Boolean Algebras in Visser Algebras

Majid Alizadeh
School of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science
College of Science, University of Tehran
P. O. Box 14155-6455
Tehran, Iran
e-mail: malizadeh@khayam.ut.ac.ir

Mohammad Ardeshir
Department of Mathematics, Sharif University of Technology
P.O. Box 11365-9415
Tehran, Iran
e-mail: mardeshir@sharif.edu

Wim Ruitenburg
Department of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science
Marquette University
P.O. Box 1881
Milwaukee, WI 53201, USA
e-mail: wimr@mscs.mu.edu

Abstract

We generalize the double negation construction of Boolean algebras in Heyting algebras, to a double negation construction of the same in Visser algebras (also known as basic algebras). This result allows us to generalize Glivenko's Theorem from intuitionistic propositional logic and Heyting algebras to Visser's basic propositional logic and Visser algebras.

Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 03G05, 03G25, 06D20, secondary: 03B20.

Keywords: Boolean algebra, Glivenko Theorem, Visser logic.

1 Introduction

Basic Propositional Calculus BPC, which was introduced by Albert Visser in [5], captures a sublogic of Intuitionistic Propositional Calculus IPC which corresponds with modal logic K4 in essentially the same way that IPC corresponds with modal logic S4. In [3] and [4] we introduce Visser algebras (where we named them basic algebras), which correspond with BPC in the same way that Heyting algebras correspond with IPC and that Boolean algebras correspond with Classical Propositional Calculus CPC. In Appendix A we present axiomatizations and some elementary properties of both BPC and Visser algebras.

The double negation construction of Boolean algebras from Heyting algebras is well-known. It is natural to consider how closely one can repeat this construction over Visser algebras. Surprisingly the end result still works, although in details we use several new ideas.

Glivenko's Theorem also goes through, but with an interesting reformulation. Given propositional formula ψ, define $\xi(\psi) := ((\top \to \psi) \to \psi) \to (\top \to \psi)$. Formulas $\xi(\psi)$ are of interest in their own right, see [4, page 323]. Over IPC, formulas ψ and $\xi(\psi)$ are equivalent. So, in particular, IPC proves

$\neg\xi(\bot)$. With Theorem 4.7 we show that for all (sequent) theories $\Gamma \supseteq$ BPC we have

$$\Gamma \text{ proves } \varphi \to \xi(\bot) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \Gamma + \text{CPC proves } \varphi \to \xi(\bot).$$

So if $\Gamma \supseteq$ IPC, then Γ proves $\neg\varphi$ if and only if $\Gamma+$CPC proves $\neg\varphi$ (Glivenko's Theorem).

2 Boolean Algebras

A definition and some key properties of Visser algebras are presented in Appendix A. For the purposes of this paper we introduce notations $\Box a$ for $1 \to a$, and x^a for $x \to a$. So $\Box\Box a = 1 \to (1 \to a)$, and $x^{aaa} = ((x \to a) \to a) \to a$. For all terms $t(x)$ built from the defining functions of $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, 1)$ and the elements A, and for all $x \in A$, we have $x \wedge t(x) = x \wedge t(1)$ (simple substitution). For example, $x \wedge (x \wedge y)^a = x \wedge (1 \wedge y)^a = x \wedge y^a$. Positive and negative occurrences in formulas and terms are defined in the usual way. If x is only positive in $t(x)$, then $x \leq y$ implies $t(x) \leq t(y)$. For example, $x^{aa} \leq \Box a \to a$. If x is only negative in $t(x)$, then $x \leq y$ implies $t(y) \leq t(x)$. For example, $\Box a \leq x^a$.

An element a is called Heyting if $\Box a = a$. A Visser algebra is a Heyting algebra exactly when all its elements are Heyting. Since $a \leq \Box a$ for all a we have that 1 is always Heyting, but 0 need not be Heyting.

Proposition 2.1. *Let a be an element of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Then*

1. $(x \wedge y)^a \leq x \to y^a \leq (x \wedge y)^{\Box a}$
2. $(x \wedge y)^{aa} = x^{aa} \wedge y^{aa}$

Proof. Item 1: First, $(x \wedge y)^a \wedge x = y^a \wedge x \leq y^a$, so $(x \wedge y)^a \leq x \to y^a$. Second, $x \wedge y \leq x$ implies $x \to y^a = x \to (y \to a) \leq (x \wedge y) \to (y \to a) = (x \wedge y) \to (1 \to a) = (x \wedge y)^{\Box a}$.

Item 2: Direction $(x \wedge y)^{aa} \leq x^{aa} \wedge y^{aa}$ is immediate from the positive positions of x and y. For the other direction, with $(x \to y^a) \wedge y^{aa} \leq x^a$ and item 1 we get $x^{aa} \wedge y^{aa} \wedge (x \wedge y)^a \leq x^{aa} \wedge y^{aa} \wedge (x \to y^a) \leq x^{aa} \wedge x^a = \Box a \wedge x^a = \Box a$. So $x^{aa} \wedge y^{aa} \leq (x \wedge y)^a \to \Box a$. From the positive position of x we get $x^{aa} \leq \Box a \to a$. Thus, with transitivity, $x^{aa} \wedge y^{aa} \leq (x \wedge y)^{aa}$. $\Box$

Let $a \in A$. An element x is called a-regular if $x^{aa} = x$. Let $R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ be the set of a-regular elements of $\mathfrak{A}$. Clearly we have $\{x^a : x \in A\} \supseteq \{x^{aa} : x \in A\} \supseteq \{x^{aaa} : x \in A\} \supseteq \ldots \supseteq R^a(\mathfrak{A})$. Since x is positive in x^{aa} and $0^{aa} = \Box a$ and $1^{aa} = \Box a \to a$, we also have $R^a(\mathfrak{A}) \subseteq [\Box a, \Box a \to a]$. The set $R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ inherits a partial order from $\mathfrak{A}$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let a be an element of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Then*

1. $x \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ *implies* $x^a \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$
2. $\Box a \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ *(this is [4, Proposition 2.12])*
3. $\Box a \to a \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$
4. $x, y \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ *implies* $x \wedge y \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$

Proof. Item 1 is immediate, since $x^{aa} = x$ implies $x^{aaa} = x^a$.

Item 2: By positivity of $\Box a$ we have $(\Box a \to a) \to a \leq \Box a \to a$, so with simple substitution $(\Box a \to a) \to a \leq \Box a$. Thus $(\Box a)^{aa} = \Box a$.

Item 3 is immediate from items 1 and 2.

Item 4 is Proposition 2.1.2. $\Box$

So $R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ inherits top and bottom from interval $[\Box a, \Box a \to a]$, and is closed under $\wedge$. We show below that closure under $x \mapsto x^a$ essentially means closure under (relative) complement.

Given $a \in A$, define $x \vee_a y = (x \vee y)^{aa}$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let a be an element of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Then*

1. $x, y \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ *implies* $x \vee_a y \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$
2. $x, y \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ *implies* $x \vee y \leq x \vee_a y$
3. $z \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ *plus* $x \vee y \leq z$ *imply* $x \vee_a y \leq z$
4. $x \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ *implies* $x \wedge (y \vee_a z) = (x \wedge y) \vee_a (x \wedge z)$

Proof. Item 1: $x \vee_a y = (x^a \wedge y^a)^a$. Apply Propositions 2.2.1 and 2.2.4.

Item 2: With positivity, $x \vee y = x^{aa} \vee y^{aa} \leq (x \vee y)^{aa} = x \vee_a y$.

Item 3: $x \vee y \leq z$ implies $x \vee_a y \leq z^{aa} = z$.

Item 4: With Proposition 2.1.2, $x \wedge (y \vee_a z) = x^{aa} \wedge (y \vee z)^{aa} = (x \wedge (y \vee z))^{aa} = ((x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z))^{aa} = (x \wedge y) \vee_a (x \wedge z)$. $\Box$

Given $a \in A$, define $x \to_a y = x^a \vee_a y$. Let $\mathfrak{R}^a(\mathfrak{A})$ be structure $(R^a(\mathfrak{A}), \wedge, \vee_a, \to_a, \Box a, \Box a \to a)$. By Propositions 2.2 and 2.3.1, this structure is well-defined.

Theorem 2.4. *Let a be an element of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Then $\mathfrak{R}^a(\mathfrak{A})$ is a Boolean algebra.*

Proof. By Propositions 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, and 2.3, $(R^a(\mathfrak{A}), \wedge, \vee_a, \Box a, \Box a \to a)$ is a bounded distributive lattice. So it suffices to show that $x \mapsto x^a$ gives a (relative) Boolean complement.

For all x we have $x \wedge x^a = x \wedge \Box a$. In case $x \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ this means $x \wedge x^a = \Box a$ and so x and x^a are relatively disjoint.

Suppose x and y are such that both $x \leq y$ and $x^a \leq y$. Then $y^a \leq x^a \leq y$, so $y^a \leq \Box a$ and so $y^a = \Box a$. So also $y^{aa} = \Box a \to a$. So if $x \leq y$ plus $x^a \leq y$ plus $y \in R^a(\mathfrak{A})$, then $y = \Box a \to a$, the largest element of $\mathfrak{R}^a(\mathfrak{A})$. $\Box$

3 Boolean Elements and Morphisms

We have a further characterization of the elements of $R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ which allows us to find an idempotent Visser algebra morphism from the 'subalgebra' of $\mathfrak{A}$ on interval $[a, 1]$, onto $\mathfrak{R}^a(\mathfrak{A})$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let a be an element of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Then*

1. $x \wedge x^{aa} = x \wedge (\Box a \to a)$ *(so $x \leq \Box a \to a$ if and only if $x \leq x^{aa}$)*
2. $\Box a \leq x$ *implies* $x^a \leq x^{aaa}$
3. $x^{aaa} = x^a \wedge (\Box a \to a)$
4. $x^{aaaa} = x^{aa}$

5. $R^a(\mathfrak{A}) = \{x^{aa} \ : \ x \in A\}$

Proof. Item 1 is immediate by simple substitution.

Item 2: $\Box a \leq x$ implies $x^a \leq \Box a \to a$. Apply item 1.

Item 3: By simple substitution of x^a we have $x^a \wedge x^{aaa} = x^a \wedge (\Box a \to a)$. So $x^{aaa} \geq x^a \wedge (\Box a \to a)$. For the other direction, inequality $x \wedge (\Box a \to a) \leq x^{aa}$ of item 1 implies $x^{aaa} \leq (x \wedge (\Box a \to a))^a$. From positivity of x^a we get $x^{aaa} \leq \Box a \to a$. Thus, with simple substitution, $x^{aaa} \leq (\Box a \to a) \wedge (x \wedge (\Box a \to a))^a = (\Box a \to a) \wedge x^a$.

Item 4: For all x we have $x^{aa} \leq \Box a \to a$. Apply item 3 with x replaced by x^a.

Item 5 is immediate from item 4. $\Box$

Proposition 3.1.3 may be viewed as the natural generalization of Brouwer's triple negation theorem. If a is Heyting, then it yields $x^{aaa} = x^a$ for all x, and so $R^a(\mathfrak{A}) = \{x^a \ : \ x \in A\}$.

Now we have the tools to present an idempotent Visser algebra morphism from subinterval $[a, 1]$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ onto $\mathfrak{R}^a(\mathfrak{A})$.

First some facts about Visser algebras on intervals. Let $a, b \in A$ be with $a \leq b$. We construct a Visser algebra $\mathfrak{I}^{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{A})$ on interval $[a, b]$ as follows. Define $x \to_I y = (x \to y) \wedge b$. Define $\mathfrak{I}^{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{A}) = ([a, b], \wedge, \vee, \to_I, a, b)$. Clearly $\mathfrak{I}^{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{A})$ is well-defined. The map $\pi_{[a,b]} : x \mapsto (x \wedge b) \vee a = (x \vee a) \wedge b$ is a well-defined map from A onto $[a, b]$. If $b = 1$, then $x \to_I y = x \to y$, so $\mathfrak{I}^{[a,1]}(\mathfrak{A})$ is clearly a Visser algebra, and is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{A}$ except for the bottom element.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $a \leq b$ be elements of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Then $\mathfrak{I}^{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{A})$ is a Visser algebra, and $\pi_{[a,b]}$ is an idempotent bounded distributive lattice morphism from $\mathfrak{A}$ onto $\mathfrak{I}^{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{A})$.*

Proof. The bounded distributive lattice properties are well-known. One easily verifies the defining Visser algebra properties of Appendix A for arrow $x \to_I y$. $\Box$

Map $\pi_{[a,b]}$ need not respect arrows even when $\mathfrak{A}$ is a Heyting algebra and $b = 1$, since $\pi_{[a,1]}(x \to y) = (x \to y) \vee a$ and $\pi_{[a,1]}(x) \to_I \pi_{[a,1]}(y) = x \to (y \vee a)$ need not be the same.

Finally the morphism of primary interest. Let $a \in A$. Define map $\gamma_a : A \to R^a(\mathfrak{A})$ by $\gamma_a(x) = x^{aa}$. By Proposition 3.1.5, map γ_a is well-defined. We are primarily interested in γ_a with restriction to subdomain $[a, 1]$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let a and b be elements of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Then*

1. $(x^{aa} \vee y^{aa})^{aa} = (x \vee y)^{aa}$

2. $(x \to (b \vee y))^a \leq ((x \to b) \vee y)^a$

3. $(x \to (a \vee y))^a = ((x \to a) \vee y)^a$

Proof. Item 1: With Propositions 2.1.2 and 3.1.4 we have $(x^{aa} \vee y^{aa})^{aa} = (x^{aaa} \wedge y^{aaa})^a = (x^a \wedge y^a)^{aaa} = (x \vee y)^{aaaa} = (x \vee y)^{aa}$.

Item 2 immediately follows from $(x \to b) \vee y \leq x \to (b \vee y)$.

Item 3: By item 2 we need only show one direction. Since $(a \vee y)^a = y^a$ we have $(x \to (a \vee y))^a \geq (x \to (a \vee y))^a \wedge y^a = ((x \to (a \vee y)) \wedge ((a \vee y) \to a))^a \wedge y^a \geq (x^a)^a \wedge y^a = ((x \to a) \vee y)^a$. $\Box$

Theorem 3.4. *Let a be an element of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Then γ_a is an idempotent Visser algebra morphism from $\mathfrak{I}^{[a,1]}(\mathfrak{A})$ onto $\mathfrak{R}^a(\mathfrak{A})$.*

Proof. Preservation of top 1, bottom a, and conjunction are easy. Onto and idempotency of γ_a follow from Propositions 3.1.4 and 3.1.5. Equation $\gamma_a(x \vee y) = \gamma_a(x) \vee_a \gamma_a(y)$ is Proposition 3.3.1. Finally, let $y \in [a, 1]$. Then $a \leq y$, so with Proposition 3.3.3 we have $(x \to y)^a = (x^a \vee y)^a$. Combined with Proposition 3.3.1 we then have $\gamma_a(x \to y) = (x \to y)^{aa} = (x^a \vee y)^{aa} = (x^{aaa} \vee y^{aa})^{aa} = \gamma_a(x) \to_a \gamma_a(y)$. □

Map $\gamma_a : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{R}^a(\mathfrak{A})$ is an idempotent onto bounded lattice morphism with $\gamma_a(x \to y) = (x \to y)^{aa} \leq (x \to (a \vee y))^{aa} = (x^a \vee y)^{aa} = \gamma_a(x) \to_a \gamma_a(y)$. In general these two expressions are not equal, even when $\mathfrak{A}$ is a Heyting algebra.

4 Glivenko Theorems

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a bounded distributive lattice with binary function $x \to y$ satisfying $x \to y = 1$ for all $x, y \in A$. Then $\mathfrak{A}$ is clearly a Visser algebra. All Visser algebras satisfying $\Box 0 = 1$ can so be obtained from bounded distributive lattices. They belong to the very interesting collection of Visser algebras that satisfy the principle of excluded middle $x \vee x^0 = 1$, a collection which was essentially introduced in [3] (see also [4, Proposition 5.11]). So the principle of excluded middle is not sufficient to yield just Boolean algebras. Therefore the following is not completely self-evident.

Proposition 4.1. *Let Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfy the schema of double negation elimination $x^{00} \leq x$. Then $\mathfrak{A}$ is a Boolean algebra.*

Proof. Clearly $\Box 0 = 0^{00} \leq 0$, so $\Box 0 = 0$. Let $x \in A$. Then $\Box x \wedge x^0 \leq \Box 0 = 0$, so $\Box x \leq x^{00} \leq x$. So $\mathfrak{A}$ is a Heyting algebra satisfying double negation elimination, and thus is a Boolean algebra. □

The Glivenko Theorems we describe below, involve inverse images of $\Box 0$ and $\Box 0 \to 0$ under the Visser algebra morphisms $\gamma_0 : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{R}^0(\mathfrak{A})$ of Section 3 (note that $\mathfrak{I}^{[0,1]}(\mathfrak{A}) = \mathfrak{A}$). We use the following defined term in the description of these inverse images.

For Visser algebra elements a, define $\xi(a) = (\Box a \to a) \to \Box a$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let a be an element of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Then*

1. $\xi(a) \wedge (\Box a \to a) = \Box a$
2. $\Box \xi(a) = \xi(a)$ *(this is [4, Proposition 2.11])*
3. $x \to \xi(a) = 1$ *if and only if* $x \leq \xi(a)$
4. $\xi(a) \to a = \Box a \to a$

Proof. Item 1: With simple substitution, $\xi(a) \wedge (\Box a \to a) = \Box\Box a \wedge (\Box a \to a) \leq \Box a$.

Item 2: By item 1 we have $1 = \xi(a) \wedge (\Box a \to a) \to \Box a$. So $\Box \xi(a) \leq (\Box a \to a) \to \xi(a) = (\Box a \to a) \to \xi(a) \wedge (\Box a \to a) = (\Box a \to a) \to \Box a = \xi(a)$.

Item 3: From right to left is immediate. For the converse, suppose $x \to \xi(a) = 1$. Then with item 2 we have $x = x \wedge (x \to \xi(a)) = x \wedge \Box \xi(a) \leq \xi(a)$.

Item 4: Obviously $\xi(a) \to a \leq \Box a \to a$. Conversely, with item 1 and simple substitution we have $(\Box a \to a) \wedge (\xi(a) \to a) = (\Box a \to a) \wedge (\xi(a) \wedge (\Box a \to a) \to a) = (\Box a \to a) \wedge (\Box a \to a)$. □

Proposition 4.3. *Let a be an element of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Then*

$$\Box a \to a \leq x^a \text{ if and only if } x^{aa} = \Box a \text{ if and only if } x \leq \xi(a)$$

Proof. With Propositions 2.2.2 and 3.1.3 we have $\Box a \to a \leq x^a$ implies $x^{aa} \leq (\Box a)^{aa} = \Box a$ (and so $x^{aa} = \Box a$) implies $\Box a \to a \leq x^{aaa} \leq x^a$. So the first two statements are equivalent. By Proposition 4.2.4 we have $x \leq \xi(a)$ implies $\Box a \to a \leq x \to a$. So the third statement implies the first. For the converse, suppose the first statement. Then $x \wedge (\Box a \to a) \leq x \wedge x^a \leq \Box a$. So $x \leq (\Box a \to a) \to \Box a = \xi(a)$. $\Box$

So the inverse image of $\Box a$ under γ_a is the principal ideal $[0, \xi(a)]$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let a be an element of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$, and $\gamma_a(x) = x^{aa}$ be the idempotent bounded distributive lattice morphism from $\mathfrak{A}$ onto $\mathfrak{R}^a(\mathfrak{A})$. Then $\gamma_a^{-1}(\Box a) = \{x \in A \ : \ x^{\xi(a)} = 1\}$ and $\gamma_a^{-1}(\Box a \to a) = \{x \in A \ : \ x^{a\xi(a)} = 1\}$.*

Proof. With Propositions 4.3 and 4.2.3 we have $\gamma_a(x) = \Box a$ if and only if $x^{\xi(a)} = 1$. Similarly, $\gamma_a(x) = \Box a \to a$ if and only if $x^{aa} = \Box a \to a$ if and only if (use Propositions 2.2.2 and 3.1.4) $x^{aaa} = \Box a$ if and only if (Proposition 4.3) $x^a \leq \xi(a)$ if and only if (Proposition 4.2.3) $x^{a\xi(a)} = 1$. $\Box$

Fix a propositional language $\mathcal{L}$. With its presentation in [3] (see also [4, Proposition 2.4]), the Lindenbaum algebra of basic propositional logic BPC is isomorphic in the natural way with the free Visser algebra on the set of propositional letters of $\mathcal{L}$. Sequent theories $\Gamma \supseteq$ BPC correspond with adding equations between (equivalence classes of) formulas of $\mathcal{L}$. Examples are intuitionistic propositional logic $\Gamma =$ IPC, which is axiomatizable by schema $\top \to \varphi \Rightarrow \varphi$, and classical propositional logic $\Gamma =$ CPC, which is axiomatizable by schema $(\varphi \to \bot) \to \bot \Rightarrow \varphi$, also written as $\neg\neg\varphi \Rightarrow \varphi$. Write $\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma$ for the Lindenbaum Visser algebra of Γ, with elements $[\varphi]_\Gamma = \{\psi \in \mathcal{L} \ : \ \Gamma \vdash \psi \Leftrightarrow \varphi\}$. Given sequent theories $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta$, the map $\pi^\Gamma_\Delta : [\varphi]_\Gamma \mapsto [\varphi]_\Delta$ is a Visser algebra morphism from $\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma$ onto $\mathfrak{A}_\Delta$. A Visser algebra morphism $\mu : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ induces a congruence on $\mathfrak{A}$ in the usual way by $x \sim y$ exactly when $\mu(x) = \mu(y)$. If $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_\Gamma$ for some sequent theory Γ, then $\Delta(\mu) = \{\varphi \Rightarrow \psi \ : \ [\varphi]_\Gamma \sim [\varphi \wedge \psi]_\Gamma\}$ is the unique sequent theory containing Γ such that $\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma/(\sim) \cong \mathfrak{A}_{\Delta(\mu)}$ by the usual isomorphism $[[\varphi]_\Gamma]_\sim \mapsto [\varphi]_{\Delta(\mu)}$. We call $\Delta(\mu)$ the congruence theory implied by μ. Given sequent theories $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta \subseteq \Delta(\mu)$, map $\nu([\varphi]_\Delta) = \mu([\varphi]_\Gamma)$ is the unique function (and Visser algebra morphism) that makes the following diagram commute.



where ν is an isomorphism exactly when $\Delta = \Delta(\mu)$.

Given element a of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$, we have $R^a(\mathfrak{A}) \subseteq A$. So each function μ from $\mathfrak{A}$ uniquely determines a restricted function μ_a from $\mathfrak{R}^a(\mathfrak{A})$. Let $\mu : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ be a Visser algebra morphism. Then the following diagram commutes, with $\mu_a(x^{aa}) = \mu(x)^{\mu(a)\mu(a)}$.



The following is not immediately self-evident since the idempotent onto maps γ_a and $\gamma_{\mu(a)}$ need not be Visser algebra morphisms.

Proposition 4.5. *Let a be element of Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A}$, and $\mu : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ be a Visser algebra morphism. Then μ_a is a Visser algebra morphism.*

Proof. This is essentially immediate from the definition of the Boolean algebra in terms of the defining functions of the original Visser algebra. For example, $\mu_a(x \vee_a y) = \mu(x \vee_a y) = \mu((x \vee y)^{aa}) = (\mu(x) \vee \mu(y))^{\mu(a)\mu(a)} = \mu_a(x) \vee_{\mu(a)} \mu_a(y)$. $\square$

So map μ_a is also a Boolean algebra morphism.

Proposition 4.6. *Let Γ be a sequent theory. Then the congruence theory implied by $\gamma_0 : \mathfrak{A}_\Gamma \to \mathfrak{R}^0(\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma)$ equals $\Gamma + \mathrm{CPC}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.1.4 we have $\gamma_0([\varphi]_\Gamma) = \gamma_0([\neg\neg\varphi]_\Gamma)$. So $\Gamma \cup \mathrm{CPC} \subseteq \Delta(\gamma_0)$. Consider the following diagram.



where π is short for $\pi^\Gamma_{\Gamma+\mathrm{CPC}}$. The bottom γ_0 is clearly an identity between Boolean algebras. The outer square and the top left triangle both commute. An easy diagram chase plus π onto gives that the lower right triangle also commutes. So $\pi_0\nu = 1$. Since γ_0 is onto, ν is also onto. With $\nu = \nu\pi_0\nu$ this gives $\nu\pi_0 = 1$. Thus ν is a Visser algebra isomorphism, and $\Gamma + \mathrm{CPC} = \Delta(\gamma_0)$, $\square$

This is essentially all we need to generalize the Glivenko Theorems from IPC to BPC. We employ the following notations for formulas and sequent theories over BPC.

We write $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ as short for $\Gamma \vdash (\top \Rightarrow \varphi)$. This agrees with default practice over IPC, where, with modus ponens, $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi$ and $\top \Rightarrow \varphi \to \psi$ are provably equivalent. So intuitionistic theories can ignore sets of sequents in favor of sets of formulas, by simply dropping the $\top \Rightarrow$ part.

Define $\xi(\varphi)$ as short for $((\top \to \varphi) \to \varphi) \to (\top \to \varphi)$. This is in agreement with the function ξ over Visser algebras of the form $\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma$, since $\xi([\varphi]_\Gamma) = [\xi(\varphi)]_\Gamma$.

Theorem 4.7. *Let Γ be a sequent theory over* BPC. *Then for all formulas φ we have*

1. $\Gamma \vdash \varphi \to \xi(\bot)$ *if and only if* $\Gamma + \mathrm{CPC} \vdash \varphi \to \bot$

2. $\Gamma \vdash (\varphi \to \bot) \to \xi(\bot)$ *if and only if* $\Gamma + \mathrm{CPC} \vdash \varphi$

Proof. Item 1: $\Gamma \vdash \varphi \to \xi(\bot)$ if and only if $[\varphi]_\Gamma^{\xi(0)} = 1$ in $\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma$ if and only if (Theorem 4.4) $[\varphi]_\Gamma^{00} = 0$ in $\mathfrak{R}^0(\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma)$ if and only if (Proposition 4.6) $[\varphi]_{\Gamma+\mathrm{CPC}} = 0$ in $\mathfrak{A}_{\Gamma+\mathrm{CPC}}$ if and only if $\Gamma + \mathrm{CPC} \vdash \varphi \to \bot$.

Item 2: By item 1 we have $\Gamma \vdash (\varphi \to \bot) \to \xi(\bot)$ if and only if $\Gamma + \mathrm{CPC} \vdash (\varphi \to \bot) \to \bot$. Apply double negation elimination over CPC. □

Since $\mathrm{IPC} \vdash ((\top \to \varphi) \Leftrightarrow \varphi)$, we have $\mathrm{IPC} \vdash (\xi(\varphi) \Leftrightarrow \varphi)$. In particular, $\mathrm{IPC} \vdash \neg\xi(\bot)$. So over IPC, Theorem 4.7 reduces to the well-known:

Theorem 4.8 (Glivenko)**.** *Let* Γ *be a theory over* IPC*. Then for all formulas* φ *we have*

1. $\Gamma \vdash \neg\varphi$ *if and only if* $\Gamma + \mathrm{CPC} \vdash \neg\varphi$
2. $\Gamma \vdash \neg\neg\varphi$ *if and only if* $\Gamma + \mathrm{CPC} \vdash \varphi$

A Appendix. Axioms and Algebras

We choose an axiomatization of Basic Propositional Calculus BPC using sequents. We briefly recall some relevant points from [4]. Our formulas are built from propositional variables using $\top$, $\bot$, $\varphi \wedge \psi$, $\varphi \vee \psi$, and $\varphi \to \psi$. Negation $\neg\varphi$ and bi-implication $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ are defined in the usual way by $\varphi \to \bot$ and $(\varphi \to \psi) \wedge (\psi \to \varphi)$ respectively. Symbols $\top$ and $\bot$ are both atoms and nullary connectives. The foundation of our sequent theories is a collection of closure rules which, on its own, generates a bounded distributive prelattice with preorder $\Rightarrow$, on the collection of formulas. In each rule below, a single horizontal line means that if the sequents above the line hold, then so do the ones below the line. A rule with multiple conclusions is an abbreviation for several rules with single conclusions. A double line means the same as a single line, but in both directions, so is really an abbreviation for two (possibly abbreviated) rules. The absence of a line means that the conclusion holds without premiss. So sequents are identifiable as special rules. Here they are:

$\varphi \Rightarrow \varphi$ reflexivity,

$$\frac{\varphi \Rightarrow \psi \quad \psi \Rightarrow \theta}{\varphi \Rightarrow \theta} \quad \text{transitivity,}$$

$\varphi \Rightarrow \top \quad \bot \Rightarrow \varphi$ top and bottom,

$$\frac{\varphi \Rightarrow \psi \quad \varphi \Rightarrow \theta}{\overline{\varphi \Rightarrow \psi \wedge \theta}} \qquad \frac{\psi \Rightarrow \varphi \quad \theta \Rightarrow \varphi}{\overline{\psi \vee \theta \Rightarrow \varphi}} \quad \text{meet and join,}$$

$\varphi \wedge (\psi \vee \theta) \Rightarrow (\varphi \wedge \psi) \vee (\varphi \wedge \theta)$ distributivity, and

$$\frac{\varphi \wedge \psi \Rightarrow \theta}{\varphi \Rightarrow \psi \to \theta} \quad \text{implication introduction.}$$

If in the implication introduction rule we were to replace the single horizontal line by a double line, we essentially add modus ponens to the system and so get Intuitionistic Propositional Calculus IPC. In the absence of modus ponens we need to add the 'formalized' versions of some of the rules of $\Rightarrow$:

$(\varphi \to \psi) \wedge (\psi \to \theta) \Rightarrow \varphi \to \theta$ formal transitivity,

$(\varphi \to \psi) \wedge (\varphi \to \theta) \Rightarrow \varphi \to (\psi \wedge \theta)$ formal meet, and

$$(\psi \to \varphi) \wedge (\theta \to \varphi) \Rightarrow (\psi \vee \theta) \to \varphi \qquad \text{formal join.}$$

This completes the axiomatization of BPC. It is possible to define theories over BPC in terms of adding rules. For the purposes of this paper we restrict ourselves to theories that are obtained by only adding sequents (or: rules without premiss). Examples are IPC, which is axiomatizable by adding the schema $(\top \to \varphi) \Rightarrow \varphi$, and CPC, which is axiomatizable by adding the schema $((\varphi \to \bot) \to \bot) \Rightarrow \varphi$.

A Visser algebra $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, 1)$ (called a basic algebra in [1, 2, 3, 4]) is a bounded distributive lattice $(A, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ with an arrow satisfying the schemas

$$(a \to b \wedge c) = (a \to b) \wedge (a \to c)$$
$$(b \vee c \to a) = (b \to a) \wedge (c \to a)$$
$$(a \to a) = 1$$
$$a \leq (1 \to a)$$
$$(a \to b) \wedge (b \to c) \leq (a \to c) \qquad \text{(transitivity)}$$

where $\leq$ is the usual order relation implied by the lattice. This completes the axiomatization of a Visser algebra. A Heyting algebra is a Visser algebra satisfying the extra schema $(1 \to a) = a$. Visser algebras need not be Heyting algebras, but they always satisfy:

$$a \wedge b \leq c \text{ implies } a \leq b \to c$$

Further such properties can be found in [4], [1], or [2].

Visser algebra morphisms preserve sequent theories. For example, the image of a Heyting algebra under a Visser algebra morphism is again a Heyting algebra. The same applies to Boolean algebras.

References

[1] Majid Alizadeh and Mohammad Ardeshir. *On the linear Lindenbaum algebra of basic propositional logic*, Mathematical Logic Quarterly **50** no. 1 (2004), 65–70.

[2] Majid Alizadeh and Mohammad Ardeshir. *On Löb algebras, II*, Logic Journal of the IGPL **20** no. 1 (2012), 27–44.

[3] Mohammad Ardeshir. *Aspects of Basic Logic*. PhD Thesis, Department of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science, Marquette University, Milwaukee, 1995.

[4] Mohammad Ardeshir and Wim Ruitenburg. *Basic propositional calculus I*, Mathematical Logic Quarterly **44**, no. 3 (1998), 317–343.

[5] Albert Visser. *A propositional logic with explicit fixed points*, Studia Logica **40** (1981), 155–175.