

A Paraconsistent Approach to Quantum Computing

Juan C. Agudelo* Walter Carnielli†

Abstract

We propose a method to define axiomatic theories for deterministic Turing machine computations. This method, when applied to axiomatizing computations in non-deterministic Turing machines, produces (in some cases) contradictory theories, therefore trivial theories (considering classical logic as the underlying logic). Substituting in such theories the underlying logic by the paraconsistent logic *LFII** permits us to define a new model of computation which we call *paraconsistent Turing machine*. We show that this initial model of computation allows the simulation of important quantum computing features. In particular, it allows to simulate the quantum solution of the well-known Deutsch's and Deutsch-Jozsa problems. However, we show that this initial model of computation does not adequately represent the notion of *entangled states*, a key feature in quantum computing. In this way, the construction is refined by defining a paraconsistent logic with a connective expressing entangled states in a logical fashion, and this logic is used to define a more sharpened model of paraconsistent Turing machines, better approaching the quantum computing features. Finally, we define complexity classes for the models introduced and establish some surprising relationships with classical complexity classes.

1 Introduction

The undecidability of first-order logic was first proved by Alonzo Church in [12] and an alternative proof of the same result was presented by Alan Turing in [26]. In his paper, Turing defined an abstract model of automatic machines, now known as *Turing machines* (TMs), and demonstrated that there exist unsolvable problems for that class of machines. By representing machine computations in first-order theories, he could then prove that the decidability of first-order logic would imply the solution of the established unsolvable problems. Consequently,

*Ph.D. Program in Philosophy, area of Logic, IFCH and Group for Applied and Theoretical Logic- CLE, State University of Campinas - UNICAMP, Brazil. Logic and Computation Research Group, Eafit University, Colombia.

†IFCH and Group for Applied and Theoretical Logic- CLE, State University of Campinas - UNICAMP, Brazil. SQIG - IT, Portugal.

by *reductio ad absurdum*, first-order logic is shown to be undecidable. Turing’s proof was simplified by Richard Büchi in [8], and a more recent and clear version of this proof is presented by George Boolos and Richard Jeffrey in [7, Chap. 10].

By following [7] and adding new axioms, we define a method to obtain adequate theories for computations in *deterministic* TMs (DTMs) (Sec. 2), which leads to a formal notion of representation of TM computation, therefore enhancing the standard way in which TMs are captured by means of classical first-order logic. In this sense, we can claim that the underlying logic of this model of computation is indeed the classical one.

Next, we will show that by using the same axiomatization method for *non-deterministic* TMs (NDTMs) we obtain (in some cases) contradictory theories, therefore trivial theories in view of the underlying logic. At this point, we have two options in sight to avoid triviality: (a) A first option, consisting in the classical move of restricting theories in a way that contradictions could not be derived (just representing computations in NDTMs); (b) a second option, consisting in substituting the underlying logic by a paraconsistent logic, allowing contradictions but not triviality, and providing a way to define new models of computation through the interpretation of theories. The first option is sterile: incapable of producing a new model of computation. In this paper, we follow the second option initially defining (Sec. 3) a model of *paraconsistent* TMs (ParTMs), using the paraconsistent logic *LFI1** (see [10]). We then show that ParTMs are capable of simulating some important features of quantum computing (Sec. 3.1); in particular, we show that the quantum solution of Deutsch’s and Deutsch-Jozsa problems can be simulated in ParTMs (Sec. 3.1.1). However, as explained in Sec. 3.1.2, ParTMs are not adequate to simulate *entangled states*, a key feature in quantum computing. Thus, still in Sec. 3.1.2, we define a paraconsistent logic with a *non-separable* conjunction and, with this logic, a new model of paraconsistent TMs is defined, which we call *entangled paraconsistent* TMs (EParTMs). In EParTMs, perfect entangled states can be successfully simulated.¹

The *Paraconsistent computability theory* has already been mentioned in [24, p. 196] as an ‘emerging field of research’. In that paper, *dialethic machines* are summarily described as Turing machines acting under dialethic logic (a kind of paraconsistent logic) in the presence of a contradiction, but no definition of any model of computation is presented.² Also, it is presented an obscure argument attempting to show how dialethic machines could be used to compute classically uncomputable functions. Contrarily, our models of ParTMs and EParTMs do not intend to break the Church-Turing thesis, i.e., all problems computed by ParTMs and EParTMs can also be computed by TMs (Sec. 3.2). However,

¹ParTMs were first presented in [3] and relations with quantum computing were presented in [1], but here we obtain some improvements and introduce the model of EParTMs, which represents a better approach to quantum computing.

²The authors say that “it is not difficult to describe how a machine might encounter a contradiction: For some statement A , both A and $\neg A$ appear in its output or among its inputs” (cf. [24, p. 196]); but how can $\neg A$ ‘appear’? They also claim that “By contrast [with a classical machine], a machine programmed with a dialethic logic can proceed with its computation satisfactorily [when a contradiction appears]”; but how would they proceed?

such models are advantageous for the understanding of quantum computing and parallel computation in general. Definitions of computational complexity classes for ParTMs and EParTMs in addition to interesting relations with existing classical and quantum computational complexity classes are presented in Sec. 3.2.

The paraconsistent approach to quantum computing presented here is just one way to describe the role of quantum features in the process of computation by means of non-classical logics; in [2] we presented another way to define a model of computation based on another paraconsistent logic, also related with quantum computing. The relationship between these two different definitions of paraconsistent computation is a task to be addressed in future work.

2 Axiomatization of TM Computations

A TM can be briefly described as an abstract machine equipped with a read/write head and a potentially infinite tape divided into cells, each one with capacity to hold a single symbol. In any (discrete) instant of time, the machine is in one of the states (among a finite collection of states), reading the symbol of one cell of the tape. The behavior of the machine is defined by a finite set of instructions, which determine the actions of the machine depending on the current state and the scanned symbol. Considering $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ as a finite set of states and $\Sigma = \{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$ as a finite set of read/write symbols, the machine instructions can be defined by quadruples of one of the following types:

$$q_i s_j s_k q_l, \tag{I}$$

$$q_i s_j R q_l, \tag{II}$$

$$q_i s_j L q_l. \tag{III}$$

The first type of instructions indicates that when the machine reaches state q_i , scanning the symbol s_j , it writes down the symbol s_k and changes to state q_l . The second type of instructions indicate that when the machine reaches state q_i , scanning the symbol s_j , it moves to the next cell to the right and changes to state q_l . The third type of instructions is similar to the second one, but the movement is instead towards the left-hand direction. By convention, we enumerate the instants of time and the cells of the tape by integer numbers, and we establish that machine computations begin at time 0, with a symbol sequence on the tape (the *input* of the computation), and with the machine in state q_1 scanning the symbol on cell 0. s_1 is assumed to be the *empty* symbol.

Taking into account [7, Chap. 10], in order to represent the computation of a TM \mathcal{M} with input α (hereafter $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$), we initially define the first-order theory $\Delta_{FOL}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ over the first-order language $\mathcal{L} = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_n, S_1, \dots, S_m, <, ', 0\}$,³ where symbols Q_i , S_j and $<$ are binary predicate symbols, $'$ is a unary

³The subscript *FOL* on Δ aims to emphasize the fact that we are considering the *classical first-order logic* (FOL) as the underlying logic of the theory, i.e. $\Delta_{FOL} \vdash A$ means $\Delta \vdash_{FOL} A$. A different subscript will indicate that another (non-classical) first-order logic is being taken into consideration.

function symbol and 0 is a constant symbol. In the intended interpretation \mathcal{I} of the sentences in $\Delta_{FOL}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$, variables are interpreted as integer numbers, and symbols in \mathcal{L} are interpreted in the following way:

- $Q_i(t, x)$ indicates that $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ is in state q_i , at time t , scanning the cell x ;
- $S_j(t, x)$ indicates that $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ contains the symbol s_j , at time t , on cell x ;
- $< (x, y)$ indicates that x is less than y , in the standard order of integer numbers;
- $'(x)$ indicates the successor of x ;
- 0 indicates the number 0.

To simplify notation, we will use $x < y$ instead of $< (x, y)$ and x' instead of $'(x)$. The theory $\Delta_{FOL}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ consists of the following axioms:

- Axioms establishing the properties of $'$ and $<$:

$$\forall z \exists x (z = x'), \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\forall z \forall x \forall y ((z = x') \wedge (z = y')) \rightarrow (x = y), \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((x < y) \wedge (y < z)) \rightarrow (x < z), \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\forall x (x < x'), \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$\forall x \forall y ((x < y) \rightarrow (x \neq y)). \quad (\text{A5})$$

- An axiom for each instruction i_j of \mathcal{M} . The axiom is defined depending respectively of the instruction type (I), (II) or (III) as:

$$\forall t \forall x \left(\left(Q_i(t, x) \wedge S_j(t, x) \right) \rightarrow \left(Q_i(t', x) \wedge S_k(t', x) \wedge \forall y \left((y \neq x) \rightarrow \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^m (S_i(t, y) \rightarrow S_i(t', y)) \right) \right) \right) \right). \quad (\text{A}_{i_j} \text{ (I)})$$

$$\forall t \forall x \left(\left(Q_i(t, x) \wedge S_j(t, x) \right) \rightarrow \left(Q_i(t', x') \wedge \forall y \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^m (S_i(t, y) \rightarrow S_i(t', y)) \right) \right) \right). \quad (\text{A}_{i_j} \text{ (II)})$$

$$\forall t \forall x \left(\left(Q_i(t, x') \wedge S_j(t, x') \right) \rightarrow \left(Q_i(t', x) \wedge \forall y \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^m (S_i(t, y) \rightarrow S_i(t', y)) \right) \right) \right). \quad (\text{A}_{i_j} \text{ (III)})$$

- An axiom to specify the initial configuration of the machine. Considering the input $\alpha = s_{i_0}s_{i_1}\dots s_{i_{p-1}}$, where p represents the length of α , this axiom is defined by:

$$Q_1(0,0) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{j=0}^{p-1} S_{i_j}(0,0^j) \right) \wedge \forall y \left(\left(\bigwedge_{j=0}^{p-1} y \neq 0^j \right) \rightarrow S_1(0,y) \right), \quad (A\alpha)$$

where 0^j means j iterations of the successor ($'$) function to constant 0.

In [7], a sentence H is defined to represent the halting of the computation, and it is thus proved that $\Delta_{FOL}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash H$ iff the machine \mathcal{M} with input α halts. In this way, the decidability of first-order logic implies the solution of the *halting problem*, a well-known unsolvable problem; this proves (by *reductio ad absurdum*) the undecidability of first-order logic. For Boolos and Jeffrey's aims $\Delta_{FOL}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ theories are strong enough, but our purpose is to attain a precise logical representation of TM computations. Therefore, we will formally define the notion of representability of a TM computation and show that new axioms must be added to $\Delta_{FOL}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ theories. Our definition of representation of a TM computation (Definition 3) is founded upon the definitions of representation of functions and relations (Definition 1 and 2) in theories introduced by Alfred Tarski in collaboration with Andrzej Mostowski and Raphael M. Robinson in [25].

Definition 1. Let f be a function of arity k , Δ an arbitrary theory and $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k, x)$ a wff (with $k+1$ free variables) in Δ . The function f is represented by φ in Δ if $f(m_1, \dots, m_k) = n$ implies (bars are used to denote numerals):

1. $\Delta \vdash \varphi(\bar{m}_1, \dots, \bar{m}_k, \bar{n})$,
2. if $n \neq p$ then $\Delta \vdash \neg\varphi(\bar{m}_1, \dots, \bar{m}_k, \bar{p})$, and
3. $\Delta \vdash \varphi(\bar{m}_1, \dots, \bar{m}_k, \bar{q}) \rightarrow \bar{q} = \bar{n}$.

Definition 2. Let R be a relation of arity k , Δ an arbitrary theory and $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ a wff (with k free variables) in Δ . The relation R is represented by φ in Δ if:

1. $(m_1, \dots, m_k) \in R$ implies $\Delta \vdash \varphi(\bar{m}_1, \dots, \bar{m}_k)$, and
2. $(m_1, \dots, m_k) \notin R$ implies $\Delta \vdash \neg\varphi(\bar{m}_1, \dots, \bar{m}_k)$.

Definition 3. Let \mathcal{M} be a TM, α the input for \mathcal{M} , and $\mu(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) = \langle \mathbb{Z}, Q_1^\mu, Q_2^\mu, \dots, Q_n^\mu, S_1^\mu, S_2^\mu, \dots, S_m^\mu, <^\mu, '^\mu, 0^\mu \rangle$ the structure determined by the intended interpretation \mathcal{I} .⁴ A theory Δ , in the language $\mathcal{L} =$

⁴ \mathbb{Z} represents the integers, the relations Q_i^μ express couples of instants of time and positions for states q_i in the computation of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$, relations S_j^μ express couples of instants of time and positions for symbols s_j in the computation of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$, $<^\mu$ is the standard strict order on \mathbb{Z} , $'^\mu$ is the successor function on \mathbb{Z} and 0^μ is the integer 0.

$\{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_n, S_0, S_1, \dots, S_{m-1}, <', 0\}$, represents the computation of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ if:

1. $<^\mu$ is represented by $\varphi(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x < y$ in Δ ,
2. $'^\mu$ is represented by $\varphi(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x' = y$ in Δ ,
3. Q_i^μ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) are represented by $\varphi(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q_i(x, y)$ in Δ , and
4. S_j^μ ($j = 1, \dots, m$) are represented by $\varphi(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S_j(x, y)$ in Δ .

Theorem 1. Let \mathcal{M} be a TM and α the input for \mathcal{M} . The theory $\Delta_{\text{FOL}}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ cannot represent the computation of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$.

Proof. We show that condition 2 of Definition 2 cannot be satisfied for relations Q_i and S_j : Indeed, when $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ is in state q_i , at time t and position x , it is not in any other state q_j ($i \neq j$); in this case, we have that $\Delta_{\text{FOL}}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash Q_i(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$ (by the proof in [7, Chap. 10]), but on the other hand we have that $\Delta_{\text{FOL}}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \not\vdash \neg Q_j(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$, because a non-standard TM with the same instructions of \mathcal{M} (but allowing multiple simultaneous states starting the computation in two-different simultaneous states, for example) also validates all axioms in $\Delta_{\text{FOL}}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$. A similar situation occurs with relations S_j . We can also define other non-standard TMs which allow different symbols and states, on different positions of the tape, at times before the beginning or after the end of the computation, in such a way that the machine validates all axioms in $\Delta_{\text{FOL}}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$. \square \square

Theorem 1 shows that it is necessary to expand the theories $\Delta_{\text{FOL}}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ to disallow non-standard interpretations and to grant representation of computations in accordance with Definition 3. We thus define the notion of an *intrinsic theory of the computation of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$* as the theory $\Delta_{\text{FOL}}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ by specifying which new axioms have to be added to $\Delta_{\text{FOL}}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ theories, so that these extended theories are able to represent their respective TM computations (Theorem 2). For the specification of such axioms, we will suppose that before the beginning of any computation and after the end of any computation (if the computation halts), the machine is in none of its states and no symbols (not even the empty symbol) occurs anywhere in its tape. New axioms are defined as follows:

- An axiom to define the situation of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ before the beginning of the computation:

$$\forall t \forall x \left((t < 0) \rightarrow \left(\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \neg Q_i(t, x) \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^m \neg S_j(t, x) \right) \right) \right). \quad (\text{At0})$$

- An axiom to define the situation of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ after the end of the computation (if the computation halts):

$$\forall t \forall x \left(\neg \left(\bigvee_{q_i s_j \in I} \left(Q_i(t, x) \wedge S_j(t, x) \right) \right) \rightarrow \forall u \forall y \left(t < u \rightarrow \left(\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \neg Q_i(u, y) \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^m \neg S_j(u, y) \right) \right) \right) \right), \quad (Ath)$$

where subscript $q_i s_j \in I$ means that, in the disjunction, only combinations of $q_i s_j$ coincident with the first two symbols of some instruction of \mathcal{M} are taken into account.

- An axiom for any state symbol q_i of \mathcal{M} establishing the uniqueness of any state and any position in a given instant of time:

$$\forall t \forall x \left(Q_i(t, x) \rightarrow \left(\left(\bigwedge_{j \neq i} \neg Q_j(t, x) \right) \wedge \forall y \left(y \neq x \rightarrow \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \neg Q_i(t, y) \right) \right) \right). \quad (Aq_i)$$

- An axiom for any read/write symbol s_i of \mathcal{M} establishing the uniqueness of any symbol in a given instant of time and position:

$$\forall t \forall x \left(S_i(t, x) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{i \neq j} \neg S_j(t, x) \right). \quad (As_j)$$

Theorem 2. *Let \mathcal{M} be a TM and α the input for \mathcal{M} . Then, the intrinsic theory $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ represents the computation of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$.*

Proof. Representation for the relation $<^\mu$ and for the function $'^\mu$ is easy to proof. Representation for relations Q_i^μ and S_j^μ follows from the proof in [7, Chap. 10] and direct applications of the new axioms in the intrinsic theory $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$. \square \square

Already in [26], Turing defined an “automatic machine” (or *a-machine*) as being a machine (in the previously defined sense) whose actions are *completely* determined by its *configurations*⁵ at each stage of the computation; Turing also defined a “choice machine” (or *c-machine*) as being only partially determined by the configurations: when such a machine reaches an “ambiguous” configuration (i.e. a configuration where multiple instructions can be executed) some arbitrary choice has to be made by an external operator, so that the computation can continue. In other words, a TM is an a-machine if there are no pairs

⁵Turing uses the word *configuration* to designate the pair of the current state and the symbol scanned by the machine. The two initial symbols of any instruction determine the configuration in which the instruction must be executed.

of instructions with the same two initial symbols; otherwise, it is a c-machine. The a-machines correspond to the DTMs and c-machines correspond to the NDTMs. The definitions and theorems above consider only DTMs; the next theorem proves that the method of axiomatization defined above, when used to NDTMs, produces contradictory theories (in some cases).

Theorem 3. *Let \mathcal{M} be a NDTM and α an input for \mathcal{M} . If $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ reaches an ambiguous configuration, then its intrinsic theory $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ is contradictory.*

Proof. Let t be the time at which $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ reaches the ambiguous configuration $q_i s_j$ on position x , and let $i_m = q_i s_j XY$ and $i_n = q_i s_j ZW$ be two different instructions of \mathcal{M} executable at time t . By the proof in [7, Chap. 10], we have that $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash Q_i(t, x)$ and $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash S_i(t, x)$. If $X = s_k$ and $Z = s_p$ (with $k \neq p$), by using axiom (A i_j (I)), we obtain $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash S_k(t', x)$ and $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash S_p(t', x)$; thus, using (A s_j), we obtain $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash \neg S_p(t', x)$ (a contradiction). If $Y = q_l$ and $W = q_p$ (with $l \neq p$), by axioms (A i_j (I)), (A i_j (II)) and (A i_j (III)), we obtain $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash Q_l(t', x)$ and $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash Q_p(t', x)$; thus, using (A q_i) we obtain $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash \neg Q_p(t', x)$ (a contradiction). If $X = s_k$ and $Z \in \{R, L\}$, by using axiom (A i_j (I)), we obtain $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash Q_l(t', x)$ and, by using axiom (A i_j (II)) or (A i_j (III)), we obtain $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash Q_p(t', y)$ (where $x \neq y$); thus, by using (A q_i), we obtain $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash \neg Q_l(t', x)$ (a contradiction). \square \square

In [22, p. 48], Odifreddi, in his definition of a TM, establishes a condition of “consistency” of the machine disallowing the existence of “contradictory” instructions (i.e., instructions with the same two initial symbols), which corresponds to the notion of DTM. Thus, NDTMs are those not accomplishing the condition of consistency. Theorem 3 shows that Odifreddi’s idea of consistency of TMs coincides with the consistency of the intrinsic theories $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$.

Note that contradictions in intrinsic theories $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ arise by the multiple use of axioms (A i_j (I)), (A i_j (II)) and (A i_j (III)) for the same instance of t in combination with the use of axioms (A q_i) or (A s_j). The multiple use of axioms (A i_j (I)), (A i_j (II)) and (A i_j (III)) for the same instance of t indicates the simultaneous execution of multiple instructions, which can derive (at time $t + 1$) multiplicity of symbols in the cell of the tape where the instruction is executed, or multiplicity of states and positions, while axioms (A q_i) and (A s_j) establishes the uniqueness of such elements. Intrinsic theories $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ can be easily adapted to deal with the idea that only one instruction is chosen to be executed when the machine reaches an ambiguous configuration, obtaining adequate theories for NDTMs computations. However, this is not our interest in this paper. We are interested in generalizing the notion of TM by using a paraconsistent logic, as this is a fecund way of approaching quantum computing from the logical viewpoint.

3 Paraconsistent TMs

There are many paraconsistent logics, they are proposed from different philosophical perspectives but share the feature of being logics that support contradictions without falling into deductive trivialization. Although in the definition of ParTMs we could, in principle, depart from any first-order paraconsistent logic, we will use the logic $LF11^*$ (see [11]) because it possesses an already established proof-theory and first-order semantics, has properties that allows natural interpretations of consequences of $\Delta_{LF11^*}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ theories⁶ as ‘paraconsistent computations’, and also allows the addition of conditions to control the execution of instructions involving multiplicity of symbols and states.⁷ $LF11^*$ is the first-order extension of $LF11$, which is an LFI that extends positive classical logic, defines connectives of consistency \circ and inconsistency \bullet , and identifies inconsistency with contradiction by means of the equivalence $\bullet A \leftrightarrow (A \wedge \neg A)$.

For intrinsic theories $\Delta_{LF11^*}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ the proof in [7, Chap. 10] continues to hold, because $LF11^*$ is an extension of positive classical logic. Thus, as described above, the use of multiple axioms describing instructions for the same instance of t indicates simultaneous execution of instructions, which gives place to multiplicity of symbols in the cell and multiplicity of states and positions. Such a multiplicity, in conjunction with axioms (Aq_i) and (As_j) , entails contradictions which are identified in $LF11^*$ with inconsistencies. Thus, inconsistency in $LF11^*$ theories characterize multiplicity.

By taking advantage of the robustness of $LF11^*$ in the presence of inconsistencies and their interpretation as multiplicity, we can supply the ParTMs with conditions on inconsistency in the two initial symbols of instructions in order to control the process of computation. q_i^\bullet will indicate that the instruction will only be executed in configurations where the machine is in multiple states or multiple positions, and s_j^\bullet will indicate that the instruction will only be executed on cells with multiple symbols. These conditions correspond to put the connective \bullet , respectively, in front of the predicate Q_i or S_j in the antecedent of axioms related to instructions.

Note that axioms $(Ai_j \text{ (I)})$, $(Ai_j \text{ (II)})$ and $(Ai_j \text{ (III)})$ not only express the action of instructions but also specify the preservation of symbols not modified by the instruction. Thus, in ParTMs, we have to take into account that any instruction is executed in a specific position of the tape, carrying symbols from cells not modified by the instruction to the next instant of time; this is completed independently of the execution of other instructions.

A ParTM is then defined as:

Definition 4. *A ParTM is a NDTM such that:*

- *When the machine reaches an ambiguous configuration it simultaneously executes all possible instructions, which can produce multiplicity on states,*

⁶Intrinsic theories $\Delta_{LF11^*}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ are obtained by substituting the underlying logic of $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ theories by $LF11^*$.

⁷It is worth to remark that the choice of another paraconsistent logic, with other features, can lead to different notions of ParTMs, as is the case in Sec. 3.1.2.

positions and symbols in some cells of the tape;

- Each instruction is executed in the position corresponding to the respective state; symbols on cells not modified by the instructions are carried to the next instant of time;
- Inconsistency (or multiplicity) conditions are allowed on the first two symbols of instructions (as described above);
- The machine stops when there are no instructions to be executed; at this stage some cells of the tape can contain multiple symbols, any choice of them represents a result of the computation.⁸

The next example illustrates how a ParTM performs computations:

Example 1. Let \mathcal{M} be a ParTM with instructions: $i_1 : q_1 0 0 q_2$, $i_2 : q_1 0 1 q_2$, $i_3 : q_2 0 R q_3$, $i_4 : q_2 1 R q_3$, $i_5 : q_3 \emptyset 1 q_4$, $i_6 : q_4 0 0 q_5$, $i_7 : q_4 1 0 q_5$, $i_8 : q_4 1 \bullet * q_5$, $i_9 : q_5 * 1 q_5$. Figure 1 schematizes the computation of \mathcal{M} , beginning in position 0, state q_1 and reading the symbol 0 (with symbol \emptyset in all other cells of the tape). Instructions to be executed in each instant of time t are written within parentheses (note that instruction i_8 is not executed at time $t = 3$ because of the condition of inconsistency on the scanned symbol). The machine \mathcal{M} will be useful in the paraconsistent solution of Deutsch’s and Deutsch-Jozsa problems (Sec. 3.1.1).




Figure 1: Example of computation in a ParTM

⁸When the model of ParTMs was introduced in [3], authors were not aware of the model of *parallel Turing machines* defined in [27], which is very similar to our definition of ParTMs. The main difference is that in parallel Turing machines “A simultaneous write into the same tape cell is allowed only if the processors are trying to write the same symbol; otherwise the computation is not legal and its result is undefined.” (cf. [27, p. 5]), while in ParTMs multiple symbols in the same cell of the tape are allowed. Although this difference seems to be minimal, the capacity of ParTMs to hold multiple symbols is essential in the simulation of quantum algorithms, as we show in Sec. 3.1.

3.1 Simulating Quantum Computation through Paraconsistent TMs

In the Neumann-Dirac formulation, quantum mechanics is synthesized in four postulates (cf. [21, Sec. 2.2]): The first postulate establishes that states of isolated physical systems are represented by unitary vectors in a Hilbert space (known as the *space state* of the system); the second postulate claims that evolution of closed quantum systems is described by unitary transformations on the Hilbert space; the third postulate deals with observations of physical properties of the system by relating physical properties with Hermitian operators (called *observables*) and establishing that, when a measurement is performed, an eigenvalue of the observable is obtained (with a certain probability depending on the state of the system) and the system collapses to the respective eigenstate; finally, the fourth postulate establishes the tensor product of the state spaces of component systems as being the state space of the compound system, allowing to represent the state of a compound system as the tensor product of the state of its subsystems (when the states of the subsystems are known).

The best known models of quantum computation, namely *quantum Turing machines* (QTM) and *quantum circuits* (QCs), are direct generalizations of TMs and boolean circuits, respectively, using the laws of quantum mechanics.

By taking into account the postulates of quantum mechanics briefly described above, a QTM (introduced in [15]) is defined by considering elements of a TM (state, position and symbols on the tape) as identified with observables of a quantum system. The configuration⁹ of a QTM is thus represented by a unitary vector in a Hilbert space and the evolution is described by a unitary operator (with some restrictions to satisfy the requirement that the machine operates by ‘finite means’, see [15, p. 7] and [23]). Because the configuration of a QTM is described by a unitary vector, it is in general a linear superposition of basis states (called a *superposed state*), where basis states represent classical TM configurations. In quantum mechanics, superposed states can be interpreted as the coexistence of the multiple states, thus a QTM configuration can be interpreted as the simultaneous existence of multiple classical TM configurations. The linearity of the operator describing the evolution of a QMT allows us to think in the parallel execution of instructions over the different states (possibly an exponential number) present in the superposition. Unfortunately, to know the result of the computation, we have to perform a measurement of the system and, by the third postulate of quantum mechanics, we can obtain only one classical TM configuration in a probabilistic way, in effect, irredeemably losing all other configurations. The art of ‘quantum programming’ consists in taking advantage of the intrinsic parallelism of the model, before the end of the computation, to solve problems more efficiently than in the classical case.

As showed in [23], the evolution of a QTM can be equivalently specified by a *local transition function*¹⁰ $\delta: Q \times \Sigma \times \{\Sigma \cup \{R, L\}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, which validates some

⁹Here ‘configuration’ means not only the current state and the scanned symbol of the machine but also the current position and symbols on all cells of the tape.

¹⁰Some changes were made in the definition of δ to deal with the quadruple notation for

conditions related to uniqueness of state vectors and reversibility of operators. In this definition, the transition $\delta(q_i, s_j, Op, q_l) = c$ can be interpreted as the following action of the QTM: If the machine is in state q_i reading the symbol s_j , it follows with probability amplitude c that the machine will perform the operation Op (which can be either to write a symbol or to move on the tape) and reaches the state q_l . The amplitude c cannot be interpreted as the probability of performing the respective transition, as with probabilistic TMs. Indeed, QTMs do not choose only one transition to be executed; they can perform multiple transitions simultaneously in a single instant of time in a superposed configuration.

By taking into account that each choice function on the elements of a ParTM, in an instant of time t , gives a classical TM configuration; a configuration of a ParTM can be viewed as a perfect¹¹ superposition of classical TM configurations. This way, ParTMs seem to be similar to QTMs: We could see ParTMs as QTMs without amplitudes (which allows only to represent perfect superpositions). However, in ParTMs actions performed by different instructions mix indiscriminately, and thus all combinations of singular elements in a ParTM configuration are taken into account, which makes it impossible to represent entangled states by only considering multiplicity of elements as superposed states (this point is discussed in Sec. 3.1.2). Another difference between the models of QTMs and ParTMs is that the former is inherently reversible while the later is not (and the mixture of actions of different instructions complicates any purported definition of reversible ParTMs). In spite of the differences between ParTMs and QTMs, ParTMs are capable to simulate important features of quantum computing; in particular, they can simulate quantum algorithms solving the Deutsch and Deutsch-Jozsa problems while preserving efficiency (Sec. 3.1.1). In Sec. 3.1.2, we define another model of ParTMs, based on a paraconsistent logic with a ‘non-separable’ conjunction, which allows to simulate perfect entangled states and represents a better approaching to the model of QTMs.

3.1.1 Paraconsistent Solutions for Deutsch and Deutsch-Jozsa Problems

Given an arbitrary function $f: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and an ‘oracle’ (or black box) that computes f , Deutsch’s problem consists in defining a procedure to determine if f is *constant* ($f(0) = f(1)$) or *balanced* ($f(0) \neq f(1)$) allowing only one query to the oracle. Classically, the procedure seems to require two queries to the oracle in order to compute $f(0)$ and $f(1)$, plus a further step for the comparison; but by taking advantage of the quantum laws the problem can be solved in a more efficient way, by executing just a single query. A probabilistic quantum solution to Deutsch’s problem was first proposed in [15] and a deterministic quantum algorithm was given in [13]. The deterministic solution is usually formulated in the QCs formalism, so we briefly describe this model of computation before

instructions we are using here.

¹¹A superposed state is said to be perfect if all states in the superposition have the same amplitude.

presenting the quantum algorithm.

The model of QCs (introduced in [16]) is defined by generalizing the boolean circuit model in accordance with the postulates of quantum mechanics: The classical unit of information, the *bit*, is generalized to the *quantum bit* (or *qubit*), which is mathematically represented by a unitary vector in a two-dimensional Hilbert space; classical logic gates are replaced by unitary operators; registers of qubits are represented by tensor products and measurements (following conditions of the third postulate above) are accomplished at the end of the circuits in order to obtain the output of the computation.¹² Under this definition, the QC depicted in Figure 2 represents a deterministic solution to Deutsch's problem.




Figure 2: QC to solve Deutsch's problem

In the figure, squares labeled by *H* represent *Hadamard* gates. A Hadamard gate is a quantum gate which performs the following transformations ($|\cdot\rangle$ representing a vector in Dirac's notation):

$$\begin{aligned} H:|0\rangle &\mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \\ |1\rangle &\mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The rectangle labeled by U_f represents the quantum oracle that performs the operation $U_f(|x, y\rangle) = |x, y \oplus f(x)\rangle$, where $|x, y\rangle$ represents the tensorial product $|x\rangle \otimes |y\rangle$ and \oplus represents addition module 2. Vectors $|\psi_i\rangle$ are depicted to explain, step by step, the process of computation:

1. At the beginning of the computation the input register takes the value $|\psi_0\rangle = |0, 1\rangle$;
2. After performing the two first Hadamard gates the following superposition is obtained:

$$|\psi_1\rangle = H|0\rangle \otimes H|1\rangle = \frac{1}{2}((|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \otimes (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)); \quad (2)$$

¹²For a detailed introduction to QCs see [21].

3. By applying the operation U_f one obtains:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_2\rangle &= U_f \left(\frac{1}{2} (|0,0\rangle - |0,1\rangle + |1,0\rangle - |1,1\rangle) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (|0,0 \oplus f(0)\rangle - |0,1 \oplus f(0)\rangle + |1,0 \oplus f(1)\rangle - |1,1 \oplus f(1)\rangle) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left((-1)^{f(0)} (|0\rangle \otimes (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)) + (-1)^{f(1)} (|1\rangle \otimes (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)) \right) \\
&= \begin{cases} \pm \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \right) \otimes \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \right) & \text{if } f(0) = f(1), \\ \pm \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \right) \otimes \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \right) & \text{if } f(0) \neq f(1). \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

4. By applying the last Hadamard gate one finally reaches:

$$|\psi_3\rangle = \begin{cases} \pm |0\rangle \otimes \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \right) & \text{if } f(0) = f(1), \\ \pm |1\rangle \otimes \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \right) & \text{if } f(0) \neq f(1). \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

After a measurement of the first qubit of the state $|\psi_3\rangle$ is accomplished (on the standard basis, cf. [21]), one obtains 0 (with probability 1) if f is constant or 1 (with probability 1) if f is balanced.

The first step of the above QC generates a superposed state (Eq. (2)), which is taken into the next step to compute the function f in parallel (Eq. (3)), generating a quantum interference between the values of $f(0)$ and $f(1)$ in such a way that, in the first qubit, one gets a different superposition depending on if f is constant or balanced. By applying again a Hadamard gate on the first qubit, the basis state $|0\rangle$ is obtained if f is constant, otherwise (if f is balanced) one obtains $|1\rangle$ (Eq. (4)). Thus, by performing a measurement over of the first qubit, we determine with certainty if f is constant or balanced. Note that U_f is used only once in the computation.

The ParTM in Example 1 gives a ‘paraconsistent’ simulation of the quantum algorithm that solves Deutsch’s problem, for the particular case where f is the constant function 1. Instructions i_1 and i_2 , executed simultaneously at time $t = 0$, simulate the generation of the superposed state. Instructions i_3 to i_5 compute the constant function 1 over the superposed state, performing in parallel the computation of $f(0)$ and $f(1)$, and writing the results on position 1 of the tape. Instructions i_6 to i_9 check whether $f(0) = f(1)$, writing 0 on position 1 of the tape if there are no multiplicity of symbols on the cell (meaning that f is constant) or writing 1 in other case (meaning that f is balanced). In the present case $f(0) = f(1) = 1$, thus execution of instructions i_6 to i_9 gives as result the writing of 0 on position 1 of the tape.

Consider a TM \mathcal{M}' as a black box computing a function $f: \{0,1\} \rightarrow \{0,1\}$. We could substitute instructions i_3 to i_5 in Example 1 (adequately renumbering instructions and states from i_6 to i_9 if necessary) by the instructions of \mathcal{M}' in order to determine if f is constant or balanced. In this way we define a paraconsistent simulation of the quantum algorithm that solves Deutsch’s problem. In

the simulation, \mathcal{M}' is the analog of U_f and quantum parallelism is mimicked by the parallelism provided by the multiplicity allowed in the ParTMs. Notwithstanding, the parallelism provided by this first ParTM model has some peculiar properties which could give rise to ‘anomalies’ in the process of computation. For instance, consider a TM \mathcal{M}' with instructions: $i_1 = q_1 00q_2$, $i_2 = q_1 11q_3$, $i_3 = q_2 0Rq_4$, $i_4 = q_3 1Rq_4$, $i_5 = q_2 1Rq_5$, $i_6 = q_4 \emptyset 1q_4$, $i_7 = q_5 \emptyset 0q_5$. If \mathcal{M}' starts the computation on position 0 and state q_1 , with a single symbol (0 or 1) on position 0 of the tape, and with symbol \emptyset on all other cells of the tape, then \mathcal{M}' computes the constant function 1. Nevertheless, if \mathcal{M}' begins reading symbols 0 and 1 (both simultaneously on cell 0), then it produces 0 and 1 as its outputs, as if \mathcal{M}' had computed a balanced function. Thus, in the parallel solution to Deutsch’s problem, we have to impose some restrictions in the definition of \mathcal{M}' :

- Combination of instructions $q_i s_j s_j q_k$, $q_k s_j Op q_l$ and $q_k s_m Op q_n$ are not allowed;
- movements to the left are not allowed;
- \mathcal{M}' does not modify symbols on position 0 of the tape;
- \mathcal{M}' writes the value of $f(x)$ on position 1 on the tape at the final step of the computation; and
- \mathcal{M}' takes the same number of steps to compute $f(0)$ and $f(1)$.

The Deutsch-Jozsa problem, first presented in [17], is the generalization of Deutsch’s problem to functions $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, where f is assumed to be either constant or balanced.¹³ A quantum solution to the Deutsch-Jozsa problem is a direct generalization of the quantum solution to Deutsch’s problem presented above: The input register is now constituted of $n + 1$ qubits and takes the value $|0\rangle^{\otimes n} \otimes |1\rangle$ (where $|\cdot\rangle^{\otimes n}$ represents the tensorial product of n qubits $|\cdot\rangle$); new Hadamard gates are added to act on the new qubits in the input register and also on the first n outputs of U_f , and U_f is now a black box acting on $n + 1$ qubits, performing the operation $U_f(|x_1, \dots, x_n, y\rangle) = |x_1, \dots, x_n, y \oplus f(x_1, \dots, x_n)\rangle$. In this case, when a measurement of the first n qubits is accomplished at the end of the computation, if all the values obtained are 0, then f is constant (with probability 1); in another case f is balanced (with probability 1).¹⁴

The paraconsistent solution to Deutsch’s problem can be easily generalized to solve the Deutsch-Jozsa problem as well: The input to \mathcal{M} must be a sequence of n symbols 0; instructions i_1 and i_2 must be substituted by instructions $i_1 = q_1 00q_2$, $i_2 = q_1 01q_2$, $i_3 = q_1 0Rq_1$, $i_4 = q_1 \emptyset Lq_3$, $i_5 = q_3 0Lq_3$, $i_6 = q_3 \emptyset Rq_4$, and the machine \mathcal{M}' is now considered to be a black box computing a constant or balanced function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, with similar restrictions as those imposed before.

¹³ f is balanced if $f^{-1}(0) = f^{-1}(1)$, where \overline{A} represents the cardinal of the set A .

¹⁴Calculations are not presented here, for details see [21].

3.1.2 Simulating Entangled States

In quantum theory, if we have n physical systems with state spaces H_1, \dots, H_n respectively, the system composed by the n systems has associated to it the state space $H_1 \otimes \dots \otimes H_n$ (in this case, \otimes represent the tensorial product between state spaces). Moreover, if we have that the states of the n component systems are respectively $|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_n\rangle$, then the state of the composed system is $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\psi_n\rangle$. However, there are states in composed systems that cannot be described as tensorial products of the states of the component systems; these states are known as *entangled states*. An example of a two qubit entangled state is $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$.

Entangled states enjoy the property that a measurement of one state in the component system affects the state of other component systems, even when systems are spatially separated. In this way, singular (one particle) systems lose identity, because their states are only describable in conjunction with other systems. Entanglement is one of the more (if not the most) puzzling characteristics of quantum mechanics, with no analogue in classical physics. Many quantum computing researchers think that entangled states play a definite role in the definition of efficient quantum algorithms, but this is not a completely established fact; any elucidation about this would be of great relevance. In this direction, we are going to show how the concept of entanglement can be expressed in logical terms, and we will define a new model of paraconsistent TMs (EParTMs) in which perfect entangled states are well represented. EParTMs can be seen (avoiding inconsistency conditions in instructions) as a simplification of QTMs.

As mentioned before, choice functions over the different elements (state, position and symbol on the cells of the tape) of a ParTM, in a given instant of time t , determine a classical TM configuration. Then, a configuration of a ParTM can be viewed as a perfect superposition of classical TM configurations where all combinations of singular elements are taken into account. Ignoring amplitudes, the tensorial product of composed systems coincides with all combinations of the basis states present (with amplitude greater than 0) in the component systems. For instance, if a system S_1 is in state $|\psi_1\rangle = |a_{i_1}\rangle + \dots + |a_{i_n}\rangle$ and a system S_2 is in state $|\psi_2\rangle = |b_{j_1}\rangle + \dots + |b_{j_m}\rangle$, then the composed system of S_1 and S_2 is in state $|\psi_{1,2}\rangle = |a_{i_1}b_{j_1}\rangle + \dots + |a_{i_1}b_{j_m}\rangle + \dots + |a_{i_n}b_{j_1}\rangle + \dots + |a_{i_n}b_{j_m}\rangle$. This rule can be applied $n - 1$ times to obtain the state of a system composed by n subsystems. Consequently, just by interpreting multiplicity of elements as superposed states, ParTMs cannot represent entangled states, because all of their configurations can be expressed as tensorial products of their singular elements. This is why we define the new model of EParTMs, or “entangled paraconsistent TMs” (cf. Definition 6).

In a ParTM configuration all combinations of singular elements are taken into account in the execution of instructions (and also in the reading of results). This is because the logic $LFI1^*$, used in the definition of the model, validates the *rule of separation* (i.e. $\vdash_{LFI1^*} A \wedge B$ implies $\vdash_{LFI1^*} A$ and $\vdash_{LFI1^*} B$) and the *rule of adjunction* (i.e. $\vdash_{LFI1^*} A$ and $\vdash_{LFI1^*} B$ implies $\vdash_{LFI1^*} A \wedge B$). Then, for instance, if $\Delta_{LFI1^*}^*(\mathcal{M}(n)) \vdash Q_1(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \wedge S_1(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$ and $\Delta_{LFI1^*}^*(\mathcal{M}(n)) \vdash$

$Q_2(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \wedge S_2(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$, it is also possible to deduce $\Delta_{\text{LFII}^*}^*(\mathcal{M}(n)) \vdash Q_1(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \wedge S_2(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$ and $\Delta_{\text{LFII}^*}^*(\mathcal{M}(n)) \vdash Q_2(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \wedge S_1(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$.

By the previous explanation, if we want to define a model of paraconsistent TMs where configurations are not totally mixed, we have to consider a paraconsistent logic where the rule of separation or the rule of adjunction are not both valid. There exist non-adjunctive paraconsistent logics,¹⁵ but paraconsistent systems where the rule of separation fails have never been proposed. Moreover, despite the fact that non-adjunctive paraconsistent logics appear to be an acceptable solution to avoid the phenomenon of total mixing on ParTMs, the notion of entanglement seems to be more related with the fail of the rule of separation: Indeed, an entangled state describes the ‘conjunctive’ state of a composed system, but not the state of each single subsystem. Thus, in order to define a model of paraconsistent TMs better approaching the behavior of QTMs, we first define a paraconsistent logic with a *non-separable* conjunction.

By following the ideas in [5] (see also [6]), a paraconsistent negation \sim is defined into the well-known modal system $S5$ (departing from classical negation \neg) by $\sim A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \diamond \neg A$ (some properties of this negation are presented in the referred papers). We now define a *non-separable* conjunction \wedge_\diamond into $S5$ by $A \wedge_\diamond B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \diamond(A \wedge B)$, where \wedge is the classical conjunction. Some properties of this conjunction are the following:

$$\vdash_{S5} A \wedge_\diamond B \text{ does not imply neither } \vdash_{S5} A \text{ nor } \vdash_{S5} B, \quad (\wedge_\diamond 1)$$

$$\vdash_{S5} A \text{ and } \vdash_{S5} B \text{ implies } \vdash_{S5} A \wedge_\diamond B, \quad (\wedge_\diamond 2)$$

$$\not\vdash_{S5} (A \wedge_\diamond (B \wedge_\diamond C)) \leftrightarrow ((A \wedge_\diamond B) \wedge_\diamond C), \quad (\wedge_\diamond 3)$$

$$\vdash_{S5} (A \wedge_\diamond B) \leftrightarrow (B \wedge_\diamond A), \quad (\wedge_\diamond 4)$$

$$\not\vdash_{S5} ((A \wedge_\diamond B) \wedge (C \wedge_\diamond D)) \rightarrow ((A \wedge_\diamond D) \vee (C \wedge_\diamond B)) \quad (\wedge_\diamond 5)$$

$$\vdash_{S5} (A_1 \wedge_\diamond (A_2 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n)) \leftrightarrow \diamond(A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n). \quad (\wedge_\diamond 6)$$

Property $(\wedge_\diamond 1)$ reflects the non-separable character of \wedge_\diamond , while $(\wedge_\diamond 2)$ shows that \wedge_\diamond validates the rule of adjunction and $(\wedge_\diamond 3)$ grants the non-associativity of \wedge_\diamond . $(\wedge_\diamond 4)$ shows that \wedge_\diamond is commutative, $(\wedge_\diamond 5)$ is a consequence of $(\wedge_\diamond 1)$ related with the expression of entangled states, and $(\wedge_\diamond 6)$ is a simple application of the definition of \wedge_\diamond which will be useful below.

A paraconsistent non-separable logic, which we will call $PNS5$, can be ‘extracted’ from the modal logic $S5$ (as much as done for negation in [5]) by in-

¹⁵The most famous of them is the *discussive* (or *discursive*) logic $D2$, introduced by Stanisław Jaśkowski in [19] and [20], with extensions to first order logic and with possible applications in the axiomatization of quantum theory, cf. [14].

ductively defining a translation $*$: $ForPNS5 \rightarrow ForS5$ as:¹⁶

$$\begin{aligned} A^* &= A \text{ if } A \text{ is atomic,} \\ (\sim A)^* &= \diamond \neg(A)^*, \\ (A \wedge_{\diamond} B)^* &= \diamond(A^* \wedge B^*), \\ (A \# B)^* &= A^* \# B^* \text{ for } \# \in \{\vee, \rightarrow\}; \end{aligned}$$

and by defining a consequence relation in the wffs of $PNS5$ as:

$$\Gamma \vdash_{PNS5} A \text{ iff } \Gamma^* \vdash_{S5} A^*,$$

where Γ represents a subset of $ForPNS5$ and $\Gamma^* = \{B^* | B \in \Gamma\}$. This translation completely specifies $PNS5$ as a sublogic of $S5$ with the desired properties. As a consequence of the definition $PNS5$ is decidable (because $S5$ is decidable), but the fact that $S5$ is axiomatizable does not imply that $PNS5$ will be. The axiomatization of $PNS5$ is still an open question.

In the spirit of the LFIs (see [10]), we can define a connective \bullet of ‘inconsistency’ in $PNS5$ by $\bullet A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A \wedge_{\diamond} \sim A$ (which is equivalent to $\diamond A \wedge \diamond \neg A$ in $S5$), a connective \circ of ‘consistency’ by $\circ A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sim \bullet A$ (which is equivalent to $\Box \neg A \vee \Box A$ in $S5$), a classical negation \neg by $\neg A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sim A \wedge_{\diamond} \circ A$ (which is equivalent to $\diamond \neg A \wedge (\Box \neg A \vee \Box A)$ in $S5$, entailing $\neg A$) and we can also recover the classical conjunction by $A \wedge B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \neg(\neg A \vee \neg B)$. Consequently, the ‘explosion principles’ $(A \wedge \sim A \wedge \circ A) \rightarrow B$ and $(A \wedge_{\diamond} (\sim A \wedge_{\diamond} \circ A)) \rightarrow B$ are theorems of $PNS5$; in this way, $PNS5$ is a legitimate logic of formal inconsistency (cf. [10]). These definitions also allow us to fully embed classical propositional logic into $PNS5$.

With the aim to use the logic $PNS5$ (instead of $LF11^*$) in the definition of EParTMs, we first need to extend $PNS5$ to first-order logic with equality, or alternatively we can consider the well known first-order version (with equality) of $S5$, which we will denote by $S5Q^=$, and regard the connectives $\sim, \wedge_{\diamond}, \bullet$ and \circ as definitions into this logic. Here we will take the second option, leaving the first-order extension of $PNS5$ for a future work, with the conviction that the study of such logic is of interest in the axiomatization of quantum theory.

Now we will substitute the underlying logic of intrinsic theories $\Delta_{FOL}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ by $S5Q^=$, and through the Kripkean interpretation of $\Delta_{S5Q^=}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ theories, we will define what is a EParTM. Before that, we need to identify which kind of negation (\neg or \sim) and conjunction (\wedge or \wedge_{\diamond}) are adequate in each axiom of $\Delta_{S5Q^=}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ (we will consider right-associative conjunction, i.e., $A \wedge B \wedge C$ always mean $A \wedge (B \wedge C)$; this is necessary proviso because of the non-associativity of \wedge_{\diamond} (cf. property $(\wedge_{\diamond}3)$):

- In axioms (A1)-(A5), negations and conjunctions are the classical ones;
- in axioms $(A_{i_j} \text{ (I)})$ - $(A_{i_j} \text{ (III)})$, the conjunction in the antecedent is \wedge_{\diamond} , (considering $(\wedge_{\diamond}6)$) only the first conjunction in the consequent is \wedge_{\diamond} (other conjunctions are classical), and negation in $(A_{i_j} \text{ (I)})$ is classical;

¹⁶Where $ForPNS5$ is the set of propositional formulas generated over the signature $\sigma = \{\sim, \wedge_{\diamond}, \vee, \rightarrow\}$ (defined in the usual way) and $ForS5$ is the set of formulas of $S5$.

- in axioms (A α) and (At0), negations and conjunctions are the classical ones;
- in axiom (Ath), only the conjunction in the antecedent is \wedge_\diamond , all other connectives are classical;
- in axioms (A q_i) and (A s_j), all conjunctions are classical, but negations are \sim (except in $y \neq x$), and it is also necessary to add the connective \diamond before the predicates Q_i and S_i into the antecedent of the axioms.

We also need to define a notion of *representation* of configurations of TMs by worlds in a (possible-worlds) kripkean structure:

Definition 5. *Let w be a world in a kripkean structure. If $Q_i(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), \dots, S_{j-1}(\bar{t}, -1), S_{j_0}(\bar{t}, 0), S_{j_1}(\bar{t}, 1), \dots$ are valid predicates on w , we say that w represents a configuration of a TM \mathcal{M} at time \bar{t} , and the configuration is given by the intended interpretation I presented above.*

By considering the choices of connectives and the definition above, worlds in the kripkean interpretation of $\Delta_{S5Q=}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ represent the parallel computation of all possible computational paths of a NDTM \mathcal{M} for the input α :

- By axiom (A α), there will be a world w_0 representing the initial configuration of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$;
- by axioms (A i_j (I))-(A i_j (III)), if w_t represents a non-final configuration of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ at time t , by any instruction i_j to be executed at time t (on such configuration) will be a world $w_{t+1,j}$ representing a configuration of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha)$ at time $t + 1$.

Configurations represented by worlds for the same instant of time t can be considered as *superposed configurations*. In a superposed configuration, a state on position x and a symbol on position y are said to be *entangled* if there exist i, j, k, l ($i \neq k$ and $j \neq l$) such that $\Delta_{S5Q=}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash Q_i(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \wedge_\diamond S_j(\bar{t}, \bar{y})$, $\Delta_{S5Q=}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \vdash Q_k(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \wedge_\diamond S_l(\bar{t}, \bar{y})$ and $\Delta_{S5Q=}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \not\vdash Q_i(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \wedge_\diamond S_l(\bar{t}, \bar{y})$ or $\Delta_{S5Q=}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha)) \not\vdash Q_k(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \wedge_\diamond S_j(\bar{t}, \bar{y})$. In a similar way, the notion of entangled symbols on positions x and y can also be defined.

Taking into account the definition of the connective of inconsistency in $S5Q^\neq$, as in the model of ParTMs, we can define conditions of inconsistency in the execution of instructions in the EParTMs. In this case, by the definition of the connective of inconsistency in $S5Q^\neq$ and its kripkean interpretation, condition q_i^\bullet will indicate that the instruction will be executed only when at least two configurations in the superposition differ in the current state or position, while condition s_j^\bullet will indicate that the instruction will be executed only when at least two configurations in the superposition differ in the symbol on the position where the instruction can be executed.

A EParTM is then defined as:

Definition 6. *A EParTM is a NDTM such that:*

- When the machine reaches an ambiguous configuration (in the sense of Turing) with n possible instructions to be executed, the machine configuration splits into n copies, executing one different instruction in each copy; the set of the distinct configurations for an instant of time t is called a superposed configuration;
- Inconsistency conditions are allowed on the first two symbols of instructions (as indicated above);
- When there are no instructions to be executed (in any current configuration), the machine stops; at this stage the machine can be in a superposed configuration, each configuration in the superposition represents a result of the computation.

Note that a EParTM performs in parallel all possible paths of computation of a NDTM, and only such paths. This differs from the previous model of ParTMs, where combination of actions of different instructions led to computational paths not possible in the corresponding NDTM. Additionally, we have the possibility to define instructions that are to be executed depending upon configurations in different paths of computation (defining consistency conditions on instructions). In the next section, we show how this characteristic can be used in the efficient solution of problems.

Following [4], it is possible to define a reversible EParTM for any EParTM without inconsistency conditions in instructions.¹⁷ This way, EParTMs almost coincide with QTMs without amplitudes; EParTMs represent perfect superpositions with no direct representation of the notion of *phase* (see [21, p. 193]). In QTMs, the notion of phase is a key ingredient in allowing *interference* between different paths of computation, which is essential in order to take advantage of quantum parallelism in the efficient solution of problems. On the other hand, as mentioned above, EParTMs provide inconsistency conditions on instructions as a mechanism to accomplish action depending on different paths of computation, but this mechanism is clearly irreversible. Theorem 6 in the next section shows the importance of the question: Is it possible to simulate inconsistency conditions on instructions in QTMs?

3.2 About the Power of ParTMs and EParTMs

In order to estimate the computational power of ParTMs and EParTMs, we first define what the ‘deciding’ of a language (i.e. a set of strings of symbols $L \subset \Sigma^*$, where Σ is a set of symbols and $*$ represents the Kleene closure) means in these models of computation. In the definition, we will consider multiple results in a computation as being possible responses among which we have to randomly select exactly one. This consideration is in agreement with the modal interpretation of $\Delta_{S5Q}^*(\mathcal{M}(\alpha))$ theories and is also convenient if we think in of

¹⁷In the case of EParTMs, it is only necessary to avoid overlapping in the ranges of instructions; the parallel execution of all possible instructions in an ambiguous configuration does not imply irreversibility.

the physical implementation of such models (in the light of quantum theory). We will also suppose that ParTMs and EParTMs have two distinguished states: q_y (the *accepting state*) and q_n (the *rejecting state*), and that all final states of the machine (if it halts) are q_y or q_n .

Definition 7. Let $L \subset \Sigma^*$ be a language and \mathcal{M} be a ParTM (EParTM). We say that \mathcal{M} decides the language L if for any string $x \in L$, $\mathcal{M}(x)$ halts with at least one of the multiple final configurations in state q_y when $x \in L$, or $\mathcal{M}(x)$ halts with all final configurations in state q_n when $x \notin L$. Moreover, we say that x is accepted with probability m/n if $\mathcal{M}(x)$ halts in a ‘superposition’ of n configurations and m of them are in state q_y ; conversely, we say that x is rejected with probability m/n if $\mathcal{M}(x)$ halts in a ‘superposition’ of n configurations and m of them are in state q_n .

Computational complexity classes for ParTMs and EParTMs are defined in the usual way: ParTM-PTIME (EParTM-PTIME) is the class of languages decided by some ParTM (EParTM) in polynomial time; ParTM-EXPTIME (EParTM-EXPTIME) is the class of languages decided by some ParTM (EParTM) in exponential time. Space complexity is defined in an analogous way, considering only the largest space used for the different superposed configurations. Bounded-error probabilistic time complexity classes are also defined as: BParTM-PTIME (BEPParTM-PTIME) is the class of languages decided by some ParTM (EParTM) in polynomial time, accepting strings in the language with probability greater than $1/2$ and rejecting strings not in the language with probability greater than $1/2$. BParTM-EXPTIME and BEPParTM-EXPTIME are defined similarly.

Now, we will prove that ParTMs are computationally equivalent to DTMs, showing how to simulate computation of ParTMs by DTMs computations (Theorem 4). As a consequence, we have that the class of languages decided by both models of computation are the same. It is obvious that computations performed by DTMs can be computed also by ParTMs, because DTMs are particular cases of ParTMs. What is surprising is that the simulation of ParTM by DTMs is performed with *only* a polynomial slowdown in time (Theorem 5) and a constant factor overhead in space (direct consequence of the proof of Theorem 4). Theorems 4 and 5 are inspired in the simulation of multi-tape TMs by one-tape TMs as presented in [18], and show once more how powerful the classical model of TMs is.

Theorem 4. Any ParTM can be simulated by a DTM.

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} be a ParTM with n states and m input/output symbols. Define a DTM \mathcal{M}' and suppose its tape is divided into $2n + m$ tracks. Symbols 1 and 0 on track i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) and position p of \mathcal{M}' represent respectively that q_i is or is not one of the states of \mathcal{M} in position p . In a similar way, symbols 1 and 0 on track j ($n + 1 \leq j \leq n + m$) and position p of \mathcal{M}' respectively represent the occurrence or non-occurrence of symbol s_j on position p of \mathcal{M} . Tracks $n + m + 1$ to $2n + m$ are used to calculate states resulting from the parallel

execution of instructions in \mathcal{M} , and values on these tracks represent states of \mathcal{M} in the same way as tracks 1 to n . The symbol $\$$ is used on track 1 of \mathcal{M}' to delimitate the area where \mathcal{M} is in any state (i.e., where any symbol 1 appears on some track i associated to states of \mathcal{M}). To simulate a step of computation of \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{M}' scans the tape between delimiters $\$$ in four times. In the first scan (from left to right), \mathcal{M}' simulates the parallel execution of instructions where the action is a movement to right: In each position, \mathcal{M}' writes values in tracks $n+m+1$ to $2n+m$ in accordance with states ‘remembered’ from the previous step and collects (in the state of the machine, depending on the content of tracks 1 to $n+m$ and the instructions of movement to right of \mathcal{M}) the states to be written in the next position of the tape; \mathcal{M}' also moves delimiters $\$$ if necessary. The second scan is similar to the first one, but in the opposite direction and simulating instructions of movement to the left, taking care in the writing of values so as not to delete values 1 written in the previous scan. In the third scan (from left to right), \mathcal{M}' simulates the parallel execution of instructions where the action is the modification of symbols on the tape: In each position, depending on the content of tracks 1 to $n+m$ and in accordance with the writing instructions of \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{M}' writes values on tracks $n+1$ to $n+m$ (corresponding to symbols written by instructions of \mathcal{M}) and also on tracks $n+m+1$ to $2n+m$ (corresponding to changes of states of the writing instructions of \mathcal{M} , taking care in the writing of values so as not to delete values 1 written in the previous scans). Finally, \mathcal{M}' performs a fourth scan (from right to left) copying values from tracks $n+m+1$ to $2n+m$ on tracks 1 to n and writing 0 on tracks $n+m+1$ to $2n+m$. □ □

Theorem 5. *The DTM of Theorem 4 simulates n steps of the corresponding ParTM in time $O(n^2)$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} be a ParTM and \mathcal{M}' be the DTM described in the proof of Theorem 4 such that \mathcal{M}' simulates the behavior of \mathcal{M} . After n steps of computation, the leftmost state and the rightmost state of \mathcal{M} cannot be separated by more than $2n$ cells, consequently this is the separation of $\$$ delimiters in the first track of \mathcal{M}' . In any scan of \mathcal{M}' , in the simulation of a step of computation of \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{M}' has to move between $\$$ delimiters, and a writing operation can be performed in any position, thus any scan takes at most $4n$ steps of computation (ignoring steps due to scanning of delimiters $\$$ and their possible relocation). Therefore, the simulation of the n step of computation of \mathcal{M} takes at most $16n$ steps, i.e., time $O(n)$. Consequently, for the simulation of n steps of \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{M}' requires no more than n times this much, i.e., time $O(n^2)$. □ □

Corollary 1. *The class of languages decided by ParTMs and DTMs are the same, and languages are decided with the same temporal and spacial complexity in both models.*

Proof. Direct consequence of theorems 4 and 5; it is only necessary to add another scan between delimiters $\$$ at the final of the simulation to search for an accepting state, finalizing \mathcal{M}' in its accepting state if symbol 1 is found in the

track corresponding to the accepting state of \mathcal{M} , or finalizing \mathcal{M}' in its rejecting state if no symbol 1 is found in the track corresponding to the accepting state of \mathcal{M} . Clearly, this additional scan takes at most a polynomial number of steps (thus preserving the temporal complexity) and does not use new space (thus preserving the spacial complexity). \square \square

In [9], Cristian S. Calude shows that the quantum solution to Deutsch's problem can be 'de-quantized' to a classical deterministic solution which is as efficient as the quantum one, illustrating how the notion of 'superposition' (a key ingredient of quantum algorithms) is classically available in this specific case. However, the method of de-quantization proposed by Calude is not uniformly scalable to solve the Deutsch-Jozsa problem. The paraconsistent solutions to Deutsch's and Deutsch-Jozsa problems presented above with the initial model of ParTMs, in combination with the constructive prove of Theorem 4, give another way to de-quantize these problems preserving efficiency. Indeed, Theorem 5 shows how quantum parallelism can be classically simulated in some cases.

Now, to which respects EParTMs the situation is different: The class of languages decided in both models continues to be the same (DTMs can simulate all paths of computation of a EParTM, writing different configurations in separate portions of the tape and considering the different configurations in the simulation of instructions with inconsistency conditions), but all *NP*-problems can be *deterministically* (with probability 1) computed in polynomial time by EParTMs (a direct consequence of Theorem 6, since satisfiability of propositional formulas in conjunctive normal form (CSAT) is *NP*-complete). Thus, time complexity of EParTMs and DTMs are equal only if $P = NP$, which is broadly believed to be false.

Theorem 6. *CSAT is in BEParTMs-PTIME.*

Proof. It is not difficult to define a NDTM \mathcal{M} deciding CSAT in polynomial time in which all computational paths have the same depth and finish in the same position of the tape. By considering \mathcal{M} as a EParTM all computational paths are performed in parallel, obtaining a superposition of configurations in which at least one of them is in state q_y if the codified conjunctive normal form formula is satisfiable, or with all configurations in q_n otherwise. Thus, by adding the instructions $i_{n+j} : q_y^\bullet s_j s_j q_y$ and $i_{n+m+j} : q_n^\bullet s_j s_j q_y$ to \mathcal{M} (where m is the number of input/output symbols of \mathcal{M} and $1 \leq j \leq m$) we have the acceptance or rejection with probability 1. \square \square

4 Final Remarks

In this paper, we generalize the method of axiomatization of Turing machine computations not only with foundational aims, but also envisaging new models of computation by logical handling (basically by substitution of the underlying logic of intrinsic theories of computation), showing a way in which logical representations can be used in the construction of new concepts. We believe that the

method of axiomatization defined here sheds light to new ways of approaching the $P \stackrel{?}{=} NP$ problem by means of axiomatizing (by the method proposed here) computations in an efficient universal DTM and in an efficient universal NDTM, and establishing structural relations between the models of such theories.

The new models of computation defined here use a sophisticated logical language which permits to express some important features of quantum computing. The first model allows the simulation of superposed states by means of multiplicity of elements in TMs, enabling de-quantization of some quantum algorithms but unable to speed up classical computation. In order to overcome this weakness we define a second model able to represent entangled states, in this way, reaching an exponential speed-up of an NP -complete problem. Both models are grounded on paraconsistent logic (LFIs). In particular, the only element in the language that cannot be directly simulated in quantum computing is the “inconsistency operator” of the second model. As this is a key component in the efficiency of the whole model, an important problem is to decide whether it can or cannot be characterized by quantum means.

In spite of *paraconsistent computational theory* being only an emerging field of research, we believe that this logic relativization of the notion of computation is really promising in the search of efficient solutions of problems, particularly helping in the understanding of the role of quantum features and indeterminism in processes of computation.

Acknowledgements

We thank two anonymous referees that read a previous version of this paper for their valuable comments and suggestions. This research was supported by FAPESP- Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo, Brazil, Thematic Research Project grant 2004/14107-2. The first author is also supported by a FAPESP scholarship grant 05/04123-3, and the second by a CNPq (Brazil) Research Grant 300702/2005-1 and by FCT and EU-FEDER (Portugal).

References

- [1] Juan C. Agudelo and Walter Carnielli. Quantum algorithms, paraconsistent computation and Deutsch’s problem. In Bhanu Prasad, editor, *Proceedings of the 2nd Indian International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1609–1628, Pune, India, 2005.
- [2] Juan C. Agudelo and Walter Carnielli. Unconventional models of computation through non-standard logic circuits. In Selim G. Akl, Cristian S. Calude, Michael J. Dinneen, Grzegorz Rozenberg, and Todd Wareham, editors, *Unconventional Computation, 6th International Conference, UC 2007, Proceedings*, volume 4618 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 29–40, Kingston, Canada, 2007.

- [3] Juan C. Agudelo and Andrés Sicard. Máquinas de Turing paraconsistentes: una posible definición. *Matemáticas: Enseñanza Universitaria*, XII(2):37–51, 2004. Available at: <http://revistaerm.univalle.edu.co/Enlaces/volXII2.html>.
- [4] Charles H. Bennett. Logical reversibility of computation. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 17:525–532, 1973.
- [5] Jean-Yves Béziau. S5 is a paraconsistent logic and so is first-order classical logic. *Logical Studies*, (9):301–309, 2002.
- [6] Jean-Yves Béziau. Paraconsistent logic from a modal viewpoint. *Journal of Applied Logic*, 3:7–14, 2005.
- [7] George Boolos and Richard Jeffrey. *Computability and logic*. Cambridge University Press, 3rd. edition, 1989.
- [8] J. Richard Büchi. Turing-machines and the Entscheidungsproblem. *Mathematische Annalen*, 148:201–213, 1962.
- [9] Christian S. Calude. De-quantizing the solution of Deutsch’s problem. *International Journal of Quantum Information*, 5:409–415, 2007. Preprint available at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0610220>.
- [10] Walter A. Carnielli, Marcelo E. Coniglio, and João Marcos. Logics of Formal Inconsistency. In D. Gabbay and F. Guenther, editors, *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*, volume 14, pages 15–107. Springer, 2nd edition, 2007. Preprint available at *CLE e-Prints* vol 5, n. 1, 2005. http://www.cle.unicamp.br/e-prints/vol_5,n_1,2005.html.
- [11] Walter A. Carnielli, João M. de Almeida, and Sandra de Amo. Formal inconsistency and evolutionary databases. *Logic and logical philosophy*, pages 115–152, 2000.
- [12] Alonso Church. A note on the Entscheidungsproblem. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 1(1):40–41, 1936. pp. 101-102.
- [13] Richard Cleve, Artur Ekert, Chiara Macchiavello, and Michele Mosca. Quantum algorithms revisited. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A*, 454:339–354, 1998.
- [14] Newton C. A. da Costa and Francisco A. Doria. On Jaśkowski’s discussive logics. *Studia Logica*, 54(1):33–60, 1995.
- [15] David Deutsch. Quantum theory, the Church-Turing principle and the universal quantum computer. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A*, 400:97–117, 1985.
- [16] David Deutsch. Quantum computational networks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A*, 425:73–90, 1989.

- [17] David Deutsch and Richard Jozsa. Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A*, 439:553–558, 1992.
- [18] John Hopcroft, Rayeev Motwani, and Jefferey D. Ullman. *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation*. Addison Wesley, 2nd edition, 2001.
- [19] Stanisław Jaśkowski. Rachunek zdań dla systemów dedukcyjnych sprzecznych. *Studia Societatis Scientiarum Torunensis, Sectio A*, I(5):57–77, 1948. Translated into English as ‘A propositional calculus for inconsistent deductive systems’ in *Logic and Logic Philosophy*, 7:35-56, 1999.
- [20] Stanisław Jaśkowski. O koniunkcji dedukcyjnej w rachunku zdań dla systemów dedukcyjnych sprzecznych. *Studia Societatis Scientiarum Torunensis, Sectio A*, I(8):171–172, 1949. Translated into English as ‘On discussive conjunction in the propositional calculus for inconsistent deductive systems’ in *Logic and Logic Philosophy*, 7:57-59, 1999.
- [21] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [22] Piergiorgio Odifreddi. *Classical recursion theory. The theory of functions and sets of natural numbers*. Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics, volume 125. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1989.
- [23] Masanao Ozawa and Haramichi Nishimura. Local transition function of quantum Turing machines. *Theoretical Informatics and Applications*, 34:379–402, 2000. Preprint available at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9811069>.
- [24] Richard Sylvan and Jack Copeland. Computability is logic-relative. In Graham Priest and Dominic Hyde, editors, *Sociative logics and their applications: essays by the late Richard Sylvan*, pages 189–199. London: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2000.
- [25] Alfred Tarski, Andrzej Mostowski, and Raphael M. Robinson. Undecidable Theories. In L. E. J. Brouwer, E. W. Beth, and A. Heyting, editors, *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland, 1953.
- [26] Alan M. Turing. On computable numbers, with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, pages 230–265, 1936. A correction, *ibid*, vol 43. 1936-1937. págs. 544 - 546.
- [27] Juraj Wiedermann. Parallel Turing machines. Technical Report RUU-CS84-11, University of Utrecht, 1984. Available at <http://www.cs.uu.nl/research/techreps/repo/CS-1984/1984-11.pdf>.