson algebras have a commutative, regular TD term.

TD terms for Nelson algebras

- **Theorem** (S., V., 2004-2006).

(1) A commutative TD term for Nelson algebras is

$$p(x, y, z) := (x \Rightarrow y) \rightarrow ((y \Rightarrow x) \rightarrow z).$$

(2) A commutative, regular TD term with respect to **1** for Nelson algebras is

$$p(x, y, z) := ((x \Rightarrow y) \wedge (y \Rightarrow x)) * ((x \Rightarrow y) \wedge (y \Rightarrow x)) * z.$$

(1) and (2) both follow immediately on observing that n -potent \mathbf{FL}_{ew} -algebras have both a commutative TD term and a commutative, regular TD term.