

Negative Translations for Affine and Łukasiewicz Logic

Rob Arthan and Paulo Oliva

(January 16, 2022)

Abstract

We investigate four well-known negative translations of classical logic into intuitionistic logic within a substructural setting. We find that in *affine logic* the translation schemes due to Kolmogorov and Gödel both satisfy Troelstra’s criteria for a negative translation. On the other hand, the schemes of Glivenko and Gentzen both fail for affine logic, but for different reasons: one can extend affine logic to make Glivenko work and Gentzen fail and *vice versa*. By contrast, in the setting of *Łukasiewicz logic*, we can prove a general result asserting that a wide class of formula translations including those of Kolmogorov, Gödel, Gentzen and Glivenko not only satisfy Troelstra’s criteria with respect to a natural intuitionistic fragment of Łukasiewicz logic but are all equivalent.

1 Introduction

Negative translations (also known as double negation translations) have a long history in logic and proof theory. Kolmogorov [14] was probably the first one to observe that classical logic can be “embedded” into its intuitionistic fragment. He defined a translation $A \mapsto A^K$ which places double negations in front of every subformula, and showed that A is provable classically if and only if A^K is provable intuitionistically. Around the same time, Glivenko [10], Gödel [11] and Gentzen [8] defined more “economic” translations that also eliminate classical principles from proofs at the cost of introducing extra negations, but not as many as Kolmogorov’s.

In the present paper we recast these negative translations in the setting of substructural logic, concentrating on logics lying between intuitionistic affine \mathbf{AL}_i logic and classical Łukasiewicz logic \mathbf{LL}_c . This will shed light on the amount of contraction required in order to make the translations work.

In Section 2, we define a fragment of classical Łukasiewicz logic \mathbf{LL}_c , which we will call *intuitionistic Łukasiewicz logic*¹ \mathbf{LL}_i . Just as Łukasiewicz logic [12] is a subsystem of classical logic \mathbf{CL} , intuitionistic Łukasiewicz logic is a subsystem of the usual intuitionistic logic \mathbf{IL} [19]. This paper focuses on propositional logic, leaving a similar study for predicate logic to future work.

¹Our reasons for adopting this terminology are given in Section 6.




Figure 1: Relationships between the six logics

\mathbf{LL}_i and \mathbf{LL}_c are defined here as extensions of the $\{\multimap, \otimes, \perp\}$ -fragment of *intuitionistic affine logic* \mathbf{AL}_i , i.e. intuitionistic multiplicative linear logic [1, 3, 9] extended by allowing weakening. A similar sequent calculus for Łukasiewicz logic based on classical affine logic has been proposed in [6]. The main differences are that we work on the implication-conjunction fragment of affine logic, and take *intuitionistic* affine logic as the starting point.

Starting from \mathbf{AL}_i one obtains *intuitionistic Łukasiewicz logic* \mathbf{LL}_i by adjoining the axiom that we call *commutativity of weak conjunction* [CWC]

$$A \otimes (A \multimap B) \vdash B \otimes (B \multimap A)$$

which is a simple consequence of contraction, but is strictly weaker than it. The reason we call $A \otimes (A \multimap B)$ a weak form of conjunction can be explained as follows: Note that $A \otimes (A \multimap B)$ implies both A and B , but without contraction (so that A can be used twice), we do not have in general $A \otimes (A \multimap B) \vdash A \otimes B$. On the other hand, due to the presence of weakening in the affine systems, we always have $A \otimes B \vdash A \otimes (A \multimap B)$. Hence, $A \otimes (A \multimap B)$ is a form of conjunction strictly weaker than the usual multiplicative conjunction $A \otimes B$. The axiom states that this conjunction is commutative. It is also known as the *axiom of divisibility* in the basic logic literature [13].

The logic \mathbf{LL}_i has been studied before, under different names. For instance, Blok and Ferreirim [4] refer to it as $S_{\mathcal{HO}}$. \mathbf{LL}_i can also be viewed as a fragment of Hájek’s *basic logic* without the (intuitionistically unacceptable) *axiom of pre-linearity* [12]

$$(A \multimap B) \multimap C, (B \multimap A) \multimap C \vdash C$$

The relationship between the various logical systems is depicted as a commutative diagram in Figure 1, where arrows indicate inclusion.

The intuitionistic systems \mathbf{AL}_i and \mathbf{LL}_i have “classical” counterparts (\mathbf{AL}_c and \mathbf{LL}_c , respectively) obtained by adding the law of *double negation elimination* [DNE]

$$A^{\perp\perp} \vdash A$$

where A^{\perp} is defined as $A \multimap \perp$.

In order to move horizontally in the diagram of Figure 1 from the left-most column (affine system) to the right-most column (intuitionistic \mathbf{IL} , and classical logic \mathbf{CL}) one adds the *contraction axiom* [CON]

$$A \vdash A \otimes A$$

$$\boxed{
\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \multimap B} [\multimap I] & \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta \vdash A \multimap B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash B} [\multimap E] \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta \vdash B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash A \otimes B} [\otimes I] & \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \otimes B \quad \Delta, A, B \vdash C}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash C} [\otimes E]
\end{array}
}$$

Figure 2: Natural deduction (in sequent-style) rules for \otimes and \multimap

Since, over \mathbf{AL}_i , [CON] entails [CWC], the Łukasiewicz systems sit in between the affine systems, where no contraction is permitted, and the systems with full contraction. In this sense, one can think of [CWC] as extending \mathbf{AL}_i with a restricted form of contraction that keeps track of what is left unconsumed when one uses A and $A \multimap B$ to obtain B .

The main result in this paper is that all four standard negative translations of \mathbf{CL} into \mathbf{IL} are also negative translations of \mathbf{LL}_c into \mathbf{LL}_i (Section 5). Our result relies on several derivations of novel theorems of \mathbf{LL}_i , in particular the result that, over \mathbf{LL}_i , the double negation mapping $A \mapsto A^{\perp\perp}$ is a homomorphism (Section 4).

We also prove that Kolmogorov’s and Gödel’s translations are even negative translations of \mathbf{AL}_c into \mathbf{AL}_i (Section 3), and in an appendix give a brief description of counter-examples demonstrating that Glivenko and Gentzen are not: in fact \mathbf{AL}_i can be extended so as to make the Glivenko translation a negative translation but not the Gentzen translation or *vice versa*.

In the present paper, whenever we need to show that a formula is provable in one of our logics, we do so constructively. In the case of \mathbf{LL}_i most non-trivial derivations involve intricate applications of [CWC]. We express here our gratitude to the late Bill McCune for the development of the automated theorem prover Prover9 and the finite-model finder Mace4 [16], which we have used extensively to find derivations or counter-models to our various conjectures. Most of the \mathbf{LL}_i derivations presented here were initially found by Prover9. Perhaps remarkably, we found it possible to organise and present the derivations in what we believe is a systematic and human-readable style.

2 Definitions of the Logics

2.1 Language

We work in a language, \mathcal{L} , built from a countable set of propositional variables $\text{Var} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots\}$, the constant \perp (falsehood) and the binary connectives \multimap (implication) and \otimes (conjunction). We write A^\perp for $A \multimap \perp$ and \top for $\perp \multimap \perp$. Our choice of notation for connectives is that commonly used for affine logic, since all the systems we consider will be extensions of intuitionistic affine logic.

As usual, we adopt the convention that \multimap associates to the right and has lower precedence than \otimes , which in turn has lower precedence than $(\cdot)^\perp$. So, for example, the brackets in $(A \otimes (B^\perp)) \multimap (C \multimap (D \otimes F))$ are all redundant, while those in $((A \multimap B) \multimap C) \otimes D)^\perp$ are all required.

2.2 The logics

In this section we give *natural deduction* systems (in sequent style) for the logics we will study. The judgments of the calculi are sequents $\Gamma \vdash A$ where the *context* Γ is a multiset of formulas and A is a formula. The rules of inference for *all* the calculi comprise the sequent formulation of a natural deduction system shown in Figure 2.

The six calculi are defined by adding to the rules of Figure 2 some or all of the following axiom schemata: *assumption* [ASM], *contraction* [CON], *ex falso quodlibet* [EFQ], *double negation elimination* [DNE], and *commutativity of weak conjunction* [CWC], defined in Figure 3. The six calculi and their axiom schemata are as defined in Table 1.

The systems \mathbf{AL}_i , \mathbf{AL}_c , \mathbf{LL}_i and \mathbf{LL}_c are intuitionistic and classical variants of affine logic and Łukasiewicz logic. \mathbf{IL} and \mathbf{CL} as we shall see shortly are the usual intuitionistic and classical logic. The relationship between the six logics is depicted in Figure 1.

As our axiom schemata all allow additional premisses Γ in the context, the following rule of weakening

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma, A \vdash B} [\text{WK}]$$

is admissible in all our logics, since given a proof tree with $\Gamma \vdash B$ at the root, we may obtain a proof of $\Gamma, A \vdash B$ by adding A to the context of every sequent on *some* path from the root to a leaf (axiom). Also, note that in intuitionistic affine logic \mathbf{AL}_i , and hence in all the logics, the contraction axiom [CON] is inter-derivable with the contraction rule

$$\frac{\Gamma, A, A \vdash B}{\Gamma, A \vdash B} [\text{CON}_r]$$

Thus with [CON] we have the structural rules of weakening and contraction, which proves our claim that \mathbf{IL} and \mathbf{CL} are the usual intuitionistic and classical propositional logics.

Many of the results in this paper involve the derivability of a particular sequent in one of our calculi above (mainly \mathbf{LL}_i). When deriving these, we will make clear in the statement of the result which logic we are using, and will present proofs as sequences of formulas, all of which are either an assumption, an axiom, or a consequence of previously derived formulas. We illustrate this with the following basic result:

Lemma 1 (\mathbf{LL}_i) *If $C \vdash A$ and $C \vdash B$ then $C \vdash A \otimes (A \multimap B)$.*

Proof:

$\frac{}{\Gamma, A \vdash A}$ [ASM]	$\frac{}{\Gamma, A \vdash A \otimes A}$ [CON]
$\frac{}{\Gamma, \perp \vdash A}$ [EFQ]	$\frac{}{\Gamma, \neg\neg A \vdash A}$ [DNE]
$\frac{}{\Gamma, A, A \multimap B \vdash B \otimes (B \multimap A)}$ [CWC]	

Figure 3: Sequent Calculus Axioms

Calculus	Axiom Schemata
AL_i	[ASM], [EFQ]
AL_c	[ASM], [EFQ], [DNE]
LL_i	[ASM], [CWC], [EFQ]
LL_c	[ASM], [CWC], [EFQ], [DNE]
IL	[ASM], [CON], [EFQ]
CL	[ASM], [CON], [EFQ], [DNE]

Table 1: The Six Calculi

$C \multimap A$	[Given] (1)
$C \multimap B$	[Given] (2)
C	[Given] (3)
$A \otimes (A \multimap C)$	[By (1), (3) and CWC] (4)
$A \otimes (A \multimap B)$	[By (2) and (4)] ■

The above lemma shows that (over **LL_i**) $A \otimes (A \multimap B)$ is the weakest formulas that is stronger than both A and B . Note that since we do not have contraction in **LL_i**, in the above proof it is important that (3) is only used once, and that its consequence (4) is also only used once, and so on.

Notation. We will apply the [CWC] axiom in slightly different ways. For instance, in the proof above we had derived C and $C \multimap B$, and by [CWC] were able to conclude $B \otimes (B \multimap C)$. In some cases we will find it more convenient to state the two conclusions B and $B \multimap C$ in separate lines of the proof, specially when these are then used in different ways later on (e.g. see proof of Lemma 7).

The rules of Figure 2 and the axioms of Figure 3 are closed under substitution of formulas for variables. Hence a substitution instance of a theorem in any of our logics is again a theorem of that logic. When reading a result such as Lemma 1, it is immaterial whether one views the letters A , B and C as metavariables ranging over \mathcal{L}

or as specific variables in $\text{Var} \subset \mathcal{L}$.

As mentioned in the introduction, in [6] one can find an earlier proposal of viewing Łukasiewicz logic as an extension of affine logic. In that context, a rule called $(\&, l_c)$ was added to classical affine logic in order to obtain classical Łukasiewicz logic. It is easy to check that in the presence of weakening the premise of that rule is derivable, which means that over affine logic the rule $(\&, l_c)$ should be viewed as the axiom schema $A \& B \vdash A \otimes (A \multimap B)$. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that we extend \mathbf{LL}_i with the additive conjunction $A \& B$, with the usual rules, as in [6]. By Lemma 1 above, and since $A \& B \vdash A$ and $A \& B \vdash B$, we have that over \mathbf{AL}_i the axiom $(\&, l_c)$ follows from [CWC]. Conversely, since $A \& B$ is commutative, and $A \otimes (A \multimap B) \vdash A \& B$, it follows that over \mathbf{AL}_i the axiom [CWC] follows from $(\&, l_c)$. Therefore, one can indeed obtain \mathbf{LL}_i by adjoining either of the axioms to \mathbf{AL}_i . Our choice here is to work with [CWC], and have $A \& B$ as a derived connective, as we will see in the next section.

Particularly in the literature on Łukasiewicz logic the systems that we have presented above in natural (in sequent style) deduction are traditionally presented as Hilbert-style systems with *modus ponens* as the only rule of inference (see [12], Def. 3.1.3, for a Hilbert-style presentation of \mathbf{LL}_c). It can be shown that the two presentations are equivalent in the sense that the sequent $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \vdash A$ is derivable in one of logics iff $A_1 \multimap A_2 \multimap \dots \multimap A_n \multimap A$ is derivable in the corresponding Hilbert style system.

2.3 Derived connectives

In addition to the primitive connectives \otimes and \multimap , we will make extensive use of the following four *derived* binary connectives $A \sqcap B$, $A \sqcup B$, $A \Rightarrow B$, $A \downarrow B$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
A \sqcap B &\equiv A \otimes (A \multimap B) && \text{(pre-conjunction)} \\
A \sqcup B &\equiv (B \multimap A) \multimap A && \text{(pre-disjunction)} \\
A \Rightarrow B &\equiv A \multimap A \otimes B && \text{(strong implication)} \\
A \downarrow B &\equiv A^\perp \otimes (B \multimap A) && \text{(NOR binary connective)}
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that we are assuming conjunction binds more strongly than the implication, so that $A \Rightarrow B$ is $A \multimap (A \otimes B)$. For the new connectives we will also use the convention that \sqcap, \sqcup and \downarrow all bind more strongly than \Rightarrow . So $(A \sqcup B) \Rightarrow (C \sqcap D)$, for instance, may be written as $A \sqcup B \Rightarrow C \sqcap D$.

\mathbf{AL}_i cannot prove the commutativity of \sqcap and \sqcup . \mathbf{LL}_i adds the commutativity of \sqcap to \mathbf{AL}_i as an axiom schema, but still can't prove the commutativity of \sqcup . In \mathbf{LL}_i , the pre-conjunction $A \sqcap B$ behaves like the additive conjunction $A \& B$ of linear logic. \mathbf{LL}_c has been defined above as \mathbf{LL}_i extended with [DNE], but it can be shown that one also obtains \mathbf{LL}_c from \mathbf{LL}_i by adding the commutativity of \sqcup as an axiom schema. In \mathbf{LL}_c , the pre-disjunction $A \sqcup B$ then behaves like the additive disjunction $A \oplus B$ of linear logic. In \mathbf{IL} , when full contraction is available, the two conjunctions $A \sqcap B$ and $A \otimes B$ become equivalent. However, $\perp \sqcup A \equiv A^{\perp\perp}$ while $A \sqcup \perp \equiv A$, so that the commutativity of \sqcup is intuitionistically unacceptable as it implies [DNE].

We have chosen our notation so that in each of the derived connectives the left operand appears both positively and negatively while the right operand appears only positively in \sqcap, \sqcup and \Rightarrow and only negatively in \Downarrow .

Definition 1 Let T be any of the extensions of \mathbf{AL}_1 discussed above. We write $A \leftrightarrow_T B$ if $A \vdash B$ and $B \vdash A$ in T . When the T in question is clear from the context we just write $A \leftrightarrow B$.

Let $A[B]$ be a formula that contains B as a subformula. It is easy to show, by induction on A , that if $B \leftrightarrow C$ then $A[B] \leftrightarrow A[C]$.

We conclude this section with a short list of basic theorems of \mathbf{AL}_1 which will prove very useful in the sequel.

Lemma 2 (\mathbf{AL}_1) *The following have simple and short derivations:*

- (i) $A \vdash B \sqcup A$, in particular, taking $B = \perp$, $A \vdash A^{\perp\perp}$
- (ii) $A \vdash B \Rightarrow A$
- (iii) $A \otimes B \leftrightarrow A \otimes (A \Rightarrow B)$
- (iv) $C \sqcup (A \multimap B) \vdash (C \sqcup A) \multimap (C \sqcup B)$
- (v) $(A^{\perp} \multimap B^{\perp})^{\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow A^{\perp} \multimap B^{\perp}$
- (vi) $A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow A \multimap B^{\perp\perp}$
- (vii) $(A^{\perp\perp} \otimes B^{\perp\perp})^{\perp} \leftrightarrow (A \otimes B)^{\perp}$
- (viii) $(A \otimes B)^{\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow (A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp})^{\perp}$

Proof: Easy, making much use of $A^{\perp\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow A^{\perp}$ and $A \multimap B^{\perp} \leftrightarrow (A \otimes B)^{\perp} \leftrightarrow B \multimap A^{\perp}$. For instance, we can prove (vi) via the following chain of simple equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp\perp} &\leftrightarrow (A^{\perp\perp} \otimes B^{\perp})^{\perp} \leftrightarrow (B^{\perp} \otimes A^{\perp\perp})^{\perp} \leftrightarrow B^{\perp} \multimap A^{\perp\perp\perp} \\ &\leftrightarrow B^{\perp} \multimap A^{\perp} \leftrightarrow (B^{\perp} \otimes A)^{\perp} \leftrightarrow (A \otimes B^{\perp})^{\perp} \leftrightarrow A \multimap B^{\perp\perp} \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

3 Negative Translations

In [18], Troelstra identifies certain requirements on a translation of classical logic into intuitionistic logic and shows that any two translations satisfying these requirements are intuitionistically equivalent. To set up the analogue of this characterisation in our substructural setting, we first define the notion of *negative formula* in the language \mathcal{L} .

Definition 2 *The set \mathcal{N} of negative formulas is defined inductively as*

- $\perp \in \mathcal{N}$,
- if $A \in \mathcal{N}$ and $B \in \mathcal{N}$ then $A \otimes B \in \mathcal{N}$,

- if $B \in \mathcal{N}$ then $A \multimap B \in \mathcal{N}$.

We can now formulate an adaptation of Troelstra's requirements:

Definition 3 Let \mathbf{L} be a fragment of intuitionistic logic \mathbf{IL} over the language \mathcal{L} . A formula translation $(\cdot)^\dagger: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ is called a negative translation for \mathbf{L} if the following holds for every formula A in the language of \mathbf{L}

(NT1) \mathbf{L} proves $A^\dagger \vdash B$ and $B \vdash A^\dagger$, for some $B \in \mathcal{N}$.

(NT2) $\mathbf{L} + [\text{DNE}]$ proves $A^\dagger \vdash A$ and $A \vdash A^\dagger$.

(NT3) if $\mathbf{L} + [\text{DNE}]$ proves $\vdash A$ then \mathbf{L} proves $\vdash A^\dagger$.

Conditions (NT1), (NT2) and (NT3) correspond to Troelstra's [18, Section 10] (iii), (i) and (ii), respectively. We have rearranged them as we will show that in \mathbf{LL}_i condition (NT3) is redundant (Theorem 23). It is often the case in practice that $A^\dagger \in \mathcal{N}$, so that (NT1) holds trivially.

In this section we shall consider the four well-known negative translations for \mathbf{IL} , namely, Kolmogorov, Gödel, Gentzen and Glivenko, in the context of affine logic \mathbf{AL}_i (cf. [7] for an analysis of the relationship between these translations in the setting of intuitionistic first-order logic). We prove that both Kolmogorov and Gödel are negative translations for \mathbf{AL}_i , and give counter-examples to show that Gentzen and Glivenko fail to satisfy (NT3). In Section 5, however, we will see that in \mathbf{LL}_i all these formula translations are negative translations, and in fact, we will also be able to show all negative translations are provably equivalent in \mathbf{LL}_i .

3.1 Kolmogorov and Gödel translations

First of all, we show that both the Kolmogorov and the Gödel translations are in fact negative translations for *affine* logic, i.e. no contraction is necessary to prove (NT1) – (NT3). Let \mathcal{L} be the language of the theories \mathbf{AL}_c and \mathbf{AL}_i .

Definition 4 (Kolmogorov translation [14]) For each formula $A \in \mathcal{L}$ associate a formula $A^K \in \mathcal{L}$ inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P^K &\equiv P^{\perp\perp} && (P \text{ atomic}) \\ \perp^K &\equiv \perp \\ (A \otimes B)^K &\equiv (A^K \otimes B^K)^{\perp\perp} \\ (A \multimap B)^K &\equiv (A^K \multimap B^K)^{\perp\perp}. \end{aligned}$$

We will also consider the following negative translation which can be distilled from [11]. In Gödel's presentation an implication $A \multimap B$ is translated as $(A \otimes B^\perp)^\perp$. We use here that in \mathbf{AL}_i this is equivalent to $A \multimap B^{\perp\perp}$. The translation often referred to as the Gödel-Gentzen translation will be treated in the following section, where we attribute it to Gentzen. It will become clear that in the substructural setting the Gödel translation is not the same as the Gentzen one.

Definition 5 (Gödel translation [11]) For each formula $A \in \mathcal{L}$ we first associate a formula $A^* \in \mathcal{L}$ inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P^* &\equiv P & (P \text{ atomic}) \\ \perp^* &\equiv \perp \\ (A \otimes B)^* &\equiv A^* \otimes B^* \\ (A \multimap B)^* &\equiv A^* \multimap (B^*)^{\perp\perp}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we define $A^{\text{Gö}} = (A^*)^{\perp\perp}$. Gödel [11] in fact does not need this final double negation since in Heyting arithmetic one can already prove $(A^*)^{\perp\perp} \vdash A^*$. Hence in that context we can even take $A^{\text{Gö}} = A^*$. In \mathbf{AL}_i , however, we need the outermost double negation to make the proof of the following theorem go through.

Theorem 3 Both the Kolmogorov translation $(\cdot)^{\text{K}}$ and the Gödel translation $(\cdot)^{\text{Gö}}$ are negative translations for \mathbf{AL}_i .

Proof: In the case of Kolmogorov we have:

(NT1). Trivial since $A^{\text{K}} \in \mathcal{N}$.

(NT2). Clearly $\mathbf{AL}_c = \mathbf{AL}_i + [\text{DNE}]$ proves $A \leftrightarrow A^{\text{K}}$.

(NT3). Finally, we show that if $\Gamma \vdash A$ is provable in \mathbf{AL}_c then $\Gamma^{\text{K}} \vdash A^{\text{K}}$ is provable in \mathbf{AL}_i , where Γ^{K} abbreviates $B_0^{\text{K}}, \dots, B_n^{\text{K}}$. This can be shown by induction on the derivation of the sequent $\Gamma \vdash A$. The cases of the axioms [ASM] and [EFQ] are trivial. In the case of [DNE] we just need to observe that $A^{\perp\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow A^{\perp}$ holds in \mathbf{AL}_i (cf. Lemma 2). In the case of $[\multimap\text{E}]$ we need to derive $\Gamma^{\text{K}}, \Delta^{\text{K}} \vdash B^{\text{K}}$ from $\Gamma^{\text{K}} \vdash A^{\text{K}}$ and $\Delta^{\text{K}} \vdash (A \multimap B)^{\text{K}}$. This can be done as

$$\frac{\Gamma^{\text{K}} \vdash A^{\text{K}} \quad \frac{\frac{\Delta^{\text{K}} \vdash (A \multimap B)^{\text{K}}}{\Delta^{\text{K}} \vdash (A^{\text{K}} \multimap B^{\text{K}})^{\perp\perp}} \text{(def)}}{\Delta^{\text{K}} \vdash A^{\text{K}} \multimap B^{\text{K}}} \text{(Lemma 2 (v))}}{\Gamma^{\text{K}}, \Delta^{\text{K}} \vdash B^{\text{K}}} [\multimap\text{E}]$$

$[\multimap\text{I}]$ can also be easily shown as

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma^{\text{K}}, A^{\text{K}} \vdash B^{\text{K}}}{\Gamma^{\text{K}} \vdash A^{\text{K}} \multimap B^{\text{K}}} [\multimap\text{I}]}{\Gamma^{\text{K}} \vdash (A^{\text{K}} \multimap B^{\text{K}})^{\perp\perp}} \text{(Lemma 2 (v))}}{\Gamma^{\text{K}} \vdash (A \multimap B)^{\text{K}}} \text{(def)}$$

The case of $[\otimes\text{I}]$ is easy once we observe that $A \vdash A^{\perp\perp}$ is provable in \mathbf{AL}_i (cf. Lemma 2).

Finally, the case of $[\otimes E]$ can be shown as

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma^K \vdash (A \otimes B)^K}{\Gamma^K \vdash (A^K \otimes B^K)^{\perp\perp}} \text{ (def)} \quad \frac{\Delta^K, A^K, B^K \vdash C^K}{\Delta^K, (C^K)^\perp \vdash (A^K \otimes B^K)^\perp}}{\frac{\frac{\Gamma^K, \Delta^K, (C^K)^\perp \vdash \perp}{\Gamma^K, \Delta^K \vdash (C^K)^{\perp\perp}} [-\circ I]}{\Gamma^K, \Delta^K \vdash C^K} [-\circ E]}$$

In the final step above we are using that $(A^K)^{\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow A^K$, which is easy to show.

For the Gödel translation, it is enough to show that $A^K \leftrightarrow A^{\text{Gö}}$ in \mathbf{AL}_i . We do that by induction on the structure of A . The base case is trivial. Recall that $A^{\text{Gö}} = (A^*)^{\perp\perp}$. For implication we have

$$\begin{aligned} (A \multimap B)^K &\leftrightarrow (A^K \multimap B^K)^{\perp\perp} && \text{(def } (\cdot)^K \text{)} \\ &\leftrightarrow ((A^*)^{\perp\perp} \multimap (B^*)^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} && \text{(IH)} \\ &\leftrightarrow (A^* \multimap (B^*)^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} && \text{(Lemma 2 (vi))} \\ &\leftrightarrow (A \multimap B)^{\text{Gö}}. && \text{(def } (\cdot)^{\text{Gö}} \text{)} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for conjunction

$$\begin{aligned} (A \otimes B)^K &\leftrightarrow (A^K \otimes B^K)^{\perp\perp} && \text{(def } (\cdot)^K \text{)} \\ &\leftrightarrow ((A^*)^{\perp\perp} \otimes (B^*)^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} && \text{(IH)} \\ &\leftrightarrow (A^* \otimes B^*)^{\perp\perp} && \text{(Lemma 2 (vii))} \\ &\leftrightarrow (A \otimes B)^{\text{Gö}}. && \text{(def } (\cdot)^{\text{Gö}} \text{)} \end{aligned}$$

That concludes the inductive proof. ■

3.2 Gentzen and Glivenko translations

For both the Gentzen and the Glivenko translations (defined below) a corresponding Theorem 3 no longer holds for \mathbf{AL}_i . These translations rely on uses of contraction which are not available in affine logic. Nevertheless, we will find that the amount of contraction available in Łukasiewicz logic, via [CWC], is sufficient for these translations to go through (Section 5). The Gentzen negative translation works by adding double negations on all the atoms of a given formula:

Definition 6 (Gentzen translation [8]) *For each formula $A \in \mathcal{L}$ associate a formula*

$A^{\text{Gen}} \in \mathcal{L}$ inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P^{\text{Gen}} &\equiv P^{\perp\perp} && (P \text{ atomic}) \\ \perp^{\text{Gen}} &\equiv \perp \\ (A \otimes B)^{\text{Gen}} &\equiv A^{\text{Gen}} \otimes B^{\text{Gen}} \\ (A \multimap B)^{\text{Gen}} &\equiv A^{\text{Gen}} \multimap B^{\text{Gen}}. \end{aligned}$$

As $A^\perp = A \multimap \perp$, we have that $(A^\perp)^{\text{Gen}}$ is equivalent to $(A^{\text{Gen}})^\perp$.

Theorem 4 *The translation $(\cdot)^{\text{Gen}}$ is not a negative translation for \mathbf{AL}_i .*

Proof: We show that (NT3) fails for the Gentzen translation on \mathbf{AL}_i . Let P, Q be atomic formulas and take $A \equiv (P \otimes Q)^{\perp\perp} \multimap (P \otimes Q)$. Obviously \mathbf{AL}_c proves A , since A is an instance of [DNE]. However the Gentzen translation of A is

$$(P^{\perp\perp} \otimes Q^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} \multimap P^{\perp\perp} \otimes Q^{\perp\perp}$$

which is not provable in \mathbf{AL}_i (see Lemma 25 part (i) in Appendix A for a model demonstrating this). ■

The Glivenko negative translation simply doubly negates the whole formula:

Definition 7 (Glivenko translation [10]) *Given a formula $A \in \mathcal{L}$ define its Glivenko translation A^{Gli} as $A^{\text{Gli}} \equiv A^{\perp\perp}$.*

Theorem 5 *The Glivenko translation is not a negative translation for \mathbf{AL}_i .*

Proof: As with the Gödel translation, we also show that (NT3) fails in the Glivenko translation for \mathbf{AL}_i . Let P be an atomic formula. The Glivenko translation of $P^{\perp\perp} \multimap P$ (an instance of [DNE]) is $(P^{\perp\perp} \multimap P)^{\perp\perp}$, which is not provable in \mathbf{AL}_i (see Lemma 25 part (ii) in Appendix A for a model demonstrating this). ■

We conclude by noting that the Gentzen and the Glivenko translations do not have to fail simultaneously, i.e. there are extensions of \mathbf{AL}_i for which one translation works but the other does not.

Theorem 6 *There are extensions \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 of \mathbf{AL}_i such that*

- (i) $(\cdot)^{\text{Gli}}$ is a negative translation for \mathbf{A}_1 but $(\cdot)^{\text{Gen}}$ is not;
- (ii) $(\cdot)^{\text{Gen}}$ is a negative translation for \mathbf{A}_2 but $(\cdot)^{\text{Gli}}$ is not.

Proof: See Theorem 26 in Appendix A. ■

Remark 1 \mathbf{AL}_i can be presented using a Gentzen-style sequent calculus that admits cut-elimination. This leads to a relatively efficient decision procedure for \mathbf{AL}_i which one can use as an alternative to semantic methods to decide unprovability where needed in the proofs of Theorems 4 and 5. However, we do not know of a proof based on cut-elimination for Theorem 6.

4 Homomorphism Properties of Double Negation in \mathbf{LL}_i

Our goal in this section is to find \mathbf{LL}_i derivations of some important theorems about the primitive and derived connectives. These include:

- a derivation of $[\text{DNE}]^{\perp\perp}$ (Corollary 13);
- a duality property between \sqcup and \downarrow (Theorem 14); and,
- homomorphism properties of the double negation mapping $A \mapsto A^{\perp\perp}$ with respect to both implication (Section 4.3) and conjunction (Section 4.4);

As we have already remarked, the derivations we will give have been extracted by analysis of computer-generated proofs found by the Prover9 automated theorem-prover. Our contribution was to propose conjectures to Prover9, to study the machine-oriented proofs it found and to present the proofs in a human-intelligible form by breaking them down into structurally interesting lemmas. This was an iterative process since often Prover9 was able to find simpler proofs of a lemma when presented with it as a conjecture in isolation. In cases when Prover9 was unable to find a proof, Mace4 was often able to find a counter-model: a finite model of the logic in question in which the conjecture can be seen to fail. See Appendix A for examples of algebraic models of \mathbf{AL}_i found by Mace4.

It follows from work on commutative GBL-algebras that \mathbf{LL}_i is decidable [5]. However the problem is PSPACE-complete. In [2], we give a simple indirect method for demonstrating that a formula is valid in intuitionistic Łukasiewicz Logic, a heuristic method which we have used extensively in parallel with attempts to find explicit proofs and counter-examples with Prover9 and Mace4.

4.1 Basic identities on $\sqcup, \Rightarrow, \sqcap$

We start by proving in \mathbf{LL}_i several useful results about the derived connectives \sqcup, \sqcap and \Rightarrow .

Lemma 7 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $B \sqcup (A \Rightarrow B) \vdash A \Rightarrow B$

Proof: Since $A \Rightarrow B \equiv A \multimap A \otimes B$, we will show $A, B \sqcup (A \Rightarrow B) \vdash A \otimes B$:

A	[Given]	(5)
$B \sqcup (A \Rightarrow B)$ (i.e., $((A \Rightarrow B) \multimap B) \multimap B$)	[Given]	(6)
$A \multimap ((A \Rightarrow B) \multimap B)$	[Derivable]	(7)
$(A \Rightarrow B) \multimap B$	[By (5), (7) and CWC]	(8)
$((A \Rightarrow B) \multimap B) \multimap A$		(9)
B	[By (6), (8) and \multimap E]	(10)
$B \multimap (A \Rightarrow B)$	[By Lemma 2 (ii)]	(11)
$A \Rightarrow B$ (i.e., $A \multimap A \otimes B$)	[By (10), (11) and CWC]	(12)
$(A \Rightarrow B) \multimap B$		(13)

$$\begin{array}{ll}
A & \text{[By (9), (13) and } \multimap\text{E]} \quad (14) \\
A \otimes B & \text{[By (12), (14) and } \multimap\text{E]} \quad \blacksquare
\end{array}$$

The following lemma is used in Section 4.4. It shows that from $A \multimap C$ and $C \multimap B$ we can conclude more than $A \multimap C$.

Lemma 8 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $A \multimap C, C \multimap B \vdash (A \multimap B) \otimes (A \sqcap B \multimap C)$

Proof:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
A \multimap C & \text{[Given]} \quad (15) \\
C \multimap B & \text{[Given]} \quad (16) \\
(A \multimap C) \multimap (A \multimap B) & \text{[From (16), easy]} \quad (17) \\
(A \multimap B) \otimes ((A \multimap B) \multimap (A \multimap C)) & \text{[By (15) and (17) and CWC]} \quad (18) \\
(A \multimap B) \otimes (A \sqcap B \multimap C) & \text{[By (18) and Def. of } A \sqcap B] \quad \blacksquare
\end{array}$$

So far, we have not used the constant \perp . We now prove a few basic properties of $(\cdot)^\perp$ and its relation to the derived connectives.

Lemma 9 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $B \sqcup A \vdash A^\perp \Rightarrow B$

Proof:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
B \sqcup A & \text{[Given]} \quad (19) \\
A \multimap (A^\perp \Rightarrow B) & \text{[Derivable, easy]} \quad (20) \\
B \sqcup (A^\perp \Rightarrow B) & \text{[By (19) and (20)]} \quad (21) \\
A^\perp \Rightarrow B & \text{[By (21) and Lemma 7]} \quad \blacksquare
\end{array}$$

It turns out that many intuitionistically unacceptable equivalences become provable in \mathbf{LL}_i “under” a negation. For example, our first important result is that in \mathbf{LL}_i strong implication \Rightarrow is a dual of a weak conjunction \sqcap in the sense that $(A \sqcap B)^\perp \leftrightarrow A \Rightarrow B^\perp$. This is akin to the relation between conjunction and implication $(A \otimes B)^\perp \leftrightarrow A \multimap B^\perp$ which one obtains in \mathbf{AL}_i simply by currying and uncurrying.

Theorem 10 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $(A \sqcap B)^\perp \leftrightarrow A \Rightarrow B^\perp$

Proof: The derivation of $A \Rightarrow B^\perp \vdash (A \sqcap B)^\perp$ is straightforward. We present the derivation of the converse $(A \sqcap B)^\perp \vdash A \Rightarrow B^\perp$,

$$\begin{array}{ll}
(A \sqcap B)^\perp \text{ (i.e., } (A \otimes (A \multimap B))^\perp) & \text{[Given]} \quad (22) \\
A \multimap (B \multimap A) & \text{[Derivable, easy]} \quad (23) \\
B^\perp \multimap (A \sqcup B) \multimap A \otimes B^\perp & \text{[Derivable, Lemma 9]} \quad (24) \\
(B \otimes (B \multimap A))^\perp & \text{[From (22) and CWC]} \quad (25) \\
(B \multimap A) \multimap B^\perp & \text{[From (25), easy]} \quad (26) \\
(B \multimap A) \multimap (A \sqcup B) \multimap A \otimes B^\perp & \text{[By (24) and (26)]} \quad (27) \\
A \multimap (A \multimap (B \multimap A)) \multimap A \otimes B^\perp & \text{[By (27) and CWC]} \quad (28) \\
A \multimap A \otimes B^\perp & \text{[By (23) and (28)]} \quad (29) \\
A \Rightarrow B^\perp & \text{[By (29) and Def. of } A \Rightarrow B] \quad \blacksquare
\end{array}$$

Corollary 11 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $A \Rightarrow B^\perp \leftrightarrow B \Rightarrow A^\perp$

Proof: Direct from Theorem 10, since \sqcap is commutative (i.e. [CWC]). ■

4.2 Symmetries of \sqcup and \downarrow and [DNE]

Although the commutativity of \sqcup is clearly a classical principle, it is perhaps surprising that commutativity of $B \downarrow A$ can be proved intuitionistically.

Theorem 12 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $B \downarrow A \leftrightarrow A \downarrow B$

Proof: By symmetry it is enough to prove $B \downarrow A \vdash A \downarrow B$. Recall that $B \downarrow A$ is defined as $(B \multimap A) \otimes A^\perp$. Hence, we must show $B \multimap A, A^\perp \vdash (A \multimap B) \otimes B^\perp$, which we can do as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
B \multimap A & \text{[Given]} \quad (30) \\
A^\perp & \text{[Given]} \quad (31) \\
A^\perp \multimap (A \multimap B) & \text{[Derivable (using [EFQ])]} \quad (32) \\
A \multimap B & \text{[From (31), (32) and CWC]} \quad (33) \\
(A \multimap B) \multimap A^\perp & \quad (34) \\
(B \multimap A) \multimap B^\perp & \text{[From (34) and CWC]} \quad (35) \\
B^\perp & \text{[By (30) and (35)]} \quad (36) \\
(A \multimap B) \otimes B^\perp & \text{[By (33) and (36)]} \quad \blacksquare
\end{array}$$

A corollary of the above theorem is that the double negation of the classical axiom [DNE] is provable in \mathbf{LL}_i .

Corollary 13 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $(A^{\perp\perp} \multimap A)^{\perp\perp}$

Proof: Let $X = (A^\perp \Rightarrow A)$. Then

$$\begin{array}{ll}
(A^{\perp\perp} \multimap A)^\perp & \text{[Given]} \quad (37) \\
A^{\perp\perp} \multimap (A^\perp \Rightarrow A) & \text{[Derivable, easy]} \quad (38) \\
((A^\perp \Rightarrow A) \multimap A)^\perp & \text{[From (37) using (38)]} \quad (39) \\
A \multimap ((A^\perp \Rightarrow A) \multimap A) & \text{[Derivable (using [WK])]} \quad (40) \\
((A^\perp \Rightarrow A) \multimap A) \downarrow A & \text{[From (39) and (43)]} \quad (41) \\
A \downarrow ((A^\perp \Rightarrow A) \multimap A) & \text{[By (41) and Theorem 12]} \quad (42) \\
(A \downarrow (X \multimap A)) \multimap (A^\perp \otimes (A \sqcup X)) & \text{[Derivable, easy]} \quad (43) \\
A^\perp \otimes (A \sqcup (A^\perp \Rightarrow A)) & \text{[By (42) and (43)]} \quad (44) \\
A^\perp \otimes A & \text{[By (44) and Lemma (7)]} \quad (45) \\
\perp & \text{[Easy]} \quad \blacksquare
\end{array}$$

Remark 2 *It is well known that the above corollary is provable in full intuitionistic logic \mathbf{IL} . The usual proof making (apparently) essential use of the full contraction axiom goes as follows. Assuming (a) $(A^{\perp\perp} \multimap A)^\perp$ we must derive a contradiction. First use (a) to derive A^\perp , by [WK]. Assume also (b) $A^{\perp\perp}$. From (b) and A^\perp we obtain \perp , and hence A . Discharging the assumption (b) we have $A^{\perp\perp} \multimap A$, which by (a) gives a contradiction. Note, however, that assumption (a) was used twice. The corollary above gives us a proof using only the weak form of contraction permitted by [CWC].*

Next we present a theorem showing that the NOR connective $A \downarrow B$ is indeed the negation of the disjunction \sqcup , a fact which holds in full intuitionistic logic \mathbf{IL} , but again, via a simple proof that appears to make essential use of the full contraction axiom.

Theorem 14 (\mathbf{ELL}_i) $(A \sqcup B)^\perp \leftrightarrow A \downarrow B$

Proof: As usual one of the directions is easy, in this case $A \downarrow B \vdash (A \sqcup B)^\perp$. We prove the other direction $((B \multimap A) \multimap A)^\perp \vdash A^\perp \otimes (B \multimap A)$ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
((B \multimap A) \multimap A)^\perp & \text{[Given]} \quad (46) \\
((B \multimap A) \multimap A)^\perp \multimap (B \multimap A) & \text{[Derivable]} \quad (47) \\
B \multimap A & \text{[From (46) and (47) and CWC]} \quad (48) \\
(B \multimap A) \multimap ((B \multimap A) \multimap A)^\perp & (49) \\
((B \multimap A) \otimes ((B \multimap A) \multimap A)^\perp)^\perp & \text{[By (49), easy]} \quad (50) \\
(A \otimes (A \multimap (B \multimap A)))^\perp & \text{[By (50) and CWC]} \quad (51) \\
A \multimap (B \multimap A) & \text{[Derivable]} \quad (52) \\
A^\perp & \text{[By (51) and (52)]} \quad (53) \\
A^\perp \otimes (B \multimap A) & \text{[By (48) and (53)]} \quad \blacksquare
\end{array}$$

The above theorem implies the commutativity of $A \sqcup B$ under a negation:

Theorem 15 (\mathbf{ELL}_i) $(A \sqcup B)^\perp \leftrightarrow (B \sqcup A)^\perp$

Proof: Direct from Theorems 12 and 14. \blacksquare

4.3 Double negation homomorphism: Implication

We now show that (in \mathbf{ELL}_i) the double negation mapping $A \mapsto A^{\perp\perp}$ is a homomorphism for implication, i.e.

$$(A \multimap B)^{\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp\perp}.$$

We will show the same for conjunction in Section 4.4. Note that by definition $\perp \sqcup A \equiv A^{\perp\perp}$. Hence, it follows from Lemma 2 (iv) that

$$(A \multimap B)^{\perp\perp} \vdash A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp\perp}$$

and hence $(A \multimap B)^{\perp\perp} \vdash A \multimap B^{\perp\perp}$ is provable already in \mathbf{AL}_i . We will now see that the converse implication holds in \mathbf{LL}_i . Again, the fact that this holds in full intuitionistic logic is well known. See [18], page 9, for instance, for an \mathbf{IL} -derivation of Theorem 16. That derivation, however, uses the assumption $(A \multimap B)^\perp$ twice, and hence cannot be formalised in \mathbf{LL}_i .

Theorem 16 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow (A \multimap B)^{\perp\perp}$

Proof: By the remarks above, we have only the left-to-right direction to prove:

$$A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp\perp} \quad [\text{Given}] \quad (54)$$

$$A \multimap A^{\perp\perp} \quad [\text{Derivable}] \quad (55)$$

$$A \multimap B^{\perp\perp} \quad [\text{From (54) and (55)}] \quad (56)$$

$$(B^{\perp\perp} \multimap B) \multimap (A \multimap B) \quad [\text{From (56)}] \quad (57)$$

$$(A \multimap B)^\perp \multimap (B^{\perp\perp} \multimap B)^\perp \quad [\text{From (57)}] \quad (58)$$

$$(A \multimap B)^\perp \multimap \perp \quad [\text{From (58) and Corollary 13}] \quad (59)$$

$$(A \multimap B)^{\perp\perp} \quad [\text{By (59)}] \quad \blacksquare$$

4.4 Double negation homomorphism: Conjunction

As done in Section 4.3 for implication, we now show that (in \mathbf{LL}_i) the double negation mapping $A \mapsto A^{\perp\perp}$ is also a homomorphism for conjunction, i.e.

$$(A \otimes B)^{\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \otimes B^{\perp\perp}.$$

This result will follow immediately from a duality between implication (\multimap) and conjunction (\otimes) – Theorem 18 below.

Lemma 17 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $A^\perp \leftrightarrow (A \multimap B) \otimes (A \sqcap B)^\perp$

Proof: Left-to-right follows directly from Lemma 8, taking $C = \perp$. For the converse observe that $(A \sqcap B)^\perp \leftrightarrow A \multimap (A \multimap B)^\perp$. \blacksquare

Theorem 18 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $(A^\perp \multimap B)^\perp \leftrightarrow A^\perp \otimes B^\perp$

Proof: The implication from right to left is easy. For the other direction:

$$(A^\perp \multimap B)^\perp \quad [\text{Given}] \quad (60)$$

$$(A^{\perp\perp} \Rightarrow (A^\perp \multimap B)^\perp) \multimap A^\perp \quad [\text{Derivable}] \quad (61)$$

$$(A^\perp \multimap B) \multimap A^{\perp\perp} \quad [\text{By (60) and Lemma (17)}] \quad (62)$$

$$((A^\perp \multimap B) \sqcap A^{\perp\perp})^\perp \quad (63)$$

$$(A^\perp \sqcap B)^\perp \quad [\text{By (62), easy}] \quad (64)$$

$$A^\perp \Rightarrow B^\perp \quad [\text{By (64) and Theorem 10}] \quad (65)$$

$$A^{\perp\perp} \Rightarrow (A^\perp \multimap B)^\perp \quad [\text{By (63) and Theorem 10}] \quad (66)$$

$$A^\perp \quad [\text{By (61) and (66)}] \quad (67)$$

$$A^\perp \otimes B^\perp \quad [\text{By (65) and (67)}] \quad \blacksquare$$

Theorem 19 (\mathbf{LL}_i) $(A \otimes B)^{\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \otimes B^{\perp\perp}$

Proof: By Theorem 18, $(A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp})^{\perp} \leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \otimes B^{\perp}$. But it is easy to show that $(A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp})^{\perp} \leftrightarrow (A \otimes B)^{\perp\perp}$, even in \mathbf{AL}_i (cf. Lemma 2). ■

4.5 Some De Morgan Dualities for \mathbf{LL}_i

Theorem 10 proves an interesting De Morgan duality between \sqcap and \Rightarrow . For completeness, we now give analogous dualities for all of our connectives (primitive and derived).

Theorem 20 *The following De Morgan dualities hold in \mathbf{LL}_i*

$$\begin{aligned} (A \otimes B)^{\perp} &\leftrightarrow A \multimap B^{\perp} \\ (A \multimap B)^{\perp} &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \otimes B^{\perp} \\ (A \sqcap B)^{\perp} &\leftrightarrow A \Rightarrow B^{\perp} \\ (A \Rightarrow B)^{\perp} &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \sqcap B^{\perp} \\ (A \sqcap B)^{\perp} &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp} \sqcup B^{\perp} \\ (A \sqcup B)^{\perp} &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp} \sqcap B^{\perp} \\ (A \downarrow B)^{\perp} &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp} \Rightarrow B^{\perp\perp} \end{aligned}$$

Proof: The first equation $(A \otimes B)^{\perp} \leftrightarrow A \multimap B^{\perp}$ follows directly from currying and uncurrying. For the second equation we calculate as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (A \multimap B)^{\perp} &\leftrightarrow (A \multimap B)^{\perp\perp\perp} && \text{(easy)} \\ &\leftrightarrow (A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp\perp})^{\perp} && \text{(Theorem 16)} \\ &\leftrightarrow (B^{\perp} \multimap A^{\perp})^{\perp} && \text{(easy)} \\ &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \otimes B^{\perp}. && \text{(Theorem 18)} \end{aligned}$$

The third equation follows from Theorem 10 and [CWC]. The fourth equation can be derived as:

$$\begin{aligned} (A \Rightarrow B)^{\perp} &\leftrightarrow (A \multimap A \otimes B)^{\perp} && \text{(def } \Rightarrow) \\ &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \otimes (A \otimes B)^{\perp} && \text{(duality of } \multimap) \\ &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \otimes (B \multimap A^{\perp}) && \text{(duality of } \otimes) \\ &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \otimes (B \multimap A^{\perp\perp\perp}) && (A^{\perp} \leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp\perp}) \\ &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \otimes (A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp}) && \text{(easy)} \\ &\leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp} \sqcap B^{\perp}. && \text{(def } \sqcap) \end{aligned}$$

The fifth equation follows by:

$$\begin{aligned}
(A \sqcap B)^\perp &\leftrightarrow (A \otimes (A \multimap B))^\perp && \text{(easy)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A \multimap B)^{\perp\perp} \multimap A^\perp && \text{(easy)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp\perp}) \multimap A^\perp && \text{(Theorems 16)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (B^\perp \multimap A^\perp) \multimap A^\perp && \text{(easy)} \\
&\leftrightarrow A^\perp \sqcup B^\perp.
\end{aligned}$$

For the sixth equation we proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(B \sqcup A)^\perp &\leftrightarrow ((A \multimap B) \multimap B)^\perp && \text{(def } \sqcup \text{)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A \multimap B)^{\perp\perp} \otimes B^\perp && \text{(duality of } \multimap \text{)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A^{\perp\perp} \otimes B^\perp)^\perp \otimes B^\perp && \text{(duality of } \multimap \text{)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (B^\perp \multimap A^{\perp\perp\perp}) \otimes B^\perp && \text{(duality of } \otimes \text{)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (B^\perp \multimap A^\perp) \otimes B^\perp && (A^\perp \leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp\perp}) \\
&\leftrightarrow B^\perp \sqcap A^\perp. && \text{(def } \sqcap \text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

The last equation follows from Theorem 14 and the laws for \sqcap and \sqcup . ■

5 Negative Translations of Łukasiewicz Logic

In this section we show that all four translations considered (Kolmogorov, Gödel, Gentzen and Glivenko) are negative translations for \mathbf{LL}_i . In fact, as it is the case in \mathbf{IL} , it turns out that any two negative translations for \mathbf{LL}_i are equivalent. This is a non-trivial result, since, as we have shown, the Gentzen and Glivenko translations fail for \mathbf{AL}_i . The crucial property we will need here is that the double negation mapping $A \mapsto A^{\perp\perp}$ is a homomorphism in \mathbf{LL}_i , as proven in Sections 4.3 and 4.4.

Theorem 21 *The Glivenko translation $(\cdot)^{\text{Gli}}$ is a negative translation for \mathbf{LL}_i .*

Proof: We show by induction on the structure of A that $A^K \leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp}$ in \mathbf{LL}_i . This is similar to the proof of Theorem 3, where we showed that Gödel's translation is equivalent to Kolmogorov's in \mathbf{AL}_i . In here we need a slightly stronger version of Lemma 2 (vi) which in fact follows from Theorem 16. Again, the base case is trivial. For implication we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(A \multimap B)^K &\leftrightarrow (A^K \multimap B^K)^{\perp\perp} && \text{(def } (\cdot)^K \text{)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A^{\perp\perp} \multimap B^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} && \text{(IH)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A \multimap B)^{\perp\perp\perp\perp} && \text{(Theorem 16)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A \multimap B)^{\perp\perp}. && \text{(easy)}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly for conjunction

$$\begin{aligned}
(A \otimes B)^K &\leftrightarrow (A^K \otimes B^K)^{\perp\perp} && \text{(def } (\cdot)^K\text{)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A^{\perp\perp} \otimes B^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} && \text{(IH)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A \otimes B)^{\perp\perp\perp\perp} && \text{(Lemma 2 (vi))} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A \otimes B)^{\perp\perp}. && \text{(easy)}
\end{aligned}$$

■

But note that we have not yet used the full strength of our homomorphism properties for double negation, as we only used it in a “negated context”. We will make use of them now to show that any translation for \mathbf{LL}_i which satisfies (NT1) and (NT2) will in fact also satisfy (NT3).

Lemma 22 *For any formula $A \in \mathcal{N}$ we have that $A \leftrightarrow_{\mathbf{LL}_i} A^{\perp\perp}$.*

Proof: By induction on $A \in \mathcal{N}$. We need to consider three cases:

If $A = \perp$ the result is trivial.

If $A = B \multimap C$ with $C \in \mathcal{N}$ then, by the inductive hypothesis, $C \leftrightarrow C^{\perp\perp}$. Hence $B \multimap C \leftrightarrow B \multimap C^{\perp\perp}$. Since $B \multimap C^{\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow B^{\perp\perp} \multimap C^{\perp\perp}$, even in \mathbf{AL}_i , by Theorem 16 we have that $B \multimap C \leftrightarrow (B \multimap C)^{\perp\perp}$.

If $A = B \otimes C$ with $B, C \in \mathcal{N}$ then, by the inductive hypothesis, we have that $B \leftrightarrow B^{\perp\perp}$ and $C \leftrightarrow C^{\perp\perp}$, hence $B \otimes C \leftrightarrow (B \otimes C)^{\perp\perp}$ by Theorem 19. ■

Theorem 23 *Any translation $(\cdot)^\dagger$ for \mathbf{LL}_i which satisfies (NT1) and (NT2) is equivalent to $(\cdot)^{\text{Gli}}$ and hence is a negative translation, i.e., $(\cdot)^\dagger$ also satisfies (NT3).*

Proof: Fix a formula A . By (NT1), $A^\dagger \leftrightarrow B$ with $B \in \mathcal{N}$. That $A^\dagger \leftrightarrow_{\mathbf{LL}_i} A^{\text{Gli}}$ can be shown as

$$\begin{aligned}
A^\dagger &\leftrightarrow B \\
&\leftrightarrow B^{\perp\perp} && \text{(Lemma 22)} \\
&\leftrightarrow (A^\dagger)^{\perp\perp} && \text{(since } A^\dagger \leftrightarrow B\text{)} \\
&\leftrightarrow A^{\perp\perp}. && \text{(by (NT2) and Theorem 21)}
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 21, $(\cdot)^{\text{Gli}}$ satisfies (NT3), hence so does $(\cdot)^\dagger$. ■

Corollary 24 *The Gentzen translation $(\cdot)^{\text{Gen}}$ is a negative translation for \mathbf{LL}_i .*

Proof: Since $(\cdot)^{\text{Gen}}$ satisfies (NT1) and (NT2) in \mathbf{LL}_i . ■

Theorem 23 can be used to conclude that several other formula translations are also negative translations for \mathbf{LL}_i .

Example 1 Define a variant of the Gödel translation whereby the definition of $(A \multimap B)^*$ is modified as

$$(A \multimap B)^* \equiv A \multimap (B^*)^{\perp\perp},$$

i.e. the premise of the implication is not inductively translated. It is easy to see that this “simplification” still satisfies (NT1) and (NT2) and hence, by Theorem 23, is a negative translation for \mathbf{LL}_i . A similar simplification can be considered for the Gentzen translation, leading, again, to a negative translation for \mathbf{LL}_i .

Example 2 Define $A^\dagger \in \mathcal{L}$ inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P^\dagger &\equiv P^\perp && (P \text{ atomic}) \\ \perp^\dagger &\equiv \top \\ (A \otimes B)^\dagger &\equiv A^\dagger \multimap (B^\dagger)^\perp \\ (A \multimap B)^\dagger &\equiv A^\dagger \otimes (B^\dagger)^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Then we define the Krivine translation of A as $A^{\text{Kr}} = (A^\dagger)^\perp$. The formula A^{Kr} is clearly a negative formula. It is also easy to check that $A^{\text{Kr}} \leftrightarrow_{\mathbf{LL}_c} A$. Therefore, by Theorem 23, it is a negative translation for \mathbf{LL}_i . This translation is inspired by the negative translation behind Krivine’s classical realizability interpretation [15, 17].

6 Concluding Remarks

Let us conclude with an argument that supports our choice of the name “intuitionistic Łukasiewicz logic” for the logic \mathbf{LL}_i . First, an “intuitionistic Łukasiewicz logic” should be both a fragment of Łukasiewicz logic \mathbf{LL}_c and intuitionistic logic \mathbf{IL} ; and \mathbf{LL}_i satisfies this criteria. But there are indeed other “logics” which also satisfy this criteria, so why to single out \mathbf{LL}_i ?

First, one might try to simply take the intersection of \mathbf{IL} and \mathbf{LL}_c . This is indeed the maximal set of logical theorems which are both valid in \mathbf{LL}_c and \mathbf{IL} . But it is not clear to us how one could give a simple sequent calculus for such logic. Moreover, this logic would not have the disjunction property, since $[\text{DNE}] \vee [\text{CON}]$ belongs to the intersection, but $[\text{DNE}]$ is not provable in \mathbf{IL} , and $[\text{CON}]$ is not provable in \mathbf{LL}_c . Indeed, this has gone beyond what a constructivist would accept as an “intuitionistic” fragment of \mathbf{LL}_c .

Given our results above about the soundness of the negative translations for \mathbf{LL}_c and \mathbf{LL}_i , we want to argue that \mathbf{LL}_i is the only logic to be an extension of \mathbf{AL}_i having this soundness property. More precisely, let Δ be some axiom schema such that

- (1) $\mathbf{AL}_i + \Delta \subset \mathbf{IL}$, i.e. Δ is intuitionistically valid,
- (2) $\mathbf{AL}_i + \Delta + [\text{DNE}] = \mathbf{LL}_c$, i.e. Δ and $[\text{DNE}]$ together takes \mathbf{AL}_i to \mathbf{LL}_c

and suppose the Glivenko translation is a negative translation for $\mathbf{AL}_i + \Delta$, i.e.

- (3) if \mathbf{LL}_c proves $\vdash A$ then $\mathbf{AL}_i + \Delta$ proves $\vdash A^{\perp\perp}$.

We argue that over \mathbf{AL}_i we have $\Delta^{\perp\perp} \leftrightarrow [\text{CWC}]^{\perp\perp}$, in the sense that for any instance B of $[\text{CWC}]$ there exists $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \Delta$ such that \mathbf{AL}_i proves $A_1^{\perp\perp}, \dots, A_n^{\perp\perp} \vdash B^{\perp\perp}$; and similarly with $[\text{CWC}]$ and Δ interchanged.

First, assume $B \in [\text{CWC}]$. Since \mathbf{LL}_c proves $\vdash B$, by (3) we have that $\mathbf{AL}_i + \Delta$ proves $\vdash B^{\perp\perp}$. Which means that for some $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \Delta$ we have that \mathbf{AL}_i proves $A_1^{\perp\perp}, \dots, A_n^{\perp\perp} \vdash B^{\perp\perp}$, using Lemma 2 (vi).

Conversely, assume $B \in \Delta$. Again, since \mathbf{LL}_c proves $\vdash B$, by our soundness result for the Glivenko translation (Theorem 21), we have that $\mathbf{AL}_i + [\text{CWC}]$ proves $\vdash B^{\perp\perp}$. Which means that for some $A_1, \dots, A_n \in [\text{CWC}]$ we have that \mathbf{AL}_i proves $A_1^{\perp\perp}, \dots, A_n^{\perp\perp} \vdash B^{\perp\perp}$, again using Lemma 2 (vi).

Acknowledgements. We are indebted to the late Franco Montagna for bringing [5] to our attention, and for a manuscript detailing how their decision procedure for commutative GBL-algebras leads to a decision procedure for \mathbf{LL}_i . We would also like to thank George Metcalfe and Isabel Ferreirim for helpful correspondence.

References

- [1] Abramsky, S.: Computational interpretations of linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science* **111**(1-2), 3–57 (1993) 2
- [2] Arthan, R., Oliva, P.: On pocrimis and hoops (2014). <http://arXiv.org/abs/1404.0816> 12, 24
- [3] Benton, P.N., Bierman, G.M., de Paiva, V.C.V.: A term calculus for intuitionistic linear logic. In: M. Bezem, J.F. Groote (eds.) *Proceedings of Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 664, pp. 75–90. Springer (1993) 2
- [4] Blok, W.J., Ferreirim, I.M.A.: On the structure of hoops. *Algebra Universalis* **43**(2-3), 233–257 (2000) 2
- [5] Bova, S., Montagna, F.: The consequence relation in the logic of commutative GBL-algebras is PSPACE-complete. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **410**(12-13), 1143–1158 (2009). DOI 10.1016/j.tcs.2008.10.024. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2008.10.024> 12, 21
- [6] Ciabattoni, A., Luchi, D.: Two connections between linear logic and Lukasiewicz logics. In: *Proceedings of the 5th Kurt Gödel Colloquium on Computational Logic and Proof Theory*, pp. 128–139. Springer-Verlag, London, UK (1997). URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=648040.744733> 2, 6
- [7] Ferreira, G., Oliva, P.: On the relation between various negative translations. *Logic, Construction, Computation, Ontos-Verlag Mathematical Logic Series* **3**, 227–258 (2012) 8

- [8] Gentzen, G.: Über das Verhältnis zwischen intuitionistischer und klassischer Arithmetik, galley proof (received in 1933). *Mathematische Annalen* (1933) **1**, 10
- [9] Girard, J.Y.: Linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science* **50**(1), 1–102 (1987) **2**
- [10] Glivenko, V.I.: Sur quelques points de la logique de M. Brouwer. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de Belgique* **15** (1929) **1**, 11
- [11] Gödel, K.: Zur intuitionistischen Arithmetik und Zahlentheorie. *Ergebnisse eines Mathematischen Kolloquiums* **4**, 34–38 (1933) **1**, 8, 9
- [12] Hájek, P.: *Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic*. Kluwer Academic Publishers (1998) **1**, 2, 6
- [13] Jipsen, P., Montagna, F.: On the structure of generalized BL-algebras. *Algebra Univers.* **55**(2-3), 227–238 (2006) **2**
- [14] Kolmogorov, A.N.: On the principle of the excluded middle (Russian). *Mat. Sb.* **32**, 646–667 (1925) **1**, 8
- [15] Krivine, J.: Dependent choice, ‘quote’ and the clock. *Th. Comp. Sc.* **308**, 259–276 (2003) **20**
- [16] McCune, W.: Prover9 and Mace4 (2005–2010). <http://www.cs.unm.edu/~mccune/prover9/> **3**, 22
- [17] Oliva, P., Streicher, T.: On Krivine’s realizability interpretation of classical second-order arithmetic. *Fundamenta Informaticae* **84**(2), 207–220 (2008) **20**
- [18] Troelstra, A.S.: *Metamathematical Investigation of Intuitionistic Arithmetic and Analysis*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 344. Springer, Berlin (1973) **7**, 8, 16
- [19] Troelstra, A.S., Schwichtenberg, H.: *Basic Proof Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2nd edition) (2000) **1**

A Semantics: pocrim and hoops

In this appendix: we give a brief sketch of the algebraic semantics for \mathbf{AL}_1 and extensions thereof; we exhibit the models mentioned in the proofs of Theorems 4 and 5; and we exhibit extensions of \mathbf{AL}_1 to justify Theorem 6. Most of these models were found with the assistance of Mace4 [16].

Definition 8 A (bounded) pocrim is a structure \mathbf{P} for the signature $(1, 0, \cdot, \rightarrow; \leq)$ of type $(0, 0, 2, 2; 2)$, such that, (i) the $(1, \cdot, \leq)$ -reduct of \mathbf{P} is an ordered commutative monoid (written multiplicatively) with $0 \leq x \leq 1$ for every x , (ii) for every x and y , $x \leq y$ iff $x \rightarrow y = 1$, and (iii) the residuation property holds: for every x, y and z , $x \cdot y \leq z$ iff $x \leq y \rightarrow z$.

A hoop is a pocrim in which $x \cdot (x \rightarrow y) = y \cdot (y \rightarrow x)$ holds for every x, y and z .
In any pocrim, we define the negation operator \neg , by $\neg x = x \rightarrow 0$, and the double negation operator, δ , by $\delta(x) = \neg\neg x$. A pocrim is involutive if $\delta(x) = x$ for every x .

The name ‘‘pocrim’’ is an acronym for ‘‘partially ordered, commutative, residuated, integral monoid’’. All the pocrim in this appendix will be finite, and hence necessarily bounded, i.e., they have a least element 0, so we will often omit ‘‘bounded’’.

We define the notions of satisfaction, validity, soundness and completeness in the usual way. That is to say, given a pocrim $\mathbf{P} = (P, 1, 0, \cdot, \rightarrow; \leq)$ and an *interpretation* $I : \text{Var} \rightarrow P$, we define the value $V_I(A)$ of a formula A under I by $V_I(P_i) = I(P_i)$, $V_I(A \otimes B) = V_I(A) \cdot V_I(B)$ and $V_I(A \rightarrow B) = V_I(A) \rightarrow V_I(B)$. We say I *satisfies* A and write $I \models A$ if $V_I(A) = 1$ and we say \mathbf{P} *satisfies* A and write $\mathbf{P} \models A$ if $I \models A$ for every interpretation of I in \mathbf{P} . If \mathcal{C} is a class of pocrim, we say A is *valid* in \mathcal{C} and write $\mathcal{C} \models A$ if $\mathbf{P} \models A$ for every pocrim $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}$. We say \mathcal{A} is *sound* for a class \mathcal{C} of pocrim, if whenever A is provable in \mathcal{A} then $\mathcal{C} \models A$; we say \mathcal{A} is *complete* for \mathcal{C} if whenever $\mathcal{C} \models A$ then A is provable in \mathcal{A} .

It can be shown using well-known methods that \mathbf{AL}_j is sound and complete for the class \mathcal{P} of all bounded pocrim and that \mathbf{LL}_j is sound and complete for the class \mathcal{H} of all hoops.

Note that idempotency ($x = x \cdot x$ for all $x \in P$) in pocrim corresponds to contraction in logic. The smallest pocrim that is not idempotent has three elements 0, a and 1, where a is not idempotent so that we must have $a \cdot a = 0$. We call this pocrim \mathbf{L}_3 . The ordering is $1 > a > 0$ and the operation tables are as follows:

\cdot	1	a	0	\rightarrow	1	a	0	δ	1	1
1	1	a	0	1	1	a	0	1	1	1
a	a	0	0	a	1	1	a	a	a	a
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0

Here we list the elements in decreasing order so that the identity for multiplication goes in its familiar place in column 1 and row 1. We tabulate double negation as well as multiplication and implication for convenience in later calculations.

Noting that the hoop identity $x \cdot (x \rightarrow y) = y \cdot (y \rightarrow x)$ holds in any pocrim if $x \in \{0, 1\}$ or if $x = y$, one sees that \mathbf{L}_3 is a hoop. The tabulated value of δ shows that \mathbf{L}_3 is also involutive. It can be shown that (up to isomorphism) there are 7 pocrim of order 4 of which 2, which we call \mathbf{P}_4 and \mathbf{Q}_4 , are not hoops. \mathbf{P}_4 comprises the chain $1 > b > c > 0$. The operation tables for \mathbf{P}_4 are as follows.

\cdot	1	b	c	0	\rightarrow	1	b	c	0	δ	1	1
1	1	b	c	0	1	1	b	c	0	1	1	1
b	b	0	0	0	b	1	1	b	b	b	b	b
c	c	0	0	0	c	1	1	1	b	c	b	b
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0

In \mathbf{P}_4 , $\delta(c) = b$, so \mathbf{P}_4 is not involutive. Moreover \mathbf{P}_4 is not a hoop since $b \cdot (b \rightarrow c) = 0 \neq c = c \cdot (c \rightarrow b)$. However, the image of double negation is a subpocrim with universe $\{0, b, 1\}$ isomorphic to the involutive hoop \mathbf{L}_3 .

\mathbf{Q}_4 comprises the chain $1 > p > q > 0$ and has operation tables as follows:

\cdot	1	p	q	0	\rightarrow	1	p	q	0	δ	
1	1	p	q	0	1	1	p	q	0	1	1
p	p	p	0	0	p	1	1	q	q	p	p
q	q	0	0	0	q	1	1	1	p	q	q
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0

Like \mathbf{P}_4 , \mathbf{Q}_4 is not a hoop since $p \cdot (p \rightarrow q) = 0 \neq q = q \cdot (q \rightarrow p)$. \mathbf{Q}_4 is involutive.

Our final example of a pocrim that is not a hoop, which we call \mathbf{Q}_6 , has 6 elements $1 > r > s > t > u > 0$. Its operation tables are as follows:

\cdot	1	r	s	t	u	0	\rightarrow	1	r	s	t	u	0	δ	
1	1	r	s	t	u	0	1	1	r	s	t	u	0	1	1
r	r	r	t	t	u	0	r	1	1	s	s	u	0	r	1
s	s	t	t	t	0	0	s	1	1	1	r	u	u	s	s
t	t	t	t	t	0	0	t	1	1	1	1	u	u	t	s
u	u	u	0	0	0	0	u	1	1	1	1	1	s	u	u
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0

\mathbf{Q}_6 is not involutive, e.g., because $\delta(r) = 0$. As indicated by the block decomposition of the operation tables, there is a homomorphism $h : \mathbf{Q}_6 \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_4$. The kernel congruence of h has equivalence classes $\{1, r\}$, $\{s, t\}$, $\{u\}$ and $\{0\}$ which are mapped by h to 1, p , q and 0 in \mathbf{Q}_4 respectively.

The next lemma gives the examples mentioned in the proofs of Theorems 4 and 5.

Lemma 25 *The following hold in the indicated pocrim:*

- (i) In \mathbf{Q}_4 , $\delta(\delta(p) \cdot \delta(q)) = 0 \neq 1 = \delta(\delta(p) \cdot \delta(q))$;
- (ii) In \mathbf{P}_4 , $\delta(\delta(c) \rightarrow c) = b \neq 1$.

Proof: Straightforward calculations using the operation tables. ■

If \mathbf{P} is a pocrim, we write $\text{Th}(\mathbf{P})$, for the *theory* of \mathbf{P} , i.e., the set of all formulas A such that $\mathbf{P} \models A$. If \mathbf{P} is finite, then, given A , it is a finite task to decide whether $\mathbf{P} \models A$. So $\text{Th}(\mathbf{P})$ is recursive and hence is a recursively axiomatisable extension of \mathbf{AL}_1 . In our final theorem, we give two theories that justify Theorem 6 together with explicit descriptions of their classical extensions.

Theorem 26 *Let $\mathbf{A}_1 = \text{Th}(\mathbf{Q}_6)$ and $\mathbf{A}_2 = \text{Th}(\mathbf{P}_4)$, then*

- (i) $(\cdot)^{\text{Gli}}$ is a negative translation for \mathbf{A}_1 but $(\cdot)^{\text{Gen}}$ is not;
- (ii) $(\cdot)^{\text{Gen}}$ is a negative translation for \mathbf{A}_2 but $(\cdot)^{\text{Gli}}$ is not.

Moreover we have $\mathbf{A}_1 + [\text{DNE}] = \text{Th}(\mathbf{Q}_4)$ and $\mathbf{A}_2 + [\text{DNE}] = \text{Th}(\mathbf{L}_3)$.

Proof: See [2, Theorem 5.2.5 and Lemma 5.2.6]. ■