

# A generalization of falsity in finitely-many valued logics

Nissim Francez

---

## 1. Introduction

In propositional classical logic, if a formula  $\varphi$ , under some valuation  $\mathbf{v}$ , is not true, then  $\varphi$  is false, and if it is not false, it is true. This toggling between truth and falsehood is captured in propositional classical logic by means of *negation* ‘ $\neg$ ’, with its truth-table<sup>1</sup>:

$\varphi$	$\neg\varphi$
—	—
$t$	$f$
—	—
$f$	$t$

Consider now some multi-valued<sup>1</sup> logic  $\mathcal{L}$  with a set of truth-values<sup>2</sup>

$$\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}, \quad n \geq 2$$

**Q:** *What does it mean that under some valuation  $\mathbf{v}$ , some  $\varphi$  does not have the truth-value  $v_i$  for some  $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ ?*

*And, in particular, can this meaning be captured by means of a suitable negation in  $\mathcal{L}$ ?*

Suppose we have already identified  $v_1$  with  $t$  and  $v_n$  with  $f$  (see [5] for one such identification; see Section 4 for the definition used where). Then, there is interest in the special instances of the question

**Q:**

What does it mean that  $\varphi$  is not true under some valuation  $\mathbf{v}$ , or not false.

---

Address for correspondence: Nissim Francez, Department of Computer Science, Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel. Email: francez@cs.technion.ac.il.

<sup>1</sup>I consider here only finitely many truth-values.

<sup>2</sup>I ignore here the issue, orthogonal to our interest, whether  $\mathcal{V}$  is a set of truth-values or merely some *semantic values*.

Traditionally in multi-valued logics, negation is viewed (*truth*) *functionally*,  $\neg\varphi$  mapping the truth-value  $v_i$  of  $\varphi$  to some other, *specific*, truth-value  $v_j$ , where  $i = j$  is not excluded<sup>3</sup>. This mapping is again depicted as a multi-valued truth-table. Some well-know examples are listed below, without considerations of interpretation of those truth-values.

**Kleene's  $K_3$  [7]:** Here  $\mathcal{V} = \{t, n, f\}$ , and the truth-table for negation is

$\varphi$	$\neg\varphi$
— —	— —
$t$	$f$
— —	— —
$n$	$n$
— —	— —
$f$	$t$

**Belnap-Dunn *first-degree entailment* (FDE) [1, 2, 3]:** Here  $\mathcal{V} = \{t, b, n, f\}$ , and the truth-table for negation is

$\varphi$	$\neg\varphi$
— —	— —
$t$	$f$
— —	— —
$n$	$n$
— —	— —
$b$	$b$
— —	— —
$f$	$t$

**Post cyclic negation [8]:**  $\mathcal{V} = \{v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$  and negation is *cyclic*.

$\varphi$	$\neg\varphi$
— — —	— — —
$v_0$	$v_1$
— — —	— — —
$v_1$	$v_2$
— — —	— — —
$\vdots$	$\vdots$
— — —	— — —
$v_{n-1}$	$v_0$

---

<sup>3</sup>See  $K_3$  below for a case of  $i = j$ .

Consequently, the question **Q** is traditionally answered as follows: for any  $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ , if, under a valuation  $\mathbf{v}$ ,  $\varphi$  does not have truth-value  $v_i$ , then  $\varphi$  has under  $\mathbf{v}$  some *specific* truth-value  $v_j$ , where  $j = i$  is not excluded.

In this paper, I aim at another way to answer the question **Q**: *If, under some valuation  $\mathbf{v}$ ,  $\varphi$  does not have truth-value  $v_i$ , this is understood as  $\varphi$  having, under  $\mathbf{v}$ , non-deterministically, any other (not functionally determined) truth-value in  $\mathcal{V}$ .*

There is no “privileged”  $v_j$  materializing not having the value  $v_i$ !

This means that traditional multi-valued negations, as exemplified above, cannot be used to express this interpretation of not having  $v_i$ . Instead, I introduce another operator, that generalizes negation in multi-valued logics as a non-deterministic operator. To distinguish our approach, I use a unary operator ‘ $N$ ’ instead of ‘ $\neg$ ’.

I consider  $n$  operators,  $N_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . The intended meaning of  $N_i\varphi$ , when true under some valuation  $\mathbf{v}$ , is that  $\varphi$  *does not have the truth-value  $v_i$*  under  $\mathbf{v}$ . This, however, is not taken to mean as having some *specific* truth-value  $v_j$ ; rather, it is taken to mean that  $\varphi$  has, *non-deterministically*, any value different from  $v_i$ .

Thus,  $N_i\varphi$  can never (i.e., for no valuation  $\mathbf{v}$ ) share the same truth-value with  $\varphi$ . It reflects the meta-linguistic negation of ‘ $\varphi$  has truth-value  $v_i$ ’. In this,  $N_i$  differ from  $\neg\varphi$  in traditional multi-valued logics, where  $\mathbf{v}[\varphi] = \mathbf{v}[\neg\varphi]$  is certainly possible, e.g., for the truth-value  $n$  in  $K_3$  as shown above.

As for the intended meaning of  $N_i\varphi$  when having a truth-value  $v_j \neq v_1 = t$ , this will be specified below once the theory is set up.

As the framework for our study, we chose *located sequents*, introduced and studied in general in [6], and used for a related issue in [4]. The formalism is delineated in Section 2.

## 2. Preliminaries: located formulas and sequents

For  $n \geq 2$ , let  $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  be a collection of truth-values underlying a multi-valued logic  $\mathcal{L}^n$  with a propositional object-language  $L_n$  with, possibly, some additional unspecified connectives defined by truth-tables over  $\mathcal{V}$ . Let  $\hat{n} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

### Definition 2.1. (located formulas<sup>4</sup>)

A *located formula* (*l-formula*) is a pair  $(\varphi, k)$ , where  $\varphi$  is an object-language formula and  $k \in \hat{n}$ . We say that  $(\varphi, k)$  *locates*  $\varphi$  at  $v_k$ .

The intended interpretation of  $(\varphi, k)$  is that  $\varphi$  is associated with the truth-value  $v_k \in \mathcal{V}$ .

### Definition 2.2. (located sequents)

A *located sequent* (*l-sequent*)  $\Pi$  has the form  $\Gamma : \Delta$ , where  $\Gamma, \Delta$  are (possibly empty) finite collections<sup>5</sup> of *l-formulas*.

<sup>5</sup>The exact nature of a collection, e.g., a set or a multi-set, depends on the specific logic being defined.

I use  $\Pi$  for sets of  $l$ -sequents. Let  $\sigma$  range over valuations, mapping formulas to truth-values in  $\mathcal{V}$ ; for atomic sentences the mapping is arbitrary, and it is extended to compound formulas so as to respect the truth-tables of the operators. Below, I define the central semantic notions as applicable to  $l$ -sequents.

**Definition 2.3. (satisfaction, consequence)**

**satisfaction:**  $\sigma \models \Pi (= \Gamma : \Delta)$  iff:

$$\text{if } \sigma \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket = v_k \text{ for all } (\varphi, k) \in \Gamma, \text{ then } \sigma \llbracket \psi \rrbracket = v_j \text{ for some } (\psi, j) \in \Delta \quad (1)$$

**consequence:**

$$\Pi \models \Pi \text{ iff for every } \sigma : \sigma \models \Pi' \text{ for all } \Pi' \in \Pi \text{ implies } \sigma \models \Pi \quad (2)$$

**validity:**  $\Pi$  is *valid* iff  $\sigma \models \Pi$  for every  $\sigma$ .

In [4, 6], various proof-systems over  $l$ -sequents are presented (in a different notation) sound and (strongly) complete for the above consequence relation, constructed from the truth-tables in a uniform way. The multi-valued ND-systems  $\mathcal{N}^n$  (over  $l$ -sequents) with their structural and logical rules for an arbitrary  $n$ -ary connective are presented in an appendix.

### 3. Transparent falsity and binary poly-sequents

#### 3.1. Transparent falsity and disquotation

As a preliminary step, I consider the case where<sup>6</sup>  $n = 2$ , in which the non-determinism involved is only apparent, since ‘any truth-value other than  $t$ ’ is just  $f$ , and ‘any truth-value other than  $f$ ’ is just  $t$ . This section is an adaptation from [5].

Suppose we want to add to classical logic a *transparent falsity-predicate*  $F(x)$ . What would be the way to express falsity? Fortunately, because of the properties of classical negation, where the truth of  $\neg\varphi$  expresses the falsity of  $\varphi$ , we can use it for creating such an analog to the disquotation property of the well-known truth predicate:

$$(DF) \quad F(\hat{\varphi}) \leftrightarrow \neg\varphi \quad (3)$$

where  $\hat{\varphi}$  is a name for  $\varphi$  (e.g., the Gödel number). The transparency of  $F(x)$  can be expressed via the following  $I/E$ -rules, in analogy to the well-known rules for the transparent truth predicate.

$$\frac{\neg\varphi}{F(\hat{\varphi})} (FI) \quad \frac{F(\hat{\varphi})}{\neg\varphi} (FE) \quad (4)$$

Notably, those rules are *impure* in that they feature a connective ( $\neg$  here) different from the one introduced/eliminated by the rules.

*But, what can be done in a more general setting, where no analog to classical negation is present (or definable), to have a transparent falsity predicate?*

<sup>6</sup>For better readability, I use  $\{t, f\}$  instead of  $\{v_1, v_2\}$ .

### 3.2. Bivalent $l$ -sequents and transparent truth/falsity predicates

#### 3.2.1. Bivalent $l$ -sequents

Consider now binary  $l$ -sequents  $\Pi = \Gamma : \Delta$  (i.e., where  $n = 2$ ). The advantage of this notation in the bivalent case is that it enables expressing falsity of a formula  $\varphi$  *without appealing to negation*, just using a located formula  $(\varphi, f)$ . Note that both false assumptions and false conclusions are allowed, residents of the respective  $\Gamma$  (assumptions) and  $\Delta$  (conclusions).

I consider a sound and complete ND-system  $\mathcal{N}^2$  for the logic of bivalent valid  $l$ -sequents. Since the connectives are orthogonal to our current concerns, I omit the presentation of their  $I/E$ -rules. However, this system allows speaking proof-theoretically about my concerns.

The proof system  $\mathcal{N}^2$  is a special case of  $\mathcal{N}^n$  for  $n = 2$ . The general system is presented in an appendix.

We now can state that the falsity predicate  $F(x)$  is disquotational by the following analogy to (3), without any appeal to negation.

$$(PSD_{ft}) \Gamma : \Delta, (F(\hat{\varphi}), t) \dashv\vdash_{\mathcal{N}^2} \Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, f) \quad (5)$$

That is: if  $F(\hat{\varphi})$  is true, indicated by its  $t$ -location of the l.h.s., then  $\varphi$  is false, indicated by  $f$ -location of the r.h.s., and vice versa.

$$(PSD_{tf}) \Gamma : \Delta, (F(\hat{\varphi}), f) \dashv\vdash_{\mathcal{N}^2} \Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, t) \quad (6)$$

That is: if  $F(\hat{\varphi})$  is false, indicated by its  $f$ -location of the l.h.s., then  $\varphi$  is true, indicated by  $t$ -location of the r.h.s., and vice versa.

Note the use of a false conclusion in this formulation of the disquotation property of the falsity predicate. This is how the use of (binary)  $l$ -sequents overcomes the lack of direct means to refer to falsity without using (classical) negation.

Similarly, we can add to  $\mathcal{N}^2$  the following *pure* falsity transparency  $I/E$ -rules, not appealing to ' $\neg$ ':

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, f)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (F(\hat{\varphi}), t)} (FI_t) \quad \frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (F(\hat{\varphi}), t)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, f)} (FE_t) \quad (7)$$

Again, for the  $(FI_t)$ -rule, if  $\varphi$  is false, indicated by its location  $f$  in  $\Delta$  of the premise, then  $F(\hat{\varphi})$  is true, indicated by  $t$ -locating it in  $\Delta$  of the conclusion, and similarly for the  $(FE_t)$ -rule. Note that in the formulation of these rules, both false assumptions and false conclusions are employed.

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, t)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (F(\hat{\varphi}), f)} (FI_f) \quad \frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (F(\hat{\varphi}), f)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, t)} (FE_f) \quad (8)$$

Again, both (5) and (6) become derivable by means of the transparency  $I/E$ -rules for  $F(x)$ .

Next, those ideas are generalized for an arbitrary  $n \geq 2$ .

## 4. Truth, falsity and their uniqueness

In this section, I identify truth and falsity in  $\mathcal{V}$  and prove their uniqueness. Recall that no other connectives besides  $\mathcal{N}_i$  are assumed to be present.

#### 4.1. Identifying truth

##### Definition 4.1. (truth)

A truth-value  $v_j \in \mathcal{V}$ , for some  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , is a *truth* iff the following holds for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and every  $\varphi$ :

$$(N_i) \Gamma : \Delta, (N_i \varphi, j) \dashv\vdash_{\mathcal{N}^n} \Gamma : \Delta, \{(\varphi, k) \mid k \neq i\} \quad (9)$$

That is, for any  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the locating  $N_i \varphi$  at  $v_j$  (i.e., at a truth) is necessary and sufficient for locating  $\varphi$  itself with  $\{v_k \mid k \neq i\}$  (i.e., *not* with  $v_i$ ). Thus, being located with a truth assures the intended meaning of  $N_i \varphi$  as *not assigning*  $v_i$  to  $\varphi$  (for all  $i$ s).

For this definition to make sense, I need to show that truth is unique; that is, if  $v_j$  and  $v_k$  are truths, then  $j = k$ . The existence of a truth is shown at the end of the paper, in 27.

##### Proposition 4.2. (uniqueness of truth)

If both  $v_j$  and  $v_k$  are truths, then  $j = k$ .

**Proof:** Assume, towards a contradiction, that for  $j \neq k$  both  $v_j$  and  $v_k$  are truths. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (N_k \varphi, j) : (N_k \varphi, j) & \xrightarrow[\dashv\vdash_{\mathcal{N}^n}]{(N_t, \text{with } i=k)} (N_k \varphi, j) : \{(\varphi, m) \mid m \neq k\} \\ & \xrightarrow[\dashv\vdash_{\mathcal{N}^n}]{(N_t, \text{with } i=k)} (N_k \varphi, j) : (N_k \varphi, k) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

But,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(N_k \varphi, j) : (N_k \varphi, j) \quad (N_k \varphi, j) : (N_k \varphi, k)}{(*) \quad (N_k \varphi, j) :} (c_{j,k}) \\ & \frac{(*) \quad (N_k \varphi, j) :}{: \{(\varphi, m) \mid m \neq j\}} (shift) \\ & \frac{: \{(\varphi, m) \mid m \neq j\}}{: (N_k(N_k \varphi), j)} (N_t \text{ with } i = j) \quad \text{substitute } N_k \varphi \text{ for } \varphi \text{ in } (*) \\ & \frac{: (N_k(N_k \varphi), j)}{: (N_k(N_k \varphi), j)} (cut) : \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

a contradiction.

Thus,  $j = k$ .

For the coordination rule  $(c_{j,k})$  and the  $(cut)$  rule – see the appendix.

Since the numbering of the truth-values in  $\mathcal{V}$  is arbitrary, we assume henceforth that  $v_1$  is the unique truth in  $\mathcal{V}$ .

#### 4.2. Identifying falsity

##### Definition 4.3. (falsity)

A truth-value  $v_j \in \mathcal{V}$ , for some  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , is a *falsity* iff the following holds for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and every  $\varphi$ :

$$(N_f) \Gamma : \Delta, (N_i \varphi, j) \dashv\vdash_{\mathcal{N}^n} \Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, i) \quad (12)$$

That is, for any  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , locating  $N_i \varphi$  with  $v_j$  (i.e., a falsity) is necessary and sufficient for locating  $\varphi$  itself with  $v_i$ . Thus, being located at a falsity assures the intended meaning of  $N_i \varphi$  as *not assigning*  $v_i$  to  $\varphi$  (for all  $i$ s) does not hold.

Again, for this definition to make sense, I need to show that falsity is unique; that is, if  $v_j$  and  $v_k$  are falsities, then  $j = k$ . The existence of a falsity is shown at the end of the paper, in 5.27.

**Proposition 4.4. (uniqueness of falsity)**

If both  $v_j$  and  $v_k$  are falsities, then  $j = k$ .

**Proof:** Assume, towards a contradiction, that for  $j \neq k$  both  $v_j$  and  $v_k$  are falsities. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (N_k\varphi, j) : (N_k\varphi, j) & \xrightarrow[\vdash_{\mathcal{N}^n}]{(N_f, \text{with } i=k)} (N_k\varphi, j) : (\varphi, k) \\ & \xrightarrow[\vdash_{\mathcal{N}^n}]{(N_f, \text{with } i=k)} (N_k\varphi, j) : (N_k\varphi, k) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

But,

$$\frac{(N_k\varphi, j) : (N_k\varphi, j) \quad (N_k\varphi, j) : (N_k\varphi, k)}{(N_k\varphi, j) : (c_{j,k})} \quad (14)$$

A contradiction is now derived as in (11).

Thus,  $j = k$ .

Since the numbering of the truth-values in  $\mathcal{V}$  is arbitrary, we assume henceforth that  $v_n$  is the unique falsity in  $\mathcal{V}$ .

## 5. A natural deduction system for $N_i$

I again assume that  $N_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$  are all the operators in the object-language, ignoring at this point any other connectives.

### 5.1. The rules for $N_1$

Let us start with the case of  $N_1$ , with  $N_1\varphi$  being true (i.e., having truth-value  $v_1 = t$ ). In this case, by the intended interpretation,  $\varphi$  indeed does not have the truth-value  $v_1 = t$ .

The natural  $I/E$ -rules rules fitting the intended interpretation are the following (cf. (7)).

**$I$ -rule:**

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, \{(\varphi, j) \mid j \neq 1\}}{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, 1)} (N_1I_1) \quad (15)$$

The premise expresses that  $\varphi$  has any of the truth-values  $v_j$ , for  $j \neq 1$ , that is  $\varphi$  *having* truth-value  $v_1$ , *is not true*. The conclusion is that  $N_1\varphi$  is located at  $v_1$  (i.e., is true).

**$E$ -rule:**

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, 1)}{\Gamma : \Delta, \{(\varphi, j) \mid j \neq 1\}} (N_1E_1) \quad (16)$$

The premise expresses that  $N_1\varphi$  is true, located in  $v_1$ . The elimination is by distributing  $\varphi$  itself, disjunctively, to all  $v_j$ ,  $j \neq 1$ .

Next, consider the situation where  $N_1\varphi$  is false, i.e., having the truth-value  $v_n$ . In this case, by the intended interpretation, *it is not the case* that  $\varphi$  does not have the truth-value  $v_1 = t$ . In other words,  $\varphi$  has the value  $v_1$ .

The natural  $I/E$ -rules rules fitting the intended interpretation are the following.

**$I$ -rule:**

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, 1)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, n)} (N_1I_n) \quad (17)$$

**$E$ -rule:**

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, n)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, 1)} (N_1E_n) \quad (18)$$

Next, suppose  $1 < i \leq n$ , and suppose  $N_1\varphi$  has truth value  $v_i$ .

**A failing attempt:**

To direct the thought, consider first  $i = 2$  and suppose that  $v_2$ , in some sense, means “almost true”. What does it mean that it is “almost true” that  $\varphi$  does not have the truth-value  $v_1 = t$ ?

A suggestive interpretation of this situation is that either  $\varphi$  has *just one* other truth-value  $v_j$  for  $j \neq 1$ , or it *does* have truth-value  $v_1$ .

Generalizing, it is suggestive to interpret  $\varphi$  not having truth-value  $v_1 = t$  to a truth degree  $v_i$  as either  $\varphi$  having any other truth-value  $v_j \in A \subset \mathcal{V}$ , where  $A$  is of size  $i - 1$ , or  $\varphi$  *does* have the value  $v_1$ .

This would lead to the following  $I/E$ -rules:

**$I$ -rule:** For some  $A \subset \hat{n}$  of size  $i - 1$ , where  $1 \notin A$ , there is a rule

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, A \cup \{1\})}{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, i)} (N_1I_A - attempted) \quad (19)$$

The premise expresses that  $\varphi$  has one of the  $i - 1$  truth-values in  $A$  (that exclude  $v_1$ ), or does have truth-value  $v_1$ . The conclusion locates  $N_1\varphi$  in  $v_i$ .

**$E$ -rule:** For every  $A \subset \hat{n}$  of size  $i - 1$ , where  $1 \notin A$ , there is a rule

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, i)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, A \cup \{1\})} (N_1E_A - attempted) \quad (20)$$

The premise asserts that  $N_1\varphi$  has truth-value  $v_i$ . The conclusion distributes  $\varphi$  disjunctively among the  $i - 1$  truth-values (excluding  $v_1$ ), or in  $v_1$ .

Unfortunately, *this attempt fails!*

Consider the following derivation.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, n)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, 1)} (N_1E_n)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, A \cup \{1\})} (W)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, j), j \neq n} (N_1I_A - attempted)$$



But by applying coordination to the assumption and conclusion of the above derivation, we get

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, j, j \neq n) \quad \Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, n)}{\Gamma : \Delta} (c_{j,n})$$

That is,  $N_1\varphi$  “disappeared”! This is, of course, wrong.

To understand what is going on and reach the correct rules, consider again the informal interpretation of  $N_1\varphi$ : it means negating *in the meta-language* that the truth-value of  $\varphi$  is  $v_1$ . However, the meta-language employs classical logic, which is bivalent. Recall that  $N_1\varphi$  having truth-value  $v_i$  means that, for a “truth-degree”  $i$ ,  $\varphi$  does not have the truth-value  $v_1$ . So, the above interpretation must be either true or false. Thus, in the logic,  $N_1\varphi$  can only be located at  $v_1$  (truth) or  $v_n$  falsity. It cannot be located at any other  $v_j$ ,  $j \neq 1, n$ .

This is reflected in  $(N_1\varphi, j)$  having *no* I-rule, and the following E-rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_1\varphi, j), j \neq 1, n}{\Gamma : \Delta} (N_1E_j) \quad (21)$$

## 5.2. The general case $N_k$

I now apply the same considerations to the general case  $N_k$  for  $1 < k \leq n$ .

**I-rule:**

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, \{(\varphi, j) \mid j \neq k\}}{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_k\varphi, v_1)} (N_kI_1) \quad (22)$$

The premise expresses that  $\varphi$  has any of the truth-values  $v_j$ , for  $j \neq k$ , that is  $\varphi$  *having* truth-value  $v_k$ , *is not true*. The conclusion is that  $N_k\varphi$  is located at  $v_1$  (i.e., is true).

**E-rule:**

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_k\varphi, v_1)}{\Gamma : \Delta, \{(\varphi, j) \mid j \neq k\}} (N_kE_1) \quad (23)$$

The premise expresses that  $N_1\varphi$  is true, located in  $v_1$ . The elimination is by distributing  $\varphi$  itself, disjunctively, to all  $v_j$ ,  $j \neq k$ .

Next, consider the situation where  $N_k\varphi$  is false, i.e., having the truth-value  $v_n$ . In this case, by the intended interpretation, *it is not the case* that  $\varphi$  does not have the truth-value  $v_k$ . In other words,  $\varphi$  *has* the value  $v_k$ .

The natural *I/E*-rules rules fitting the intended interpretation are the following.

**I-rule:**

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, k)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_k\varphi, n)} (N_kI_n) \quad (24)$$

**E-rule:**

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_k\varphi, n)}{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, k)} (N_kE_n) \quad (25)$$

Again,  $N_k\varphi$  cannot have any other truth-value except  $v_1$  or  $v_n$ . This is again reflected in  $(N_k\varphi)$  having *no* I-rule, and the following E-rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (N_k\varphi, j), j \neq 1, n}{\Gamma : \Delta} (N_k E_j) \quad (26)$$

A somewhat tedious calculation can show that those *I/E*-rules are generated, by the recipe for operational rules in the appendix, from the following truth-tables for the  $N_i$ s:

$$\begin{aligned} N_i(v_j) &= v_1, \text{ for } j \neq i \\ N_i(v_i) &= v_n \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

This establishes the existence of truth and falsity in the general case.

### Appendix: The proof-system $\mathcal{N}^n$

**initial poly-sequents:** For every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ :  $\Gamma, (\varphi, i) : \Delta, (\varphi, i)$

**shifting rules:**

$$\frac{\Gamma, (\varphi, i) : \Delta}{\Gamma : \Delta, \varphi \times i} (\vec{s}_i) \quad \frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, i)}{\Gamma, (\varphi, j) : \Delta} (\overleftarrow{s}_{i,j}), j \neq i$$

**coordination:**

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, i) \quad \Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi, j)}{\Gamma : \Delta} (c_{i,j}), i \neq j$$

From  $(c_{i,j})$  the *Weakening* rules are derivable:

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta}{\Gamma, \Gamma' : \Delta} (WL) \quad \frac{\Gamma : \Delta}{\Gamma : \Delta, \Delta'} (WR)$$

**operational rules:** Those are irrelevant here, and are presented for completeness only. The guiding lines for the construction are the following, expressed in terms of a generic  $p$ -ary operator, say ‘\*’.

(*\*I*): Such rules introduce a conclusion  $\Gamma : \Delta, (*(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_p), k)$ .

- In general, if in the truth-table for ‘\*’ the values  $v_{i_j}$  for  $\varphi_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq p$ , yield the value  $v_k$  for  $*(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_p)$ , then there is a rule

$$\frac{\{\Gamma : \Delta, (\varphi_j, i_j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq p\}}{\Gamma : \Delta, (*(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_p), k)} (*I_{i_1, \dots, i_p, k})$$

The rule  $(*I_{i_1, \dots, i_p, k})$  has, thus,  $p$  premises.

(*\*E*): Such rules have a major premise  $\Gamma : \Delta, (*(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_p), k)$ .

$$\frac{\Gamma : \Delta, (*(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_p), k) \quad \{\Gamma, *(\varphi_1, k_1), \dots, (\varphi_p, k_p) : \Delta \mid * (v_{k_1}, \dots, v_{k_p}) = v_k\}}{\Gamma : \Delta} (*E_k)$$

for each  $k = 1, \dots, n$ .

A detailed discussion of this system, presented in a different but equivalent notation, can be found in [4].

**Acknowledgement** I thank Michael Kaminski for his involvement in this paper.

## References

- [1] Nuel D. Belnap. How a computer should think. In Gilbert Ryle, editor, *Contemporary aspects of philosophy*, pages 30–56. Stocksfield:Oriel Press, 1976.
- [2] Nuel D. Belnap. A useful four-valued logic. In J. Michael Dunn and George Epstein, editors, *Modern uses of multiple-valued logic*, pages 8–37. Dordrecht:Reidl, 1977.
- [3] J. Michael Dunn. Intuitive semantics for first-degree entailments and ‘coupled trees’. *Philosophical Studies*, 29:149–168, 1976.
- [4] Nissim Francez and Michael Kaminski. On poly-logistic natural-deduction for finitely-valued propositional logics. *Journal of Applied Logic*, 6:255–288, 2019. Special issue for papers presented at ISRALOG17, Haifa, October 2017.
- [5] Nissim Francez and Michael Kaminski. Transparent truth-value predicates in multi-valued logics. *Logique et Analyse*, 62(245):55–71, 2019. doi: 10.2143/LEA.245.0.3285705.
- [6] Michael Kaminski and Nissim Francez. Calculi for multi-valued logics. *Logica Universalis*, 15(2):193–226, 2021.
- [7] Stephen C. Kleene. *Introduction to metamathematics*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1952.
- [8] Emil Post. Introduction to a general theory of elementary propositions. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 43(3):163–185, 1921.