

Obligations and permissions on selfextensional logics

Andrea De Domenico¹, Ali Farjami², Krishna Manoorkar¹, Alessandra Palmigiano^{1,3},
Mattia Panettiere¹, and Xiaolong Wang^{1,4}

¹School of Business and Economics, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1105, Amsterdam, 1081 HV, The Netherlands

²School of Computer Engineering, Iran University of Science and Technology, Tehran, Iran

³Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics, University of Johannesburg, Corner Kingsway and University Road, Rossmore, Johannesburg, South Africa

⁴School of Philosophy and Social Development, Shandong University, South Shanda Road No.27, Jinan, 250100, China

Abstract

We further develop the abstract algebraic logic approach to input/output logic initiated in [13], where the family of selfextensional logics was proposed as a general background environment for input/output logics. In this paper, we introduce and discuss the generalizations of several types of permission (negative, dual negative, static, dynamic), as well as their interactions with normative systems, to various families of selfextensional logics, thereby proposing a systematic approach to the definition of normative and permission systems on nonclassical propositional bases.

Keywords: input/output logic, selfextensional logics, abstract algebraic logic.

Declarations

Competing interests

The authors of this study declare that there is no conflict of interest with any commercial or financial entities related to this research.

Authors' contributions

Xiaolong Wang drafted the initial version of this article. Other authors have all made equivalent contributions to it.

Funding

The authors who affiliated by Vrije Universiteit has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 101007627. Xiaolong Wang is supported by the China Scholarship Council No.202006220087.

Krishna Manoorkar is supported by the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek grant KIVI.2019.001 awarded to Alessandra Palmigiano.

1 Introduction

The present paper continues a line of investigation, recently initiated in [13], which studies *input/output logics* from an algebraic logic perspective [17].

The framework of *input/output logic* [24] has been introduced for modelling the interaction between logical inferences and other agency-related notions such as conditional obligations, goals, ideals, preferences, actions, and beliefs, in the context of the formalization of normative systems in philosophical logic and AI. Recently, the original framework of input/output logic, based on classical propositional logic, has been generalized to incorporate various forms of *nonclassical* reasoning [30, 33], and these generalizations have contextually motivated the introduction of algebraic and proof-theoretic methods in the study of input/output logic [34, 7]. In the present paper, the various notions of *permission systems* introduced in [25], namely *negative permission*, *positive static permission* and *dynamic permission*, are generalized and studied uniformly in the context of *selfextensional logics* [36], both in themselves, and in connection with normative systems. In the same context, the notion of *dual negative permission system* (cf. Section 4.2) is introduced and studied.

Selfextensional logics (cf. Section 2.1) form a wide class of logical systems which have been intensely studied in abstract algebraic logic [22, 21], but have also been studied from a duality-theoretic [23] and proof-theoretic [3] perspective. Selfextensional logics are the logics for which the *weak replacement property* holds: substituting any two interderivable formulas for a variable in any formula gives rise to interderivable formulas. In algebraic terms, selfextensionality is equivalently defined as the property that the interderivability relation be a congruence of the algebra of formulas. Besides classical propositional logic, well known examples of nonclassical logics which are selfextensional are intuitionistic [27], bi-intuitionistic [31], (classical and positive) modal [15, 5], substructural [18], quantum [6], linear [19], intermediate [37], De Morgan [26], semi De Morgan [32] logics. More in general, all logics whose canonically associated classes of algebras are varieties of normal (resp. regular, monotone) (distributive) lattice expansions [8, 9], and in which the entailment relation is captured by the order of the algebras,¹ are selfextensional.² We refer to these logics as normal (resp. regular, monotone) (D)LE-logics [8]. Choosing selfextensional logics as the background environment allows for a systematic and principled generalization of the theory of input/output logic to a large family of nonclassical logics, capturing a wide variety of reasoning forms directly relevant in their interaction with norms. For instance, as is well known, intuitionistic and intermediate logics capture forms of reasoning for which truth is *constructive* and is identified with *provability* [35], while De Morgan and semi De Morgan logics capture *paraconsistent* forms of reasoning, which allow e.g. to reason about inconsistent information without lapsing into absurdity; linear logic captures reasoning about (different types of) resources, while it has been argued (cf. [10]) that non-distributive LE-logics capture forms of *hyperconstructive* reasoning, in which truth is *evidential*, and also forms of categorical reasoning. Moreover, the specific abstract algebraic logic approach to selfextensional logics allows to abstract away from certain idiosyncratic features relative e.g. to the way in which a given logic is presented.

Structure of the paper. In Section 2, we collect basic definitions and facts about selfextensional logics and their metalogical properties, as well as normative and permission systems. In Section 3, we build on [13] and generalize normative systems and their associated output operators to the context of selfextensional logics; in Section 4, we introduce, discuss, and study the properties of negative, dual negative, positive static, and positive dynamic permission systems in the context of selfextensional logics. We conclude in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

The present section collects preliminaries on selfextensional logics (cf. Section 2.1), and on input/output logics (cf. Section 2.2) based on these.

¹That is, letting $\text{Alg}(\mathcal{L})$ denote the class of algebras canonically associated with a given logic \mathcal{L} , if φ and ψ are formulas, then $\varphi \vdash \psi$ iff $h(\varphi) \leq h(\psi)$ for every $A \in \text{Alg}(\mathcal{L})$ and every homomorphism $h : \text{Fm} \rightarrow A$.

²That is, the weak replacement property holds for the consequence relation associated with the standard (e.g. Hilbert-style) presentation of each of these logics.

2.1 Selfextensional logics and metalogical properties

Logics as consequence relations. Abstract algebraic logic [17] takes the notion of logical entailment rather than theoremhood as primary. Consequently, a *logic* is defined as a tuple $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$ such that Fm is the term algebra (in a given algebraic or logical signature) over a set Prop of atomic propositions, and \vdash is a *consequence relation* on Fm , i.e. \vdash is a relation between sets of formulas and formulas such that³, for all $\Gamma, \Delta \subseteq \text{Fm}$ and all $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$,

- (a) if $\varphi \in \Gamma$ then $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$;
- (b) if $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ and $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta$, then $\Delta \vdash \varphi$;
- (c) if $\Delta \vdash \varphi$ and $\Gamma \vdash \psi$ for every $\psi \in \Delta$, then $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$.

Clearly, any such relation \vdash induces a preorder on Fm , which we still denote \vdash , by restricting to singletons. Let $\equiv \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ denote the equivalence relation induced by the preorder \vdash ; that is, the interderivability relation \equiv is defined by $\varphi \equiv \psi$ iff $\varphi \vdash \psi$ and $\psi \vdash \varphi$. A logic \mathcal{L} is *selfextensional* (cf. [36]) if for any $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$, if $\varphi \equiv \psi$ then $\delta(\varphi/p) \equiv \delta(\psi/p)$ for every $\delta \in \text{Fm}$.

Consequence relations and closure operators. Consequence relations (and hence logics defined as indicated above) can be equivalently presented by means of closure operators:⁴ let $Cn(\Gamma) := \{\psi \mid \Gamma \vdash \psi\}$ denote the *theory* of Γ for any $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Fm}$.⁵ The set $Cn(\emptyset)$ collects the *theorems* of \mathcal{L} .⁶ If $Cn(\emptyset) = \text{Fm}$, then \mathcal{L} is *inconsistent*. The assignment $\Gamma \mapsto Cn(\Gamma)$ defines a closure operator $Cn(-) : (\mathcal{P}(\text{Fm}), \subseteq) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P}(\text{Fm}), \subseteq)$, and conversely, for any such closure operator C , the relation $\vdash_C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\text{Fm}) \times \text{Fm}$ defined as $\Gamma \vdash_C \varphi$ iff $\varphi \in C(\Gamma)$ is a consequence relation on Fm . Finally, if \vdash is a consequence relation, $\vdash = \vdash_{C_\vdash}$, where C_\vdash denotes the closure operator associated with \vdash , and if C is a closure operator on $(\mathcal{P}(\text{Fm}), \subseteq)$, then $C = C_{\vdash_C}$.

Metalogical properties. Taking the notion of consequence relation as primary in defining a logical system allows one to abstract away from specific features of the presentation of a logic, and specifically, from any concrete logical signature. However, as is customary in abstract algebraic logic literature, the familiar logical connectives such as conjunction, disjunction, and implication can be reintroduced in terms of their behaviour w.r.t. the consequence relation of the given logic. This gives rise to *metalogical properties* of the closure operator associated with the consequence relation of given logics. In what follows, we collect the best-known metalogical properties, capturing the abstract behaviour of conjunction, disjunction, and implication (cf. [17, 16]), but also other less well-known properties e.g. those which capture the behaviour of co-implication, negation, and co-negation. In particular, we model the metalogical properties of negation along the lines of the axiomatic hierarchy presented in [2].

1. The *conjunction property* (\wedge_P) holds for \mathcal{L} if a term $t(x, y)$ (which we denote $x \wedge y$) exists in the language of \mathcal{L} such that $Cn(\varphi \wedge \psi) = Cn(\{\varphi, \psi\})$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$.
2. The *disjunction property* (\vee_P) holds for \mathcal{L} if a term $t(x, y)$ (which we denote $x \vee y$) exists in the language of \mathcal{L} such that $Cn(\varphi \vee \psi) = Cn(\varphi) \cap Cn(\psi)$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$.
3. The *strong disjunction property* (\vee_S) holds for \mathcal{L} if a term $t(x, y)$ (which we denote $x \vee y$) exists in the language of \mathcal{L} such that $Cn(\Gamma, \varphi \vee \psi) = Cn(\Gamma, \varphi) \cap Cn(\Gamma, \psi)$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ and every $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Fm}$.
4. The *bottom property* (\perp_P) holds for \mathcal{L} if a term t (which we denote \perp) exists in the language of \mathcal{L} such that $Cn(\perp) = \text{Fm}$.

³In the literature, (cf. [16]) consequence relations are typically required to be also closed under substitution of atomic propositions, that is, for any $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi\} \subseteq \text{Fm}$, if $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ then $\{\sigma(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma\} \vdash \sigma(\varphi)$, where $\sigma : \text{Fm} \rightarrow \text{Fm}$ is an endomorphism. Another common requirement is compactness, that is, whenever $\Gamma \vdash \varphi$, then $\Gamma' \vdash \varphi$ for some finite subset $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$.

⁴For any poset P , a map $C : P \rightarrow P$ is a *closure operator* if, for all $x, y \in P$: (a) $x \leq C(x)$; (b) $x \leq y$ implies $C(x) \leq C(y)$; (c) $C(C(x)) \leq C(x)$.

⁵In what follows, we write e.g. $Cn(\varphi)$ for $Cn(\{\varphi\})$, and $Cn(\Gamma, \varphi)$ for $Cn(\Gamma \cup \{\varphi\})$.

⁶Different consequence relations might have the same set of theorems, one example being the local and the global consequence relations induced by the class of Kripke frames on the language of classical modal logic.

5. The *weak top property* (\top_W) holds for \mathcal{L} if a term t (which we denote \top) exists in the language of \mathcal{L} such that $\top \in Cn(\varphi)$ for every $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$.
6. The *top property* (\top_P) holds for \mathcal{L} if a term t (which we denote \top) exists in the language of \mathcal{L} such that $Cn(\top) = Cn(\emptyset)$.
7. The *weak negation property* (\neg_W) holds for \mathcal{L} if a term $t(x)$ (which we denote $\neg x$) exists in the language of \mathcal{L} such that $\psi \in Cn(\varphi)$ implies $\neg\varphi \in Cn(\neg\psi)$ for any $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$. For any logic \mathcal{L} with \neg_W ,
 - (a) The *right-involutive negation property* (\neg_{Ir}) holds for \mathcal{L} if $Cn(\neg\neg\varphi) \subseteq Cn(\varphi)$ for any $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$.
 - (b) The *left-involutive negation property* (\neg_{Il}) holds for \mathcal{L} if $Cn(\varphi) \subseteq Cn(\neg\neg\varphi)$ for any $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$.
 - (c) The *involutive negation property* (\neg_I) holds for \mathcal{L} if both \neg_{Il} and \neg_{Ir} hold for \mathcal{L} .
 - (d) The *absurd negation property* (\neg_A) holds for \mathcal{L} if $Cn(\varphi, \neg\varphi) = \text{Fm}$ for any $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$.
 - (e) The *pseudo negation property* (\neg_P) holds for \mathcal{L} if \wedge_P holds for \mathcal{L} , and moreover, $\neg\psi \in Cn(\varphi, \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi))$ for any $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$.
 - (f) The *excluded middle property* (\sim_A) holds for \mathcal{L} if $Cn(\varphi) \cap Cn(\neg\varphi) = Cn(\emptyset)$ for any $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$.
 - (g) The *pseudo co-negation property* (\sim_P) holds for \mathcal{L} if \vee_P holds for \mathcal{L} , and moreover, $\varphi \vee \neg(\varphi \vee \psi) \in Cn(\neg\psi)$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$.
 - (h) The *strong negation property* (\neg_S) holds for \mathcal{L} if $Cn(\varphi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$ implies $\neg\psi \in Cn(\varphi)$.
8. The (weak)⁷ *deduction-detachment property* (\rightarrow_P) holds for \mathcal{L} if a term $t(x, y)$ (which we denote $x \rightarrow y$) exists in the language of \mathcal{L} such that $\psi \in Cn(\chi, \varphi)$ iff $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in Cn(\chi)$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$.
9. The *co-implication property* (\prec_P) holds for \mathcal{L} if a term $t(x, y)$ (which we denote $x \prec y$, to be read as “ x excludes y ”) exists in the language of \mathcal{L} such that $\chi \in Cn(\varphi \prec \psi)$ iff $Cn(\chi) \cap Cn(\psi) \subseteq Cn(\varphi)$ for all $\varphi, \psi, \chi \in \text{Fm}$.

Lemma 2.1. For any logic $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$,

1. If properties \wedge_P , \vee_P , and \neg_W hold for \mathcal{L} , then $\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi \vdash \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$.
2. If in addition property \neg_{Il} holds for \mathcal{L} , then $\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) \vdash \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$.

Proof. 1. Let $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$. By \neg_W and \wedge_P , from $\varphi \in Cn(\varphi, \psi) = Cn(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ it follows $\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) \in Cn(\neg\varphi)$. Similarly, one shows that $\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) \in Cn(\neg\psi)$. Hence, by \vee_P , $\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) \in Cn(\neg\varphi) \cap Cn(\neg\psi) = Cn(\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi)$ holds, from which $\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi \vdash \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ immediately follows.

2. Since $\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi \in Cn(\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi) = Cn(\neg\varphi) \cap Cn(\neg\psi) \subseteq Cn(\neg\varphi)$, by applying \neg_W we get $\neg\neg\varphi \in Cn(\neg(\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi))$, i.e. $Cn(\neg\neg\varphi) \subseteq Cn(\neg(\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi))$, and by \neg_{Il} , $\varphi \in Cn(\neg\neg\varphi) \subseteq Cn(\neg(\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi))$. Similarly, one shows $\psi \in Cn(\neg(\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi))$. The two statements imply, by \wedge_P , that $\varphi \wedge \psi \in Cn(\varphi \wedge \psi) = Cn(\varphi, \psi) \subseteq Cn(\neg(\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi))$. Applying again \neg_W we obtain $\neg\neg(\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi) \in Cn(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi))$ and using \neg_{Il} again we get $\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi \in Cn(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi))$, as required. \square

Lemma 2.2. For any logic $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$,

1. If properties \wedge_P , \vee_P , and \neg_W hold for \mathcal{L} , then $\neg(\varphi \vee \psi) \vdash \neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$.
2. If in addition property \neg_S , \neg_A and \vee_S hold for \mathcal{L} , then $\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi \vdash \neg(\varphi \vee \psi)$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ ⁸.

Proof. 1. Let $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$. From \vee_P it follows that $\varphi \vee \psi \in Cn(\varphi)$, which implies, by \neg_W , that $\neg\varphi \in Cn(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi))$. Similarly, $\neg\psi \in Cn(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi))$. Hence, $Cn(\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi) = Cn(\neg\varphi, \neg\psi) \subseteq Cn(\neg(\varphi \vee \psi))$, as required.

2. Let $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$. By \vee_S and \neg_A it follows that $Cn(\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi, \varphi \vee \psi) = Cn(\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi, \varphi) \cap Cn(\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi, \psi) \supseteq Cn(\neg\varphi, \varphi) \cap Cn(\neg\psi, \psi) = \text{Fm} \cap \text{Fm} = \text{Fm}$. By \neg_S , this implies $\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi \vdash \neg(\varphi \vee \psi)$, as required. \square

⁷We refer to this property as weak, because in the literature the property referred to as *deduction-detachment property* is $\psi \in Cn(\Gamma, \varphi)$ iff $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in Cn(\Gamma)$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ and $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Fm}$.

⁸Notice that this can also be proven using \neg_I and the previous Lemma in place of \vee_S , \neg_S , and \neg_A .

Proposition 2.3. *For any logic $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$,*

1. *if \wedge_P and \vee_S hold for \mathcal{L} , then $\alpha \wedge (\beta \vee \gamma) \vdash (\alpha \wedge \beta) \vee (\alpha \wedge \gamma)$ for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \text{Fm}$.*

2. *For all $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Fm}$, if $\alpha \in \text{Cn}(\beta)$, then $\text{Cn}(\Gamma, \alpha) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\Gamma, \beta)$ for every $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Fm}$.*

3. *The following are equivalent:*

(a) *Property \neg_{Ir} holds of \mathcal{L} ;*

(b) *for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$, $\varphi \vdash \neg\psi$ iff $\psi \vdash \neg\varphi$.*

4. *Property \top_P implies \top_W , and if $\text{Cn}(\emptyset) \neq \emptyset$, then \top_W implies \top_P .*

5. *Properties \perp_P and \neg_{Ir} imply \top_W , and in the presence of $\text{Cn}(\emptyset) \neq \emptyset$, also \top_P .*

6. *If $\text{Cn}(\emptyset) \neq \emptyset$, and \wedge_P , and \perp_P hold, then the following are equivalent:*

(a) *properties \neg_{Ir} , \neg_A , and \neg_P hold;*

(b) *$\varphi \wedge \psi \vdash \perp$ iff $\varphi \vdash \neg\psi$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$.*

7. *In the presence of \wedge_P and \vee_S , properties \neg_{Il} and \neg_A imply \neg_P .*

8. *In the presence of \vee_P , the following are equivalent:*

(a) *property \prec_P holds;*

(b) *$\varphi \prec \psi \vdash \chi$ iff $\varphi \vdash \chi \vee \psi$.*

9. *If $\text{Cn}(\emptyset) \neq \emptyset$, then \perp_P , \neg_{Ir} , and \neg_P imply \neg_S .*

10. *In the presence of \wedge_P , the following are equivalent:*

(a) *property \rightarrow_P holds;*

(b) *$\chi \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ iff $\varphi \wedge \chi \vdash \psi$.*

11. *If \prec_P holds, then, for all $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$, if $\varphi \vdash \psi$ then $\alpha \prec \psi \vdash \alpha \prec \varphi$ and $\varphi \prec \alpha \vdash \psi \prec \alpha$.*

12. *If \rightarrow_P holds, then, for all $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$, if $\varphi \vdash \psi$ then $\alpha \rightarrow \varphi \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \psi$ and $\psi \rightarrow \alpha \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \alpha$.*

Proof. 1. $\text{Cn}(\alpha \wedge (\beta \vee \gamma)) = \text{Cn}(\alpha, \beta \vee \gamma) = \text{Cn}(\alpha, \beta) \cap \text{Cn}(\alpha, \gamma) = \text{Cn}(\alpha \wedge \beta) \cap \text{Cn}(\alpha \wedge \gamma) = \text{Cn}((\alpha \wedge \beta) \vee (\alpha \wedge \gamma))$.

2. By assumption and the monotonicity of $\text{Cn}(-)$, $\alpha \in \text{Cn}(\beta) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\Gamma, \beta)$; moreover, $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Cn}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\Gamma, \beta)$. Hence, $\text{Cn}(\Gamma, \alpha) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\Gamma, \beta)$, as required.

3. ((a) \Rightarrow (b)) Without loss of generality we only prove that $\varphi \vdash \neg\psi$ implies $\psi \vdash \neg\varphi$. From $\neg\psi \in \text{Cn}(\varphi)$ we get $\neg\varphi \in \text{Cn}(\neg\neg\psi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\psi)$, via \neg_W and then \neg_{Ir} . This proves the assertion.

((b) \Rightarrow (a)) We need to prove that $\text{Cn}(\neg\neg\varphi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi)$, and that $\varphi \in \text{Cn}(\psi)$ implies $\neg\psi \in \text{Cn}(\neg\varphi)$. For the first part, $\neg\varphi \vdash \neg\varphi$ implies $\varphi \vdash \neg\neg\varphi$, which yields the required inclusion. For the second part, let $\varphi \in \text{Cn}(\psi)$. By assumption, to prove $\neg\psi \in \text{Cn}(\neg\varphi)$ it is enough to show that $\neg\neg\varphi \in \text{Cn}(\psi)$. The last statement holds because $\text{Cn}(\neg\neg\varphi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\psi)$.

4. By assumption, $\top \in \text{Cn}(\emptyset) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi)$ for every $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$, which proves the first part of the statement. For the second part, $\text{Cn}(\top) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\emptyset)$ for any $\varphi \in \text{Cn}(\emptyset)$, and by assumption such a φ exists.

5. Let $\top := \neg\perp$ be the required term. For any $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$, $\perp \vdash \varphi$ by \perp_P , which implies $\neg\varphi \vdash \neg\perp$ by \neg_W for any $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$. Hence in particular, instantiating $\varphi := \neg\varphi$, we get $\neg\neg\varphi \vdash \neg\perp$ for any $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$, which implies, by \neg_{Ir} , that $\varphi \vdash \neg\neg\varphi \vdash \neg\perp$ for any $\varphi \in \text{Fm}$, which proves the first part of the statement. Specializing the last statement to any $\varphi \in \text{Cn}(\emptyset)$ yields $\text{Cn}(\neg\perp) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\emptyset)$, which completes the proof.

6. $((a) \Rightarrow (b))$ If $\varphi \vdash \neg\psi$, then by \neg_A and item 2 above, $\text{Fm} = \text{Cn}(\psi, \neg\psi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\psi, \varphi) = \text{Cn}(\varphi \wedge \psi)$, hence $\text{Cn}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{Cn}(\perp)$, as required. Conversely, assume that $\text{Cn}(\perp) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi \wedge \psi)$, which implies, by \neg_W , that $\text{Cn}(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\neg\perp)$. From this and item 2 we get $\text{Cn}(\varphi, \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi, \neg\perp) = \text{Cn}(\varphi)$, the last identity holding since, by item 5, $\text{Cn}(\neg\perp) = \text{Cn}(\emptyset)$. The required statement follows from this inclusion and \neg_P .
- $((b) \Rightarrow (a))$ By item 3, to show \neg_{Ir} , it is enough to show that equivalence 3(b) holds. If $\varphi \vdash \neg\psi$, then by assumption $\varphi \wedge \psi \vdash \perp$, i.e. (thanks to \wedge_P) $\psi \wedge \varphi \vdash \perp$ iff $\psi \vdash \neg\varphi$, as required. As to \neg_A , from $\neg\psi \vdash \neg\psi$ we get $\neg\psi \wedge \psi \vdash \perp$, which, in the presence of \perp_P and \wedge_P , is equivalent to $\text{Cn}(\neg\psi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$, as required. As to \neg_P , by assumption, the required entailment $\varphi \wedge \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) \vdash \neg\psi$ is equivalent to $(\varphi \wedge \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) \wedge \psi \vdash \perp$, which by \wedge_P is equivalent to $((\varphi \wedge \psi) \wedge \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) \vdash \perp$, which is equivalent to $\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) \vdash \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)$, which is trivially true.
7. Lemma 2.1 and the assumptions (\neg_{II} in particular) imply that $\text{Cn}(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) = \text{Cn}(\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi)$. Hence, from this, \vee_S , \neg_A , and item 2, $\text{Cn}(\varphi, \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) = \text{Cn}(\varphi, \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi) = \text{Cn}(\varphi, \neg\varphi) \cap \text{Cn}(\varphi, \neg\psi) = \text{Cn}(\varphi, \neg\psi)$. The required statement follows from this and $\neg\psi \in \text{Cn}(\varphi, \neg\psi)$.
8. $((a) \Rightarrow (b))$ It is enough to show that $\chi \in \text{Cn}(\varphi \prec \psi)$ iff $\chi \vee \psi \in \text{Cn}(\varphi)$. By \prec_P and \vee_P , $\chi \in \text{Cn}(\varphi \prec \psi)$ iff $\chi \vee \psi \in \text{Cn}(\chi \vee \psi) = \text{Cn}(\chi) \cap \text{Cn}(\psi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi)$, as required.
- $((b) \Rightarrow (a))$ $\chi \in \text{Cn}(\varphi \prec \psi)$ iff $\varphi \prec \psi \vdash \chi$ iff $\varphi \vdash \chi \vee \psi$ iff $\text{Cn}(\chi) \cap \text{Cn}(\psi) = \text{Cn}(\chi \vee \psi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi)$.
9. By assumption, $\text{Cn}(\varphi \wedge \psi) = \text{Cn}(\varphi, \psi) = \text{Fm} = \text{Cn}(\perp)$, i.e. $\varphi \wedge \psi \vdash \perp$, which implies $\neg\perp \vdash \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)$. From this and item 2 we get $\text{Cn}(\varphi, \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi, \neg\perp) = \text{Cn}(\varphi)$, the last identity holding since, by item 5, $\text{Cn}(\neg\perp) = \text{Cn}(\emptyset)$. The required statement follows from this inclusion and \neg_P .
10. $((a) \Rightarrow (b))$ It is enough to show that $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \text{Cn}(\chi)$ iff $\psi \in \text{Cn}(\varphi \wedge \chi)$. By \rightarrow_P and \wedge_P , $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \text{Cn}(\chi)$ iff $\psi \in \text{Cn}(\varphi, \chi) = \text{Cn}(\varphi \wedge \chi)$, as required.
- $((b) \Rightarrow (a))$ $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \text{Cn}(\chi)$ iff $\chi \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ iff $\varphi \wedge \chi \vdash \psi$ iff $\text{Cn}(\psi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi \wedge \chi) = \text{Cn}(\varphi, \chi)$.
11. By $\alpha \prec \varphi \in \text{Cn}(\alpha \prec \varphi)$ and \prec_P we deduce $\text{Cn}(\alpha \prec \varphi) \cap \text{Cn}(\varphi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\alpha)$. Hence, from $\text{Cn}(\psi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi)$ it follows $\text{Cn}(\alpha \prec \varphi) \cap \text{Cn}(\psi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\alpha \prec \varphi) \cap \text{Cn}(\varphi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\alpha)$, and using \prec_P again, we conclude $\alpha \prec \varphi \in \text{Cn}(\alpha \prec \psi)$, as required. For the second part of the statement, by $\psi \prec \alpha \in \text{Cn}(\psi \prec \alpha)$ and \prec_P we deduce $\text{Cn}(\psi \prec \alpha) \cap \text{Cn}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\psi)$. This and $\text{Cn}(\psi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi)$ imply $\text{Cn}(\psi \prec \alpha) \cap \text{Cn}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi)$, and using \prec_P again, we get $\psi \prec \alpha \in \text{Cn}(\varphi \prec \alpha)$, as required.
12. The first part of the statement is equivalent to $\alpha \rightarrow \psi \in \text{Cn}(\alpha \rightarrow \varphi)$, which, by \rightarrow_P , is equivalent to $\psi \in \text{Cn}(\alpha \rightarrow \varphi, \alpha)$. Since by assumption $\psi \in \text{Cn}(\varphi)$, it is enough to show that $\varphi \in \text{Cn}(\alpha \rightarrow \varphi, \alpha)$, which, by \rightarrow_P , is equivalent to $\alpha \rightarrow \varphi \in \text{Cn}(\alpha \rightarrow \varphi)$, which is true. The second part is equivalent to $\varphi \rightarrow \alpha \in \text{Cn}(\psi \rightarrow \alpha)$, which, by \rightarrow_P , is equivalent to $\alpha \in \text{Cn}(\psi \rightarrow \alpha, \varphi)$. Since by assumption $\psi \in \text{Cn}(\varphi)$, by item 2, it is enough to show that $\alpha \in \text{Cn}(\psi \rightarrow \alpha, \psi)$, which again by \rightarrow_P is equivalent to $\psi \rightarrow \alpha \in \text{Cn}(\psi \rightarrow \alpha)$, which is true. □

Example 2.4. Here we list some well known logics whose standard consequence relations are selfextensional; for each of them, we highlight the metalogical properties it enjoys, and we also specify a nontrivial⁹ ‘term-connective’ witnessing the property whenever it does not belong to the primitive signature with which the given logic is most commonly presented.

1. For the selfextensional logic \mathcal{L} canonically associated with the class of lattices with bottom and without top, properties \wedge_P , \vee_P and \perp_P hold but \top_W does not. For this logic, $\text{Cn}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ (i.e. \mathcal{L} is a logic without theorems).
2. For positive modal logic [15], properties \wedge_P and \vee_S , \perp_P , \top_P hold and no other property listed above.
3. For orthologic [20], only properties \wedge_P , \vee_P , \perp_P , \top_P , \neg_I , and \neg_A hold.

⁹For instance, a trivial choice of $t(x)$ for which \neg_A , \neg_{II} , and \neg_P hold is $t(x) := \perp$, and dually, a trivial choice of $t(x)$ for which \sim_A , \neg_{Ir} , and \sim_P hold is $t(x) := \top$.

4. For the logic of pseudocomplemented lattices [4, Chapter 7], properties \top_P , \perp_P , \wedge_P , \vee_P , \neg_A and \neg_S hold.
5. For the basic Lambek calculus [18], property \neg_W holds for $t_1(x) := x \setminus \perp$ and for $t_2(x) := \perp / x$.
 - (a) If the ‘contraction’¹⁰ axiom $\varphi \vdash \varphi \otimes \varphi$ is added, then \neg_A also holds for $t_1(x)$ and $t_2(x)$ as above.
 - (b) If the ‘weakening’ axiom $\varphi \otimes \psi \vdash \varphi$ is added, then \top_W also holds for $t_1(x) := x \setminus x$ and $t_2(x) := x / x$. Notice, however, that since $Cn(\emptyset) = \emptyset$, \top_P does not hold.
6. For semi-De Morgan logic [32], only properties \wedge_P , \vee_S , \perp_P , \top_P and \neg_W hold.
 - (a) For lower quasi-De Morgan logic, property \neg_{Ir} also holds.
 - (b) For upper quasi-De Morgan logic, property \neg_{Il} also holds.
 - (c) For almost pseudocomplemented logic, property \neg_A also holds.

Properties \neg_I and \sim_A do not hold for any of these logics.
7. For De Morgan logic [26], all the properties of semi-De Morgan logic hold, with the addition of \neg_I . However, neither \neg_A nor \sim_A hold.
8. Properties \wedge_P , \vee_S , \perp_P , \top_P , and \rightarrow_P hold for intuitionistic logic. Furthermore, properties \neg_{Ir} , \neg_A , \neg_P , and \neg_S hold for $t(x) := x \rightarrow \perp$.
9. For bi-intuitionistic logic [31], all the properties of intuitionistic logic hold plus \prec_P . Furthermore, \neg_{Il} , \sim_A and \sim_P hold for $t(x) := \top \prec x$.
10. For any logic based on classical logic (e.g. classical modal logic K and other modal expansions of CPL), properties \neg_I , \neg_A , \neg_P , \neg_S , \sim_A , and \sim_P hold, while \rightarrow_P holds for $t_1(x, y) := \neg x \vee y$ and \prec_P holds for $t_2(x, y) := x \wedge \neg y$.
11. For the implicative fragment of intuitionistic logic, only \rightarrow_P holds (cf. [22, 21]).

2.2 Normative systems

Input/output logic [24] is a framework modelling the interaction between the relation of logical entailment between states of affair (states of affair being represented by formulas) and other binary relations on states of affair, representing e.g. systems of norms, strategies, preferences, and so on.

Let $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CPL}} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash_{\text{CPL}})$, s.t. Fm is the language of classical propositional logic (CPL) over a given (denumerable) set Prop of proposition variables, and $\vdash_{\text{CPL}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\text{Fm}) \times \text{Fm}$ is the entailment relation of classical propositional logic. Throughout this paper, *formulas*, i.e. elements in Fm will be denoted by lowercase Greek letters, and sets of formulas by uppercase Greek letters. For any $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Fm}$, let $Cn_{\text{CPL}}(\Gamma) := \{\varphi \in \text{Fm} \mid \Gamma \vdash_{\text{CPL}} \varphi\}$. A *normative system* on \mathcal{L}_{CPL} is a relation $N \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$, the elements (α, φ) of which are called *conditional norms* (or obligations).

A normative system $N \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ is *internally incoherent* if (α, φ) and $(\alpha, \neg\varphi) \in N$ for some $\alpha, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$; a normative system N is *internally coherent* if it is not internally incoherent. If $N, N' \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ are normative systems, N is *almost included* in N' (in symbols: $N \subseteq_c N'$) if $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ and $\alpha \not\vdash_{\text{CPL}} \perp$ imply $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N'$.

Each norm $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ can be intuitively read as “given α , it *should* be the case that φ ”. This interpretation can be further specified according to the context: for instance, if N formally represents a system of (real-life) rules/norms, then we can read $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ as “ φ is obligatory whenever α is the case”; if N formally represents a scientific theory, then we can read $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ as “under conditions α , one should observe φ ”, in the sense that the scientific theory predicts φ whenever α ; finally, if N formally represents (the execution

¹⁰We refer to this axiom as contraction since it corresponds to the well known contraction rule $\frac{\varphi, \varphi \vdash \delta}{\varphi \vdash \delta}$. Likewise, the weakening axiom corresponds to the weakening rule $\frac{\varphi \vdash \delta}{\varphi, \psi \vdash \delta}$.

of) a program, then we can read $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ as “in every state of computation in which α holds, the program will move to a state in which φ holds”. For any $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Fm}$, let $N(\Gamma) := \{\psi \mid \exists \alpha (\alpha \in \Gamma \ \& \ (\alpha, \psi) \in N)\}$.

An *input/output logic* is a tuple $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}_{\text{CPL}}, N)$ s.t. \mathcal{L}_{CPL} is a classical propositional logic, and N is a normative system on \mathcal{L}_{CPL} .

For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$, and each $1 \leq i \leq 4$, the output operation out_i^N is defined as follows: for any $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Fm}$,

$$out_i^N(\Gamma) := N_i(\Gamma) = \{\psi \in \text{Fm} \mid \exists \alpha (\alpha \in \Gamma \ \& \ (\alpha, \psi) \in N_i)\}$$

where $N_i \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ is the *closure* of N under (i.e. the smallest extension of N satisfying) the inference rules below, as specified in the table.

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{}{(\top, \top)} (\top) \quad \frac{}{(\perp, \perp)} (\perp) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad \beta \vdash \alpha}{(\beta, \varphi)} (\text{SI}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad \varphi \vdash \psi}{(\alpha, \psi)} (\text{WO}) \\ \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha, \psi)}{(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi)} (\text{AND}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\beta, \varphi)}{(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi)} (\text{OR}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi)}{(\alpha, \psi)} (\text{CT}) \end{array}$$

N_i	Rules
N_1	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND})$
N_2	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND}), (\text{OR})$
N_3	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND}), (\text{CT})$
N_4	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND}), (\text{OR}), (\text{CT})$

Table 1: closures of normative systems

Remark 2.5. In [29], the following additional rules are considered:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha, \psi) \quad \alpha \wedge \varphi \wedge \psi \not\vdash \perp}{(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi)} (\text{R-AND}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi) \quad \alpha \wedge \varphi \wedge \psi \not\vdash \perp}{(\alpha, \psi)} (\text{R-CT}) \\ \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\beta, \psi)}{(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi \vee \psi)} (\text{ex-OR}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad \varphi \equiv \psi}{(\alpha, \psi)} (\text{Eq}) \end{array}$$

where $\varphi \equiv \psi$ iff $\varphi \vdash \psi$ and $\psi \vdash \varphi$. The rules in the upper row are versions of (AND) and (CT) with a built-in consistency check, while those in the lower row are derivable from (OR) and (WO). These rules give rise to a space of sixteen normative systems, generated by replacing (AND) and (CT) (resp. (OR) and (WO)) in Table 2.2 with their modified versions. In the present paper, we only focus on the four types of normative systems indicated in the Table 2.2. However, it is possible to generalize the whole space of normative systems considered in [29] to selfextensional logics, and at the end of the next section we will briefly outline how this can be done.

2.3 Permission systems

Negative permission systems. Any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}_{\text{CPL}}, N)$ induces the *conditional or negative permission system* $P_N \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ (cf. [24]) defined as follows:

$$P_N := \{(\alpha, \varphi) \mid (\alpha, \neg\varphi) \notin N\}.$$

The same definition applies verbatim to any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}_{\text{IPL}}, N)$, where \mathcal{L}_{IPL} denotes intuitionistic propositional logic.

Proposition 2.6. For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}_{\text{CPL/IPL}}, N)$ for which (WO) holds, P_N is the largest permission system P such that, for all $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$,

$$\text{if } (\alpha, \varphi) \in P \text{ and } (\alpha, \psi) \in N, \text{ then } Cn(\varphi, \psi) \neq \text{Fm}.$$

Proof. Let us first show that the property holds for P_N . Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ such that $(\alpha, \psi) \in N$. If $Cn(\varphi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$, then $\psi \vdash_{\text{CPL/IPL}} \neg\varphi$, which would imply, by (WO), that $(\alpha, \neg\varphi) \in N$, i.e. $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_N$, as required. The same argument shows that any permission system P for which the property holds must be included in P_N . \square

Static positive permission systems. Static positive permission captures the idea that ψ be permitted under γ iff it is normatively entailed by some explicitly given permission (α, φ) in P , given the normative system N . In what follows, for any rule (R), and any normative system N on \mathcal{L}_{CPL} , we let $N^{(R)} \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ denote the closure of N under rule (R). For any $(\alpha, \varphi) \in \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$, we let $N_{(\alpha, \varphi)}^{(R)} \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ denote the closure of $N \cup \{(\alpha, \varphi)\}$ under rule (R), and for any $1 \leq i \leq 4$, we let $N_{(\alpha, \varphi)}^i \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ denote the closure of $N \cup \{(\alpha, \varphi)\}$ under the rules specified in Table 2.2.

For any normative system N on \mathcal{L}_{CPL} , any conditional permission system $P \subseteq P_N$, and any rule (R), the *static positive permission systems associated with $N^{(R)}$ and P* (cf. [25]) are defined as follows:

$$S^{(R)}(P, N) := \begin{cases} \bigcup \{N_{(\alpha, \varphi)}^{(R)} \mid (\alpha, \varphi) \in P\} & \text{if } P \neq \emptyset \\ N^{(R)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For any $1 \leq i \leq 4$, the *static positive permission systems associated with N^i and P* are defined as follows:

$$S^i(P, N) := \begin{cases} \bigcup \{N_{(\alpha, \varphi)}^i \mid (\alpha, \varphi) \in P\} & \text{if } P \neq \emptyset \\ N^i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It immediately follows from the definition above that

$$N^{(R)} \subseteq S^{(R)}(P, N) \text{ and } N^i \subseteq S^i(P, N).$$

Dynamic permission systems. The notion of dynamic permission intends to capture the idea that a proposition φ be permitted under condition α whenever forbidding it under α , given the obligations of the normative system N , would entail forbidding some ψ under some satisfiable condition γ which is explicitly permitted under γ .

Definition 2.7. (cf. [25]) *For any normative system N on \mathcal{L}_{CPL} , any conditional permission system $P \subseteq P_N$, and any rule (R), the dynamic positive permission system $D^{(R)}(P, N)$ is defined as follows:*

$$D^{(R)}(P, N) = \{(\alpha, \varphi) \mid \exists \gamma \exists \psi (\gamma \not\vdash \perp \ \& \ (\gamma, \psi) \in S^{(R)}(P, N) \ \& \ (\gamma, \neg\psi) \in N_{(\alpha, \neg\varphi)}^{(R)})\},$$

and for any $1 \leq i \leq 3$, the dynamic positive permission system $D^i(P, N)$ is defined as follows:

$$D^i(P, N) = \{(\alpha, \varphi) \mid \exists \gamma \exists \psi (\gamma \not\vdash \perp \ \& \ (\gamma, \psi) \in S^i(P, N) \ \& \ (\gamma, \neg\psi) \in N_{(\alpha, \neg\varphi)}^i)\}.$$

3 Normative systems on selfextensional logics

In the present section we build on [13, Section 2.2], and introduce generalized versions of normative systems in the framework of selfextensional logics.

Definition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$ be a logic in the sense specified in Section 2.1. A normative system on \mathcal{L} is a relation $N \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$, the elements (α, φ) of which are called conditional norms (or obligations).*

A normative system $N \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ is internally incoherent if (α, φ) and $(\alpha, \psi) \in N$ for some $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ such that $\text{Cn}(\alpha) \neq \text{Fm}$ and $\text{Cn}(\varphi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$; a normative system N is internally coherent if it is not internally incoherent. If $N, N' \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ are normative systems, N is almost included in N' (in symbols: $N \subseteq_c N'$) if $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ and $\text{Cn}(\alpha) \neq \text{Fm}$ imply $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N'$.

The intuitive reading of any norm $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ remains the same as that discussed in the previous section. For any $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Fm}$, let $N(\Gamma) := \{\psi \mid \exists \alpha (\alpha \in \Gamma \ \& \ (\alpha, \psi) \in N)\}$.

Definition 3.2. *An input/output logic is a tuple $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$ s.t. $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$ is a (selfextensional) logic, and N is a normative system on \mathcal{L} .*

Definition 3.3 (Output operations). *For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$, and each $1 \leq i \leq 4$, the output operation out_i^N is defined as follows: for any $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Fm}$,*

$$out_i^N(\Gamma) := N_i(\Gamma) = \{\psi \in \text{Fm} \mid \exists \alpha(\alpha \in \Gamma \ \& \ (\alpha, \psi) \in N_i)\}$$

where $N_i \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ is the closure of N under (i.e. the smallest extension of N satisfying) the inference rules below, as specified in the table.

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{}{(\top, \top)} (\top) \quad \frac{}{(\perp, \perp)} (\perp) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad \beta \vdash \alpha}{(\beta, \varphi)} (\text{SI}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad \varphi \vdash \psi}{(\alpha, \psi)} (\text{WO}) \\ \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha, \psi)}{(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi)} (\text{AND}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\beta, \varphi)}{(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi)} (\text{OR}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi)}{(\alpha, \psi)} (\text{CT}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi \vee \psi) \quad Cn(\alpha, \psi) = \text{Fm}}{(\alpha, \varphi)} (\text{EX}) \end{array}$$

N_i	Rules
N_1	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND})$
N_2	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND}), (\text{OR})$
N_3	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND}), (\text{CT})$
N_4	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND}), (\text{OR}), (\text{CT})$

Table 2: closures of normative systems

Clearly, with the exception of (SI) and (WO), all the rules above (as well as the rules below and in the next section) apply only to those input/output logics based on selfextensional logics with the (minimal) metalogical properties guaranteeing the existence of the corresponding term-connectives. So, for instance, rules (AND) and (CT) only apply in the context of logics for which \wedge_P holds, and so on. For the sake of a better readability, in the remainder of the paper we will implicitly assume these basic properties, and only mention the additional properties when it is required.

Generalizations of (AND) and (OR) which do not require \wedge_P and \vee_P , but are equivalent to these closure rules in the presence of (SI), (WO), and the above mentioned metalogical properties, are the following:

$$\frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha, \psi)}{(\alpha, \chi) \text{ for some } \chi \in Cn(\varphi, \psi)} (\text{DD}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\beta, \varphi)}{(\gamma, \varphi) \text{ for some } \gamma \in Cn(\alpha) \cap Cn(\beta)} (\text{UD})$$

Let us conclude the present section by discussing the new rule (EX), and how the rules mentioned in Remark 2.5 can be generalized to selfextensional logics. The rule (EX) describes the natural interaction of normative systems with the coimplication connective $\alpha \prec \psi$, which in CPL is defined as $\alpha \wedge \neg \psi$. The intuitive meaning of this rule is closely related with the logical principle of “modus tollens”: if whenever α either φ or ψ should hold, and α logically excludes ψ , then φ should hold whenever α . Notice that any normative system N on CPL for which (WO) holds is also closed under (EX): indeed, if $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}_{\text{CPL}}$ s.t. $\alpha N(\varphi \vee \psi)$ and $\vdash_{\text{CPL}} \alpha \wedge \neg \psi$, then $\varphi \vee \psi \vdash_{\text{CPL}} (\varphi \vee \psi) \wedge \top \cong (\varphi \vee \psi) \wedge (\alpha \wedge \neg \psi) \cong (\varphi \wedge (\alpha \wedge \neg \psi)) \vee (\psi \wedge (\alpha \wedge \neg \psi)) \cong (\varphi \wedge (\alpha \wedge \neg \psi)) \vee \perp \cong \varphi$.

While the rules (ex – OR) and (Eq) can be considered verbatim (in the case of (ex – OR), provided of course \vee_P holds for \mathcal{L}), the built-in consistency check characterizing (R – AND) and (R – CT) can be incorporated as follows:

$$\frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha, \psi) \quad Cn(\alpha, \varphi, \psi) \neq \text{Fm}}{(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi)} (\text{R – AND}) \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi) \quad Cn(\alpha, \varphi, \psi) \neq \text{Fm}}{(\alpha, \psi)} (\text{R – CT})$$

4 Permission systems on selfextensional logics

In the present section, we introduce and motivate the extension of the different notions of permission studied in the context of input/output logic [25], namely, negative permission (cf. Section 4.1), positive static permission (cf. Section 4.3), and dynamic permission (cf. Section 4.4), to the general setting of selfextensional logics.

4.1 Negative permission systems

Since the definition of negative permission as given at the beginning of Section 2.3 does not apply verbatim to the environment of normative systems based on the generic logics described in Definition 3.1, we will use the characterizing property of P_N stated in Proposition 2.6 for the following definition, which informally says that any φ is permitted under a given α iff φ is not logically inconsistent with any obligation ψ under α .

Definition 4.1. For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$,

$$P_N := \{(\alpha, \varphi) \mid \forall \psi((\alpha, \psi) \in N \Rightarrow Cn(\varphi, \psi) \neq \text{Fm})\}.$$

Proposition 4.2. For any selfextensional logic $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$ with \neg_S and \neg_A , and any normative system N on Fm which is closed under (WO),

$$P_N = \{(\alpha, \varphi) \mid (\alpha, \neg\varphi) \notin N\}.$$

Proof. For the left-to-right inclusion, let $\psi := \neg\varphi$; by the assumption and \neg_A , $Cn(\varphi, \neg\varphi) = \text{Fm}$ implies that $(\alpha, \neg\varphi) \notin N$, as required. Conversely, let $\alpha, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \neg\varphi) \notin N$ and let $\psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\varphi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$. By \neg_S , this implies that $\psi \vdash \neg\varphi$. Hence, $(\alpha, \psi) \notin N$, for otherwise, by (WO), $(\alpha, \psi) \in N$ and $\psi \vdash \neg\varphi$ would imply that $(\alpha, \neg\varphi) \in N$, against the assumption. \square

Hence, by the proposition above, Definition 4.1 is equivalent to the definition of negative permission as given at the beginning of Section 2.3 in all settings based on classical and intuitionistic propositional logic, but also on (non distributive) logics such as the logic of pseudocomplemented lattices (cf. Example 2.4.4).

Proposition 4.3. If N is internally coherent, then $N \subseteq_c P_N$.

Proof. Let $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ with $Cn(\alpha) \neq \text{Fm}$ and suppose for the sake of contradiction that $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_N$. Then a formula ψ exists such that $(\alpha, \psi) \in N$ and $Cn(\varphi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$, making N internally incoherent. \square

Proposition 4.4. For any $N_1, N_2 \subseteq \text{Fm}$, if $N_1 \subseteq N_2$ then $P_{N_2} \subseteq P_{N_1}$.

Proof. If $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_{N_1}$, then $Cn(\varphi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$ and $(\alpha, \psi) \in N_1 \subseteq N_2$ for some $\psi \in \text{Fm}$. Hence, $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_{N_2}$, as required. \square

Consider the following closure rules on $P_N^c := (\text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}) \setminus P_N$:¹¹

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{}{(\top, \perp)} (\top)^\triangleright & \frac{}{(\perp, \top)} (\perp)^\triangleright & \frac{(\beta, \varphi) \quad \alpha \vdash \beta}{(\alpha, \varphi)} (\text{SI})^\triangleright \\ \frac{(\alpha, \psi) \quad \varphi \vdash \psi}{(\alpha, \varphi)} (\text{WO})^\triangleright & \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha, \psi)}{(\alpha, \varphi \vee \psi)} (\text{AND})^\triangleright & \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\beta, \varphi)}{(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi)} (\text{OR})^\triangleright \\ \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \in N \quad (\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi)}{(\alpha, \psi)} (\text{CT})^\triangleright & \frac{(\alpha, \varphi \rightarrow \psi) \in N \quad Cn(\alpha, \psi) = \text{Fm}}{(\alpha, \varphi)} (\text{EX})^\triangleright & \end{array}$$

The relationship between each rule $(X)^\triangleright$ and its corresponding rule (X) is similar to the one between the rule scheme (HR) and $(\text{HR})^{-1}$ discussed in [25, Section 2].¹² Specifically, each rule $(X)^\triangleright$ has been obtained by reading off the equivalence “ $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ iff $(\alpha, \neg\varphi) \in P_N^c$ ” from the corresponding rule (X) and then applying manipulations which yield logically equivalent conditions in classical logic. For instance, as to $(\top)^\triangleright$, we proceed as follows: $(\top, \top) \in N$ iff $(\top, \neg\top) \in P_N^c$ iff $(\top, \perp) \in P_N^c$; as to $(\text{WO})^\triangleright$, we rewrite “ $(\alpha, \psi) \in N$ and

$$\frac{(\alpha, \psi) \quad \varphi \vdash \psi}{(\alpha, \varphi)}$$

¹¹For instance, the rule $\frac{(\alpha, \psi) \quad \varphi \vdash \psi}{(\alpha, \varphi)}$ reads as follows: if $(\alpha, \psi) \notin P_N$ and $\varphi \vdash \psi$ then $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_N$.

¹²The main difference between the study of the properties of conditional permissions in [25] and the present study is that the former is developed in terms of the properties of P_N itself, whereas the present one is carried out in terms of the closure properties of the complement of P_N . One reason for this is that P_N^c can be understood as a system of *prohibitions*, and hence as a particular type of normative system, studying which in terms of rules formulated as Horn-type conditions seems to provide a greater conceptual uniformity. This uniformity is also reflected in the properties of the algebraic structures which are used as a semantic environment for permission systems in input/output logic in the companion paper [12]. We refer to this paper for an expanded discussion on this issue.

$\psi \vdash \varphi$ entail $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ ” as “ $(\alpha, \neg\psi) \in P_N^c$ and $\neg\varphi \vdash \neg\psi$ entail $(\alpha, \neg\varphi) \in P_N^c$ ”, then we instantiate $\psi := \neg\psi$ and $\varphi := \neg\varphi$ and use the fact that classical negation is involutive. Of course, having used classically valid logical equivalences to generate these rules does not imply that these rules are mere reformulations of the closure rules for normative systems in every context. The picture is more nuanced, as the next proposition shows.

Proposition 4.5. *For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$,*

1. *If \perp_P and \top_W hold for \mathcal{L} , P_N^c is closed under $(\top)^\triangleright$ iff $(\top, \psi) \in N$ for some $\psi \in \text{Fm}$.*
 2. *If \perp_P and \top_W hold for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (WO), then N is closed under (\top) iff P_N^c is closed under $(\top)^\triangleright$.*
 3. *If \perp_P and \top_W hold for \mathcal{L} , P_N^c is closed under $(\perp)^\triangleright$ iff $(\perp, \psi) \in N$ for some $\psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\psi) = \text{Fm}$.*
 4. *If \perp_P and \top_W hold for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (WO), then N is closed under (\perp) iff P_N^c is closed under $(\perp)^\triangleright$.*
 5. *P_N^c is closed under (WO) $^\triangleright$.*
 6. *If N is closed under (SI), then P_N^c is closed under (SI) $^\triangleright$.*
 7. *If \perp_P , \top_P , \neg_I , \neg_A , and \neg_P hold for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (WO), then N is closed under (SI) iff P_N^c is closed under (SI) $^\triangleright$.*
 8. *If \wedge_P and \vee_S hold for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (AND), then P_N^c is closed under (AND) $^\triangleright$.*
 9. *If \perp_P , \top_P , \neg_I , \neg_A , and \neg_P hold for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (WO), then N is closed under (AND) iff P_N^c is closed under (AND) $^\triangleright$.*
 10. *If \vee_S holds for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (OR) and (WO), then P_N^c is closed under (OR) $^\triangleright$.*
 11. *If \perp_P , \top_P , \neg_I , \neg_A , and \neg_P hold for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (WO), then N is closed under (OR) iff P_N^c is closed under (OR) $^\triangleright$.*
 12. *If N is closed under (CT), then P_N^c is closed under (CT) $^\triangleright$.*
 13. *If \perp_P , \top_P , \neg_I , \neg_A , and \neg_P hold for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (WO), then N is closed under (CT) iff P_N^c is closed under (CT) $^\triangleright$.*
- Proof.*
1. $(\top, \perp) \in P_N^c$ iff $(\top, \perp) \notin P_N$ iff $(\top, \psi) \in N$ and $Cn(\perp, \psi) = \text{Fm}$ for some $\psi \in \text{Fm}$, iff $(\top, \psi) \in N$ for some $\psi \in \text{Fm}$, since \perp_P implies that the second conjunct is always true.
 2. By the previous item, it is enough to show that $(\top, \top) \in N$ iff $(\top, \psi) \in N$ for some $\psi \in \text{Fm}$. This equivalence is guaranteed by the assumption that N be closed under (WO).
 3. $(\perp, \top) \in P_N^c$ iff $(\perp, \top) \notin P_N$ iff $(\perp, \psi) \in N$ and $Cn(\top, \psi) = \text{Fm}$ for some $\psi \in \text{Fm}$ iff $(\perp, \psi) \in N$ for some $\psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\psi) = \text{Fm}$. The last equivalence holds because of \top_W .
 4. By the previous item, it is enough to show that $(\perp, \perp) \in N$ iff $(\perp, \psi) \in N$ for some $\psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\psi) = \text{Fm}$. This equivalence is guaranteed by $\psi \vdash \perp$ and the assumption that N be closed under (WO).
 5. Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $\varphi \vdash \psi$ and $(\alpha, \psi) \notin P_N$. Hence, some $\psi' \in \text{Fm}$ exists s.t. $(\alpha, \psi') \in N$ and $Cn(\psi, \psi') = \text{Fm}$. Since $\varphi \vdash \psi$, the latter identity implies that $Cn(\varphi, \psi') = \text{Fm}$. Thus, ψ' is a witness for $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_N$, as required.
 6. Let $\alpha, \beta, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $(\beta, \varphi) \notin P_N$. Hence, $(\beta, \psi) \in N$ and $Cn(\varphi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$ for some $\psi \in \text{Fm}$. Since N is closed under (SI), from $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $(\beta, \psi) \in N$, it follows that $(\alpha, \psi) \in N$. Hence, ψ is also a witness to $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_N$, as required.

7. By the previous item, the proof is complete if we show that P_N^c being closed under $(\text{SI})^\triangleright$ implies that N is closed under (SI) . Let $\alpha, \beta, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $(\beta, \varphi) \in N$, and let us show that $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$. By \neg_A and the definition of P_N , from $Cn(\varphi, \neg\varphi) = \text{Fm}$ it follows that $(\beta, \neg\varphi) \notin P_N$, which implies, by $(\text{SI})^\triangleright$, that $(\alpha, \neg\varphi) \notin P_N$, i.e. $(\alpha, \varphi') \in N$ and $Cn(\neg\varphi, \varphi') = \text{Fm}$ for some $\varphi' \in \text{Fm}$. By Proposition 2.3.9, the last identity implies that $\varphi' \vdash \neg\neg\varphi$, which implies $\varphi' \vdash \varphi$ by \neg_I . Hence, by (WO) , we conclude $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$, as required.
8. Arguing contrapositively, let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi \vee \psi) \in P_N$. By definition and \vee_S , this means that $Cn(\chi, \varphi) \cap Cn(\chi, \psi) = Cn(\chi, \varphi \vee \psi) = \text{Fm}$ for every $\chi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \chi) \in N$. Hence, for every such χ , either $Cn(\chi, \varphi) = \text{Fm} = Cn(\chi, \psi)$, which implies that $(\alpha, \varphi) \in P_N$ and $(\alpha, \psi) \in P_N$, as required.
9. By the previous item, the proof is complete if we show that P_N^c being closed under $(\text{AND})^\triangleright$ implies that N is closed under (AND) . Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ and $(\alpha, \psi) \in N$. By \neg_A and the definition of P_N , from $Cn(\neg\varphi, \varphi) = \text{Fm} = Cn(\neg\psi, \psi)$ we deduce that $(\alpha, \neg\varphi) \notin P_N$ and $(\alpha, \neg\psi) \notin P_N$, which implies, by $(\text{AND})^\triangleright$, that $(\alpha, \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi) \notin P_N$. This entails, since P_N^c is closed under $(\text{WO})^\triangleright$ (cf. item 8) and $\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) \vdash \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi$ by Lemma 2.1, that $(\alpha, \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)) \notin P_N$. By definition, this means that $(\alpha, \varphi') \in N$ and $Cn(\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi), \varphi') = \text{Fm}$ for some $\varphi' \in \text{Fm}$. Hence, by Proposition 2.3.9 and \neg_I , $\varphi' \vdash \neg\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi) \vdash \varphi \wedge \psi$. By (WO) , this implies that $(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi) \in N$, as required.
10. Let $\alpha, \beta, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_N$ and $(\beta, \varphi) \notin P_N$. Hence, $(\alpha, \psi_1) \in N$ and $(\beta, \psi_2) \in N$ for some $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\varphi, \psi_1) = \text{Fm} = Cn(\varphi, \psi_2)$. By (WO) and (OR) and \vee_S , this implies that $(\alpha \vee \beta, \psi_1 \vee \psi_2) \in N$. Moreover, \vee_S entails that $Cn(\varphi, \psi_1 \vee \psi_2) = Cn(\varphi, \psi_1) \cap Cn(\varphi, \psi_2) = \text{Fm} \cap \text{Fm} = \text{Fm}$. This shows that $\psi_1 \vee \psi_2$ is a witness for $(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi) \notin P_N$, as required.
11. By the previous item, the proof is complete if we show that P_N^c being closed under $(\text{OR})^\triangleright$ implies that N is closed under (OR) . Let $\alpha, \beta, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ and $(\beta, \varphi) \in N$. By \neg_A and the definition of P_N , from $Cn(\neg\varphi, \varphi) = \text{Fm}$ we deduce that $(\alpha, \neg\varphi) \notin P_N$ and $(\beta, \neg\varphi) \notin P_N$, which implies, by $(\text{OR})^\triangleright$, that $(\alpha \vee \beta, \neg\varphi) \notin P_N$. By definition, this means that $(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi') \in N$ and $Cn(\neg\varphi, \varphi') = \text{Fm}$ for some $\varphi' \in \text{Fm}$. Hence, by Proposition 2.3.9 and \neg_I , $\varphi' \vdash \neg\neg\varphi \vdash \varphi$. By (WO) , this implies that $(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi) \in N$, as required.
12. Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ and $(\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi) \notin P_N$. Hence, $(\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi') \in N$ for some $\psi' \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\psi, \psi') = \text{Fm}$. By (CT) , this implies that $(\alpha, \psi') \in N$, hence ψ' is the witness for $(\alpha, \psi) \notin P_N$, as required.
13. By the previous item, the proof is complete if we show that P_N^c being closed under $(\text{CT})^\triangleright$ implies that N is closed under (CT) . Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ and $(\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi) \in N$. By \neg_A and the definition of P_N , from $Cn(\neg\psi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$ we deduce that $(\alpha \wedge \varphi, \neg\psi) \notin P_N$, which implies, by $(\text{CT})^\triangleright$, that $(\alpha, \neg\psi) \notin P_N$. By definition, this means that $(\alpha, \varphi') \in N$ and $Cn(\neg\psi, \varphi') = \text{Fm}$ for some $\varphi' \in \text{Fm}$. Hence, by Proposition 2.3.9 and \neg_I , $\varphi' \vdash \neg\neg\psi \vdash \psi$. By (WO) , this implies that $(\alpha, \psi) \in N$, as required. \square

For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$ and any $1 \leq i \leq 4$, we let $P_i := P_{N_i}$.

Corollary 4.6. *For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$, if $\wedge_P, \vee_S, \perp_P$, and \top_W hold for \mathcal{L} , then P_i^c for $1 \leq i \leq 4$ is closed under the rules indicated in the following table.*

P_i^c	Rules
P_1^c	$(\top)^\triangleright, (\text{SI})^\triangleright, (\text{WO})^\triangleright, (\text{AND})^\triangleright$
P_2^c	$(\top)^\triangleright, (\text{SI})^\triangleright, (\text{WO})^\triangleright, (\text{AND})^\triangleright, (\text{OR})^\triangleright$
P_3^c	$(\top)^\triangleright, (\text{SI})^\triangleright, (\text{WO})^\triangleright, (\text{AND})^\triangleright, (\text{CT})^\triangleright$
P_4^c	$(\top)^\triangleright, (\text{SI})^\triangleright, (\text{WO})^\triangleright, (\text{AND})^\triangleright, (\text{OR})^\triangleright, (\text{CT})^\triangleright$

4.2 Dual negative permission systems

The perspective afforded by the general setting of selfextensional logics makes it possible to consider a notion of *dual conditional permission system* D_N associated with a given normative system N , which, in the setting

of classical propositional logic, is absorbed by the usual notion of negative permission:

$$(\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N \text{ iff } (\neg\alpha, \varphi) \notin N \text{ iff } (\neg\alpha, \neg\varphi) \in P_N.$$

Similarly to the generalized definition of P_N introduced in the previous subsection, a more general version of D_N can be introduced, namely:

$$D_N := \{(\alpha, \varphi) \mid \exists\beta((\beta, \varphi) \notin N \ \& \ Cn(\alpha, \beta) = \text{Fm})\},$$

which cannot be subsumed by the definition of P_N . While the notion of negative permission P_N intuitively characterizes those states of affair α and φ which can both be the case without generating a violation of the normative system N , the dual negative permission system D_N characterizes those states of affair α and φ which can both *fail* to be the case without generating a violation of the normative system N .

Proposition 4.7. *For any selfextensional logic $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$ with \neg_S and \neg_A , and any normative system N on Fm which is closed under (SI),*

$$D_N = \{(\alpha, \varphi) \mid (\neg\alpha, \varphi) \notin N\}.$$

Proof. For the right-to-left inclusion, take $\beta := \neg\alpha$ as the witness; by \neg_A , we have $Cn(\alpha, \neg\alpha) = \text{Fm}$, as required. Conversely, let $\alpha, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\beta, \varphi) \notin N$ for some $\beta \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\alpha, \beta) = \text{Fm}$. By \neg_S , this implies that $\beta \vdash \neg\alpha$. Hence, $(\neg\alpha, \varphi) \notin N$, for otherwise, by (SI), $(\beta, \varphi) \in N$, against the assumption. \square

We introduce the following closure rules on $D_N^c := (\text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}) \setminus D_N$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{}{(\perp, \top)} (\top)^\triangleleft & \frac{}{(\top, \perp)} (\perp)^\triangleleft & \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad \alpha \vdash \beta}{(\beta, \varphi)} (\text{SI})^\triangleleft \\ \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad \varphi \vdash \psi}{(\alpha, \psi)} (\text{WO})^\triangleleft & \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\alpha, \psi)}{(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi)} (\text{AND})^\triangleleft & \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\beta, \varphi)}{(\alpha \wedge \beta, \varphi)} (\text{OR})^\triangleleft \\ \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \quad (\varphi \prec \alpha, \psi) \in N}{(\alpha, \psi)} (\text{CT})^\triangleleft & & \end{array}$$

Proposition 4.8. *For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$,*

1. *If \perp_P and \top_W hold for \mathcal{L} , then D_N^c is closed under $(\top)^\triangleleft$ iff $(\beta, \top) \in N$ for all $\beta \in \text{Fm}$.*
2. *If \perp_P and \top_W hold for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (SI), then D_N^c is closed under $(\top)^\triangleleft$ iff N is closed under (\top) .*
3. *If \perp_P and \top_W hold for \mathcal{L} , D_N^c is closed under $(\perp)^\triangleleft$ iff for all $\beta \in \text{Fm}$, if $Cn(\beta) = \text{Fm}$ then $(\beta, \perp) \in N$.*
4. *If \perp_P and \top_W hold for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (SI), then D_N^c is closed under $(\perp)^\triangleleft$ iff N is closed under (\perp) .*
5. *D_N^c is closed under (SI) $^\triangleleft$.*
6. *If N is closed under (WO), then D_N^c is closed under (WO) $^\triangleleft$.*
7. *If $\perp_P, \top_P, \neg_I, \neg_A$, and \neg_P hold for \mathcal{L} , and N is closed under (SI), then N is closed under (WO) iff D_N^c is closed under (WO) $^\triangleleft$.*
8. *If \wedge_P holds for \mathcal{L} and N is closed under (AND), then D_N^c is closed under (AND) $^\triangleleft$.*
9. *If $\wedge_P, \perp_P, \top_P, \neg_I, \neg_A$, and \neg_P hold for \mathcal{L} , and N is closed under (SI), then N is closed under (AND) iff D_N^c is closed under (AND) $^\triangleleft$.*
10. *If $\wedge_P, \vee_P, \perp_P, \top_P, \neg_I, \neg_A$, and \neg_P hold for \mathcal{L} , and N is closed under (SI) and (OR), then D_N^c is closed under (OR) $^\triangleleft$.*

11. If $\wedge_P, \vee_S, \perp_P, \top_P, \neg_I, \neg_A$, and \neg_P hold for \mathcal{L} , and N is closed under (SI), then N is closed under (OR) iff D_N^c is closed under (OR) $^\triangleleft$.
12. If \vee_P and \prec_P hold for \mathcal{L} , and N is closed under (WO), (SI), and (EX), then N being closed under (CT) implies D_N^c being closed under (CT) $^\triangleleft$.
13. If $\prec_P, \wedge_S, \vee_P, \top_P$ hold for \mathcal{L} and $\neg_A, \neg_S, \neg_{Ir}$ and \sim_A hold for \mathcal{L} relative to the same term, and N is closed under (SI), then D_N^c being closed under (CT) $^\triangleleft$ implies that N is closed under (CT).

Proof. 1. $(\perp, \top) \in D_N^c$ iff $(\beta, \top) \in N$ or $Cn(\perp, \beta) \neq \text{Fm}$ for all $\beta \in \text{Fm}$ iff $(\beta, \top) \in N$ for all $\beta \in \text{Fm}$, since \perp_P implies that the second disjunct is always false.

2. By the previous item it is enough to show that $(\top, \top) \in N$ implies $(\beta, \top) \in N$ for all $\beta \in \text{Fm}$. This equivalence is guaranteed by the assumption that N be closed under (SI).
3. $(\top, \perp) \in D_N^c$ iff for all $\beta \in \text{Fm}$, if $Cn(\top, \beta) = \text{Fm}$ then $(\beta, \perp) \in N$ iff for all $\beta \in \text{Fm}$, if $Cn(\beta) = \text{Fm}$ then $(\beta, \perp) \in N$. The last equivalence is guaranteed by \top_W .
4. By the previous item, $(\top, \perp) \in D_N^c$ iff for all $\beta \in \text{Fm}$, if $Cn(\beta) = \text{Fm}$ then $(\beta, \perp) \in N$, iff $(\perp, \perp) \in N$. The last equivalence is guaranteed by $\beta \vdash \perp$ and the assumption that N be closed under (SI).
5. Arguing contrapositively, let $\alpha, \beta, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $(\beta, \varphi) \in D_N$. Hence, some $\alpha' \in \text{Fm}$ exists s.t. $(\alpha', \varphi) \notin N$ and $Cn(\beta, \alpha') = \text{Fm}$. Since $\alpha \vdash \beta$, the latter identity implies that $Cn(\alpha, \alpha') = \text{Fm}$. Thus, α' is a witness for $(\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N$, as required.
6. Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin D_N$ and $\varphi \vdash \psi$. Hence, for any $\beta \in \text{Fm}$, if $Cn(\alpha, \beta) = \text{Fm}$, then $(\beta, \varphi) \in N$. Since N is closed under (WO), from $\varphi \vdash \psi$ it follows that $(\beta, \psi) \in N$. This shows that $(\alpha, \psi) \notin D_N$, as required.
7. By the previous item, the proof is complete if we show that D_N^c being closed under (WO) $^\triangleleft$ implies that N is closed under (WO). Arguing contrapositively, let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \psi) \notin N$ and $\varphi \vdash \psi$. Hence, by \neg_A and the definition of D_N , from $Cn(\alpha, \neg\alpha) = \text{Fm}$ it follows that $(\neg\alpha, \psi) \in D_N$, which implies, by (WO) $^\triangleleft$, that $(\neg\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N$, i.e. $(\beta, \varphi) \notin N$ and $Cn(\neg\alpha, \beta) = \text{Fm}$ for some $\beta \in \text{Fm}$. By Proposition 2.3.9, the last identity implies $\beta \vdash \neg\neg\alpha$, which implies $\beta \vdash \alpha$ by \neg_I . Hence, by (SI) we conclude $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin N$, as required.
8. Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin D_N$ and $(\alpha, \psi) \notin D_N$. Hence, by definition, $(\beta, \varphi) \in N$ and $(\beta, \psi) \in N$ for every $\beta \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\alpha, \beta) = \text{Fm}$. By (AND), this implies that $(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi) \notin D_N$, as required.
9. By the previous item, the proof is complete if we show that D_N^c being closed under (AND) $^\triangleleft$ implies that N is closed under (AND). Arguing contrapositively, let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi) \notin N$. By \neg_A and the definition of D_N , this implies that $(\neg\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi) \in D_N$, which implies, by (AND) $^\triangleleft$, that either $(\neg\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N$ or $(\neg\alpha, \psi) \in D_N$. Without loss of generality, let $(\neg\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N$, i.e. $Cn(\neg\alpha, \beta) = \text{Fm}$ and $(\beta, \varphi) \notin N$ for some $\beta \in \text{Fm}$. Proposition 2.3.9 and \neg_I imply that $\beta \vdash \neg\neg\alpha \vdash \alpha$. By (SI), this implies that $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin N$, as required.
10. Arguing contrapositively, let $\alpha, \beta, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha \wedge \beta, \varphi) \in D_N$, i.e. $Cn(\alpha \wedge \beta, \gamma) = \text{Fm}$ and $(\gamma, \varphi) \notin N$ for some $\gamma \in \text{Fm}$. Proposition 2.3.9 and Lemma 2.1.2 imply that $\gamma \vdash \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$. By (SI), this implies that $(\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta, \varphi) \notin N$. By (OR), the last statement implies that $(\neg\alpha, \varphi) \notin N$ or $(\neg\beta, \varphi) \notin N$, which implies, by \neg_A , that $(\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N$ or $(\beta, \varphi) \in D_N$, as required.
11. By the previous item, the proof is complete if we show that D_N^c being closed under (OR) $^\triangleleft$ implies that N is closed under (OR). Arguing contrapositively, let $\alpha, \beta, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ such that $(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi) \notin N$. By \neg_A and the definition of D_N , this implies $(\neg(\alpha \vee \beta), \varphi) \in D_N$, and since $\neg\alpha \wedge \neg\beta \vdash \neg(\alpha \vee \beta)$ holds (cf. Lemma 2.2), by (SI) $^\triangleleft$, this implies $(\neg\alpha \wedge \neg\beta, \varphi) \in D_N$. Applying (OR) $^\triangleleft$ contrapositively, it follows that either $(\neg\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N$ or $(\neg\beta, \varphi) \in D_N$. Without loss of generality, let $(\neg\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N$, i.e. $Cn(\neg\alpha, \gamma) = \text{Fm}$ and $(\gamma, \varphi) \notin N$ for some $\gamma \in \text{Fm}$. By Proposition 2.3.9 and \neg_I , it follows that $\gamma \vdash \neg\neg\alpha \vdash \alpha$. Hence, by (SI), we conclude $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin N$, as required.

12. Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \psi) \in D_N$ and $\varphi \prec \alpha \prec \psi$. Hence, $\beta \not\prec \psi$ for some $\beta \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\alpha, \beta) = \text{Fm}$. To show that $(\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N$, it is enough to show that $\beta \not\prec \varphi$. Indeed, the assumption that \forall_P and \prec_P hold for \mathcal{L} and $\varphi \prec \alpha \vdash \varphi \prec \alpha$ imply, by Proposition 2.3.8, that $\varphi \vdash (\varphi \prec \alpha) \vee \alpha$. Hence, by (WO), $\beta \prec \varphi \vdash (\varphi \prec \alpha) \vee \alpha$ implies that $\beta \prec (\varphi \prec \alpha) \vee \alpha$. This implies, since $Cn(\alpha, \beta) = \text{Fm}$ and (EX), that $\beta \prec (\varphi \prec \alpha)$. By (SI), $\beta \wedge (\varphi \prec \alpha) \vdash (\varphi \prec \alpha) \prec \psi$ implies that $\beta \wedge (\varphi \prec \alpha) \prec \psi$, hence by (CT), we conclude that $\beta \prec \psi$, against the assumption.
13. Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \psi) \notin N$, and let us show that either $\alpha \wedge \varphi \not\prec \psi$ or $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin N$. By \neg_A , the assumption that $(\alpha, \psi) \notin N$ implies that $(\neg\alpha, \psi) \in D_N$, which implies, by (CT) $^\triangleleft$, that either $(\varphi \prec \neg\alpha, \psi) \notin N$ or $(\neg\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N$. Let us assume that $(\varphi \prec \neg\alpha, \psi) \notin N$, and let us first show that $\varphi \prec \neg\alpha \vdash \alpha \wedge \varphi$; by Proposition 2.3.8 and \prec_P , this is true iff $\varphi \vdash (\alpha \wedge \varphi) \vee \neg\alpha$, which is true, since, by \wedge_S , \top_P and \sim_A , the following chain of identities holds: $(\alpha \wedge \varphi) \vee \neg\alpha = (\alpha \vee \neg\alpha) \wedge (\varphi \vee \neg\alpha) = \top \wedge (\varphi \vee \neg\alpha) = \varphi \vee \neg\alpha$. Hence, by (SI), $(\varphi \prec \neg\alpha, \psi) \notin N$ and $\varphi \prec \neg\alpha \vdash \alpha \wedge \varphi$ imply $\alpha \wedge \varphi \not\prec \psi$, as required. Finally, $(\neg\alpha, \varphi) \in D_N$ iff $\beta \not\prec \varphi$ for some $\beta \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\beta, \neg\alpha) = \text{Fm}$. This implies, by \neg_S and \neg_{I_r} , that $\beta \vdash \neg\neg\alpha \vdash \alpha$; hence, by (SI), we conclude $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin N$, as required. \square

For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$ and any $1 \leq i \leq 4$, we let $D_i := D_{N_i}$.

Corollary 4.9. *For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$, if $\wedge_P, \vee_S, \top_P, \perp_P$, and \neg_W hold for \mathcal{L} , then D_i^c for $1 \leq i \leq 4$ is closed under the rules indicated in the following table.*

D_i^c	Rules
D_1^c	$(\top)^\triangleleft, (\text{SI})^\triangleleft, (\text{WO})^\triangleleft, (\text{AND})^\triangleleft$
D_2^c	$(\top)^\triangleleft, (\text{SI})^\triangleleft, (\text{WO})^\triangleleft, (\text{AND})^\triangleleft, (\text{OR})^\triangleleft$
D_3^c	$(\top)^\triangleleft, (\text{SI})^\triangleleft, (\text{WO})^\triangleleft, (\text{AND})^\triangleleft, (\text{CT})^\triangleleft$
D_4^c	$(\top)^\triangleleft, (\text{SI})^\triangleleft, (\text{WO})^\triangleleft, (\text{AND})^\triangleleft, (\text{OR})^\triangleleft, (\text{CT})^\triangleleft$

4.3 Static positive permission systems

The definition of static positive permission, originally introduced in the setting of CPL (cf. Section 2.3), can be generalized verbatim to the context of any selfextensional logic (cf. Section 2.1), as is done in the following

Definition 4.10. *For any normative system N on a selfextensional logic \mathcal{L} , any conditional permission system $P \subseteq P_N$, and any rule (R), the static positive permission systems associated with $N^{(R)}$ and P are defined as follows:*

$$S^{(R)}(P, N) := \begin{cases} \bigcup \{N_{(\alpha, \varphi)}^{(R)} \mid (\alpha, \varphi) \in P\} & \text{if } P \neq \emptyset \\ N^{(R)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For any $1 \leq i \leq 4$, the static positive permission systems associated with N^i and P are defined as follows:

$$S^i(P, N) := \begin{cases} \bigcup \{N_{(\alpha, \varphi)}^i \mid (\alpha, \varphi) \in P\} & \text{if } P \neq \emptyset \\ N^i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In what follows, we will suppress the index in the notation of positive permission whenever properties considered in each context do not depend on the specific closure properties.

Definition 4.11. *Let $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$ be a selfextensional logic. A normative system N and a permission system P on \mathcal{L} are cross-incoherent if $(\gamma, \varphi) \in N$ and $(\gamma, \psi) \in S(P, N)$ for some $\gamma, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\gamma) \neq \text{Fm}$ and $Cn(\varphi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$. If P, N are not cross-incoherent, we say they are cross-coherent.*

Proposition 4.12. *For every $P, N \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$, $S(P, N) \subseteq_c P_N$ if and only if P, N are cross-coherent.*

Proof. For the left-to-right direction, if P and N are cross-incoherent, i.e. some γ, φ and $\psi \in \text{Fm}$ exist such that $(\gamma, \varphi) \in N$, $(\gamma, \psi) \in S(P, N)$ and $Cn(\gamma) \neq \text{Fm} = Cn(\varphi, \psi)$, it is easy to see that $(\gamma, \varphi) \notin P_N$, taking ψ as the witness, which shows that $S(P, N) \not\subseteq_c P_N$, as required.

Conversely, assume $Cn(\alpha) \neq \text{Fm}$ and $(\alpha, \varphi) \in S(P, N)$. If $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_N$, then $Cn(\varphi, \psi) = \text{Fm}$ and $(\alpha, \psi) \in N$ for some formula ψ , contradicting the cross-coherence of P and N . \square

Consider the following closure rules:

$$\frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \in N \quad (\alpha, \psi)}{(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi)} (\text{AND})^\downarrow \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \in N \quad (\beta, \varphi)}{(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi)} (\text{OR})^\downarrow \quad \frac{(\alpha, \varphi) \in N \quad (\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi)}{(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi)} (\text{CT})^\downarrow$$

Proposition 4.13. *For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$ any conditional permission system $P \subseteq P_N$, and any rule $(X) \in \{(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO})\}$,*

1. $S^{(\text{AND})}(P, N)$ is closed under $(\text{AND})^\downarrow$.
2. $S^{(\text{OR})}(P, N)$ is closed under $(\text{OR})^\downarrow$.
3. if $N^{(\text{CT})}$ and $N_{(\beta, \gamma)}^{(\text{CT})}$ are closed under (AND) for any $(\beta, \gamma) \in P$, then $S^{(\text{CT})}(P, N)$ is closed under $(\text{CT})^\downarrow$.
4. $S^{(X)}(P, N)$ is closed under (X) .
5. if $S^i(P, N)$ is closed under (SI) and $(\text{CT})^\downarrow$, then $S^i(P, N)$ is closed under $(\text{AND})^\downarrow$.

Proof. 1. Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ and $(\alpha, \psi) \in S^{(\text{AND})}(P, N)$. If $P = \emptyset$, then $S^{(\text{AND})}(P, N) = N^{(\text{AND})}$, which is closed under (AND) . Hence, $(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi) \in N^{(\text{AND})}$, as required. If $P \neq \emptyset$, then by definition, $(\alpha, \psi) \in S^{(\text{AND})}(P, N)$ implies that $(\alpha, \psi) \in N_{(\beta, \gamma)}^{(\text{AND})}$ for some $(\beta, \gamma) \in P$. Since $N_{(\beta, \gamma)}^{(\text{AND})}$ is closed under (AND) , it follows that $(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi) \in N_{(\beta, \gamma)}^{(\text{AND})} \subseteq S^{(\text{AND})}(P, N)$, as required.

2. Let $\alpha, \beta, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ and $(\beta, \varphi) \in S^{(\text{OR})}(P, N)$. If $P = \emptyset$, then $S^{(\text{OR})}(P, N) = N^{(\text{OR})}$, which is closed under (OR) . Hence, $(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi) \in N^{(\text{OR})}$, as required. If $P \neq \emptyset$, then by definition, $(\beta, \varphi) \in S^{(\text{OR})}(P, N)$ implies that $(\beta, \varphi) \in N_{(\beta', \gamma)}^{(\text{OR})}$ for some $(\beta', \gamma) \in P$. Since $N_{(\beta', \gamma)}^{(\text{OR})}$ is closed under (OR) , it follows that $(\alpha \vee \beta, \varphi) \in N_{(\beta', \gamma)}^{(\text{OR})} \subseteq S^{(\text{OR})}(P, N)$, as required.

3. Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ and $(\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi) \in S^{(\text{CT})}(P, N)$. If $P = \emptyset$, then $S^{(\text{CT})}(P, N) = N^{(\text{CT})}$. Since $N^{(\text{CT})}$ is closed under (CT) , we conclude that $(\alpha, \psi) \in N^{(\text{CT})}$, and from $N^{(\text{CT})}$ being closed under (AND) we conclude that $(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi) \in N^{(\text{CT})}$, as required. If $P \neq \emptyset$, then, by definition, $(\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi) \in S^{(\text{CT})}(P, N)$ iff $(\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi) \in N_{(\beta, \gamma)}^{(\text{CT})}$ for some $(\beta, \gamma) \in P$. Since $N_{(\beta, \gamma)}^{(\text{CT})}$ is closed under (CT) , it follows that $(\alpha, \psi) \in N_{(\beta, \gamma)}^{(\text{CT})}$. Moreover, since $N_{(\beta, \gamma)}^{(\text{CT})}$ is closed under (AND) , it follows that $(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi) \in N_{(\beta, \gamma)}^{(\text{CT})} \subseteq S^{(\text{CT})}(P, N)$, as required.

4. Immediately follows from $N^{(X)}$ and $N_{(\alpha, \varphi)}^{(X)}$ being closed under (X) .

5. Let $(\alpha, \varphi) \in N$ and $(\alpha, \psi) \in S^i(P, N)$. Since $S^i(P, N)$ is closed under (SI) we have $(\alpha \wedge \varphi, \psi) \in S^i(P, N)$ and applying $(\text{CT})^\downarrow$ we get $(\alpha, \varphi \wedge \psi) \in S^i(P, N)$. \square

Corollary 4.14. *For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$, any permission system $P \subseteq P_N$ and all $1 \leq i \leq 3$, the static positive permission system $S^i(P, N)$ is closed under the rules indicated in the following table:*

$S^i(P, N)$	Rules
$S^1(P, N)$	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND})^\downarrow$
$S^2(P, N)$	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND})^\downarrow, (\text{OR})^\downarrow$
$S^3(P, N)$	$(\top), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{AND})^\downarrow, (\text{CT})^\downarrow$

Notice that (SI) and $(\text{CT})^\downarrow$ imply $(\text{AND})^\downarrow$, hence the mention of $(\text{AND})^\downarrow$ is redundant in $S^3(P, N)$.

4.4 Dynamic permission systems

In the present section, we explore some possible generalizations of the definition originally introduced in [25] (cf. Section 2.3) to various input/output settings based on selfextensional logics.

Unlike the case of the static permission, the definition of dynamic permission cannot be applied verbatim to the generic setting of arbitrary selfextensional logics. This motivates the following

Definition 4.15. For any normative system N on any selfextensional logic $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$, any conditional permission system $P \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$, and any rule (R) , the dynamic positive permission system $D^{(R)}(P, N) \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ is defined as follows:

$$D^{(R)}(P, N) = \{(\alpha, \varphi) \mid \exists \gamma \exists \psi \exists \varphi' \exists \psi' (Cn(\gamma) \neq \text{Fm} \ \& \ (\gamma, \psi) \in S^{(R)}(P, N) \ \& \ Cn(\psi, \psi') = \text{Fm} = Cn(\varphi, \varphi') \ \& \ (\gamma, \psi') \in N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}^{(R)})\},$$

and for any $1 \leq i \leq 3$, the dynamic positive permission system $D^i(P, N) \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ is defined as follows:

$$D^i(P, N) = \{(\alpha, \varphi) \mid \exists \gamma \exists \psi \exists \varphi' \exists \psi' (Cn(\gamma) \neq \text{Fm} \ \& \ (\gamma, \psi) \in S^i(P, N) \ \& \ Cn(\psi, \psi') = \text{Fm} = Cn(\varphi, \varphi') \ \& \ (\gamma, \psi') \in N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}^i)\}.$$

Much in the same spirit of [28, Definition 6.1], the definition above aims at maintaining the intended meaning of the original definition while abstracting away from the specific signature of a given selfextensional logic: indeed, it says that (α, φ) is dynamically permitted if an explicit permission (γ, ψ) exists, with γ consistent, together with formulas φ' and ψ' which are logically inconsistent with φ and ψ respectively, such that including (α, φ') as a norm would entail admitting a norm (γ, ψ') which is inconsistent with the explicit permission (γ, ψ) . In this definition, consistency and inconsistency have been expressed purely at the level of the closure operator induced by the consequence relation of the given selfextensional logic.

Notice that, if \neg_A holds, then $\neg\varphi$ and $\neg\psi$ serve as *canonical witnesses* for the roles of φ' and ψ' ; hence, Definition 2.7 (and hence [28, Definition 6.1]) implies Definition 4.15; however, even in the presence of \neg_I , \neg_A , \neg_P , and (WO), Definition 4.15 does not imply Definition 2.7, since from the assumptions one gets $(\gamma, \neg\psi) \in N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}^{(R)} \supseteq N_{(\alpha, \neg\varphi)}^{(R)}$, while the latter inclusion can be proper, and hence it is not difficult to find counterexamples to the converse implication. In what follows, we sometimes omit the superscripts when the statements do not depend on the closure we take.

Lemma 4.16. For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$ s.t. property \neg_A holds for \mathcal{L} , any rule (R) , and any permission system $P \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$,

$$S^{(R)}(P, N) \subseteq_c D^{(R)}(P, N).$$

Proof. Let $(\alpha, \varphi) \in S^{(R)}(P, N)$ s.t. $Cn(\alpha) \neq \text{Fm}$. Then the statement is verified letting $\gamma := \alpha$, $\psi := \varphi$, $\varphi' := \neg\varphi$, and $\psi' := \neg\varphi$ in the definition of $D^{(R)}(P, N)$. \square

Proposition 4.17. For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$ and any permission system P on \mathcal{L} ,

1. $(\alpha, \varphi) \in D(P, N)$ iff $N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}$ and P are cross-incoherent (cf. Definition 4.11) for some $\varphi' \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $Cn(\varphi, \varphi') = \text{Fm}$.
2. If P, N are cross-coherent, then

$$\bigcap \{P_H \mid N \subseteq H \text{ and } H \text{ and } P \text{ cross-coherent}\} \subseteq D(P, N).$$

Proof. 1. By definition, $Cn(\varphi, \varphi') = \text{Fm}$ and $N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}$ and P are cross-incoherent iff $(\gamma, \psi) \in S(P, N)$ and $(\gamma, \psi') \in N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}$ for some γ, ψ and $\psi' \in \text{Fm}$ with $Cn(\gamma) \neq \text{Fm} = Cn(\psi, \psi')$. This is exactly what $(\alpha, \varphi) \in D(P, N)$ means.

2. By the previous item, it is enough to show that if $N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}$ and P are cross-coherent, then $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_{N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}}$, where φ' is such that $Cn(\varphi, \varphi') = \text{Fm}$. Given that $(\alpha, \varphi') \in N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}$, then assuming $(\alpha, \varphi) \in P_{N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}}$ would imply $Cn(\varphi, \varphi') \neq \text{Fm}$, contrary to our assumptions. Hence, $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_{N_{(\alpha, \varphi')}}$. \square

The proposition above motivates the following definition of generalized dynamic permission system:

Definition 4.18. For any normative system N on any selfextensional logic $\mathcal{L} = (\text{Fm}, \vdash)$, any conditional permission system $P \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$, any rule (R) , and any nonempty up-directed set $\mathcal{N}_N^{(R)} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\text{Fm} \times \text{Fm})$ (\mathcal{P} being the powerset operator) such that every element H of $\mathcal{N}_N^{(R)}$ is closed under (R) , cross-coherent with P , and such that $N \subseteq H$, the dynamic positive permission system $E^{(R)}(P, N, \mathcal{N})$ is defined as follows:

$$E^{(R)}(P, N, \mathcal{N}) = \bigcap \{P_H \mid H \in \mathcal{N}_N^{(R)}\},$$

and for any $1 \leq i \leq 3$, the generalized dynamic positive permission system $E_i(P, N, \mathcal{N})$ is defined as follows:

$$E_i(P, N, \mathcal{N}) = \bigcap \{P_H \mid H \in \mathcal{N}_N^i\}.$$

Informally, the set $\mathcal{N}_N^{(R)}$ represents a given space of possible (R)-closed expansions of the normative system N which are cross-coherent with P . The condition that $\mathcal{N}_N^{(R)}$ be up-directed corresponds to the requirement that the order in which new norms are added does not affect the result.

Proposition 4.19. *For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$, any $P \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$, any rule $(X) \in \{(\top), (\perp), (\text{SI}), (\text{WO}), (\text{CT})\}$, and any $\mathcal{N}_N^{(X)}$ as in Definition 4.18, let $(E^{(X)}(P, N, \mathcal{N}))^c := (\text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}) \setminus E^{(X)}(P, N, \mathcal{N})$,*

1. $(E^{(X)}(P, N, \mathcal{N}))^c$ is closed under $(X)^\triangleright$.
2. If \mathcal{L} satisfies \wedge_P and \vee_S , then $(E^{(\text{AND})}(P, N, \mathcal{N}))^c$ is closed under $(\text{AND})^\triangleright$.
3. If \mathcal{L} satisfies \vee_S , then $(E^{(\text{WO}) \cdot (\text{OR})}(P, N, \mathcal{N}))^c$ is closed under $(\text{OR})^\triangleright$.

Proof. 1. Since $\mathcal{N}_N^{(X)}$ is not empty, we trivially have $E^{(X)}(P, N, \mathcal{N}) \subseteq P_{N^{(X)}}$, that is, $P_{N^{(X)}}^c \subseteq (E^{(X)}(P, N, \mathcal{N}))^c$. Hence, the statement holds for $(X) \in \{(\perp), (\top)\}$. To prove the statement for $(X) := (\text{SI})$, let $\alpha, \beta, \varphi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $(\beta, \varphi) \notin E^{(\text{SI})}(P, N, \mathcal{N})$, i.e. $(\beta, \varphi) \notin P_H$ for some H in $\mathcal{N}_N^{(\text{SI})}$. By Proposition 4.5.6, P_H^c is closed under $(\text{SI})^\triangleright$, hence $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_H$. This implies that $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin E^{(\text{SI})}(P, N, \mathcal{N})$, as required. The cases in which $(X) := (\text{WO})$ and $(X) := (\text{CT})$ are proven similarly, using Proposition 4.5.5 and 4.5.12.

2. Let $\alpha, \varphi, \psi \in \text{Fm}$ s.t. (α, φ) and $(\alpha, \psi) \notin E^{(\text{AND})}(P, N, \mathcal{N})$, i.e. $(\alpha, \varphi) \notin P_{H_1}$ and $(\alpha, \psi) \notin P_{H_2}$ for some $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{N}_N^{(\text{AND})}$. Since $\mathcal{N}_N^{(\text{AND})}$ is up-directed, some $H \in \mathcal{N}_N^{(\text{AND})}$ exists s.t. $H_1, H_2 \subseteq H$. By Proposition 4.4 we have $(\alpha, \varphi), (\alpha, \psi) \notin P_H$, which implies that $(\alpha, \varphi \vee \psi) \notin P_H$, since P_H^c is closed under $(\text{AND})^\triangleright$ by Proposition 4.5.8. This shows that $(\alpha, \varphi \vee \psi) \notin E^{(\text{AND})}(P, N, \mathcal{N})$, as required.

3. Similar to the previous item, using Proposition 4.5.10. \square

Corollary 4.20. *For any input/output logic $\mathbb{L} = (\mathcal{L}, N)$ such that \wedge_P and \vee_S hold¹³ for \mathcal{L} , any $P \subseteq \text{Fm} \times \text{Fm}$ and any $1 \leq i \leq 3$, the relative set-theoretic complement of $E^i(P, N, \mathcal{N})$ is closed under the rules indicated in the following table:*

$(E_i(P, N))^c$	Rules
E_1^c	$(\top)^\triangleright, (\text{SI})^\triangleright, (\text{WO})^\triangleright, (\text{AND})^\triangleright$
E_2^c	$(\top)^\triangleright, (\text{SI})^\triangleright, (\text{WO})^\triangleright, (\text{AND})^\triangleright, (\text{OR})^\triangleright$
E_3^c	$(\top)^\triangleright, (\text{SI})^\triangleright, (\text{WO})^\triangleright, (\text{CT})^\triangleright$

5 Conclusions

Results of the present paper. The present paper further develops the line of research initiated in [13], where normative systems on selfextensional logics have been introduced and studied from a semantic perspective in connection with subordination algebras [1]. In the present paper, the framework of normative systems on selfextensional logics is extended to various notions of permission systems, namely negative, dual negative, static positive, and dynamic positive permission systems, and their associated closure properties are studied in connection with the metalogical properties of selfextensional logics.

Additional rules. In the present paper, we have focused our attention on the best known closure rules of normative systems, and their direct counterparts applied to the relative complements of permission systems. Moreover, in Remark 2.5 and at the end of Section 3, we have briefly mentioned weaker variations of these rules and discussed the possibility of generalizing their study to the setting of selfextensional logics. A natural direction is to systematically explore these closure rules both from a syntactic and a semantic perspective.

¹³In fact, the properties of E_1 do not require \vee_S .

Characterizations of output operators. In [24], various output operators associated with normative systems are characterized both in terms of their being closed under syntactic rules, and in terms of various set-theoretic constructions. In the present paper, various similar characterizations or sufficient conditions are introduced (cf. Propositions 4.5, 4.8, 4.13, 4.19) for static positive permission systems and for the relative set-theoretic complements of negative permission systems, positive dynamic permission systems, and the newly introduced notion of dual negative permission systems. These characterizations or sufficient conditions are formulated in terms of closure under syntactic rules. In the companion paper [12], this syntax-driven approach is complemented by the semantic approach described in the next paragraph.

Modal characterization of syntactic rules. In [13], the study of the properties of normative systems in connection with their semantic interpretation on subordination algebras led to their correspondence-theoretic (cf. [14]) characterization in terms of the algebraic validity of modal axioms encoding properties of their associated output operators. The results in [13] cover a finite number of conditions which reflect well known closure properties of normative systems. A natural direction is to generalize these results to infinite syntactic classes of closure properties. This is the focus of the companion paper [11], currently in preparation.

References

- [1] P. Aleksandrov and V. Ponomarev. Compact extensions of topological spaces (russian). *Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. Mat. Meh. Astr. Fiz. Him.*, 5:93–108, 1959.
- [2] A. Almeida. Canonical extensions and relational representations of lattices with negation. *Studia Logica*, 91:171–199, 2009.
- [3] A. Avron. The normal and self-extensional extension of Dunn-Belnap logic. *Logica Universalis*, 14(3):281–296, 2020.
- [4] T. Blyth. *Lattices and Ordered Algebraic Structures*. Springer London, 2005.
- [5] B. F. Chellas. *Modal Logic: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- [6] M. L. D. Chiara and R. Giuntini. *Quantum Logics*, pages 129–228. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 2002.
- [7] A. Ciabattoni and D. Rozplochas. Streamlining input/output logics with sequent calculi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09496*, 2023.
- [8] W. Conradie and A. Palmigiano. Algorithmic correspondence and canonicity for non-distributive logics. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 170(9):923–974, 2019.
- [9] W. Conradie and A. Palmigiano. Constructive canonicity of inductive inequalities. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 16:1–39, 2020.
- [10] W. Conradie, A. Palmigiano, C. Robinson, and N. Wijnberg. Non-distributive logics: from semantics to meaning. In A. Rezus, editor, *Contemporary Logic and Computing*, volume 1 of *Landscapes in Logic*, pages 38–86. College Publications, 2020.
- [11] A. De Domenico, A. Farjami, K. Manoorkar, A. Palmigiano, M. Panettiere, and X. Wang. Correspondence and inverse correspondence for subordination algebras and precontact algebras. In preparation.
- [12] A. De Domenico, A. Farjami, K. Manoorkar, A. Palmigiano, M. Panettiere, and X. Wang. Obligations and permissions, algebraically. In preparation.
- [13] A. De Domenico, A. Farjami, K. Manoorkar, A. Palmigiano, M. Panettiere, and X. Wang. Subordination algebras as semantic environment of input/output logic. In *International Workshop on Logic, Language, Information, and Computation*, pages 326–343. Springer, 2022.
- [14] L. De Rudder and A. Palmigiano. Slanted canonicity of analytic inductive inequalities. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic (TOCL)*, 22(3):1–41, 2021.

- [15] J. M. Dunn. Positive modal logic. *Studia Logica: An International Journal for Symbolic Logic*, 55(2):301–317, 1995.
- [16] J. M. Font and R. Jansana. *A general algebraic semantics for sentential logics*, volume 7. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [17] J. M. Font, R. Jansana, and D. Pigozzi. A survey of abstract algebraic logic. *Studia Logica*, 74(1):13–97, 2003.
- [18] N. Galatos, P. Jipsen, T. Kowalski, and H. Ono. *Residuated Lattices: An Algebraic Glimpse at Substructural Logics*. Elsevier, 2007.
- [19] J.-Y. Girard. Linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 50(1):1–101, 1987.
- [20] R. I. Goldblatt. Semantic analysis of orthologic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 3(1/2):19–35, 1974.
- [21] R. Jansana. Selfextensional logics with implication. In J.-Y. Beziau, editor, *Logica Universalis*, pages 65–88, Basel, 2005. Birkhäuser Basel.
- [22] R. Jansana. Selfextensional logics with a conjunction. *Studia Logica*, 84(1):63–104, 2006.
- [23] R. Jansana and A. Palmigiano. Referential semantics: duality and applications. *Reports Math. Log.*, 41:63–93, 2006.
- [24] D. Makinson and L. van der Torre. Input/output logics. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 29(4):383–408, 2000.
- [25] D. Makinson and L. van der Torre. Permission from an input/output perspective. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 32(4):391–416, 2003.
- [26] A. Monteiro. Matrices de Morgan caractéristiques pour le calcul propositionnel classique. *Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências*, 32:1–7, 1960.
- [27] J. Moschovakis. Intuitionistic Logic. In E. N. Zalta and U. Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Summer 2023 edition, 2023.
- [28] M. Olszewski, X. Parent, and L. van der Torre. Input/output logic with a consistency check - the case of permission. In F. Liu, A. Marra, P. Portner, and F. V. D. Putte, editors, *Deontic Logic and Normative Systems - 15th International Conference, DEON 2020/21, Munich, Germany [virtual], July 21-24, 2021*, pages 358–375. College publications, 2021.
- [29] M. Olszewski, X. Parent, and L. van der Torre. Permissive and regulative norms in deontic logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2023.
- [30] X. Parent, D. Gabbay, and L. v. d. Torre. Intuitionistic basis for input/output logic. In *David Makinson on Classical Methods for Non-Classical Problems*, pages 263–286. Springer, 2014.
- [31] C. Rauszer. Semi-boolean algebras and their applications to intuitionistic logic with dual operations. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 83(3):219–249, 1974.
- [32] H. P. Sankappanavar. Semi-de morgan algebras. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 52(3):712–724, 1987.
- [33] A. Stolpe. A concept approach to input/output logic. *Journal of Applied Logic*, 13(3):239–258, 2015.
- [34] X. Sun. Proof theory, semantics and algebra for normative systems. *Journal of logic and computation*, 28(8):1757–1779, 2018.
- [35] M. van Atten. The Development of Intuitionistic Logic. In E. N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Summer 2022 edition, 2022.
- [36] R. Wójcicki. A logic is referential iff it is selfextensional. *Studia Logica*, 73:323–335, 2003.
- [37] M. Zakhar'yashchev. Syntax and semantics of superintuitionistic logics. *Algebra and Logic*, 28(4):262–282, 1989.