

The non-standad logic of physics: the case of the Boltzmann-Sinai hard-sphere system

Massimo Tessarotto

*Department of Mathematics, Informatics and Geosciences,
University of Trieste, Via Valerio 12, 34127 Trieste, Italy and
Research Center for Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics,
Institute of Physics, Silesian University in Opava,
Bezručovo nám.13, CZ-74601 Opava, Czech Republic
Email: maxtextss@gmail.com*

Claudio Cremaschini

*Research Center for Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics,
Institute of Physics, Silesian University in Opava,
Bezručovo nám.13, CZ-74601 Opava, Czech Republic
Email: claudiocremaschini@gmail.com*

Claudio Ascì

*Department of Mathematics,
Informatics and Geosciences, University of Trieste,
Via Valerio 12, 34127 Trieste, Italy
Email: cascì@units.it*

Alessandro Soranzo

*Department of Mathematics,
Informatics and Geosciences, University of Trieste,
Via Valerio 12, 34127 Trieste, Italy
Email: soranzo@units.it*

Marco Tessarotto

*Central Directorate for Labor,
Training, Education, and Family,
Permanent Structure for Innovation and Procedure Automation,
Via San Francesco 37, Trieste, Italy
Email: marcotts@gmail.com*

Gino Tironi

*Department of Mathematics,
Informatics and Geosciences, University of Trieste,
Via Valerio 12, 34127 Trieste, Italy
Email: gino.tironi@gmail.com
(Dated: December 30, 2024)*

One of the most challenging and fascinating issues in mathematical and theoretical physics concerns identifying the common logic, if any, which underlies the physical world. More precisely, this involves the search of the possibly-unique axiomatic logical proposition calculus to apply simultaneously both to classical and quantum realms of physics and to be consistent with the corresponding mathematical and filosofysical setups. Based on the recent establishment of quantum logic, which has been shown to apply both to Quantum Mechanics and Quantum Gravity, the crucial remaining step involves the identification of the appropriate axiomatic logical proposition calculus to be associated with Classical Mechanics. In this paper the issue is posed for a fundamental example of Classical Mechanics, which is represented by the so-called Boltzmann-Sinai dynamical system. This is realized by the ensemble of classical smooth hard-spheres, which is set at the basis of Classical Statistical Mechanics and is also commonly regarded as a possible realization of Classical Newtonian Cosmology. Depending on the initial conditions which are prescribed for such a system, its classical state is shown to obey the propositional calculus of non-classical logic. In particular, the latter is expressed by the 3-way Principle of Non-Contradiction, namely the same logical principle that holds for quantum logic. The result therefore permits to question on a mathematical basis the principles of deterministic classical logic and the validity of their character within the domain of Classical Physics. Such a conclusion represents a potential notable innovation in the logical dicotomy true/false, a crucial topic which has crossed millennia through philosophy, logic, mathematics and physics.

PACS numbers: 01.70.+w, 02.10.-v, 05.20.-y, 05.30.-d

Keywords: Classical Logic; Quantum Logic; Boltzmann-Sinai system; Statistical Physics; Principle of Non-Contradiction.

1 - INTRODUCTION

A fundamental issue concerns the search non-standard logic of physics, with particular reference to the boolean logic of truth propositional values, previously treated by some of us in the context of non-relativistic quantum mechanics (QM) and quantum gravity (GR) [1, 2]. The subject of the present paper is about the search of logic for classical mechanics (CM), its comparison with the quantum logic of QM and QG and the attempt to establish a common principle of non contradiction holding both for classical and quantum physics.

The task requires, first of all, identifying the relevant logical "truth" propositions which are admissible for classical systems, propositions which can be uniquely associated with the properties of their motion and state, respectively defined by the applications "motion" and "state", namely

$$\begin{cases} t \rightarrow \mathbf{r}(t), \\ t \rightarrow \mathbf{x}(t) \equiv \{\mathbf{r}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)\}, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with $\mathbf{r}(t) \equiv (\mathbf{r}_1(t), \mathbf{r}_2(t), \dots, \mathbf{r}_N(t))$ and $\mathbf{v}(t) \equiv (\mathbf{v}_1(t), \mathbf{v}_2(t), \dots, \mathbf{v}_N(t))$ being the configuration and velocity vectors, with $\mathbf{r}_1(t), \mathbf{r}_2(t), \dots, \mathbf{r}_N(t)$ and $\mathbf{v}_1(t), \mathbf{v}_2(t), \dots, \mathbf{v}_N(t)$ being suitably-defined position vectors (each one here assumed to span for definiteness a suitable subset of the same 3-dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3) and corresponding velocities.

The notable fact that we wish to establish is that, contrary to popular belief, the logic of CM is not provided by classical logic (CL). The goal is achieved by investigating a particle system of special interest in mathematical physics, namely formed by suitable finite-sized rigid bodies which are realized by massive rigid spheres. CM is usually taken to describe classical particle systems represented by ensembles of massive point particles, i.e., treated in the framework of the so-called Newton's classical cosmology (see below), but more generally it may concern the dynamics of arbitrary classical systems formed by ensembles of finite-size classical rigid body systems obeying the CM laws due to Galilei and Newton and are subject to mutual classical interactions such as "hard" collisions, i.e., instantaneous elastic collisions occurring among the same rigid bodies. An example of such systems is provided by the so-called *Boltzmann-Sinai system* (B-S system; a terminology introduced in Refs. [3, 4]) which is represented by an ensemble of massive, smooth and hard (i.e., rigid) spheres subject to unary, binary and multiple instantaneous elastic collisions and immersed in a bounded subset of the 3-dimensional Euclidean space (see description below).

In the paper we intend to show that, provided suitable stochastic collision laws are adopted for the B-S hard-sphere system - which is referred to for this reason as stochastic B-S system (*S-B-S system*) - its logic, and therefore also that of CM, becomes non-deterministic, i.e., it includes also a third truth logical value denoted as "undecidable" (or "indeterminate"). Thus, it coincides necessarily with that of a 3-valued propositional calculus.

In particular, in reference to the aim or the present paper our goals amount to investigate the following issues:

- **First** (*multiple collisions*): that, in the case of the S-B-S system, multiple collisions may occur. In particular these include so-called double collisions, in which two single-collisions (i.e., collisions between two hard-spheres) occur simultaneously, can generally give rise to non-unique and therefore stochastic (i.e., multiple) particle trajectories. As a consequence for the S-B-S system, the applicability of CL should be necessarily ruled out, since the latter requires the validity of the deterministic principle (i.e., uniqueness of the applications motion and state as well as uniqueness of the configuration-space and phase-space trajectories).
- **Second** (*non-standard logic*): that, for the S-B-S system in place of CL some kind of non-standard logic should supersede. In particular, besides the logical truth values *true* (unique) and *false*, a third one should occur which is referred to here as "undecidable" (or "indeterminate"). In other words this means that the non-standard logic should be governed by a so-called 3-way *Principle of non-contradiction* (*3-way PNC*, see below in section 5) in which the occurrence of *undecidability* (or *indeterminacy*) in CM arises due to the existence of multiple, and therefore necessarily stochastic, trajectories.
- **Third** (*analogy with quantum logic*): the undecidability feature is remarkably similar to what happens, although for quite different physical motivations and causes, in the case of quantum logic, i.e., the formulation of the propositional (Boolean) logic of quantum physics. In fact, the said logical principle should agree with the analogous 3-way logical principle previously determined in the two cases represented respectively by non-relativistic QM [1] and QG [2].

- **Fourth** (*notions of undecidability*): it should be noted additionally that the notions of *undecidability* which arise in such contexts are potentially different from each other in the various cases considered and, in particular, also different from that occurring in mathematics, namely in the context of Gödel undecidability theorems [6]. In fact, in mathematics undecidability usually occurs when and an indeterminate form arises, namely a mathematical expression occurs whose value cannot be determined (i.e., for example, if it does not admit a unique value as in the case of trajectories for CM) and, respectively in QM, QG and for the B-S system. In fact, while as shown in QM and QG [1, 2] this is due to the possible occurrence of observables which are endowed with an infinite standard deviation, instead, in the context of the B-S system undecidability occurs - as we intend to prove here - because of the occurrence of stochastic trajectories.
- **Fifth** (*connection with Gödel undecidability theorems*): finally, the connection with Gödel undecidability theorems is investigated and two issues are addressed: a) whether the notion of undecidability available in the context of the B-S system is consistent or not with that adopted in the context of Gödel theory; and b) whether the B-S system may represent or not an example-case and an application of Gödel undecidability theorems [6].

2 - THE STATE OF THE ART

This work is part of an investigation dealing, on one hand, with the search of logic in physics and, on the other hand, with the mathematical properties of the B-S hard-sphere system.

Regarding logic, here we consider in particular the case of CM. Customarily, this refers to the well known formulation of Newton's classical cosmology based on the deterministic point particle model of universe, to be considered as a finite/infinite but numerable ensemble of massive point particles moving in a flat Galileian spacetime. In fact, its connection with classical logic is well-known. This was first recognized by Immanuel Kant in his *Critique of Pure Reason* [7, 8], who remarked that based on Newton's principle of determinism [9], Newton's classical cosmology could only obey the 2-way logic of true and false propositions, i.e., classical logic, and therefore satisfy the Aristotle's 2-way PNC.

However, the deterministic description of classical matter afforded by Newtonian cosmology may not hold for more general body systems, such as in particular the B-S system. Nevertheless, the same subject matter (i.e., logic) pertains more generally both to classical and quantum physics. The subject has been recently investigated in the context of non-relativistic quantum mechanics and quantum gravity, for which a common 3-way Principle of non-contradiction has been proved to hold (see again [1, 2]). Finally, as far as the B-S hard-sphere system is concerned, its mathematical properties must carefully be dealt with also in view of the considerable amount of related specialized literature available in the field and dealing specifically with statistical mechanics and its kinetic theory treatment.

2.1 - The classical logic of Newton's classical cosmology

It is usually regarded as part of the common wisdom that CM should be deterministic (i.e., it should obey the so-called Newton's deterministic principle, see below) and hence should be governed by CL.

According to this view, the rationale should therefore be founded on the 2-valued propositional calculus (i.e., in which the only logical truth values are *true* and *false*), fulfilling the principles of CL, namely, the Law of identity or deterministic principle (any true trajectory is unique), the Law of non-contradiction (any true proposition (trajectory) cannot be false) and the Law of excluded middle (any proposition (trajectory) is either true or false, no other possibility arises). These three laws can be summarized respectively by

- The 2-way principle of non-contradiction (2-way PNC), namely in which the only possible logical and mutually exclusive truth values are true or false;
- And the deterministic principle (any true logical proposition is unique).

Therefore, in CM the true logical value (which identify the semantics of CM) should be uniquely associated with the deterministic state of a classical system. This must be identified with a vector field of the form $\mathbf{x}(t) \equiv (\mathbf{r}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$, in which $\mathbf{r}(t)$ and $\mathbf{v}(t)$ denote the position and velocity vectors prescribing its state.

The traditional approach for the explicit construction of the 2-way semantic true/false is based on the same strategy originally pointed out by Birkhoff and von Neumann [10] (B-vN) for Hamiltonian mechanics. Accordingly, in CM the truth values, which are attached to all possible phase-space trajectories (and which by assumption should realize at least $C^{(0)}$, i.e., continuous, configuration-space trajectories), are uniquely identified as follows:

- 1st logical truth proposition "true": in CM, for a prescribed initial state $\mathbf{x}(t_o) \equiv \mathbf{x}_o \equiv (\mathbf{r}(t_o) = \mathbf{r}_o, \mathbf{v}(t_o) = \mathbf{v}_o)$, we shall denote as "true" a phase-space trajectory, if it coincides with that determined by Newton's equations, namely the trajectory generated by the corresponding classical flow defined for all $t, t_o \in I (\subseteq \mathbb{R})$,

$$\mathbf{x}(t_o) \equiv \mathbf{x}_o \rightarrow \mathbf{x}(t) \equiv \chi(\mathbf{x}_o, t_o, t), \quad (2)$$

which relates the initial state $\mathbf{x}(t_o) \equiv \mathbf{x}_o$ with its image at time t . This is determined by solving the Cauchy initial-value problem associated with the corresponding Newton equations of motion for the same classical system.

- 2nd logical truth proposition "false": again, given the prescribed initial state $\mathbf{x}(t_o) \equiv \mathbf{x}_o \equiv (\mathbf{r}(t_o) = \mathbf{r}_o, \mathbf{v}(t_o) = \mathbf{v}_o)$, we shall denote as "false" any other trajectory corresponding to different initial conditions, namely of the type

$$\mathbf{x}(t_o) \equiv \mathbf{x}_o \rightarrow \mathbf{x}'(t) \equiv \chi(\mathbf{x}'_o, t_o, t), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{x}'_o \neq \mathbf{x}_o$.

In this regard, a well known example is provided by Newtonian (Classical) cosmology (see Ref. [13] and also Appendix A in Ref. [1]). This is based on the representation of matter in terms of a finite or numerable set of massive point particles which are immersed in a so-called Galileian space-time (i.e., the universe). The latter is by assumption taken to be the direct product of an infinite Euclidean 3-dimensional configuration space (identified with the ambient space) and an infinite Euclidean 1-dimensional time axis (in which therefore time is "absolute", i.e., frame-independent). The point particles obey the Newton equations of motion, an assumption which is taken to hold identically, i.e., at all times and in the whole space, except at discrete "collision" events and discrete positions of configurations space where mutual (unary, binary or multiple) instantaneous collisions occur. In the case of binary and multiple collisions, the latter are also taken to be elastic, i.e., to conserve total linear momentum and total kinetic energy across collisions. Hence, it follows that both binary and multiple collision laws are necessarily deterministic. In the case of point particles this is an obvious consequence of the assumed collision law. In fact, considering $k \geq 2$ colliding point particles which are referred, without loss of generality, to the ensemble center of mass (CM) for the colliding particles. It follows that, if the initial (incoming before collision) and final (outgoing after collision) states are denoted respectively by $\{(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}^{(-)i}, i = 1, k)\}$ and $\{(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}^{(+)i}, i = 1, k)\}$ (relative to the said CM of colliding particles), the so-called *bounce-backward reflection collision law* applies, according to which:

$$\mathbf{v}^{(+)i} = -\mathbf{v}^{(-)i}, \quad (4)$$

i.e., after collision the (outgoing) velocities of all colliding particles $\{(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}^{(+)i}, i = 1, N)\}$ are "bounced backward" with opposite directions with respect to the incoming velocities of the same particles, both defined in the CM of all the particles taking part in the collision event. It is obvious that the collision law (4) conserves the relevant collisional invariants defined in the same CM, namely the CM-total kinetic energy and the CM-total linear momentum of the same colliding particles.

This confirms therefore that Newtonian cosmology is deterministic. Namely, that provided the universe were indeed fulfilling Newtonian cosmology, "We ought then to regard the present state of the universe as the effect of its anterior state and as the cause of the one which is to follow." This is indeed the famous sentence expressed by Pierre Simon de Laplace in one of his latest works [14]. Which represents of course the view first expressed by Isaac Newton himself (1658 [9]), stressed in some sense stronger sense by Ruggero Boskovich, the Dalmatian astronomer and scientist from Ragusa (1758 [15]) and later invoked by Immanuel Kant in his theorization of the philosophy of Illuminism (Enlightenment, 1781 [16]).

However, the same deterministic collision law may not hold for more general (i.e., in particular finite-size) particle systems and, consequently, the conventional 2-way classical logic may not hold for them. The task of the present investigation is to go beyond the limitations set by Newtonian cosmology. That is, to prove that - contrary to what implied by Newtonian cosmology - the logic of CM is not two-valued.

The result is achieved by investigating the N -body Boltzmann-Sinai hard-sphere system, namely the N -body billiard problem formed by smooth hard spheres immersed in a rigid parallelepiped-shaped and having stationary boundary. The same particles, besides unary instantaneous elastic collisions with the boundary, are assumed to undergo instantaneous elastic binary and multiple collisions among them.

Based on the fact that multiple collisions for this system may not generally give rise to a unique outgoing state (i.e., defined after multiple collisions), and therefore be deterministic in character, we intend to show that multiple collision

laws are generally stochastic, in the sense that they may correspond to different - but equally probable - sequences of simultaneous binary collisions events. This amounts to determine a "statistical prescription" on the Boltzmann-Sinai hard-sphere system and to analyze its basic qualitative properties, with special reference to the determination of its logic.

2.2 - A more general problem

As already anticipated, however, the issue concerns, in principle, the broader perspective of identifying the logic of physics in general, i.e., both classical and quantum physics, where the latter should include quantum gravity besides quantum mechanics.

The logic of QM and the logic of QG have actually been regarded for a long time fundamental as unsolved problems of mathematical and theoretical physics. The starting inspiration was provided in 1936 by a seminal paper, titled *The Logic of Quantum Mechanics*, due to two legendary scientists, famous for their outstanding contributions in several areas of Quantum and Statistical Mechanics, namely Garrett Birkhoff and John von Neumann [10]. This paper is usually accredited for the formulation of the so-called *standard* (approach to) *quantum logic*. However, despite this credited title (and the side contribution, cited above, for establishing also the rules for connecting Hamiltonian Mechanics with CL) it did not actually solve the problem, at least for the following main reasons:

1. First, standard quantum logic is not able to recover a boolean logic, and - in particular - does not identify the appropriate notions of true and false propositions to be based on the notions quantum expectation values and standard deviations available in standard QM.
2. Second, the possible identification of the undecidability (or indeterminacy) logical truth value, relevant for establishing a possible realization of the Gödel incompleteness theorems [6], was actually never achieved.
3. Third, the same standard quantum logic does not explicitly take into account the Heisenberg inequalities, together with the generalized ones later discovered in Ref. [5].
4. Fourth, it did not include an analogous treatment for quantum gravity (QG) where analogous generalized Heisenberg inequalities can be shown to hold (see the above reference).
5. Later on, however, further issues would have emerged, some of them specifically related to QG. In fact in the context of QG the generalized Heisenberg inequalities should take an explicit 4-tensor form, implying in turn that the setting of quantum gravity should be established in the context of a 4-tensor covariant representation (see Refs. [11, 12]).

The first two are most likely the reasons why, at the time, von Neumann was apparently unsatisfied by the outcome of their paper (quantum gravity was still long time into the future). In fact, despite the fact that von Neumann was well aware of the undecidability theorems [6] established by Gödel already in 1931 (he personally attended the same International Conference of Mathematics in Königsburg where Gödel had first presented his famous theorems), in his work with Birkhoff he missed any possible link with the logic of propositional calculus based on Boolean logic. And consequently also with Gödel's theorems.

Nevertheless, in a sense, the same paper was also very successful. In fact, it was responsible for the beginning of a formidable and long-lasting conceptual debate on the subject of quantum logic (QL). Notably, this happened especially in the broader community of mathematicians and mathematical physicists [17, 18], becoming actually a full part of Mathematical Logic, Model Theory and Topology [19]. Indeed, among mathematicians the subject developed in a full-fledged new research topic, largely independent of the original ideas and problems raised by B-vN. It has to be noted in this regard that this goes into the direction of the attempt to formulate a new logic for QM. An attempt which has been under way until very recent times (see in particular [20]), in accordance with the view that propositional logic (i.e., the logic of admissible truth values) should be somehow replaced by the "logic of partitions (or equivalence relations)" [21]. Such an approach, however, just as the original contribution due to B-vN, seems incomplete because, for example, it is unrelated to classical logic even in the so-called semiclassical limit. Nevertheless the quantum logic they (B-vN) devise is apparently multi-valued. From this point of view there it appears not completely new. In this regards, in fact, it has to be noted that already from the nineteenth century multi-value logic has been considered by mathematicians [22] (for a historical review see also [23]), its foundation being based on multi-valued propositional calculus [24].

However, the logical truth values true/false in case of the B-vN paper cannot be defined at all, even if the logic of classical Hamiltonian systems can apparently be correctly recovered in the semiclassical limit (indeed, in the context of the semiclassical approximation for QM, projection operators are analogous to the characteristic functions defined on subsets of appropriate phase spaces [25]). Indeed, B-vN thought that the appropriate propositional calculus for quantum mechanics might be achieved by identifying the logical propositions with the projections of the physical observables.

The same idea actually had emerged already in earlier paper. In fact, in his classic treatise [26] John von Neumann had already pointed out that projections on a Hilbert space might be viewed as propositions about physical observables. Nevertheless, despite a few attempts [27] (see also [28] where a comparison with Gödel undecidability theorems was suggested but never actually achieved), such a choice - which von Neumann himself later seemed to consider unsatisfactory - was the reason why several further attempts to the formulation of quantum logic were proposed (see for example [29]). To the point that nowadays in some texts the term “quantum logic” is used rather narrowly to refer to the algebraic and order-theoretic aspect of propositional logic. More detailed introduction can be found in the books of Beltrametti and Cassinelli [30], Kalmbach [31], Cohen [32], Pták and Pulmannová [33], Giuntini [34] and Svozil [35, 36] among others.

Such a type of approaches, interesting as they may be, still have remained incomplete. One possible reason is that the formulation of the logic of QM and QG requires, foremost, a careful investigation on the conceptual foundations of physics, i.e., specifically QM, QG and even CM, including the possible analogies between classical and quantum physics [37, 38]. In fact, among the questions that arise when considering the problem of logic in physics, one is represented by the same reason for which these issues have remained unsolved for such a long time in different fields of physics. This concerns, more precisely, the possible identification of a *unique and common logical principle*, i.e., based on the same kind of Principle of non-contradiction, *together with the same discrete logical truth values*, among different branches of physics, which should include, besides QM and QG, also CM.

However, for the first two disciplines a possible candidate for the identification of quantum logic in terms of a 3-valued propositional calculus, which obeys a corresponding 3-valued Principle of Non-Contradiction, has actually recently been proposed [1, 2]. The result, striking for its simplicity, is related to the conditions of validity of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle and also a proper definition of the notion of admissible logical truth values arising in the context of quantum theories. More precisely, such a principle, which is intrinsic to all quantum theories, establishes a relationship between the quantum standard deviations holding between conjugate quantum variables (to be regarded in all cases as quantum observables). Nevertheless such a principle requires for its validity that the standard deviations are non-zero nor infinite. However when they are infinite the corresponding observable is obviously indeterminate (in the sense that its quantum expectation value is characterized by an infinite quantum error measurement)! This means that observables can be in some cases indeterminate. As a consequence, depending on the dynamical evolution of the quantum state and on the physically admissible standard deviations (namely those which are compatible with the phenomenon of the quantum minimum length [39]), three possible truth logical values can be established, which are labeled to as *true*, *false* and *indeterminate* (here equivalently referred to as *undecidable*). In particular, for a given quantum observable, *truth* (a), *falsity* (b) or *undecidability* (or equivalently *indeterminacy*) (c), respectively occur:

- a)-b) if its time evolution is consistent (true) or not (false) with the time evolution of the quantum state and if its quantum standard deviations remain finite (even zero) at all times;
- c) if the standard deviation of a quantum observable becomes infinite.

However, QL should exhibit a further key property. More precisely, QL should recover exactly CL in the (appropriate) semiclassical limit in which, respectively:

- QM recovers CM;
- QG recovers classical General Relativity.

To enable such features, a suitable representation of QM and, respectively, of QG, has been introduced in the cited references. This is based on the adoption of appropriate *stochastic-trajectory representations*, i.e., introducing stochastic Lagrangian trajectories - denoted as Generalized Lagrangian Paths (GLP) - which, in each case, span a corresponding configurations space. There are three main reasons for choosing such a type of representation:

- The first reason is that Lagrangian trajectories (both in QM and QG) should be stochastic in nature for consistency with the requirement that quantum particle trajectories are by definition stochastic.
- The second reason is that, as shown in Refs. [40] and [41], this feature allows to construct explicit analytical solutions of the corresponding quantum-wave equation.

- In turn, the same feature becomes of crucial importance also for the explicit analytic evaluation of the relevant quantum standard deviations which are needed for the establishment of quantum logic.

The purpose of the present investigation - representing, in a sense, the completion of the previous one given in [1, 2] - is to address the same fundamental issue also in the context of classical mechanics, thus posing the problem in a broader perspective, i.e., relevant for the establishment of the *logic of physics in general*. We anticipate that, rather remarkably, an analogous feature, based on the adoption of *stochastic-trajectories*, is found to characterize also the construction of the logic of CM.

In this regard, famous is Immanuel Kant's *declaration of faith* [7] in favour of Newtonian cosmology and hence, implicitly, of CM itself. As stated above, this is closely related to the Newton principle of determinism, i.e., the uniqueness of classical trajectories, characteristic of CM. Such a statement is expressed in his book (1781) "*Critique of Pure Reason*" [7] where he stated that the validity of Newtonian Cosmology [9] should never be questioned, since, in his own words, "*the philosopher is not [should not be, EN] permitted to avail [a] possible experience [that] is not what can be given in an experiment 'in concreto' but what is contained in the idea to which the empirical synthesis must approximate*". Which clearly means that Kant regarded Newtonian cosmology as an absolute truth, consistent with the blind faith in science, characteristic of Illuminism [16].

Paradoxically, however, the actual association of CM with classical logic must first be ascribed to Birkhoff and von Neumann. In fact, their paper [10] is the first one to point out the rigorous connection existing between Hamiltonian dynamics and classical logic (CL). However, Hamiltonian systems represent only a particular subset of CM which includes in principle also many-body and finite-size systems, such as hard-sphere systems which may be subject to hard instantaneous collisions. A particular case is provided by the N -body Boltzmann-Sinai hard-sphere system which is constituted by an ensemble of $N > 2$ smooth hard spheres subject to instantaneous elastic hard collisions and in which, by definition, the same particles do not exchange angular momentum, either during arbitrary collisions with other particles or with the boundary. We stress that none of the implications considered in this research arise in an "universe" of $N \leq 2$ particles as hard spheres. Remarkably, the ancient philosophers, like Laozi [42], had the intuition that the number 3 generates the variety of universe (while number 1 simply produces number 2, for example by negation).

2.3 - Previous investigations on the Boltzmann-Sinai hard-sphere system

The choice of the Boltzmann-Sinai system, which is intrinsically non-Hamiltonian because hard collisions are ordinarily not susceptible of an Hamiltonian treatment, seems also well motivated from another viewpoint, i.e., because it is one of the abstract physical systems which has more extensively been investigated in the last 150 years. In fact, the Boltzmann-Sinai system is the same one for which:

- The property of ergodicity on the energy-hypersurface phase-space was first rigorously established by Sinai (1963-1970) for the case $N = 2$ [43-45], then for $N = 3$ and $N = 4$ hard spheres [46, 47]. However, for $N > 4$ technical difficulties arise for the step for N to $N + 1$ hard spheres [48] (see the related review given in Ref. [49]).
- The asymptotic kinetic theory of rarefied gases was first established in 1872 by Ludwig Boltzmann [50] based on his namesake kinetic equation and by Harold Grad [51], who established its connection with classical statistical mechanics. The Boltzmann approach, based on the treatment of smooth-hard-spheres binary collisions, has been proved correct for smooth PDFs [52], despite the adoption (for the 2-body PDF) of physically-incorrect collision boundary conditions (CBC) in terms of the so-called PDF-conserving CBC [53].
- The limits of validity of the Boltzmann equation and related H-theorem were first established [3] showing that both become incorrect in the case of the so-called "certainty" PDF, i.e., the Dirac delta PDF.
- The exact statistical theory for finite systems of smooth hard spheres, subject to binary and unary collisions, was established for the first time in terms of the so-called Master kinetic equation [4]. This was achieved thanks to the discovery of a physically-based modified CBC for the N -body PDF [53, 54], which differs intrinsically from the PDF-conserving CBC adopted originally by Boltzmann.

In particular, the same Master kinetic equation was shown:

- To imply, in contrast to the Boltzmann H-theorem, the validity of a constant-H theorem [55].

- To be globally valid [56].
- Finally, to recover exactly the Boltzmann equation and the Boltzmann H-theorem in the so-called Boltzmann-Grad limit [52].

3 - THE OPEN PROBLEM

In this section the main open problems for the B-S system are addressed. These concern the treatment of multiple collisions.

3.1 - Treatment of multiple collisions in smooth-hard-sphere systems

The aim of the subsequent part of the paper is to investigate two issues:

- The prescription of multiple collisions occurring in many-body classical systems. In the following, as an illustration, we shall limit our analysis to double collisions only.
- The determination of the logic of classical systems in which such multiple elastic collisions occur.

The case considered here refers to a set of like, smooth hard spheres, i.e., massive rigid spheres of diameter $\sigma > 0$ which do not exchange angular momentum among them (nor with the boundary), but carry (only) linear momentum and kinetic energy, which are exchanged among colliding particles but in which total linear momenta and kinetic energy of the colliding particles are conserved. This is the case of the so-called B-S system. The latter is the ensemble of $N > 2$ like classical particles represented by smooth hard spheres which belong to the bounded configuration interior domain of a 3-dimensional bounded subset of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3 (the so-called 3-dimensional billiard), which is assumed to be endowed with a stationary, rigid and infinitely massive parallelepiped-shaped boundary. Moreover, the spacetime itself is assumed to be embedded in a Galileian spacetime. The goal is to analyze a conceptual aspect which is usually simply ignored in most of previous literature but becomes of crucial importance in the present context. This is about the role of multiple collisions for the same B-S system.

The second issue to be addressed here, namely the logic of the B-S system, requires investigating certain qualitative properties of the B-S system *per se*. Not surprisingly, this means, first of all, focusing our attention on a crucial topic, previously completely ignored in the literature. This concerns the treatment of multiple-collisions in smooth-hard-spheres systems, i.e., in which three or more of such spheres collide simultaneously. This means that they should come simultaneously into contact, with negative relative normal speeds among colliding particles, i.e., more precisely such that for all the colliding particles i and j and denoting by $\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j$, $\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j$ and $\mathbf{n}_{ij} = (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)/|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$ their velocities, positions and relative-position unit vectors for which $\mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{r}_j + \sigma \mathbf{n}_{ij}$, it occurs that:

$$\mathbf{n}_{ij} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j) < 0. \quad (5)$$

3.2 - Axiomatic propositions

In particular, we intend to prove three propositions (PROP. #1-#3 below) showing that multiple collisions can be considered as realized by different ordered sequences of instantaneous binary collisions. Such sequences generally lead to different outgoing (i.e., after collision) states of the colliding particles. As a consequence, multiple collision laws are generally non-unique.

For this purpose, we first intend to show that, based on the prescription of the B-S system, the following proposition holds:

PROPOSITION #1: multiple-collision laws are necessarily realized by suitable ordered sequences of instantaneous elastic binary collisions.

In the context of CM, for the B-S system the collision laws of multiple instantaneous elastic collisions can only be realized by means of suitable ordered sequences of instantaneous binary collisions. Thus, for example, in the case of double instantaneous elastic binary collisions they are actually realized by ordered sequences of three different instantaneous elastic binary collisions.

PROOF OF PROP. #1

Let us consider as a reference example the case of the so-called double collision event $(1-2) + (2-3)$ in which three smooth hard spheres, labeled with "1", "2" and "3", happen to experience two simultaneous collisions among them, namely $(1-2)$ and $(2-3)$. The double collision occurs when simultaneously the spheres "1" and "2" and separately the spheres "2" and "3" collide mutually elastically. Such a condition is realized if particle "1" and "2" and separately the spheres "2" and "3" are in an "incoming" state (i.e., a state before a double collision event occurs), namely are approaching each other. This requires that relative velocities of particles "1" and "2" and separately the spheres "2" and "3", namely $\mathbf{v}_{12} = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2$ and $\mathbf{v}_{23} = \mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{v}_3$, satisfy the two inequalities

$$\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{12} < 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{23} < 0, \quad (7)$$

with n_{ij} denoting the unit vectors $\mathbf{n}_{ij} = (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)/|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$. Instead, the "outgoing" state (i.e., a state which occurs after a double collision event) must correspond to the condition in which,

$$\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{12} > 0, \quad (8)$$

$$\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{23} > 0. \quad (9)$$

We notice that, despite the two binary collisions $(1-2)$ and $(2-3)$ occur simultaneously, one has still to decide which of the two happens first. In the case of double collisions there are therefore two possible ordered sequences of simultaneous binary collisions. We anticipate that the distinction of the various sequences makes sense because the same sequences are physically different in the sense that generally they lead to different outgoing states (see Propositions #2 and #3).

Correspondingly, two questions arise: 1) what are the required conservations laws in multiple collisions and 2) what are the actual instantaneous elastic binary collisions taking place between the same particles. Without loss of generality we shall also assume that, before the collision event occurs, the velocity of the (center of the) sphere "2" vanishes, i.e., $\mathbf{v}_2 = 0$ and that it coincides also with the velocity of the center of mass (CM) of the system of hard spheres $(1, 2, 3)$ (notice nevertheless that for greater generality we shall assume that the center of the sphere "2" may not coincide with the same CM). Then, in this setting if v_1 is the initial velocity of the center of sphere "1", the corresponding velocity of the center of sphere "3" is necessarily such that $\mathbf{v}_3 = -\mathbf{v}_1$.

In fact, one notices that if naively one tries to impose the conservation laws on the two separate collisions $(1-2)$ and $(2-3)$, namely

- The conservation of the sum of the kinetic energies and, separately, of the linear momenta of particles "1" and "2" which should remain the same before and after collision $(1-2)$;
- The conservation of the sum of the kinetic energies and, separately, of the linear momenta of particles "2" and "3" which should remain the same before and after collision $(2-3)$;

then one can prove that the above conservation laws cannot generally be fulfilled. In fact, to overcome the difficulty requires determining suitable sequences of instantaneous elastic binary collisions. Indeed, in the case of the double collision event $(1-2) + (2-3)$, one can immediately realize that actually there necessarily occur not two but three distinct, simultaneous, binary collisions. The third one in fact is a consequence of the fact that the second particle after colliding once with the other particles must necessarily "bounce back" and experience another collision with the particle with which it has collided first.

Now, any double collision can be realized by means of two possible binary collision sequences (occurring simultaneously but in a certain order). Thus, denoting $(i-j)$ a binary collision between particles i and j , these sequences are realized respectively by

$$(1-2) + (2-3) + (1-2), \quad (10)$$

or by the alternate sequence

$$(2-3) + (1-2) + (2-3). \quad (11)$$

Next, we intend to prove the following related propositions.

- **PROPOSITION #2: general non-uniqueness of multiple-collision laws.** In general, in a multiple collision occurring among $N \geq 3$ smooth hard spheres the final velocities of the particles are not uniquely defined. In the particular case of double collisions, similarly the final velocities of the particles are generally not uniquely defined. More precisely a double collision can be achieved by means of two non-equivalent sequences of binary collisions. The non-uniqueness occurs when the relative position unit vectors \mathbf{n}_{12} and \mathbf{n}_{23} (where \mathbf{n}_{ij} ($= -\mathbf{n}_{ji}$) denote the unit vectors joining the centers of particles "i" and "j") are arbitrarily directed (namely they are not parallel or orthogonal to each other).
- **PROPOSITIONS #3A and #3B: exceptions.** The exception, which corresponds to the case in which the double collision is deterministic, i.e., the final velocities after the double collision are uniquely determined, is represented by two possible cases (labeled respectively 3A and 3B). The first case (*Proposition #3A*) occurs when the two unit vectors \mathbf{n}_{12} and \mathbf{n}_{23} are parallel to each other, namely:

$$\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{23} = 1, \quad (12)$$

which corresponds to so-called symmetric initial conditions. The second case (*Proposition #3B*) is the one in which the same unit vectors are mutually orthogonal, namely,

$$\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{23} = 0. \quad (13)$$

In this case in fact, in a proper sense, the double collision reduces to two independent binary collisions, namely (1-2) and (2-3), occurring simultaneously.

3.3 - Direct proof of Propositions #3

First, we provide a direct proof of Proposition #3A. For definiteness, let us assume that the condition of symmetry (12) is satisfied before a double collision takes place. Furthermore, let us assume that in the center of mass (CM) the following initial velocities are satisfied:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 = 0 \\ \mathbf{v}_3 = -\mathbf{v}_1 \end{cases} . \quad (14)$$

Then, elementary symmetry considerations imply that:

- The hard sphere "2" remains at rest with respect to the CM, so that, after the symmetric double collision, its outgoing velocity vanishes: $\mathbf{v}_2''' = 0$.
- The hard spheres "1" and "3" undergo an analogous collision law, namely a bounce-back in the direction of symmetry which is determined by the unit vector $\mathbf{n}_{12} = \mathbf{n}_{23}$.
- As a consequence, the following collision law is necessarily fulfilled during the symmetric double-collision:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 = 0 \\ \mathbf{v}_3 = -\mathbf{v}_1 \end{cases} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_1''' = \mathbf{v}_1 - 2\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2''' = 0 \\ \mathbf{v}_3''' = -\mathbf{v}_1 + 2\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 \end{cases} . \quad (15)$$

Next let us consider the proof of Proposition #3B. In case of initial velocities (14) and in validity of the orthogonality condition (13), then the following collision law is necessarily fulfilled during the symmetric double-collision:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 = 0 \\ \mathbf{v}_3 = -\mathbf{v}_1 \end{cases} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_1''' = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2''' = \mathbf{n}_{21}\mathbf{n}_{21} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_3''' = -\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 \end{cases} . \quad (16)$$

3.4 - Proof of Proposition 2

The proof of Proposition #2 is now obtained by constructing explicitly the possible sequences of binary collisions. As stated above, the initial velocities are in both cases taken to fulfill (14).

First case: sequence (1-2)+(2-3)+(1-2)

Let us consider for this purpose the first sequence (10). Then, denoting by $\mathbf{n}_{ij} = -\mathbf{n}_{ji}$ the unit vector joining the centers "i" and "j", after collision (1-2) velocities of particles "1" and "2" become

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}'_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}'_2 = \mathbf{n}_{21}\mathbf{n}_{21} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

The second binary collision (2-3) then brings the velocities of particle "2" and "3" respectively to

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}''_2 = \mathbf{v}'_2 - \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot [\mathbf{v}'_2 + \mathbf{v}_1] = \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot [\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1] \\ \mathbf{v}''_3 = -\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{32}\mathbf{n}_{32} \cdot [-\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}'_2] = -\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot [\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1] \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Finally, the third collision (1-2) leads particles "1" and "2" to

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}'''_1 = \mathbf{v}'_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot [\mathbf{v}'_1 - \mathbf{v}''_2] \\ \mathbf{v}'''_2 = \mathbf{v}''_2 - \mathbf{n}_{21}\mathbf{n}_{21} \cdot [\mathbf{v}''_2 - \mathbf{v}'_1] = \mathbf{v}''_2 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot [\mathbf{v}''_2 - \mathbf{v}'_1] \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

namely

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}'''_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \{\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot [\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1]\} \\ \mathbf{v}'''_2 = \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot [\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1] - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \{\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot [\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1] - \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1\} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Second case: sequence (2-3)+(1-2)+(2-3)

Let us now consider the case of the second sequence (11).

After the first binary collision (2-3) it follows that

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}'_3 = \mathbf{v}_3 - \mathbf{n}_{32}\mathbf{n}_{32} \cdot \mathbf{v}_3 = -\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{32}\mathbf{n}_{32} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}'_2 = \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_3 = -\mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Then, collision (1-2) yields

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}''_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot [\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}'_2] \\ \mathbf{v}''_2 = \mathbf{v}'_2 - \mathbf{n}_{21}\mathbf{n}_{21} \cdot [\mathbf{v}'_2 - \mathbf{v}_1] \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

or

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}''_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot [\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1] \\ \mathbf{v}''_2 = -\mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{21}\mathbf{n}_{21} \cdot [-\mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1] \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Finally, collision (2-3) yields

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}'''_2 = \mathbf{v}''_2 - \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot [\mathbf{v}''_2 - \mathbf{v}'_3] \\ \mathbf{v}'''_3 = \mathbf{v}'_3 - \mathbf{n}_{32}\mathbf{n}_{32} \cdot [\mathbf{v}'_3 - \mathbf{v}''_2] \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

namely:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}'''_2 = -\mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{21}\mathbf{n}_{21} \cdot [-\mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1] - \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \{-\mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{21}\mathbf{n}_{21} \cdot [-\mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1] + \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{32}\mathbf{n}_{32} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1\} \\ \mathbf{v}'''_3 = -\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{32}\mathbf{n}_{32} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{32}\mathbf{n}_{32} \cdot \{-\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{32}\mathbf{n}_{32} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{21}\mathbf{n}_{21} \cdot [-\mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1]\} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Let us compare the outgoing velocities in the two cases. Thus, for example, in the case of the first sequence:

$$\mathbf{v}'''_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \{\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot [\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1]\}. \quad (26)$$

As a result:

$$\mathbf{v}'''_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot [\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1], \quad (27)$$

while in the second sequence one obtains

$$\mathbf{v}'''_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot [\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{23}\mathbf{n}_{23} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1]. \quad (28)$$

It therefore follows that the final velocities $\{\mathbf{v}_1^{(f)}(t_i), \mathbf{v}_2^{(f)}(t_i), \mathbf{v}_3^{(f)}(t_i)\}$ are generally different in the two cases (10) and (11), except if $\mathbf{n}_{12}(t_i) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{23}(t_i) = 0, 1$. This implies that double collision laws cannot be uniquely defined in terms of sequences of binary elastic collisions, i.e., in other words that double collision laws are ill defined.

3.5 - Indirect proof of Propositions #3

An indirect proof of Propositions #3 can also be obtained from the proof of Proposition #2 given above. For this, it is sufficient to notice that, in validity of the condition of symmetry (12), then one obtains respectively

$$\mathbf{v}_1''' = \mathbf{v}_1 - 2\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1, \quad (29)$$

and similarly

$$\mathbf{v}_3''' = -\mathbf{v}_1 + 2\mathbf{n}_{12}\mathbf{n}_{12} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1. \quad (30)$$

4 - BASIC IMPLICATIONS: ILL-DEFINED AND STOCHASTIC B-S SYSTEMS

We intend to show that the previous propositions imply fundamental consequences for the physical interpretation of the B-S system. More precisely, depending on how multiple collisions laws are prescribed, two possible cases can be distinguished. The first one is the case in which multiple collisions remain actually what they appear, namely non-unique and therefore ill-defined.

This is a consequence of Propositions #1 and #2, which actually imply three main conclusions. The first two are as follows:

4.1 - Conclusion #1: the ordinary B-S system is ill-defined

There is no unique deterministic law which can be associated with general multiple collisions occurring in the B-S system (i.e., which correspond to arbitrary admissible initial conditions, namely compatible with the possible physical constraints set on particle motion). Therefore, in the presence of multiple collisions, the B-S system remains generally (i.e., except special "symmetric" initial conditions) ill-defined, which means that the time evolution of the same B-S system is not uniquely defined. In such a case the B-S system will be referred to as *ordinary* (O-B-S system). However, there is a physically-grounded alternative, which occurs if a suitable set of stochastic collision laws is introduced for multiple collisions.

4.2 - Conclusion #2: stochastic character of multiple collisions

As shown above, multiple collisions correspond, however, to non-unique, but well-defined, "events", namely ordered sequences of simultaneous binary collisions (see in particular Eqs.(27) and (28) in the case of double collisions). This means that multiple collisions, and the same ordered sequences by which they are realized, can be considered stochastic, namely they are not only 1) non-unique but also 2) endowed with a well-defined probability density, namely they are equiprobable.

The reason why condition 2) occurs is that in a multiple (i.e., in the case considered here, binary) collision there is no way to decide which of the sequences actually happens. Moreover, since multiple collisions occur among like particles, it is obvious that all ordered sequences of simultaneous binary collisions must have the same probability density to happen, i.e., because they cannot depend on the permutation of the labeling indexes of the colliding particles. Hence, the probability densities are permutation symmetric. Based on these considerations, the following proposition holds.

PROPOSITION #4: stochastic character of generally non-unique multiple collisions

When multiple collision laws are non-unique, then they are necessarily stochastic in character, i.e.:

- 1) *They can be represented by different sequences of instantaneous binary collisions.*
- 2) *Each sequence of instantaneous binary collisions, which occurs in a multiple collision, can be assigned a suitable probability.*
- 3) *All sequences of instantaneous binary collisions occurring in the same multiple collision are equally probable.*

PROOF OF PROP. #4

The proof is straightforward. In fact, as shown above (PROP. #2 and #3), multiple collisions are generally characterized by non-unique collisions laws which correspond to distinct ordered sequences of instantaneous binary collisions. Therefore this implies that multiple collision laws are generally non-unique, and because of permutation symmetry, also stochastic. This yields also the following third conclusion.

4.3 - Conclusion #3: stochastic B-S system

If multiple collision laws are considered stochastic, i.e., defined by means of stochastic multiple-collision laws (namely in which each possible ordered sequence of binary collisions is considered stochastic and equally probable) then the time evolution of the B-S system is stochastic.

In the remainder we shall therefore distinguish the two cases in which multiple collisions are considered either ill defined or stochastic, namely respectively the ordinary and the stochastic B-S systems.

Based on the previous arguments the main result is then provided by the following corollary.

COROLLARY TO PROP. #4: multiple-collision laws of the stochastic B-S system

For the stochastic Boltzmann-Sinai system (S-B-S system), the collision laws for multiple collisions are generally stochastic and are provided by all possible sequences of instantaneous binary collisions, with the different sequences to be regarded as equally probable.

5 - THE NON-CLASSICAL 2-WAY LOGIC OF THE ORDINARY B-S SYSTEM AND THE 3-WAY LOGIC OF THE STOCHASTIC B-S SYSTEM

We are now ready to establish the propositional logic appropriate for the two systems considered here, namely respectively the O-B-S and S-B-S systems.

5.1 - The logic of the O-B-S system

It is immediate to realize that for the O-B-S system the logic remains the same one which applies to Newton's Classical Cosmology (see subsection 2.1). In fact, the only possible logical truth propositions which therefore define the semantics of the O-B-S system are:

- **1st logical truth proposition "true"**: the truth logical value "true" for the B-S system is represented by the "phase flow" generated by the same system, whose existence is warranted "a priori" in the time interval $I (\subseteq \mathbb{R})$ provided no multiple collisions occurs in the same time interval. Hence, the unique phase flow, i.e., the phase mapping, defined for all $t, t_o \in I (\subseteq \mathbb{R})$,

$$\mathbf{x}(t_o) \equiv \mathbf{x}_o \rightarrow \mathbf{x}(t) \equiv \chi(\mathbf{x}_o, t_o, t), \quad (31)$$

relates a prescribed non-multiple collision state $\mathbf{x}(t_o) \equiv \mathbf{x}_o \equiv (\mathbf{r}(t_o) = \mathbf{r}_o, \mathbf{v}(t_o) = \mathbf{v}_o)$ with its non-collisional image at time t determined by the same phase flow, namely $\mathbf{x}(t) \equiv (\mathbf{r}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)) \equiv \chi(\mathbf{x}_o, t_o, t)$ which is prescribed at any other time $t \neq t_o$.

- **2nd logical truth proposition "false"**: the truth logical value "false" for the same system is represented, instead, by any other mapping of the type

$$\mathbf{x}(t_o) \equiv \mathbf{x}'_o \rightarrow \mathbf{x}'(t), \quad (32)$$

where for all times $t \neq t_o$, $\mathbf{x}'(t) \equiv \chi(\mathbf{x}'_o, t_o, t)$ and $\mathbf{x}'_o \neq \mathbf{x}_o$ is an arbitrary initial state differing from \mathbf{x}_o . Notice that \mathbf{x}'_o may include also non-accessible initial states for which the phase flow is not defined.

- As a consequence, the ordinary B-S system formally satisfies the customary form of the 2-way Aristotle's *Principle of non-contradiction*, namely:

Theorem 1 - The two fundamental logical propositions of the O-B-S-system (standard) logic (Aristotle's 2-WAY PNC)

Given the N-body ordinary B-S system (O-B-S system) defined above, the following fundamental logical and mutually exclusive logical propositions apply:

- *1st proposition: classical truth.*
- *2nd proposition: classical falsehood.*

5.2 - The 3-way logic of the S-B-S system

In case of the S-B-S system instead the truth propositions which apply to Newton's Classical Cosmology (see subsection 2.1) still apply provided in the time interval $I (\subseteq \mathbb{R})$ no multiple collision occurs. However, a third truth proposition now arises explicitly, precisely:

- **3rd logical truth proposition "indeterminate" (or "undecidable"):** the truth logical value "*indeterminate*", which may be equivalently called "*undecidable*", for the same system is represented, instead, by any other mapping of the type

$$\mathbf{x}(t_o) \equiv \mathbf{x}_o \rightarrow \mathbf{x}'(t) \equiv \chi_S(\mathbf{x}_o, t_1, t), \quad (33)$$

where $\chi_S(\mathbf{x}_o, t_1, t)$ can be intended either as a suitable stochastic or multiple-valued function defined for any time $t_1 \geq t_o$, $t \neq t_o$, $x'(t) \equiv (r'(t), v'(t))$, which takes into account the presence of multiple collisions occurring during the same time interval and represents all possible accessible states occurring for the same S-B-S system.

- As a consequence, the semantics of the S-B-S system, namely its logical truth values now satisfies the *3-way Principle of non-contradiction*, namely:

Theorem 2 —The three fundamental logical propositions of the non-standard CM logic (3-WAY PNC)

Given the N-body stochastic B-S system (S-B-S system) defined above, the following fundamental logical and mutually exclusive logical propositions apply:

- *1st proposition: classical truth.*
- *2nd proposition: classical falsehood.*
- *3rd proposition: classical undecidability.*

Proof: In fact, unlike in CL, for the S-B-S system the deterministic principle does not hold any more (this happens after the occurrence of any multiple collision). As a consequence three possible truth values exist, namely truth, falsehoods and undecidability (which may be termed also as classical because they refer to CM). Thus, for example, truth is (respectively falsehood and undecidability) is the common property among all possible true (false, undeterminate) phase-space trajectories. Finally, by construction the three logical values are manifestly mutually incompatible. As a consequence a 3-way Principle of non-contradiction (3-way PNC) holds. **Q.E.D.**

Therefore, the theorems indicated above (Thms. 1 and 2) identify respectively the standard 2-way classical logic and the (non-standard) 3-way non-classical logic which are based on the occurrence of two and, respectively, three different truth logical values.

The result obtained by Theorem 2 proves, in particular, that the logic of CM must be non-standard and based on the 3-way PNC.

5.3 - Physical implications

It has to be noted that, in difference with respect to the S-B-S system which is defined globally in time (i.e., for all times $t \in I \equiv \mathbb{R}$), the time evolution of the O-B-S system can only be prescribed for all times smaller than the minimum critical time t_* . For this reason, in principle, the question of the physical relevance of the O-B-S system might be called into question. On the other hand, there is no way to predict or to exclude possible multiple collision events. For this reason it follows that, at least in principle, the only physical identification for the B-S system which makes sense from the physical standpoint (in the sense that it is the only one which is globally defined), is only that of identifying it with the S-B-S system.

This means also that, in the present context, the notion of the *undecidability* (or *indeterminacy*) truth logical value is applicable only to the same S-B-S system.

Regarding the consistency of such a notion with that available in mathematics, i.e., specifically in the context of Gödel completeness/incompleteness theorems [6]), we notice that the undecidability logical truth value in the context the S-B-S system arises if the application phase mapping

$$t \rightarrow \mathbf{x}(t) = \chi(\mathbf{x}_o, t_o, t) \quad (34)$$

(with $x(t)$ denoting the state at time t , for the initial condition $x(t_o) = x_o$ and $\chi(x_o, t_o, t)$ denoting the phase flow) is stochastic at time $t > t_o$, i.e., provided a (non-symmetric) multiple collision (at, say, a time t_1) occurs in the open time interval (t_o, t) . This means that for any $t > t_1$ the flow $\chi(x_o, t_o, t)$ become stochastic and therefore that the state $x(t)$ is necessarily discontinuous at time t_1 in the velocity $v(t)$. This also implies that the notion of undecidability makes sense also from the mathematical viewpoint since it corresponds to a well-definite mathematical expression, i.e., the value of velocity jump across the discontinuity, whose value cannot be uniquely determined. The implication is therefore that the S-B-S system represents an example-case in which incompleteness occurs, and therefore an example-case in which Gödel theory applies.

The notable aspect is that this happens - namely the logical truth value undecidability occurs - despite the fact that apparently the configuration space Ω for the hard-sphere system seems to coincide with a bounded subset of the 3-dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3 (a case in which, according to Gödel, undecidability should be ruled out). The explanation, however, is immediate and follows by proving that the actual configuration space has necessarily a higher dimension in the presence of multiple collisions. In fact the configuration space is, by definition, the set in which position trajectories are uniquely mapped. Therefore in the S-B-S system, if j multiple trajectories exist in Ω . The actual configuration space coincides necessarily with the extended configuration space Ω^f represented by the product $\Omega^f = \prod_{i=1, f} \Omega$, i.e. a subset of the product space $(E^3)^f$.

Therefore, this conclusion proves the connection with Gödel theory [6]: in other words the undecidable propositions arising in the S-B-S system are consistent with the same theorems. The actual physical mechanism which gives rise to the occurrence of such logical propositions is produced by multiple collisions. This confirms therefore that the B-S system represents an example-case and an application of Gödel undecidability theorems.

The next physically-relevant issue which one might wish to address concerns therefore the question of "how likely" are multiple collision events in the S-B-S (or O-B-S) system [57–61]. This amounts to estimate the relative (canonical or microcanonical) invariant measure of the subset of phase-space in which multiple collisions events occur. As shown in the following subsection, such a measure can be estimated and shown to be identically vanishing. Its invariance property warrants that the same measure remains always vanishing at all times. In other words, excluding a subset of phase space with vanishing measure, all possible initial conditions for the hard spheres (which belong to the S–B–S system) lead in an arbitrary finite time interval to ordinary binary collisions events only.

5.4 - Estimate of the relative microcanonical measure of the subset of multiple collisions

As is well-known the microcanonical measure of the B-S system is represented by an integral on the energy hypersurface. Thus, for a system formed by $N > 2$ smooth hard spheres of diameter σ , particle kinetic energies $E^{(i)} = \frac{1}{2}mv^{(i)2}$ (for $i = 1, N$) and with total kinetic energy of the hard spheres

$$E_N = \sum_{i=1, N} E^{(i)}, \quad (35)$$

such a measure is represented by the integral

$$\Omega(\alpha) = \int_{\Gamma_N} dx \bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}) \delta(E_N - \alpha), \quad (36)$$

which is performed on the "admissible subset" (the subset of admissible configurations of the N -body phase-space Γ_N), namely the subset of Γ_N where $\bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(r) = 1$, which coincides with the subset of a parallelepiped-shaped bounded subset of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3 , i.e., the billiard, which can be occupied by the hard spheres. Here the notation is standard [4]. Thus, dx is the volume element $dx = \prod_{i,j=1, N} d^3r_i d^3v_j$, $\Theta_N(\mathbf{r})$ denotes the "ensemble theta function",

which by definition is set equal to unity on the said admissible subset of configuration space. Thus, $\bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r})$ is defined as [4]:

$$\bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\substack{i,j=1, N \\ (i < j)}} \bar{\Theta}(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| - \sigma) \sum_{k=1, N} \bar{\Theta}\left(\left|\mathbf{r}_k - \frac{\sigma}{2}\mathbf{n}_k\right| - \frac{\sigma}{2}\right), \quad (37)$$

where $\bar{\Theta}(x)$ denotes the strong Heaviside theta function

$$\bar{\Theta}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases}, \quad (38)$$

and \mathbf{n}_k is the inward unit vector orthogonal to the boundary at the point of contact of the k -th hard sphere having baricentric position \mathbf{r}_k .

Next let us pose the problem of estimating the possible effect of multiple collisions, such as for example double collisions. The proof is elementary and is based on the definition of the ensemble theta function $\bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r})$ given above.

Clearly, this must correspond to a subset of the collisional subset of binary collisions because double collisions occur when two binary collisions in turn occur, which involve the same particles. For convenience let us therefore introduce a measure on the binary collision subset. This can be defined in terms of a phase-space integral in which binary collisions are specifically taken into account, namely are prescribed in terms of Dirac deltas of the type $\delta(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| - \sigma)$ (for $i, j = 1, N$), i.e.,

$$\Omega_2(\alpha) = \int_{\Gamma_N} dx \bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}) \delta(E_N - \alpha) \sum_{i,j=1,N;i < j} \delta(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| - \sigma). \quad (39)$$

Then, thanks to the assumption of like particles, this implies that $\Omega_2(\alpha)$ must necessarily take the form

$$\Omega_2(\alpha) = N(N-1) \int_{\Gamma_N} dx \bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}) \delta(E_N - \alpha) \delta(|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2| - \sigma), \quad (40)$$

where the Dirac delta takes into account the contribution of binary collisions (1-2), i.e., occurring between particle "1" and "2", only. Hence the multiple integral evaluated on the 2-body phase space Γ_2 can always be evaluated explicitly to yield

$$\int_{\Gamma_2} d\mathbf{x}_1 d\mathbf{x}_2 \bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}) \delta(E_N - \alpha) \delta(|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2| - \sigma) = \int_{\Gamma_2} d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{r}_1 d\Sigma_{21} d\mathbf{v}_2 \bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}) \delta(E_N - \alpha), \quad (41)$$

where Σ_{21} represents the integration on a suitable solid angle element.

Now, in principle, the integral on the rhs of Eq.(41) might still depend also on multiple collisions (to be taken into account through the factor $\bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r})$), such as for example, double collisions in which either particle "1" or "2" collide with a third particle "3", namely corresponding to possible binary collisions of the type (1-3) and (2-3). We intend to demonstrate that such contributions (to $\Omega_2(\alpha)$) must vanish identically. The elementary proof is as follows.

First, one notices that in the integral on the rhs, the ensemble theta function $\bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r})$ can always be replaced with a smooth function $\bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}, \varepsilon^2)$ such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon^2 \rightarrow 0} \bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}, \varepsilon^2) = \bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (42)$$

in which $\bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}, \varepsilon^2)$ can be taken of the type

$$\bar{\Theta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{r}, \varepsilon^2) \propto \Theta(|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3| - \sigma + \varepsilon^2) \Theta(\sigma + \varepsilon^2 - |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3|) \Theta(|\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_3| - \sigma + \varepsilon^2) \Theta(\sigma + \varepsilon^2 - |\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_3|). \quad (43)$$

Now it is straightforward to show, by direct evaluation of the same phase-space integrals, that multiple collisions of the type (1-2)+(1-3) or (1-2)+(2-3) produce contributions at most of order ε^2 to $\Omega_2(\alpha)$. As a consequence, once the limit $\varepsilon^2 \rightarrow 0$ is taken, this means that double collisions can only give rise to vanishing contributions to $\Omega_2(\alpha)$. Analogous considerations can be made for higher-order multiple collisions. This proves therefore that multiple collisions give vanishing contributions to the microcanonical measure of the collisional subset.

6 - CONCLUSIONS: THE LOGIC OF CLASSICAL MECHANICS

The very concept of logic attached to classical mechanics (CM) is traditionally rooted in the notion of classical logic. Goal of this paper has been to challenge the deterministic logic of classical mechanics, showing that a 3-way non-standard logic actually holds which should be therefore considered valid for the whole set of classical physics. However, another striking conclusion arises. In fact, based on previous investigations on the logic of quantum physics (quantum mechanics and quantum gravity), the same unique logical principle of non-contradiction and the same discrete truth values appear to encompass both classical and quantum physics.

To achieve such a result, classical mechanics should include classical systems which are intrinsically stochastic.

For this purpose, in this paper the logic of classical mechanics has been tackled for the Boltzmann-Sinai (B-S) system formed by $N > 2$ smooth hard spheres subject to multiple elastic collisions. Multiple collisions have been shown to be generally realized by different sequences of simultaneous binary collision events, which implies that on the same grounds multiple collision laws are ill defined. Here, as an illustration, the case of double collisions has been considered.

To overcome the difficulty, however, suitable stochastic collision laws have been adopted for the B-S hard-sphere system, which has been referred to for this reason as stochastic B-S system.

Its logic - and therefore also that of CM - has been shown to be a non-standard logic, in the sense that it includes a third logical truth value, referred to as indeterminate/undecidable. In particular such a logical value has been shown to be compatible with the notion of undecidability adopted in the context of Gödel theory [6]. As a consequence, this means that the stochastic Boltzmann-Sinai system (S-B-S system) represents an example-case of undecidability according to Gödel undecidability theorems [6].

Thus, it coincides necessarily with that of a 3-valued propositional calculus. In other words:

- The logic of CM has been shown to be non classical and to coincide with the non-standard logic which is governed by the so-called 3-way *Principle of non-contradiction* (3-way PNC).
- Such a logical principle coincides with the 3-way logical principle previously shown to hold for quantum physics, i.e., both for non-relativistic quantum mechanics (QM) and quantum gravity (QG) [1, 2].
- Therefore, a unique 3-way PNC has been shown to govern both classical and quantum physics.

Regarding the comparison between CM and respectively both QM and QG, we stress that two common features arise, namely 1) the existence in all such cases of the three logical values "true", "false" and "*undecidable*" (or "*indeterminate*"); 2) the validity in all such cases of the same 3-way principle of non-contradiction. However, the precise definitions of the truth values which occur in QM and QG generally differ from those obtained here for CM, being related to the properties of appropriate quantum observables, rather than the position 3-vector $\mathbf{r}(t)$ holding in the case of CM.

Nevertheless, the definitions of the same truth values are not independent, in the sense that they must actually be prescribed in a consistent manner. In fact, when QM is evaluated in the semiclassical limit then it is possible to prove that it reduces exactly to CM (see details of the proof given in Ref. [2]). This implies that, depending on the specific prescription for the quantum system (which should be identified with the quantum B-S system), also the same logic of CM obtained here is expected to be recovered in the semiclassical limit.

These conclusions represent a potential notable innovation in the logical dichotomy true/false. This is a crucial topic which has crossed millennia through philosophy, logic, mathematics, physics and even theology. In the history of philosophy and science, great minds tackled the challenge, ranging from classic Authors like Confucius (Kong Fuzi), Lao Tzu (Laozi), Aristotle (Aristotélēs), Middle Ages Authors Thomas Aquinas and Ramon Llull, Age of Enlightenment Authors like Immanuel Kant and modern Authors like Kurt Friedrich Gödel, George David Birkhoff, John von Neumann and Alan Turing. In the present research we have connected the philosophical arguments to the physics of Galileo Galilei, Isaac Newton, Ludwig Boltzmann, Harold Grad and Yakov Grigorevich Sinai, with special reference to particle trajectories in the case of hard-spheres undergoing multiple collisions which are unavoidably stochastic.

Data Availability Statement

This manuscript has no associated data. [Authors' comment: The paper reports theoretical analytical study. All data pertinent to this study are contained in the paper.]

Code Availability Statement

This manuscript has no associated code/software. [Authors' comment: The paper reports theoretical analytical study and no use of code/software is made.]

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that to their knowledge there are no competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Funding information

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, Massimo Tessarotto, Claudio Cremaschini, Claudio Asci, Alessandro Soranzo, Marco Tessarotto and Gino Tironi; Investigation, Massimo Tessarotto, Claudio Cremaschini, Claudio Asci, Alessandro Soranzo, Marco Tessarotto and Gino Tironi; Writing – original draft, Massimo Tessarotto, Claudio Cremaschini, Claudio Asci, Alessandro Soranzo, Marco Tessarotto and Gino Tironi. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

-
- [1] M. Tessarotto and C. Cremaschini, *The Common Logic of Quantum Universe—Part I: The Case of Non-relativistic Quantum Mechanics*. Foundations of Physics **52**, 30 (2022).
- [2] M. Tessarotto and C. Cremaschini, *The Common Logic of Quantum Universe—Part II: The Case of Quantum Gravity*. Found. Phys. **52**, 39 (2022).
- [3] Massimo Tessarotto, Claudio Cremaschini, Marco Tessarotto, *On the conditions of validity of the Boltzmann equation and Boltzmann H-theorem*. Eur. Phys. J. Plus **128**, 32 (2013).
- [4] M. Tessarotto and C. Cremaschini, *The Master kinetic equation for the statistical treatment of the Boltzmann-Sinai classical dynamical system*. Eur. Phys. J. Plus **129**, 157 (2014).
- [5] M. Tessarotto and C. Cremaschini, *The Indeterminacy Principle in the Context of Covariant Quantum Gravity*. Entropy **22**, 1209 (2020).
- [6] K. Gödel, *Collected Works I: Publications 1929-1936*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1986.
- [7] I. Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, 1781; *Critique of Pure Reason*, first English translation by Francis Haywood. William Pickering. 1838.
- [8] I. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, Online Library of Liberty, Book 2, Chap. II, Sec. IV; <https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/llercritique-of-pure-reason>.
- [9] I. Newton, *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica* (1687); I. Newton, *The Principia: Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, University of California Press (1999).
- [10] G. Birkhoff, J. von Neumann, *The Logic of Quantum Mechanics*, Ann. of Phys. 2nd Ser., **37**(4), 823-843 (1936).
- [11] C. Cremaschini and M. Tessarotto, *Hamiltonian approach to GR – Part 1: covariant theory of classical gravity*. Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, 329 (2017).
- [12] C. Cremaschini and M. Tessarotto, *Hamiltonian approach to GR – Part 2: covariant theory of quantum gravity*. Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, 330 (2017).
- [13] Norris S. Hetherington, (2014), *Encyclopedia of Cosmology (Routledge Revivals): Historical, Philosophical, and Scientific Foundations of Modern Cosmology*. Routledge. p. 116. ISBN 978-1-317-67766-6.
- [14] *Essai philosophique sur les probabilités*, par M. le marquis de Laplace, pair de France, grand-officier de la Légion-d'honneur ; l'un des quarante de l'Académie française ; de l'Académie des sciences... Cinquième édition, revue et augmentée par l'auteur (1825); WikiSource https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/A_Philosophical_Essay_on_Probabilities/Chapter_2.
- [15] R. Boskovich, *Philosophiæ naturalis theoria redacta ad unicam legem virium in natura existentium (Theory of natural philosophy derived to the single law of forces which exist in nature)*, 1758; archived copy <https://web.archive.org/web/20070614012316/http://dpedtech.com/ROGERJOSEPHBOSCOVICH.doc>.
- [16] J. Barrow, *Gödel and Physics*, in "Kurt Gödel and the Foundations of Mathematics: Horizons of Truth", eds. M. Baez, C. Papadimitriou, H. Putnam, D. Scott and C. Harper, chap 11, 255-276, Cambridge UP, (2011).
- [17] M. Jammer, *The Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics*, New York, Wiley (1974).
- [18] G. Corsi, M.L. Dalla Chiara and G.C. Ghirardi, *Bridging the Gap: Philosophy, Mathematics and Physics Lectures on the Foundations of Science*. Studia Logica **53**, 462-464 (1994).
- [19] C.C. Chang and H. Jerome Keisler, *Model Theory*, Dover Pub. Inc., Mineola, New York (2012).
- [20] D. Ellerman, *A New Logic, a New Information Measure, and a New Information-Based Approach to Interpreting Quantum Mechanics*. Entropy 2024, 26(2), 169.
- [21] D. Ellerman, *The Logic of Partitions: Introduction to the Dual of the Logic of Subsets*. Review of Symbolic Logic. 3 (2 1108 June): 287-350(2010)..
- [22] G. Boole, *An Investigation of the Laws of Thought on which are founded the Mathematical Theories of Logic and Probabilities*, 1095, Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. (1854).
- [23] A. Church, *Introduction to Mathematical Logic*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1956).
- [24] S. Mac Lane and I. Moerdijk, *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic: A First Introduction to Topos Theory*. New York: 1098, Springer (1992).
- [25] L. Lafleche, *Optimal Semiclassical Regularity of Projection Operators and Strong Weyl Law*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04816> (2023).
- [26] J. von Neumann, Nicholas A. Wheeler (ed.). *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. New Edition. Translated by Robert T. Beyer. Princeton University Press. ISBN 9781400889921 (2018).
- [27] G. MacKay, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Dover Books on Mathematics ISBN 0-486-43517-2 (1963).

- [28] Uri Ben-Ya'acov, *Gödel's incompleteness theorem and universal physics theories*, arXiv:1906.02724 [physics.hist-ph] (2019).
- [29] A. Doering, *Topos Quantum Logic and Mixed States*, In Proceedings of Workshop on Quantum Physics and Logic (QPL 09), eds. B. Coecke, P. Panangaden, P. Selinger, Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science 270, Issue 2, 59–77 (2011).
- [30] E.G. Beltrametti and G. Cassinelli, *The Logic of Quantum Mechanics*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA (1981).
- [31] G. Kalmbach, *Orthomodular Lattices*, Academic Press, New York (1983).
- [32] D.W. Cohen, *An Introduction to Hilbert Space and quantum logic*. Springer, New York (1989).
- [33] P. Pták and S. Pulmannová, *Orthomodular Structures as Quantum logic*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (1991).
- [34] R. Giuntini, *quantum logic and Hidden Variables*. BI Wissenschaftsverlag, Mannheim (1991).
- [35] K. Svozil, *quantum logic in Algebraic Approach*. Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics, Volume **32**, Issue 1, p. 113–115 (2001).
- [36] K. Svozil, *Quantum logic*. Springer, Singapore (1998).
- [37] E. Heifetz and E. Cohen, *Toward a Thermo-hydrodynamic Like Description of Schrödinger Equation via the Madelung Formulation and Fisher Information*. Found. Physics **45**, 1514–1525 (2015).
- [38] R. Tsekov, E. Heifetz and E. Cohen, *A Hydrodynamic Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics via Turbulence*. C. R. Acad. Bulg. Sci., Vol. 72 (2019), p. 448–454; DOI: 10.7546/CRABS.2019.04.03 (2019).
- [39] M. Tessarotto and C. Cremaschini, *On the Quantum Regularization of Singular Black-Hole Solutions in Covariant Quantum Gravity*. Symmetry **15**, 1218 (2023).
- [40] M. Tessarotto and C. Cremaschini, *Generalized Lagrangian-Path Representation of Non-Relativistic Quantum Mechanics*. Found. Phys. **46**, 1022–1061 (2016).
- [41] M. Tessarotto and C. Cremaschini, *Generalized Lagrangian path approach to manifestly-covariant quantum gravity theory*. Entropy **20**, 205 (2018).
- [42] A. Waley, ed., *The Way and its Power (Laozi, Tao Te Ching)*, New York: Grove, ISBN 0-8021-5085-3, OCLC 1151668016 (1958).
- [43] Ya. G., Sinai, *On the foundations of the ergodic hypothesis for a dynamical system of statistical mechanics*. Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR **153**, 1261–1264 (1963).
- [44] Ya. G., Sinai, *Dynamical systems with elastic reflections*. Russ. Math. Surv. **25**(1), 137–189 (1970).
- [45] Ya. G., Sinai and N.I. Chernov, *Ergodic properties of certain systems of two-dimensional discs and three-dimensional balls*. Usp. Math. Nauk **42**, 153–174 (1987).
- [46] András Krámli, Nándor Simányi, and Domokos Szász, *The k -property of three billiard balls*. The Annals of Mathematics, **133**(1):37–72, 1991. <https://annals.math.princeton.edu/articles/14549>.
- [47] András Krámli, Nándor Simányi, and Domokos Szász. *The k -property of four billiard balls*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, **144**(1):107–148, February 1992. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF02099193>.
- [48] Leonid A Bunimovich, Carlangelo Liverani, Alessandro Pellegrinotti, and Yurii M Suhov. *Ergodic systems of n balls in a billiard table*. Communications in Mathematical Physics **146**, 357 (1992), <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF02102633>.
- [49] Peter Balint, Nikolai Chernov, Domokos Szász, and Imre Péter Tóth. *What mathematical billiards teach us about statistical physics?*, arXiv:2009.06284 (2020).
- [50] L. Boltzmann, *Weitere Studien über das Wärmegleichgewicht unter Gasmolekülen*, Sitzungsber. Kais. Akad. Wiss. Wien Math. Naturwiss. Classe, **66**, 275–370 (1872).
- [51] H. Grad, *Principles of the Kinetic Theory of Gases*, Thermodynamik der Gase / Thermodynamics of Gases. Series: Handbuch der Physik / Encyclopedia of Physics, ISBN: 978-3-642-45894-1. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (Berlin, Heidelberg), Edited by S. Flügge, vol. 3 / 12, pp. 205–294 (1958).
- [52] M. Tessarotto, C. Cremaschini, M. Mond, C. Asci, A. Soranzo and G. Tironi, *On the Boltzmann-Grad limit of the Master Kinetic Equations*. Found. Phys. **48**, 271 (2018).
- [53] M. Tessarotto and C. Cremaschini, *First-principle proof of the modified collision boundary conditions for the hard-sphere system*. Phys. Lett. A **378**, 1760 (2014).
- [54] M. Tessarotto and C. Cremaschini, *Theory of collisional invariants for the Master kinetic equation*. Phys. Lett. A **379**, 1206 (2015).
- [55] M. Tessarotto and C. Cremaschini, *Axiomatic foundations of entropic theorems for hard-sphere systems*. Eur. Phys. J. Plus **130**, 91 (2015).
- [56] M. Tessarotto, C. Cremaschini, C. Asci, A. Soranzo and G. Tironi, *Global validity of the Master kinetic equation for hard-sphere systems*. Eur. Phys. J. Plus **130**, 169 (2015).
- [57] Donald G. Saari: *Improbability of collisions in Newtonian gravitational systems*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **162**, 267–271; erratum, *ibid.* **168** (1972), 521, 1971.
- [58] Donald G. Saari: *Improbability of collisions in Newtonian gravitational systems. II*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **181**, 351–368 (1973).
- [59] H. Pollard and D.G. Saari, *Singularities of the n -body problem. I*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **30**, 263–269 (1968).
- [60] S. Fleischer and A. Knauf, *Improbability of Collisions in n -Body Systems*. Arch Rational Mech Anal **234**, 1007–1039 (2019).
- [61] D.G. Saari, *A global existence theorem for the four-body problem of Newtonian mechanics*. J. Differential Equations **26**, 80 (1977).