



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Note on paraconsistency and reasoning about fractions

Bergstra, J.A.; Bethke, I.

Publication date

2014

Document Version

Submitted manuscript

License

Unspecified

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bergstra, J. A., & Bethke, I. (2014). *Note on paraconsistency and reasoning about fractions*. ArXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1410.8692v1>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Note on paraconsistency and the logic of fractions

Jan A. Bergstra & Inge Bethke

Informatics Institute, University of Amsterdam*

Abstract

We apply a paraconsistent logic to reason about fractions.

1 Introduction

Suppose we want to define an arithmetic framework in which it is possible to reason about fractions in a consistent and reliable way and in which the usual laws of arithmetic hold: e.g. for natural numbers n, l and $k \neq 0 \neq m$ the equations

$$\frac{n}{m} + \frac{l}{k} = \frac{nk + lm}{mk} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{n}{m} + \frac{l}{m} = \frac{n+l}{m}$$

should be valid. At the same time, we want to consider fractions as mathematical expressions with typical syntactic operations like the numerator $num(\)$ satisfying

$$num\left(\frac{n}{m}\right) = n.$$

Then equational logic dictates

$$n + l = num\left(\frac{n+l}{m}\right) = num\left(\frac{n}{m} + \frac{l}{m}\right) = num\left(\frac{nm + lm}{mm}\right) = nm + lm.$$

for arbitrary l, n and $m \neq 0$, and our framework is inconsistent. Nevertheless, fractions are of great practical and abstract importance and we should be able to reason about them without lapsing into absurdity.

In mathematics education, one can get around this predicament in various ways: avoiding the concepts of numerator and denominator (see e.g. [6]), viewing fractions as heterogeneous subject (see e.g. [5]), or accepting cognitive conflicts (see e.g. [7]). In this note, we propose to apply paraconsistent logic.

A *paraconsistent* logic is a way to reason about inconsistent information without *exploding* in the sense that if a contradiction is obtained, then everything can be obtained.

*Science Park 904, 1098 XH Amsterdam

Paraconsistent logics come in a broad spectrum, ranging from logics with the thought that if a contradiction were true, then everything would be true, to logics that claim that some contradictions really are true. For a brief discussion see e.g. [4]. In this note, we choose a particular paraconsistent logic to tackle the dilemma sketched above. We do not claim that this is the only possible way how to proceed in our scenario; other paraconsistent logics may be suitable as well.

2 The binary C & P structure

The approach taken is known as the *preservationist* school. There the fundamental idea is that, given an inconsistent collection of premises, one should not try to reason about the collection of premises as a whole, but rather focus on internally consistent subsets of premises. In 2004, Brown and Priest [3] introduced the *Chunk and Permeate* (C & P) strategy for dealing with reasoning situations involving incompatible assumptions. In this preservationist logic, a theory is broken up into chunks and only restricted information is allowed to pass from one chunk to another.

Here we only give the rendering of the simple binary structure which is sufficient in our case. We let Σ be the two-sorted signature containing 0, 1, the numerator and denominator *num* and *denom*, the fraction $\frac{\cdot}{\cdot}$, symbols for addition and multiplication of natural numbers and fractions, respectively, and an additional error element a produced by division by zero. The binary C & P structure for our problem is $\langle \mathcal{T}_s, \mathcal{T}_t, \rho \rangle$ where

- \mathcal{T}_s is the source chunk,
- \mathcal{T}_t is the target chunk, and
- ρ is the information that is allowed to flow from source to target.

\mathcal{T}_s is the equational theory given in Table 1. Here k, l, m, n range over natural numbers or can take the error value, and α, β, γ denote fractions. Observe that in the source, fractions with identical denominators can be added (\dagger):

$$\frac{n}{m} + \frac{k}{m} = \frac{n}{1} \cdot \frac{1}{m} + \frac{k}{1} \cdot \frac{1}{m} \quad (9)$$

$$= \left(\frac{n}{1} + \frac{k}{1}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{m} \quad (6), (7)$$

$$= \frac{n+k}{1} \cdot \frac{1}{m} \quad (10)$$

$$= \frac{n+k}{m} \quad (9)$$

That \mathcal{T}_s is consistent can be seen as follows. We let \mathbb{M} be the Σ -algebra with the sorts $\mathbb{N}_a = \mathbb{N} \cup \{a\}$ and $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ where the operations are interpreted as follows. If $\circ \in \{+, \cdot\}$, then $\circ : \mathbb{N}_a \times \mathbb{N}_a \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_a$ is defined by

$$x \circ y = \begin{cases} x \circ y & \text{if } x, y \in \mathbb{N} \\ a & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$n + 0$	$= n$	(1)
$(n + m) + l$	$= n + (m + l)$	(2)
$n + m$	$= m + n$	(3)
$n \cdot 1$	$= n$	(4)
$(n \cdot m) \cdot l$	$= n \cdot (m \cdot l)$	(5)
$n \cdot m$	$= m \cdot n$	(6)
$n \cdot (m + l)$	$= n \cdot m + n \cdot l$	(7)
$\frac{n}{m} \cdot \frac{l}{k}$	$= \frac{n \cdot l}{m \cdot k}$	(8)
$\frac{n}{m}$	$= \frac{n}{1} \cdot \frac{1}{m}$	(9)
$\frac{n}{1} + \frac{m}{1}$	$= \frac{n + m}{1}$	(10)
$(\alpha + \beta) + \gamma$	$= \alpha + (\beta + \gamma)$	(11)
$\alpha + \beta$	$= \beta + \alpha$	(12)
$(\alpha \cdot \beta) \cdot \gamma$	$= \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot \gamma)$	(13)
$\alpha \cdot \beta$	$= \beta \cdot \alpha$	(14)
$\alpha \cdot (\beta + \gamma)$	$= \alpha \cdot \beta + \alpha \cdot \gamma$	(15)
$m \neq 0 \wedge m \neq a \rightarrow$	$num\left(\frac{n}{m}\right) = n$	(16)
$m \neq 0 \wedge n \neq a \rightarrow$	$denom\left(\frac{n}{m}\right) = m$	(17)

Table 1: The equational theory of the source \mathcal{T}_s

and $- : \mathbb{N}_a \times \mathbb{N}_a \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is defined by

$$\frac{x}{y} = \begin{cases} (x, y) & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{N}, y \in \mathbb{N} \\ (0, 0) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$num, denom : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_a$ are defined by

$$num((n, m)) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } m \neq 0 \\ a & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$denom((n, m)) = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } m \neq 0 \\ a & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and $+, \cdot : \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ are defined by

$$(n, m) + (l, k) = \begin{cases} (n + l, m) & \text{if } m = k \neq 0 \\ (0, 0) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$(n, m) \cdot (l, k) = \begin{cases} (nl, mk) & \text{if } m \neq 0 \neq k \\ (0, 0) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that \mathbb{M} is a model for \mathcal{T}_s . The target theory \mathcal{T}_t consists of the single conditional equation

$$k \neq 0 \rightarrow \frac{nk}{mk} = \frac{n}{m}. \quad (18)$$

Clearly, \mathcal{T}_t is consistent. However, $\mathcal{T}_s \cup \mathcal{T}_t$ is inconsistent since otherwise we have for arbitrary $k \neq 0 \neq m$

$$mk = denom\left(\frac{nk}{mk}\right) = denom\left(\frac{n}{m}\right) = m.$$

Moreover, we let ρ be the set of equations (1) – (15). $\mathcal{T}_t \cup \rho$ is consistent: \mathbb{Q}_0 and \mathbb{Q}_a —the zero-totalized and the a -totalized meadow of the rational numbers (see e.g. [1, 2]), respectively—are both models of $\mathcal{T}_t \cup \rho$. We have thus arrived at a consistent theory where we have full addition of fractions:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n}{m} + \frac{k}{l} &= \frac{nl}{ml} + \frac{km}{lm} & (18) \\ &= \frac{nl}{ml} + \frac{km}{ml} & (6) \\ &= \frac{nl + km}{ml} & (\dagger). \end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] Bergstra, J.A., Bethke, I., and Ponse, A. (2013). Cancellation meadows: a generic basis theorem and some applications. *The Computer Journal*, 56(1):3–14, doi:10.1093/comjnl/bsx147. (Also available at arXiv:0803.3969 [math.RA, cs.LO].)
- [2] Bergstra, J.A. and Ponse, A. (2014). Division by zero in common meadows. University of Amsterdam, Section Theory of Computer Science, Report TCS1410, June 2014. (Also available at arXiv:1406.3280v2 [cs.LO].)
- [3] Brown, B. and Priest, G. (2004). Chunk and Permeate, a paraconsistent inference strategy. Part I: the infinitesimal calculus. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 33:379–388.
- [4] Middelburg, C.A. (2011). A Survey of Paraconsistent Logics. arXiv:1103.4324[cs.LO].
- [5] Padberg, F. (2012). *Didaktik der Bruchrechnung* (4th edition). Series: Mathematik, Primar- und Sekundarstufe, Springer-Spektrum.
- [6] Rollnik, S. (2009). *Das pragmatische Konzept für den Bruchrechnenunterricht*. PhD thesis, University of Flensburg, Germany.
- [7] Tall, D. and Vinner, S. (1981). Concept image and concept definition in mathematics, with special reference to limits and continuity. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 12 151–169.