

An ecumenical view of proof-theoretic semantics

Victor Nascimento*, Luiz Carlos Pereira**, and Elaine Pimentel***

UERJ/CNPq, Brazil
University College London, UK

Abstract. Debates concerning philosophical grounds for the validity of classical and intuitionistic logics often have the very nature of logical proofs as one of the main points of controversy. The intuitionist advocates for a strict notion of constructive proof, while the classical logician advocates for a notion which allows non-constructive proofs through *reductio ad absurdum*. A great deal of controversy still subsists to this day on the matter, as there is no agreement between disputants on the precise standing of non-constructive methods.

Two very distinct approaches to logic are currently providing interesting contributions to this debate. The first, oftentimes called *logical ecumenism* [15], aims to provide a unified framework in which two “rival” logics may peacefully coexist, thus providing some sort of neutral ground for the contestants. The second, *proof-theoretic semantics* [20], aims not only to elucidate the meaning of a logical proof, but also to provide means for its use as a basic concept of semantic analysis. Logical ecumenism thus provides a medium in which meaningful interactions may occur between classical and intuitionistic logic, whilst proof-theoretic semantics provides a way of clarifying what is at stake when one accepts or denies *reductio ad absurdum* as a meaningful proof method.

In this paper we show how to coherently combine both approaches by providing not only a medium in which classical and intuitionistic *logics* may coexist, but also one in which classical and intuitionistic *notions of proof* may coexist.

1 Introduction

What is the meaning of a logical connective? This is a very difficult and controversial question, for many reasons. First of all, it depends on the logical setting. For example, asserting that

$A \vee B$ is valid only if it is possible to give a proof of either A or B

* Nascimento is supported in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.

** Pereira is supported by the following projects: CAPES/PRINT, CNPq-313400/2021-0, and CNPq-Gaps and Gluts.

*** Pimentel has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement Number 101007627.

clearly does not correctly determine the meaning of the classical disjunction. It turns out, as shown in [14] and further analysed in [17,7], that this also does not seem enough for determining meaning in intuitionistic logic, due to the intrinsic non-determinism on choosing between A or B for validating $A \vee B$.

In model-theoretic semantics, mathematical structures help on supporting the notion of validity, which is based on a notion of *truth*. In the case of intuitionistic logic, for example, one could use Kripke structures, where the validation of atomic propositions using the classical notion of truth (*e.g.* via truth tables) is enough for describing the meaning of the disjunction *in a given world*, where worlds are organised in a pre-order.

Although it became common to specify the meaning of formulas in terms of truth conditions, we agree with Quine’s objection to that, quoting Prawitz [16]

Following Tarski, he [Quine] states truth conditions of compound sentences, not as a way to explain the logical constants, but as a first step in a definition of logical truth or logical consequence, which Quine takes to demarcate the logic that he is interested in. He points out that the truth conditions do not explain negation, conjunction, existential quantification and so on, because the conditions are using the corresponding logical constants and are thus presupposing an understanding of the very constants that they would explain. I think that he is essentially right in saying so and that the situation is even worse: when stating truth conditions, one is using an ambiguous natural language expression that is to be taken in a certain specific way, namely in exactly the sense that the truth condition is meant to specify.

Proof-theoretic semantics [21,22,23] (PtS) provides an alternative perspective for the meaning of logical operators compared to the viewpoint offered by model-theoretic semantics. In PtS, the concept of *truth* is substituted with that of *proof*, emphasizing the fundamental nature of proofs as a means through which we gain demonstrative knowledge, particularly in mathematical contexts. PtS has as philosophical background *inferentialism* [2], according to which inferences and the rules of inference establish the meaning of expressions. This makes PtS a superior approach for comprehending reasoning since it ensures that the meaning of logical operators, such as connectives in logics, is defined based on their usage in inference.

Base-extension semantics [19] (BeS) is a strand of PtS where proof-theoretic validity is defined relative to a given collection S of inference rules regarding basic formulas of the language.¹ Hence, for example, while satisfiability of an atomic formula p at a state w in a Kripke model $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, V)$ is often given by

$$w \Vdash p \quad \text{iff} \quad w \in V(p)$$

¹ It should be noted that, in [19], base rules are restricted to formulas in the logic-free fragment only, that is, to *atomic propositions*. Here we will follow [14] and give the unity \perp an “atomic status”, allowing it to appear in atomic rules.

in BeS, validity w.r.t. a set S of atomic rules has the general shape

$$\Vdash_S p \quad \text{iff} \quad \vdash_S p$$

where $\vdash_S p$ indicates that p is *derivable* in the proof system determined by S .

Although the BeS project has been successfully developed for intuitionistic [19] and classical logics [18,11], it has not been yet systematically developed as a foundation for logical reasoning [4,9,6]. In this paper, we intend to move on with this quest, by proposing a BeS view of *ecumenical logics*, inspired by Prawitz' [16] proposal of a system combining classical and intuitionistic logics.

In Prawitz' system, the classical logician and the intuitionistic logician would share the universal quantifier, conjunction, negation and the constant for the absurdity, but they would each have their own existential quantifier, disjunction and implication, with different meanings. Prawitz' main motivation was to provide a logical framework that would make possible an inferentialist semantics for the classical logical constants. In this way, inferentialism brought forth a very specific proposal when it emerged in the ecumenical context: to provide acceptable assertability conditions for the operators of a certain logical system in another logical system which does not accept them, thus allowing the acceptance and reinterpretation of the previously rejected operators under the new inferential guise. In the context of conflicting discussions between classical and intuitionistic logicians, this would be comparable to defining assertability conditions for classical operators inside intuitionistic logic, which Prawitz actually does in [16]. Therefore, the inferentialist's main task is to create ecumenical connectives that, with the assertability conditions exposed in its inferential rules, can represent connectives accepted by one of the logical systems and rejected by the others inside the ecumenical environment.

In this work we *do not* intend to provide a BeS for Prawitz' original system, but rather to proceed with a careful analysis on different aspects of BeS for logical systems where classical and intuitionistic notions of proof coexist in peace (*i.e.* without collapsing). We start by proposing a *weak* version of BeS (in Section 3). This version relies on the concepts of local and global validity (see *e.g.* [3]), enabling us to examine various aspects of both classical and intuitionistic validities. In particular we demonstrate that, while intuitionistic validity has the property of *monotonicity*, meaning it remains unchanged under extensions, this characteristic does not hold true for classical formulas. This observation gives rise to the motto:

Classical proof plus monotonicity equals intuitionistic proof of double negation.

In Section 4 we will unwrap the full power of ecumenical BeS, by showing a strong notion of validity. In Section 5 we propose the ecumenical natural deduction system NE_B , and prove its soundness and completeness w.r.t. of such (proof-theoretic) semantic. We then conclude with some ideas to push forward the PtS agenda for ecumenical systems.

2 Base extension semantics

We will adopt Sandqvist's [19] terminology, adapted to the ecumenical setting.

The propositional *base language* is assumed to have a set $\text{At} = \{p_1, p_2, \dots\}$ of countably many atomic propositions, together with the unity \perp . The set $\text{At} \cup \{\perp\}$ will be denoted by At_\perp , and its elements will be called *basic sentences*.

We use, as does Sandqvist, systems containing natural deduction rules over basic sentences for the semantical analysis, and we allow rules to discharge basic hypothesis. Unlike Sandqvist, however, we allow the logical constant \perp to be manipulated by the rules.

Definition 1 (Atomic systems). *An atomic system (a.k.a. a basis) S is a (possibly empty) set of atomic rules of the form*

$$\frac{[A_1] \quad \dots \quad [A_n]}{a}$$

where $a_i, a \in \text{At}_\perp$ and A_i is a (possibly empty) set of basic sentences. The set of premises in a rule can be empty – in this case the rule is called an atomic axiom.

An atomic system S^n is an extension of an atomic system S (written $S \subseteq S^n$), if S^n results from adding a (possibly empty) set of atomic rules to S .

The deducibility relation \vdash_S coincides with the usual notion in the system of natural deduction consisting of just the rules in S , that is, $a_1, \dots, a_n \vdash_S a$ iff there exists a deduction whose conclusion is a and all of whose undischarged premises are members of S .

Finally, an atomic system S is called consistent if $\not\vdash_S \perp$.

2.1 Ecumenical semantic clauses

In the ecumenical setting we require all atomic systems to be consistent. Hence, whenever considering atomic systems S and extensions of S , it is implicitly considered that only consistent extensions are being taken into account.

Propositional formulas are built from basic sentences using the binary connectives $\rightarrow, \wedge, \vee$. The ecumenical language is defined as follows.

Definition 2. *The ecumenical language \mathcal{L} is comprised of the following ecumenical formulas.*

1. If $a \in \text{At}_\perp$, then $a^i, a^c \in \mathcal{L}$;
2. If $A, B \in \mathcal{L}$, then $(A \wedge B)^i, (A \vee B)^i, (A \rightarrow B)^i \in \mathcal{L}$;
3. If $A, B \in \mathcal{L}$, then $(A \wedge B)^c, (A \vee B)^c, (A \rightarrow B)^c \in \mathcal{L}$;

Notation 1 *Parenthesis are omitted whenever no confusion ensues. For easing the notation, $\neg A, A \rightarrow B, A \wedge B$ and $A \vee B$ will be abbreviations of $(A \rightarrow \perp)^i$, $(A \rightarrow B)^i, (A \wedge B)^i, (A \vee B)^i$, respectively. Finally, we stipulate that if a formula A is used without specification of its superscript, then it may be either i or c .*

Intuitively, a *intuitionistic formula* A^i represent the existence of a intuitionistic proof of A , and a *classical formula* A^c represents the existence of a classical proof of A . Since every formula of the usual language has both a classical and a intuitionistic version, every formula *may have* classical and intuitionistic proofs.

In this paper, we will focus on two definitions of semantic ecumenism, called *weak* and *strong* ecumenical semantics, respectively. In both of them, the semantics of classical proofs is given in terms of the consistency of formulas w.r.t. some atomic system, but the notions induce the classical behaviour in very different ways.

It should be observed that the weak ecumenical semantics proposed next does not have a simple syntactic characterization, and its study is meant for semantic purposes only – the goal is to explore deeply the ecumenical proof-theoretic behaviour. We present, in Section 5, an interesting ecumenical natural deduction system which is sound and complete w.r.t. the strong ecumenical semantics described in Section 4.

3 Weak ecumenical semantics

We start by distinguishing between two notions of logical validity for every atomic system S : *local* logical validity (represented by \Vdash_S^L) and *global* logical validity (represented by \Vdash_S^G). Reasons for this will become clearer later.

A weak ecumenical version of BeS is given by the definition below. As usual, we start by giving semantic conditions for basic sentences in atomic systems, expanding them through semantic clauses.

Definition 3 (Weak Validity). *Weak S -validity and weak validity are defined as follows.*

1. $\Vdash_S^L a^i$ iff $\vdash_S a$, for $a \in \text{At}_\perp$;
2. $\Vdash_S^L a^c$ iff $a \not\vdash_S \perp$, for $a \in \text{At}_\perp$;
3. $\Vdash_S^L A^c$ iff $A^i \not\vdash_S \perp$, for $A \notin \text{At}_\perp$;
4. $\Vdash_S^L (A \wedge B)^i$ iff $\Vdash_S^L A$ and $\Vdash_S^L B$;
5. $\Vdash_S^L (A \rightarrow B)^i$ iff $A \Vdash_S^G B$;
6. $\Vdash_S^L (A \vee B)^i$ iff $\forall S^n (S \subseteq S^n)$ and all $a \in \text{At}_\perp$, $A \Vdash_{S^n}^L a^i$ and $B \Vdash_{S^n}^L a^i$ implies $\Vdash_{S^n}^L a^i$;
7. For non-empty Γ , we have that $\Gamma \Vdash_S^L A$ iff for all S^n such that $S \subseteq S^n$ it holds that, if $\Vdash_{S^n}^L B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$, then $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A$;
8. $\Gamma \Vdash_S^G A$ iff for all S^n such that $S \subseteq S^n$ we have that, if for all S^m such that $S^n \subseteq S^m$ it holds that $\Vdash_{S^m}^L B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$, then for all S^m such that $S^n \subseteq S^m$ it also holds that $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A$;
9. $\Gamma \Vdash A$ iff $\Gamma \Vdash_S^G A$ for all S .

Note that our consistency requirement gives a distinct treatment to \perp when compared to the semantic clause used by Sandqvist² Moreover, while Clause 7 is the same as Sandqvist's clause "(Inf)", Clause 8 is slightly more complex. Indeed, Clauses 7 and 8 are stated separately so as to distinguish between *local* and *global* notions of logical validity [3]. This distinction is redundant in usual intuitionistic semantics, but it is essential in the weak version of ecumenical BeS.

Clause 8 could also be rewritten as follows (and we shall use both definitions interchangeably).

Lemma 1. $\Gamma \Vdash_S^G A$ iff $(\Vdash_S^G \Gamma$ implies $\Vdash_S^G A)$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Assume $\Gamma \Vdash_S^G A$. Then for every extension $S \subseteq S^n$ the following holds: if for every $S^n \subseteq S^m$ we have that $\Vdash_{S^m}^L B$ holds for every $B \in \Gamma$, then for every $S^n \subseteq S^m$ it also holds that $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A$. Now assume $\Vdash_S^G \Gamma$. By Clause 7 we have that, for every $S \subseteq S^j$, it holds for every $S^j \subseteq S^k$ that $\Vdash_{S^k}^L B$ for every $B \in \Gamma$. By putting $S^j = S^k = S$ we have $\Vdash_S^L B$ for every $B \in \Gamma$. And then we put $S^n = S$ to conclude $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A$ for all extension S^m of S , which yields $\Vdash_S^G A$.

(\Leftarrow) Assume $(\Vdash_S^G \Gamma$ implies $\Vdash_S^G A)$. Then the following holds: if for all $S \subseteq S^n$ we have that for all S^m such that $S^n \subseteq S^m$ it holds that $\Vdash_{S^m}^L B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$ (which is the same as $\Vdash_S^G \Gamma$), then for all S^m such that $S^n \subseteq S^m$ it also holds that $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A$ (which is the same as $\Vdash_S^G A$). But this is just a restatement of Clause 7, which proves the result. \square

The following result follow easily from Definition 3 and the requirement of atomic systems to be consistent.

Lemma 2. $\perp^i \Vdash \perp^c$ and vice-versa.

Due to this result, from now on \perp will be used as an abbreviation of \perp^i ($\equiv \perp^c$) in semantic contexts.

Proposition 1. For any S , $\not\Vdash_S \perp$.

Proof. This follows immediately from Clause 1 of Definition 3, the consistency requirement and Lemma 2. \square

The next result, although expected since intuitionistic provability implies classical provability, is only possible due to the change from Sandqvist's clause for \perp to the consistency requirement.

Theorem 2. $A^i \Vdash_S^L A^c$.

Proof. Assume that $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A^i$ for some $S \subseteq S^n$ and suppose that $A^i \not\Vdash_{S^n}^L \perp$. Then by Clause 7 of Definition 3 we have $\Vdash_{S^n}^L \perp$, which yields $\Vdash_{S^n} \perp$ by Clause 1, which is a contradiction. Thus, $A^i \not\Vdash_{S^n}^L \perp$, and so $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A^c$. Since S^n is an arbitrary extension of S , we have $A^i \Vdash_S^L A^c$ by Clause 7. \square

If Sandqvist's definition was used, from $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A^i$ and $A^i \not\Vdash_{S^n}^L \perp$ we could get $\Vdash_{S^n}^L a^i$ for arbitrary $a \in \text{At}_\perp$, but it would not be the case that $A^i \not\Vdash_{S^n}^L \perp$.

² In [19] the S -validity of \perp is defined as: $\Vdash_S \perp$ iff $\Vdash_S p$ for every atomic p .

3.1 Monotonicity

It is well known that BeS validity in intuitionistic logic is *monotonic*, in the sense that it is stable under base extensions. As it turns out, this is not the case in the ecumenical setting, as discussed next.

Definition 4 (Monotonicity). *A formula A is called S -monotonic with respect to an atomic system S if, for all $S \subseteq S^n$, $\Vdash_S^L A$ implies $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A$. A is called monotonic if it is S -monotonic for any atomic system S .*

Some parts of Clause 8 come for free in the presence of monotonicity (as shown next), but they must be explicitly stated on the lack of it. As such, the original notion of logical consequence provides only a weak kind of validation for non-monotonic formulas, and thus would indirectly treat classical and intuitionistic formulas *very differently*.

Theorem 3. *If S -monotonicity holds for A and all formulas in Γ , then $\Gamma \Vdash_S^L A$ iff $\Gamma \Vdash_S^G A$.*

Proof. The result is trivial if $\Gamma = \emptyset$, so we will assume Γ non-empty.

(\Rightarrow) Suppose $\Gamma \Vdash_S^L A$. Then, by Clause 7, for every S^n such that $S \subseteq S^n$ we have that, if $\Vdash_{S^n}^L B$ for every $B \in \Gamma$ then $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A$.

Now, let S^j be any such S^n in which, for all S^k such that $S^j \subseteq S^k$, we have that $\Vdash_{S^k}^L B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$. Since $S^j \subseteq S^j$, we have $\Vdash_{S^j}^L B$ for every $B \in \Gamma$ and, combining this with the information on the first part of this proof, we have $\Vdash_{S^j}^L A$. But by S -monotonicity we also have that $\Vdash_{S^j}^L A$ implies $\Vdash_{S^k}^L A$ for all S^k such that $S^j \subseteq S^k$ and, since S^j was an arbitrary extension of S satisfying the antecedent of the second part of Clause 7, we have $\Gamma \Vdash_S^G A$.

(\Leftarrow) Assume $\Gamma \Vdash_S^G A$. Then, by Clause 7, for every S^n such that $S \subseteq S^n$ we have that, if $\Vdash_{S^m}^L B$ for every $B \in \Gamma$ and for all S^m such that $S^n \subseteq S^m$ then $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A$ for all such S^m as well.

Now, let S^j be any extension of S such that $\Vdash_{S^j}^L B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$. By monotonicity, for all formulas $B \in \Gamma$ we have that, if $\Vdash_{S^j}^L B$, then $\Vdash_{S^k}^L B$ for every S^k such that $S^j \subseteq S^k$. Together with the information on the first part of this proof, this yields $\Vdash_{S^k}^L A$ for all such S^k . In particular, since $S^j \subseteq S^j$ we have $\Vdash_{S^j}^L A$ and, since S^j was an arbitrary extension of S satisfying the antecedent of the second part of Clause 7, we have $\Gamma \Vdash_S^L A$. \square

Even though intuitionistic atoms and connectives are monotonic, this is not the case in the classical setting.

Theorem 4. *Every formula containing only intuitionistic subformulas is monotonic. Classical atoms are not monotonic.*

Proof. The result for formulas containing only intuitionistic subformulas is easily proven by induction on the complexity of the formula in the same way as in [19, Lemma 3.2. (a)], where the induction hypothesis is only needed for the case of conjunction (the case for implication holds directly from the definition of general validity).

Regarding classical atoms, for $S = \emptyset$ we have that $p \not\llcorner_S \perp$ for every $p \in \text{At}$. But if S^n is the atomic system containing only the rule obtaining \perp from p , S^n is consistent and $p \vdash_{S^n} \perp$. Hence $\Vdash_S^L p^c$ and $S \subseteq S^n$, but $\not\llcorner_{S^n}^L p^c$. \square

In short, for intuitionistic formulas it is irrelevant whether local or global notions of validity is used. For ecumenical formulas containing classical subformulas, however, this choice makes an enormous difference, as illustrated in Section 3.3.

3.2 Basic lemmata

Before proceeding, we shall briefly present some lemmas which will be handy on what comes next. The proofs are in the Appendix A.

We start by showing that local validity implies global validity, and that the converse hold, in general, only in the case of empty contexts – a counter-example for Lemma 4 with non-empty contexts is given in Theorem 6.

Lemma 3. $\Gamma \Vdash_S^L A$ implies $\Gamma \Vdash_S^G A$.

Lemma 4. $\Vdash_S^G A$ implies $\Vdash_S^L A$.

The following is a form of global *modus ponens*.

Lemma 5. $\Vdash_S^G A$ and $A \Vdash_S^G B$ implies $\Vdash_S^G B$.

Finally, the following results show interactions between monotonicity, global validity and negation.

Lemma 6. If $\Vdash_S^L A$, S -monotonicity holds for A and $A \Vdash_S^G B$, then both $\Vdash_S^L B$ and $\Vdash_S^G B$.

Lemma 7. $(p \vdash_S \perp)$ iff $(p^i \Vdash_S^L \perp)$ iff $(p^i \Vdash_S^G \perp)$ iff $(\Vdash_S^L \neg p^i)$.

Corollary 1. $\Vdash_S^L p^c$ iff $p^i \not\llcorner_S^L \perp$.

Lemma 8. $A \not\llcorner_S^L \perp$ iff there is some $S \subseteq S^n$ such that $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A$.

3.3 Weak ecumenical behaviour

This section will be devoted to show some interesting behaviours when monotonicity does not hold for ecumenical formulas. Notice that, due to Corollary 1, classical atoms p^c and classical non-atomic formulas A^c may be treated uniformly in some cases.

Theorem 5. $A^c \Vdash \neg\neg A^i$ and $\neg\neg A^i \Vdash A^c$.

Proof. Let's first prove that $A^c \Vdash_S^G \neg\neg A^i$ holds for arbitrary S . Let S be an arbitrary atomic system. Let S^n be any extension of S such that, for all $S^m \subseteq S^n$, we have $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A^c$. Suppose there is some $S^n \subseteq S^k$ such that $\Vdash_{S^k}^L \neg A^i$. Since $S^n \subseteq S^k$, we also have $\Vdash_{S^k}^L A^c$, and thus $A^i \not\llcorner_{S^k}^L \perp$. By Lemma 8 we have that there is some $S^k \subseteq S^j$ such that $\Vdash_{S^j}^L A$. But, since $\Vdash_{S^k}^L \neg A^i$ and $S^k \subseteq S^j$,

we have $\Vdash_{S^j}^L \perp$, and thus $\vdash_{S^j} \perp$. Contradiction. Thus, for all extensions S^m of S^n we have $\not\Vdash_{S^m}^L \neg A^i$, which can be used together with Clause 5 to conclude $\Vdash_{S^m}^L \neg\neg A^i$ vacuously for all S^m and then conclude $A^c \Vdash_S^G \neg\neg A^i$.

Now, let's prove $\neg\neg A^i \Vdash A^c$, which amounts to proving $\neg\neg A^i \Vdash_S^G A^c$ for arbitrary S . Let S be an arbitrary atomic system. Let S^n be any extension of S such that, for all S^m for which $S^n \subseteq S^m$, we have that $\Vdash_{S^m}^L \neg\neg A^i$ holds. Assume that for some $S^n \subseteq S^k$, we have $A^i \Vdash_{S^k}^L \perp$. By Lemma 3, we have $A^i \Vdash_{S^k}^G \perp$, and thus $\Vdash_{S^k}^L \neg A^i$. By applying Lemma 3 once again we have $\Vdash_{S^k}^G \neg A^i$. But, since $S \subseteq S^n$, we have $\Vdash_{S^k}^L \neg\neg A^i$, which yields $\neg A \Vdash_{S^k}^G \perp$ by the clause for implication. We then conclude $\Vdash_{S^k}^G \perp$ by Lemma 5, which yields $\Vdash_{S^k}^L \perp$ by Lemma 4 and thus $\vdash_{S^k} \perp$, yielding a contradiction. We then finally conclude $A^i \not\Vdash_{S^m}^L \perp$ and thus $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A^c$ for arbitrary S^m extending S^n , and since S^n and S were arbitrary we conclude $\neg\neg A \Vdash_S^G A^c$, as desired. \square

The next two results are interesting, showing the globally validity can be preserved locally, but this is not always the case.

Theorem 6. $A^c \Vdash_S^L \neg\neg A^i$ does not hold for arbitrary S .

Proof. We prove the result for atoms. Consider the atomic system \emptyset , which contains no rules. Clearly, since $p \not\Vdash_{\emptyset} \perp$, we have $\Vdash_{\emptyset}^L p^c$. Suppose that $\Vdash_{\emptyset}^L \neg\neg p^i$. Consider now an extension S of \emptyset containing a rule which concludes \perp from the premise p . Hence $p \vdash_S \perp$ and, due to Lemma 7, $\Vdash_S^L \neg p^i$ holds. Since $\neg\neg p^i$ is intuitionistic, it is monotonic, and thus $\Vdash_{\emptyset}^L \neg\neg p^i$ implies $\Vdash_S^L \neg\neg p^i$. By the semantic clause for implication we then have $\neg p^i \Vdash_S^G \perp$ and, since $\Vdash_S^L \neg p^i$, by Lemma 6, we have $\Vdash_S^L \perp$, and thus $\vdash_S \perp$. Contradiction. Thus $\not\Vdash_{\emptyset}^L \neg\neg p^i$ and, since this set is an extension of itself, $p^c \not\Vdash_{\emptyset}^L \neg\neg p^i$. \square

Theorem 7. $\neg\neg A^i \Vdash_S^L A^c$ holds for arbitrary S .

Proof. Let S be any system. Consider any $S \subseteq S^n$ such that $\Vdash_{S^n}^L \neg\neg A^i$. By the clause for implication, $\neg A^i \Vdash_{S^n}^G \perp$. Assume $A^i \Vdash_{S^n}^L \perp$. Then we have $A^i \Vdash_S^G \perp$ by Lemma 3, $\Vdash_{S^n}^L \neg A^i$ by the clause for implication and $\Vdash_{S^n}^G \neg A^i$ by another application of Lemma 3. This yields $\Vdash_{S^n}^G \perp$, which leads to a contradiction. Then we conclude $A^i \not\Vdash_{S^n}^L \perp$, and thus $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A^c$. \square

Remark 1. Put together, these results show that classical proof of A is strictly weaker than a intuitionistic proof of $\neg\neg A$, and justify the motto presented in the Introduction.

The following results present ecumenical versions of the excluded middle and Peirce's law.

Theorem 8. $\Vdash_S^L A^c \vee \neg A^i$ holds for arbitrary S .

Proof. Let S be any system. Let S^n be any extension of S in which, for all S^m such that $S^n \subseteq S^m$, $A^c \Vdash_{S^m}^L q^i$ and $\neg A^i \Vdash_{S^m}^L q^i$, for every atom q . Suppose

$A^i \Vdash_{S^m}^L \perp$ holds for any of those S^m . Then $A^i \Vdash_{S^m}^G \perp$ holds due to Lemma 3, and thus $\Vdash_{S^m}^L \neg A^i$ holds. Since $\neg A^i \Vdash_{S^m}^L q^i$ for arbitrary q , we have $\Vdash_{S^m}^L q^i$ for arbitrary q . Now, suppose $A^i \not\Vdash_{S^m}^L \perp$ holds for any of those S^m . Then we have that $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A^c$ holds. Since $A^c \Vdash_{S^m}^L q^i$ holds for arbitrary atomic q^i , we conclude $\Vdash_{S^m}^L q^i$ for arbitrary q . Thus, since for any such S^m we conclude $\Vdash_{S^m}^L q^i$ for arbitrary q in all possible cases (as for all systems S it holds that either $A^i \Vdash_S^L \perp$ or $A^i \not\Vdash_S^L \perp$), we have $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A^c \vee \neg A^i$. \square

Theorem 9. $\Vdash_S^L ((A^i \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A^i) \rightarrow A^c$ holds for arbitrary S .

Proof. Let S be any system. Let S^n be any extension of S such that, for all S^m for which $S^n \subseteq S^m$ holds, $\Vdash_{S^m}^L (A^i \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A^i$ holds. Then, by definition, for all those S^m we have $(A^i \rightarrow B) \Vdash_{S^m}^G A^i$. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that for some of those S^m we have $\not\Vdash_{S^m}^L A^c$. Then we have $A^i \Vdash_{S^m}^L \perp$ by Clause 3 and Corollary 1, and thus $A^i \Vdash_{S^m}^G \perp$ by Lemma 3.

Then, since $A^i \Vdash_{S^m}^G \perp$ and for all $S^m \subseteq S^j$ we have $\not\Vdash_{S^j}^G \perp$, we get $\not\Vdash_{S^j}^G A^i$ for every S^j using the contrapositive of Lemma 5, a fact that can be combined with the clause for implication to show $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A^i \rightarrow B$ for any B , and thus $\Vdash_{S^m}^G A^i \rightarrow B$ by Lemma 3. But we also have $\Vdash_{S^m}^L (A^i \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A^i$ for all S^m , and thus $(A^i \rightarrow B) \Vdash_{S^m}^G A^i$ holds for this arbitrary S^m , which yields $\Vdash_{S^m}^G A^i$ via Lemma 5. Since $\Vdash_{S^m}^G A^i$ and $A^i \Vdash_{S^m}^G \perp$, we also have $\Vdash_{S^m}^G \perp$ by Lemma 5, which yields the desired contradiction. Then, for every such S^m extending S^n we have $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A^c$, and thus $(A^i \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A^i \Vdash_{S^n}^G A^c$, which proves $\Vdash_S^L ((A^i \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A^i) \rightarrow A^c$ for arbitrary S . \square

Such interactions between disjunctive formulas and classical formulas in the weak semantics are really remarkable, since a version of the excluded middle can be proven even for the intuitionistic disjunction, provided it comes combined with classical atoms.

There are, however, some drawbacks to this definition, which are mainly due to the interaction between the clause for disjunction and the definition of local validity. For instance, we lose validities such as the following.

Proposition 2. $(A \rightarrow C), (B \rightarrow C), (A \vee B) \Vdash_S^G C$ does not hold for all S .

Proof. Let $A = (\neg p)$, $B = (p^c)$ and $C = (\neg p^i \vee \neg \neg p^i)$. Consider the empty system \emptyset . Let S be any $\emptyset \subseteq S$ such that $\Vdash_S^G \neg p^i$. Then, for any $\emptyset \subseteq S$ we have that if $\neg p^i \Vdash_S^L q^i$ then $\Vdash_S^L q^i$, and so $\Vdash_S^G (\neg p^i \vee \neg \neg p^i)$.

By Theorem 6 we have $p^c \Vdash_S \neg \neg p$ for any S , and so if $\emptyset \subseteq S$ and $\Vdash_S^G p^c$ then $\Vdash_S^G \neg \neg p^i$, which can be used with the same argument as before to establish $p^c \Vdash_S^G (\neg p^i \vee \neg \neg p^i)$. Since S is an arbitrary extension of \emptyset , we conclude both $\Vdash_{\emptyset}^G p^i \rightarrow (\neg p^i \vee \neg \neg p^i)$ and $\Vdash_{\emptyset}^G p^c \rightarrow (\neg p^i \vee \neg \neg p^i)$. Finally, by Theorem 8 we have $\Vdash_{\emptyset}^G \neg p^i \vee p^c$. However, since $(\neg p^i \vee \neg \neg p^i)$ contains only intuitionistic subformulas and $\neg A \vee \neg \neg A$ is not an intuitionistic theorem, $\not\Vdash_{\emptyset}^G (\neg p^i \vee \neg \neg p^i)$. \square

The definition of disjunction in terms of local consequence induces behaviour which is not easily captured in simple syntactic systems, since the usual rule for disjunction elimination is no longer sound.

To fix those weaknesses, we propose next a ecumenical BeS with a stronger clause for classical formulas.

4 Strong ecumenical semantics

Definition 5 (Strong Validity). *Strong S -validity and strong validity are defined as follows.*

1. $\models_S a^i$ iff $\vdash_S a$, for $a \in \text{At}_\perp$;
2. $\models_S a^c$ iff $\forall S^n (S \subseteq S^n) : a \not\vdash_{S^n} \perp$, for $a \in \text{At}_\perp$;
3. $\models_S A^c$ iff $\forall S^n (S \subseteq S^n) : (A)^i \not\vdash_{S^n} \perp$, for $A \notin \text{At}_\perp$;
4. $\models_S (A \wedge B)^i$ iff $\models_S A$ and $\models_S B$;
5. $\models_S (A \rightarrow B)^i$ iff $A \models_S B$;
6. $\models_S (A \vee B)^i$ iff $\forall S^n (S \subseteq S^n)$ and all $a \in \text{At}_\perp$: $A \models_{S^n} a^i$ and $B \models_{S^n} a^i$ implies $\models_{S^n} a^i$;
7. For non-empty Γ , we have that $\Gamma \models_S A$ iff for all S^n such that $S \subseteq S^n$ it holds that, if $\models_{S^n} B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$, then $\models_{S^n} A$;
8. $\Gamma \models A$ iff $\Gamma \models_S A$ for all S .

The main difference between weak and strong validity is in the clauses for classical formulas. In weak validity, a formula A^c is true in S if A is consistent with S . In strong validity, a formula A^c is true in S if all its extensions are consistent with S . Weak validity uses a non-monotonic notion, whereas in strong validity classical validities are monotonic by definition. Since by Theorem 3 S -monotonicity induces a collapse between \Vdash_S^L and \Vdash_S^G and all formulas of the strong ecumenical semantics are monotonic, local and global validities are non-distinguishable.

5 An ecumenical proof system for strong ecumenical validity

In this section we will prove soundness and completeness of the natural deduction ecumenical system NE_B presented in Fig. 1 (which is a version of the system CIE presented in [13] with a restriction on iterations of the “classicality” operator) w.r.t. the strong ecumenical BeS.

We say that $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{NE}_B} A$ holds if and only if there is a deduction of A from Γ using the rules of NE_B .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma [A] \quad \Pi}{B} \rightarrow\text{-int} \qquad \frac{\Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \quad \Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{A \rightarrow B \quad B \quad A} \rightarrow\text{-elim} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \quad \Pi \quad A_j}{A_1 \vee A_2} \vee_j\text{-int} \qquad \frac{\Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_2 [A] \quad \Gamma_3 [B] \quad \Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2 \quad \Pi_3}{A \vee B \quad C \quad C} \vee\text{-elim} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \quad \Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{A \wedge B} \wedge\text{-int} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \quad \Pi}{A_1 \wedge A_2 \quad A_j} \wedge_j\text{-elim} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \quad \Pi}{A} \perp\text{-elim} \qquad \frac{[\neg A^i] \quad \Pi}{A^c} A^c\text{-int} \qquad \frac{\Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \quad \Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2 \quad A^c \quad \neg A^i}{\perp} A^c\text{-elim}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 1. Ecumenical natural deduction system NE_B .

5.1 Soundness

Contrary to what happens with completeness, the proof of soundness follows trivially from the proof in [19].

Lemma 9. $\models_S A^c$ iff $\models_S \neg\neg A^i$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Suppose $\models_S A^c$. Then, for all $S \subseteq S^n$ we have $A^i \not\models_S \perp$. Suppose that, for some of those S^n , $\models_{S^n} \neg A^i$. Then we have $A^i \models_{S^n} \perp$, which yields a contradiction. Thus for all such S^n we have $\not\models_{S^n} \neg A^i$, and so $\models_S \neg\neg A^i$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose $\models_S \neg\neg A^i$. Then, for all $S \subseteq S^n$, $\neg A^i \not\models_{S^n} \perp$. Suppose that for some of those S^n it holds that $A^i \models_{S^n} \perp$. Then we have $\models_{S^n} \neg A^i$, and thus $\models_{S^n} \perp$. Hence we have $A^i \not\models_{S^n} \perp$ for all $S \subseteq S^n$, and thus $\models_S A^c$. \square

Theorem 10 (Soundness). If $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{NE}_B} A$ then $\Gamma \models A$.

Proof. Due to the collapse between local and global consequence in strong semantics, if we eliminate all clauses for classical formulas and define $A^c = \neg\neg A^i$ we get an equivalent definition. Then, since all the remaining semantic clauses are just Sandqvist's clauses for intuitionistic logic, our proof of soundness follows from his' (provided A^c is treated as $\neg\neg A^i$ on induction steps).³

³ The only notable difference is in the treatment of $\perp\text{-elim}$, which is slightly different due to the consistency requirement. The induction hypothesis gives us $\Gamma \models \perp$ and

5.2 Completeness

We will now prove completeness for strong ecumenical semantics with respect to the natural deduction system shown in Fig. 1. We use an adaptation of Sandqvist's proof [19]; changes are made only to deal with classical formulas and the consistency constraint.

The proof of the next lemma is in Appendix B.

Lemma 10. $a \not\vdash_S \perp$ iff the system S^n obtained by adding a rule which concludes a from empty premises to S is consistent.

Let Γ^{Sub} be the set of all subformulas of formulas contained in a set Γ . Let $\Delta_\Gamma^c = \{\neg A^i \mid A^c \in \Gamma\}$. Now, let $\Gamma^* = ((\Gamma \cup \{A\})^{Sub}) \cup (\Delta_{(\Gamma \cup \{A\})^{Sub}}^c)$

We start by producing some mapping α which assigns to each formula A in Γ^* a unique p^A such that:

1. $p^A = a$, if $A = a^i$ (for some $a \in \text{At}_\perp$);
2. Else, $p^A \in \text{At}$ and $(p^A)^i \notin \Gamma^*$.

Notice that, since the assigned atoms are unique, $p^A = p^B$ iff $A = B$.

Consider now any semantic consequence $\Gamma \vDash A$. Fix any mapping α for Γ^* . Following Sandqvist's strategy, we start by using the mapping α to build an atomic system \mathfrak{A} which is finely tailored for our proof.

We start by defining atomic correspondents of the natural deduction rules:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{\Gamma [p^A] \quad \Pi}{p^{A \rightarrow B}} p^{A \rightarrow B}\text{-int} \qquad \frac{\Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \quad \Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{p^B} p^{A \rightarrow B}\text{-elim} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma \quad \Pi \quad p^{A_j}}{p^{A_1 \vee A_2}} p^{A_1 \vee A_2}\text{-int} \qquad \frac{\Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_2 [p^A] \quad \Gamma_3 [p^B] \quad \Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2 \quad \Pi_3}{q} p^{A \vee B}, q\text{-elim} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \quad p^A \quad p^B}{p^{A \wedge B}} p^{A \wedge B}\text{-int} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \quad \Pi \quad p^{A_1 \wedge A_2}}{p^{A_j}} p^{A_1 \wedge A_2}\text{-elim} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma \quad \Pi \quad p^\perp}{q} p^\perp, q\text{-elim} \qquad \frac{[p^{\neg A^i}] \quad \Pi \quad \perp}{p^{A^c}} A^c\text{-int} \qquad \frac{\Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \quad \Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2 \quad p^{A^c} \quad p^{\neg A^i}}{p^\perp} A^c\text{-elim}
 \end{array}$$

thus $\Gamma \vDash_S \perp$ for arbitrary S , from which we conclude that for no $S \subseteq S^n$ we have $\vDash_S B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$. But then $\Gamma \vDash_{S^n} A$ holds vacuously for all such S^n , which shows $\Gamma \vDash_S A$ for arbitrary A and arbitrary S and thus $\Gamma \vDash A$.

We now add atomic rules to \mathfrak{A} for all formulas $D \in \Gamma^*$, according to the following criteria.

1. For every formula D with shape $A \rightarrow B$ or $A \wedge B$, we add $p^D - int$ and $p^D - elim$ to \mathfrak{A} .
2. For every formula D with shape $A \vee B$ we add the rules $p^D - int$ to \mathfrak{A} , and for every D with shape $A \vee B$ and every $q \in \text{At}_\perp$ we add $p^D, p - elim$ to \mathfrak{A} .
3. For every formula D with shape A^c we add $p^D - int$ and $p^D - elim$ to \mathfrak{A} . Notice that, by the definition of Δ_Γ^c and Γ^* , we have $A^c \in (\Gamma \cup \{A\})^{Sub}$ implies $\neg A^i \in \Gamma^*$;
4. For every formula D and every $q \in \text{At}_\perp$ we add $p^\perp, q - elim$ to \mathfrak{A} ;
5. We also stipulate that \mathfrak{A} contains no rules other than those added by this procedure.

Lemma 11. *If NE_B is consistent, then \mathfrak{A} is consistent.*

Proof. Suppose NE_B is consistent but \mathfrak{A} is not. Then, there is a deduction Π showing $\vdash_{\mathfrak{A}} \perp$. Let Π' be the deduction obtained by replacing every p^A in Π by A (atoms not treated by the mapping α are left untouched). Since every atomic rule becomes an instance of its natural deduction correspondent, a straightforward induction on the length of derivations shows that Π' is a deduction in NE_B showing $\vdash_{\text{NE}_B} \perp$. Contradiction. Then, $\not\vdash_{\mathfrak{A}} \perp$. \square

Although this does not prove consistency of \mathfrak{A} by itself, by treating A^c as $\neg\neg A$ the usual reductions for classical natural deduction [15] can be used to obtain normalization results for NE_B , which in turn can be used to show that NE_B is consistent, and thus \mathfrak{A} is consistent.

The proof of the following Lemma is in Appendix C.

Lemma 12. *For all $A \in \Gamma^*$ and all $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq S$ it holds that $\vDash_S A$ iff $\vdash_S p^A$.*

Theorem 11 (Completeness). *$\Gamma \vDash A$ implies $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{NE}_B} A$.*

Proof. Define a mapping α and a system \mathfrak{A} for Γ and A as shown earlier. Define a set $\Gamma^{\text{At}_\perp} = \{p^A \mid A \in \Gamma\}$.

Suppose $\Gamma \vDash A$. By the definition of strong validity, we have $\Gamma \vDash_{\mathfrak{A}} A$. Now define \mathfrak{B} as the system obtained from \mathfrak{A} by adding a rule concluding p^B from empty premises for every $p^B \in \Gamma^{\text{At}_\perp}$.

We split the the proof in two cases:

1. \mathfrak{B} is consistent. Then it is a valid extension of \mathfrak{A} . By the definition of \mathfrak{B} , we have $\vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} p^B$ for all $p^B \in \Gamma^{\text{At}_\perp}$. By Lemma 12, for all $B \in \Gamma^*$ we have that, for any $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq S$, $\vdash_S p^B$ iff $\vDash_S B$. Since $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma^*$, we conclude $\vDash_{\mathfrak{B}} B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$. Since $\Gamma \vDash_{\mathfrak{A}} A$ and $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$, we also have $\vDash_{\mathfrak{B}} A$, and so by another application of Lemma 12 we conclude $\vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} p^A$. Thus, we conclude that there is a deduction Π of p^A in \mathfrak{B} .

If the deduction does not use any of the rules contained in \mathfrak{B} but not in \mathfrak{A} , Π is a deduction in \mathfrak{A} , and so $\vdash_{\mathfrak{A}} p^A$. If it does use some of the rules, by

replacing every new rule concluding p^B by an assumption p^B we obtain a deduction Π' of \mathfrak{A} which shows $\Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{A}} p^A$, for some $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma^{\text{At}\perp}$. Thus, in any case we obtain some deduction showing $\Gamma^{\text{At}} \vdash_{\mathfrak{A}} p^A$

Let Π be the deduction showing $\Gamma^{\text{At}} \vdash_{\mathfrak{A}} p^A$ obtained earlier. Define Π' as the deduction obtained by replacing every formula occurrence p^A in Π by A (atoms q occurring on instances of atomic rules for disjunction and \perp -elimination which are not mapped to anything by α are not substituted). Since every instance of every atomic rule becomes some instance of a rule in our system of natural deduction, it is straightforward to show by induction on the length of derivations that Π' is a deduction showing $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{NE}_B} A$.

2. \mathfrak{B} is inconsistent. Then, there is a deduction Π in \mathfrak{B} showing $\vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} \perp$. If Π does not use any rule contained in \mathfrak{B} but not in \mathfrak{A} , we have $\vdash_{\mathfrak{A}} \perp$, which contradicts the consistency requirement. Then, Π must use some of the new rules. But then we may replace every new rule concluding p^B by an assumption p^B to conclude $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathfrak{A}} \perp$. Define Π' as the deduction obtained by replacing every formula occurrence p^A in Π by A . It is straightforward to show by induction on the length of derivations that Π' is a deduction showing $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{NE}_B} \perp$. As a finishing touch, we apply $\perp - \text{elim}$ to obtain a deduction showing $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{NE}_B} A$. \square

6 Conclusion

We have proposed a weak and a strong versions of BeS for ecumenical systems. While the first helped furthering our understanding concerning the difference between double negations in intuitionistic logic and provability in classical logic, semantics comes into full swing when the strong notion of BeS is provided, since it allows for a new ecumenical natural deduction system which is sound and complete w.r.t. it.

This distinction allows us not only to obtain classical behaviour for formulas containing classical atoms and intuitionistic behaviour for formulas containing intuitionistic atoms, but also to put on the spotlight some basic properties of semantic entailment which are not always evident on traditional semantic analysis. As such, it may shed light on semantic differences between intuitionistic and classical logics from an even broader perspective.

There are many ways to proceed with this work. First of all, the role of local and global validity in BeS should be better explored, since it opens wide the classical behaviour, as it appears in other semantic settings for classical logic, *e.g.* as in Kripke models for classical logic [8]. One very interesting step in this direction would be to propose a proof system for our weak version of BeS. Of course, there is the natural question of what would be the BeS proposal for Prawitz' ecumenical system, in which this work took its inspiration but also other ecumenical systems, such as the ones appearing in [10,5,1]. Finally, it would be interesting to lift this discussion to ecumenical modal logics [12].

References

1. Frédéric Blanqui, Gilles Dowek, Émilie Grienenberger, Gabriel Hondet, and François Thiré. A modular construction of type theories. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 19(1), 2023.
2. Robert Brandom. *Articulating Reasons: An Introduction to Inferentialism*. Harvard University Press, 2000.
3. Pablo Cobrerros. Supervaluationism and logical consequence: A third way. *Stud Logica*, 90(3):291–312, 2008.
4. Bogdan Dicher and Francesco Paoli. The original sin of proof-theoretic semantics. *Synth.*, 198(1):615–640, 2021.
5. Gilles Dowek. On the definition of the classical connectives and quantifiers. *Why is this a Proof?*, *Festschrift for Luiz Carlos Pereira*, 27:228–238, 2016.
6. Nissim Francez. Views of proof-theoretic semantics: reified proof-theoretic meanings. *J. Log. Comput.*, 26(2):479–494, 2016.
7. Alexander V. Gheorghiu and David J. Pym. From proof-theoretic validity to base-extension semantics for intuitionistic propositional logic, 2022.
8. Danko Ilik, Gyesik Lee, and Hugo Herbelin. Kripke models for classical logic. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 161(11):1367–1378, 2010.
9. Nils Kürbis. Proof-theoretic semantics, a problem with negation and prospects for modality. *J. Philos. Log.*, 44(6):713–727, 2015.
10. Chuck C. Liang and Dale Miller. Kripke semantics and proof systems for combining intuitionistic logic and classical logic. *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.*, 164(2):86–111, 2013.
11. David Makinson. On an inferential semantics for classical logic. *Log. J. IGPL*, 22(1):147–154, 2014.
12. Sonia Marin, Luiz Carlos Pereira, Elaine Pimentel, and Emerson Sales. Ecumenical modal logic. In *DaLi 2020*, volume 12569 of *LNCS*, pages 187–204. Springer, 2020.
13. Victor Nascimento. Logical ecumenism, 2018. Master’s Dissertation.
14. Thomas Piecha, Wagner de Campos Sanz, and Peter Schroeder-Heister. Failure of completeness in proof-theoretic semantics. *J. of Philosophical Logic*, 44(3):321–335, 2015.
15. Dag Prawitz. *Natural deduction: A proof-theoretical study*. Dover Publications, 2006.
16. Dag Prawitz. Classical versus intuitionistic logic. In Bruno Lopes Edward Hermann Haesler, Wagner de Campos Sanz, editor, *Why is this a Proof?*, *Festschrift for Luiz Carlos Pereira*, volume 27, pages 15–32. College Publications, 2015.
17. David Pym, Eike Ritter, and Edmund Robinson. Categorical proof-theoretic semantics, 2023.
18. Tor Sandqvist. Classical logic without bivalence. *Analysis*, 69(2):211–218, 04 2009.
19. Tor Sandqvist. Base-extension semantics for intuitionistic sentential logic. *Logic J. of the IGPL*, 23(5):719–731, 2015.
20. Peter Schroeder-Heister. A natural extension of natural deduction. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 49:1284–1300, 1984.
21. Peter Schroeder-Heister. Uniform proof-theoretic semantics for logical constants (abstract). *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 56:1142, 1991.
22. Peter Schroeder-Heister. Validity concepts in proof-theoretic semantics. *Synthese*, 148(3):525–571, 2006.
23. Peter Schroeder-Heister. Proof-Theoretic Semantics. In Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Winter 2022 edition, 2022.

Appendix A Proofs of lemmas – Section 3.2

Lemma 3. $\Gamma \Vdash_S^L A$ implies $\Gamma \Vdash_S^G A$.

Proof. Let $\Gamma \Vdash_S^L A$. Then, by the definition of local consequence, for every S^n such that $S \subseteq S^n$ we have that if $\Vdash_{S^n}^L B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$ then $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A$. Now, let S^m be any extension of S in which for all S^i such that $S^m \subseteq S^i$, we have $\Vdash_{S^i}^L B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$. Consider any such S^i . Since $\Gamma \Vdash_S^L A$ holds and S^i is also an extension of S (by transitivity of extension), we have that $\Vdash_{S^i}^L B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$ implies $\Vdash_{S^i}^L A$. Since S^i is an extension of S^m , by definition we have $\Vdash_{S^i}^L B$ for all $B \in \Gamma$, and thus we have $\Vdash_{S^i}^L A$. But this holds for arbitrary S^i extending S^m , and so for every S^i we have $\Vdash_{S^i}^L A$. Since S^m is an arbitrary extension of S satisfying the antecedent of Clause 8 of the definition of weak validity, we conclude $\Gamma \Vdash_S^G A$. \square

Lemma 4. $\Vdash_S^G A$ implies $\Vdash_S^L A$.

Proof. Assume $\Vdash_S^G A$. Then for every $S \subseteq S^n$, it holds that $\Vdash_{S^m}^L A$, for every $S^n \subseteq S^m$. By putting $S^m = S^n = S$ we conclude $\Vdash_S^L A$. \square

Lemma 5. $\Vdash_S^G A$ and $A \Vdash_S^G B$ implies $\Vdash_S^G B$.

Proof. Assume $\Vdash_S^G A$. Thus $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A$ for all $S \subseteq S^n$. Assume $A \Vdash_S^G B$. Then, for any $S \subseteq S^m$, if for all $S^m \subseteq S^k$ we have $\Vdash_{S^k}^L A$, then for all $S^m \subseteq S^k$ we have $\Vdash_{S^k}^L B$. By putting $S = S^m$ we immediately get $\Vdash_{S^k}^L B$ for all $S \subseteq S^k$, hence $\Vdash_S^G B$. \square

Lemma 6. If $\Vdash_S^L A$, S -monotonicity holds for A and $A \Vdash_S^G B$, then both $\Vdash_S^L B$ and $\Vdash_S^G B$.

Proof. Since $\Vdash_S^L A$ holds and monotonicity holds for A , for all S^n such that $S \subseteq S^n$ we have that $\Vdash_{S^n}^L A$. Since $A \Vdash_S^G B$ holds and S is an extension of itself, we immediately conclude that $\Vdash_{S^n}^L B$ for all S^n extending S and all S^j extending any S^n , and thus $\Vdash_S^G B$. In particular, since S is an extension of itself, we also have $\Vdash_S^L B$. \square

Lemma 7. $(p \vdash_S \perp)$ iff $(p^i \Vdash_S^L \perp)$ iff $(p^i \Vdash_S^G \perp)$ iff $(\Vdash_S^L \neg p^i)$.

Proof. It follows from Theorem 4 that $(p^i \Vdash_S^L \perp)$ iff $(p^i \Vdash_S^G \perp)$, since p^i and \perp are intuitionistic formulas. On the other hand, $(p^i \Vdash_S^G \perp)$ iff $(\Vdash_S^L \neg p^i)$ follows from the clause for implication. Thus we only need to prove that $(p \vdash_S \perp)$ iff $(p^i \Vdash_S^L \perp)$.

(\Rightarrow) Let $p \vdash_S \perp$. Assume that there is an extension S^n of S in which $\Vdash_{S^n}^L p^i$. By Clause 1 we have $\vdash_{S^n} p$ and, since S^n is an extension of S and thus contains all its rules, $\vdash_{S^n} \perp$. By composing both derivations we get $\vdash_{S^n} \perp$, which clashes with the consistency requirement. Thus, for all S^n extending S we have $\not\vdash_{S^n}^L p^i$, which together with Clause 4 yields $p^i \Vdash_S^L \perp$.

(\Leftarrow) Assume $p^i \Vdash_S^\perp \perp$ and $p \not\vdash_S \perp$. Let S' be the system obtained by adding to S only a rule α which concludes p from empty premises. We start by proving that S' is consistent, as thus a valid extension of S in our semantics.

Assume S' is inconsistent, and consider the proof Π of \perp in S' . There are two possibilities:

1. If Π does not use the rule α , then Π is a proof in S . This yields a contradiction, as S must be consistent.
2. If Π uses the rule α , replace each application of α in Π by an assumption p . This immediately yields a derivation showing $p \vdash_S \perp$, contradicting the second initial hypothesis.

We then conclude that S' is consistent. But, given that $\vdash_{S'} p$, we have $\Vdash_{S'}^\perp p^i$, which can be used together with the assumption $p^i \Vdash_S^\perp \perp$ to show $\Vdash_S^\perp \perp$ and thus $\vdash_S \perp$, contradicting the consistency requirement. Thus $p \vdash_S \perp$. \square

Lemma 8. $A \not\vdash_S^\perp \perp$ iff there is some $S \subseteq S^n$ such that $\Vdash_{S^n}^\perp A$.

Proof. Assume $A \not\vdash_S^\perp \perp$. Suppose there is no $S \subseteq S^n$ with $\Vdash_{S^n}^\perp A$. Then $A \Vdash_S^\perp \perp$ holds vacuously, which is a contradiction. Hence, for some $S \subseteq S^n$ we have $\Vdash_{S^n}^\perp A$. On the other hand, assume that there is some $S \subseteq S^n$ such that $\Vdash_{S^n}^\perp A$. Suppose $A \Vdash_S^\perp \perp$. Then we have $\Vdash_{S^n}^\perp \perp$, yielding a contradiction. Thus, $A \not\vdash_S^\perp \perp$. \square

Appendix B Proof of Lemma 10

Lemma 10. $a \not\vdash_S \perp$ iff the system S^n obtained by adding a rule which concludes a from empty premises to S is consistent.

Proof. This is strengthened syntactic counterpart of Lemma 8.

Assume $a \not\vdash_S \perp$. Let S^n be the system obtained by adding a rule concluding a from empty premises to S^n . Suppose that $\vdash_{S^n} \perp$. Then there is a deduction Π in S^n showing \perp . If it does not use the new rule added to S^n , Π is also a deduction in S , and thus S violates the consistency requirement. If it does use the new rule, by replacing every occurrence of it by an assumption with shape a we get a deduction showing $a \vdash_S \perp$, which contradicts our initial hypothesis. Thus, we conclude $\not\vdash_{S^n} \perp$.

For the other direction, assume the system S^n obtained by adding a rule which concludes a from empty premises to S is consistent. Assume $a \vdash_S \perp$. But since $S \subseteq S^n$ we have $\vdash_{S^n} \perp$, violating the consistency requirement. Thus, $a \not\vdash_S \perp$. \square

Appendix C Proof of Lemma 12

Lemma 12. For all $A \in \Gamma^*$ and all $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq S$ it holds that $\vDash_S A$ iff $\vdash_S p^A$.

Proof. We show the result by induction on the complexity of formulas. For the purpose of this proof, we define complexity of intuitionistic formulas as the number of logical operators distinct from \perp occurring on them, and the complexity of any classical formula A^c as the complexity of $\neg A^i$ plus one.

1. $A = a^i$, for some $a \in \text{At}_\perp$. Then $p^A = A$, and the result follows immediately from Clause 1 of strong validity;

2. $A = A \wedge B$.

(\Rightarrow) Assume $\vDash_S A \wedge B$. Then $\vDash_S A$ and $\vDash_S B$. Induction hypothesis: $\vdash_S p^A$ and $\vdash_S p^B$. By $p^{A \wedge B} - \text{int}$, we obtain $\vdash_S p^{A \wedge B}$.

(\Leftarrow) Assume $\vdash_S p^{A \wedge B}$. Then, by $p^{A \wedge B} - \text{elim}$ we get both $\vdash_S p^A$ and $\vdash_S p^B$. Induction hypothesis: $\vDash_S A$ and $\vDash_S B$. Then, by the semantic clause for conjunction, $\vDash_S A \wedge B$.

3. $A = A \vee B$.

(\Rightarrow) Assume $\vDash_S A \vee B$. Then, for every $S \subseteq S^n$, $A \vDash_{S^n} a^i$ and $B \vDash_{S^n} a^i$ implies $\vDash_{S^n} a^i$, for any $a \in \text{At}_\perp$. Induction hypothesis: for all $S \subseteq S^n$, $p^A \vdash_{S^n} a$ and $p^B \vdash_{S^n} a$ implies $\vdash_{S^n} a$, for any $a \in \text{At}_\perp$. Let $S^n = S$. By the rules for $p^{A \vee B} - \text{int}$ we can conclude both $p^A \vdash_S p^{A \vee B}$ and $p^B \vdash_S p^{A \vee B}$, which we then use to conclude $\vdash_S p^{A \vee B}$.

(\Leftarrow) Assume $\vdash_S p^{A \vee B}$. Let S^n be any extension of S such that $A \vdash_{S^n} a$ and $B \vdash_{S^n} a$, for some $a \in \text{At}_\perp$. Clearly, since $S \subseteq S^n$, $\vdash_{S^n} p^{A \vee B}$. Then, regardless of our choice of a , the rule $p^{A \vee B}, p - \text{elim}$ can be used to show $\vdash_{S^n} a$. Induction hypothesis: for every $S \subseteq S^n$, $A \vDash_{S^n} a^i$ and $B \vDash_{S^n} p^i$ implies $\vDash_{S^n} p^i$, for any $p \in \text{At}_\perp$. By the clause for disjunction we immediately conclude $\vDash_S A \vee B$.

4. $A = A \rightarrow B$.

(\Rightarrow) Assume $\vDash_S A \rightarrow B$. Then, for any $S \subseteq S^n$, $A \vDash_{S^n} B$. Induction hypothesis: for any $S \subseteq S^n$, $p^A \vdash_{S^n} p^B$. Let $S^n = S$. Then, we can use the rule $p^{A \rightarrow B} - \text{int}$ to conclude $\vdash_S p^{A \rightarrow B}$.

(\Leftarrow) Assume $\vdash_S p^{A \rightarrow B}$. Let S^n be any extension of S such that $\vdash_{S^n} p^A$. Since $S \subseteq S^n$, we have $\vdash_{S^n} p^{A \rightarrow B}$. We can use the rule $p^{A \rightarrow B} - \text{elim}$ to conclude $\vdash_{S^n} p^B$. Then we have that for any $S \subseteq S^n$ it holds that $\vdash_{S^n} p^A$ implies $\vdash_{S^n} p^B$. Induction hypothesis: for any $S \subseteq S^n$ it holds that $\vDash_{S^n} p^A$ implies $\vDash_{S^n} p^B$. By clause 7 of the definition of strong validity this yields $A \vDash_S B$, and thus $\vDash_S A \rightarrow B$. \square

5. $A = A^c$.

(\Rightarrow) Assume $\vDash_S A^c$. Then, for any $S \subseteq S^n$, $A^i \not\vDash_{S^n} \perp$.

Induction hypothesis: for any $S \subseteq S^n$, $p^{A^i} \not\vdash_{S^n} \perp$. Then, by Lemma 10, for every S^n we have that the system obtained by adding a rule concluding p^{A^i} from empty premises to S^n is consistent.

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $p^{\neg A^i} \not\vdash_S \perp$. Then, by Lemma 10, the system S^j obtained by adding a rule concluding $p^{\neg A^i}$ from empty premises to S is consistent. But by the previous result we also have that the system S^k obtained by adding a rule concluding p^{A^i} from empty premises to S^j must be consistent. However, since $\vdash_{S^k} p^{A^i}$ and $\vdash_{S^k} p^{\neg A^i}$, we can apply the $p^{\neg A^i} - elim$ rule to show $\vdash_{S^k} p^\perp$, and thus $\vdash_{S^k} \perp$ due to the properties of the mapping α . Contradiction. Thus, $p^{\neg A^i} \vdash_S p^\perp$, and so $\vdash_S p^{A^c}$ can be obtained through an application of $p^{A^c} - int$.

(\Leftarrow) Assume $\vdash_S p^{A^c}$. Suppose there is an $S \subseteq S^n$ such that $p^A \vdash_{S^n} p^\perp$. Then, by $p^{\neg A^i} - int$ we conclude $\vdash_{S^n} p^{\neg A^i}$ and, since $S \subseteq S^n$ and thus $\vdash_{S^n} p^{A^c}$, we conclude $\vdash_{S^n} p^\perp$ through an application of $p^{A^c} - elim$, and thus $\vdash_{S^n} \perp$. Contradiction. Hence, for all $S \subseteq S^n$ we have $p^{A^i} \not\vdash_{S^n} \perp$. Induction hypothesis: for all $S \subseteq S^n$ it holds that $A^i \not\vdash_{S^n} \perp$, which by the clauses for classical formulas yield $\vDash_S A^c$. \square