

The Disjunction-Free Fragment of \mathbf{D}_2 is Three-Valued*

Hitoshi Omori

Graduate School of Information Sciences
Tohoku University
Sendai, Japan

hitoshiomori@gmail.com

In this article, the disjunction-free fragment of Jaškowski's discussive logic \mathbf{D}_2 in the language of classical logic is shown to be complete with respect to three- and four-valued semantics. As a byproduct, a rather simple axiomatization of the disjunction-free fragment of \mathbf{D}_2 is obtained. Some implications of this result are also discussed.

1 Introduction

Stanisław Jaškowski is known to be one of the modern founders of paraconsistent logic, together with Newton C. A. da Costa. The most important contribution of Jaškowski is that he clearly distinguished two notions for a theory, namely a theory being *contradictory* (or *inconsistent* in [18]) and a theory being *trivial* (or *overfilled* in [18]). In addition to this distinction, he also presented a system of paraconsistent logic known as \mathbf{D}_2 which is often referred to as discussive logic or discussive logic (cf. [18, 19]).

In this article, the disjunction-free fragment of Jaškowski's discussive logic is shown to be complete with respect to three- and four-valued semantics. Note here that \mathbf{D}_2 is known to be not complete with respect to any finitely many-valued semantics, which is proved by Jerzy Kotas in [20]. As a byproduct of the main result, a simple axiomatization of the disjunction-free fragment of Jaškowski's discussive logic in the language of classical logic is obtained. For the problem of axiomatization of \mathbf{D}_2 , see [24].

2 Semantics and proof theory

The propositional languages in this article consist of a finite set S of propositional connectives and a countable set Prop of propositional variables. The languages are referred to as \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{L}_r^- , \mathcal{L}_r , \mathcal{L}_l^- and \mathcal{L}_l when S are $\{\sim, \rightarrow_d, \wedge, \vee\}$, $\{\sim, \rightarrow_d, \wedge_d^r\}$, $\{\sim, \rightarrow_d, \wedge_d^r, \vee\}$, $\{\sim, \rightarrow_d, \wedge_d^l\}$, and $\{\sim, \rightarrow_d, \wedge_d^l, \vee\}$, respectively. Note that the languages \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}_r were introduced by Jaškowski in [18] and [19], respectively.¹

*The main result was presented with a rather different narrative at *Logic in Bochum 2, CCPEA 2016* in Seoul, *Paradoxes, Logic and Philosophy* in Beijing, *V Workshop on Philosophical of Logic* in Buenos Aires, *Prague Seminar on Paraconsistent Logic*, a colloquium in Munich and *ISRALOG17* in Haifa. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Dave Ripley whose comments led me to rethink the overall presentation of the main result. An earlier version of this article was presented at: *Non-classical modalities* in Mexico City, *the Eleventh Smirnov Readings in Logic* in Moscow, *CoPS-FaM-2019* in Gdańsk, *Paris-Bochum-Moscow Workshop in Mathematical Philosophy* in Paris and another colloquium in Munich. I would like to thank the organizers of these events for their kind invitations, warm hospitality and helpful discussions, as well as the audiences at these meeting for useful comments. I would also like to thank Jonas Rafael Becker Arenhart and Fabio De Martin Polo for helpful discussions and comments. Finally, but not the least, I would like to thank the referees for their very kind, detailed, and supportive comments that improved the presentation of the paper. The preparation of an earlier version of this article was supported by a Sofja Kovalevskaja Award of the Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation, funded by the German Ministry for Education and Research.

¹As correctly pointed out by a referee, Jaškowski also included the discussive biconditional as a *primitive* connective. However, in view of [24, Proposition 1], I will treat the discussive biconditional as a *defined* connective.

The language \mathcal{L}_l has been considered in a number of papers including [10, 38]. The language \mathcal{L}_r^- is the main one dealt with in this paper, but I will also refer to the other languages when it is helpful.² The set of formulas defined as usual in \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{L}_r^- and \mathcal{L}_l^- , are denoted by Form , Form_r^- and Form_l^- , respectively. Moreover, a formula is denoted by A, B, C , etc. and a set of formulas by Γ, Δ, Σ , etc.

2.1 Semantics for the disjunction-free fragment of \mathbf{D}_2

The original semantics of Jaškowski can be precisified by making use of translations into modal language, but here I follow Janusz Ciuciura (cf. [7]) who stated the semantics without the help of translation.

Definition 1 (\mathbf{D}_2^- -model). \mathbf{D}_2^- -model for \mathcal{L}_r^- is a pair $\langle W, v \rangle$ where W is a non-empty set and $v : W \times \text{Prop} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, an assignment of truth values to state-variable pairs. Valuations v are then extended to interpretations I to state-formula pairs by the following conditions.

- $I(w, p) = v(w, p)$, for all $w \in W$ and for all $p \in \text{Prop}$;
- $I(w, \sim A) = 1$ iff $I(w, A) = 0$;
- $I(w, A \wedge_d B) = 1$ iff $I(w, A) = 1$ and for some $x \in W$ ($I(x, B) = 1$);
- $I(w, A \rightarrow_d B) = 1$ iff for all $x \in W$ ($I(x, A) = 0$) or $I(w, B) = 1$.

Furthermore, $\Gamma \models_d A$ iff for every \mathbf{D}_2^- -model $\langle W, v \rangle$, if for all $B \in \Gamma$, there is $x \in W$ such that $I(x, B) = 1$, then $I(y, A) = 1$ for some $y \in W$.

Remark 2. Note that the semantic consequence relation is defined in an unusual way, which is not a mistake, but a definition that reflects the original idea of Jaškowski.

Now, by considering a special case of the Kripke semantics in which the cardinality of W is two, the following four-valued semantics is obtained.

Definition 3. A four-valued \mathbf{D}_2^- -interpretation of \mathcal{L}_r^- is a function $v : \text{Prop} \rightarrow \{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{0}\}$. Given a four-valued \mathbf{D}_2^- -interpretation v , this is extended to a function I that assigns every formula a truth value by truth functions depicted in the form of truth tables as follows:

A	$\sim A$	$A \wedge_d B$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{j}	$\mathbf{0}$	$A \rightarrow_d B$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{j}	$\mathbf{0}$
$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{j}	$\mathbf{0}$
\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{j}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{j}	$\mathbf{0}$
\mathbf{j}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{j}	\mathbf{j}	\mathbf{j}	\mathbf{j}	$\mathbf{0}$	\mathbf{j}	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{j}	$\mathbf{0}$
$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$

Note that the set of designated values, denoted by \mathcal{D}_4 , is $\{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$. The semantic consequence relation \models_4^- is defined in terms of preservation of designated values.

Remark 4. Assume that $W = \{w_1, w_2\}$. Then,

- $v(A) = \mathbf{1}$ corresponds to $v(w_1, A) = 1$ and $v(w_2, A) = 1$,
- $v(A) = \mathbf{i}$ corresponds to $v(w_1, A) = 1$ and $v(w_2, A) = 0$,
- $v(A) = \mathbf{j}$ corresponds to $v(w_1, A) = 0$ and $v(w_2, A) = 1$,
- $v(A) = \mathbf{0}$ corresponds to $v(w_1, A) = 0$ and $v(w_2, A) = 0$.

Note also that the unusual definition of the semantic consequence relation is here reflected as having three designated values.

²My emphasis on the languages \mathcal{L}_r^- and \mathcal{L}_r is a personal choice paying my respect to Jaškowski for introducing the first discussive conjunction in [19]. However, the main observation of the paper carries over for other languages, and some of the details are spelled out in §5.1 and §5.2.

In the above semantics, the intermediate values are representing the two possibilities depending on which of the two states or worlds falsifies the sentence. In fact, these two possibilities can be “merged”, and the third value can stand for the case in which the two states or worlds disagree. As a result, the following three-valued semantics is obtained.

Definition 5. A three-valued \mathbf{D}_2^- -interpretation of \mathcal{L}_r^- is a function $v : \text{Prop} \rightarrow \{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{0}\}$. Given a three-valued \mathbf{D}_2^- -interpretation v , this is extended to a function I that assigns every formula a truth value by truth functions depicted in the form of truth tables as follows:

A	$\sim A$	$A \wedge_d^r B$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$	$A \rightarrow_d B$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$
$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$
\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$
$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$

Note that the set of designated values, denoted by \mathcal{D}_3 , is $\{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{i}\}$. The semantic consequence relation \models_3 is defined in terms of preservation of designated values.

Remark 6. From a purely technical viewpoint, the above truth table for negation is exactly the one for the three-valued logic developed by Łukasiewicz, as well as for the Logic of Paradox (cf. [29]). Moreover, the truth table for conditional is identical with the one in \mathbf{RM}_3^\supset (cf. [2]), \mathbf{LFII} (cf. [4]) and \mathbf{CLuNs} (cf. [3]), among many other systems.

Remark 7. Note that in view of a general result established by Arnon Avron, Ofer Arieli and Anna Zamansky, it follows that \models_3 is maximally paraconsistent in the strong sense, and thus maximal with respect to extended classical logic, by [1, Corollary 3.6].

2.2 Proof system for the disjunction-free fragment of \mathbf{D}_2

I now turn to the proof theory which is presented in terms of a Hilbert-style calculus.

Definition 8. The system \mathbf{D}_2^- consists of the following axiom schemata and a rule of inference, where $A \leftrightarrow_d B$ abbreviates $(A \rightarrow_d B) \wedge_d^r (B \rightarrow_d A)$.

$A \rightarrow_d (B \rightarrow_d A)$	(Ax1)	$(\sim A \rightarrow_d A) \rightarrow_d A$	(Ax7)
$(A \rightarrow_d (B \rightarrow_d C)) \rightarrow_d ((A \rightarrow_d B) \rightarrow_d (A \rightarrow_d C))$	(Ax2)	$\sim \sim A \leftrightarrow_d A$	(Ax8)
$((A \rightarrow_d B) \rightarrow_d A) \rightarrow_d A$	(Ax3)	$\sim (A \wedge_d^r B) \leftrightarrow_d (B \rightarrow_d \sim A)$	(Ax9)
$(A \wedge_d^r B) \rightarrow_d A$	(Ax4)	$\sim (A \rightarrow_d B) \leftrightarrow_d (A \wedge_d^r \sim B)$	(Ax10)
$(A \wedge_d^r B) \rightarrow_d B$	(Ax5)	$\frac{A \quad A \rightarrow_d B}{B}$	(MP)
$(C \rightarrow_d A) \rightarrow_d ((C \rightarrow_d B) \rightarrow_d (C \rightarrow_d (A \wedge_d^r B)))$	(Ax6)		

Finally, $\Gamma \vdash A$ iff there is a sequence of formulas B_1, \dots, B_n, A ($n \geq 0$), called a *derivation*, such that every formula in the sequence either (i) belongs to Γ ; (ii) is an axiom of \mathbf{D}_2^- ; (iii) is obtained by (MP) from formulas preceding it in the sequence.

Remark 9. Note that the only unusual axiom in the literature of paraconsistent logic is (Ax9).

Before moving further, note that the deduction theorem holds for \vdash .

Proposition 10. For all $\Gamma \cup \{A, B\} \subseteq \text{Form}_r^-$, $\Gamma, A \vdash B$ iff $\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow_d B$.

3 Soundness and Completeness for the three-valued semantics

I now turn to prove that the proof system introduced in the previous section is sound and complete with respect to the three-valued semantics.

3.1 Soundness

I begin with the soundness which is easy as usual.

Proposition 11 (Soundness). For all $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq \text{Form}_r^-$, if $\Gamma \vdash A$ then $\Gamma \models_3 A$.

Proof. By a straightforward verification that each instance of each axiom schema always takes a designated value, and that (MP) preserves designated values. \square

3.2 Completeness

For the completeness, some terminologies are needed. To this end, I deploy those from [34] with a slightly different term using *non-trivial* instead of *consistent*.

Definition 12 (Schumm). For $\Sigma \cup \{B\} \subseteq \text{Form}_r^-$, Σ is *maximally non-trivial* iff (i) $\Sigma \not\vdash A$ for some $A \in \text{Form}_r^-$ and (ii) for every $A \in \text{Form}_r^-$, if $A \notin \Sigma$ then $\Sigma \cup \{A\} \vdash B$ for all $B \in \text{Form}_r^-$.

Remark 13. Note that if Σ is maximally non-trivial, then Σ is a theory, i.e. closed under \vdash .

Then the following well-known lemma is obtained. The proof is given in [34, Theorem 8].

Lemma 14 (Schumm). For all $\Sigma \cup \{A\} \subseteq \text{Form}_r^-$, suppose that $\Sigma \not\vdash A$. Then, there is a $\Pi \supseteq \Sigma$ such that Π is maximally non-trivial and $A \notin \Pi$.

Moreover, the following lemma, which will be useful later, is also easy to prove.

Lemma 15. If Σ is maximally non-trivial, then $\Sigma \vdash A \rightarrow_d B$ iff $(\Sigma \not\vdash A \text{ or } \Sigma \vdash B)$.

Definition 16. Let Σ be maximally non-trivial. Then, let v_Σ from Prop to $\{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{0}\}$ be defined as follows:

$$v_\Sigma(p) = \mathbf{1} \text{ iff } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim p \quad \text{and} \quad v_\Sigma(p) = \mathbf{i} \text{ iff } \Sigma \vdash p \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim p \quad \text{and} \quad v_\Sigma(p) = \mathbf{0} \text{ iff } \Sigma \not\vdash p$$

I need one more lemma which is the key for the completeness result.

Lemma 17. If Σ is maximally non-trivial, then the following holds for all $B \in \text{Form}_r^-$.

$$v_\Sigma(B) = \mathbf{1} \text{ iff } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim B \quad \text{and} \quad v_\Sigma(B) = \mathbf{i} \text{ iff } \Sigma \vdash B \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim B \quad \text{and} \quad v_\Sigma(B) = \mathbf{0} \text{ iff } \Sigma \not\vdash B$$

Proof. Note first that the well-definedness of v_Σ is obvious. Then the desired result is proved by induction on the construction of B . The base case, for atomic formulas, is obvious by the definition. For the induction step, the cases are split based on the connectives.

Case 1. If $B = \sim C$, then there are the following three cases.

$$\begin{array}{ll} v_\Sigma(\sim C) = \mathbf{1} \text{ iff } v_\Sigma(C) = \mathbf{0} & \text{by the definition of } v_\Sigma \\ \text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash C & \text{by IH} \\ \text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim \sim C & \text{by (Ax8)} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\Sigma}(\sim C) = \mathbf{i} \text{ iff } v_{\Sigma}(C) = \mathbf{i} & \text{ by the definition of } v_{\Sigma} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \vdash \sim C \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash C & \text{ by IH} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \vdash \sim C \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim \sim C & \text{ by (Ax8)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\Sigma}(\sim C) = \mathbf{0} \text{ iff } v_{\Sigma}(C) = \mathbf{1} & \text{ by the definition of } v_{\Sigma} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim C & \text{ by IH}
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. If $B = C \rightarrow_d D$, then there are the following three cases.

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\Sigma}(C \rightarrow_d D) = \mathbf{1} \text{ iff } v_{\Sigma}(C) = \mathbf{0} \text{ or } v_{\Sigma}(D) = \mathbf{1} & \text{ by the definition of } v_{\Sigma} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash C \text{ or } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim D & \text{ by IH} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash (C \wedge \sim D) & \text{ by } \Sigma \text{ is a theory} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim(C \rightarrow_d D) & \text{ by (Ax10)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\Sigma}(C \rightarrow_d D) = \mathbf{i} \text{ iff } v_{\Sigma}(C) \neq \mathbf{0} \text{ and } v_{\Sigma}(D) = \mathbf{i} & \text{ by the definition of } v_{\Sigma} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \vdash C \text{ and } (\Sigma \vdash D \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim D) & \text{ by IH} \\
\text{iff } (\Sigma \not\vdash C \text{ or } \Sigma \vdash D) \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash (C \wedge \sim D) & \Sigma \text{ is a theory} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \vdash (C \rightarrow_d D) \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim(C \rightarrow_d D) & \text{ by Lemma 15 and (Ax10)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\Sigma}(C \rightarrow_d D) = \mathbf{0} \text{ iff } v_{\Sigma}(C) \neq \mathbf{0} \text{ and } v_{\Sigma}(D) = \mathbf{0} & \text{ by the definition of } v_{\Sigma} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \vdash C \text{ and } \Sigma \not\vdash D & \text{ by IH} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash (C \rightarrow_d D) & \text{ by Lemma 15}
\end{aligned}$$

Case 3. If $B = C \wedge D$, then there are the following three cases.

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\Sigma}(C \wedge D) = \mathbf{1} \text{ iff } v_{\Sigma}(C) = \mathbf{1} \text{ and } v_{\Sigma}(D) \neq \mathbf{0} & \text{ by the definition of } v_{\Sigma} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \vdash D \text{ and } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim C & \text{ by IH} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash D \rightarrow_d \sim C & \text{ by Lemma 15} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim(C \wedge D) & \text{ by (Ax9)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\Sigma}(C \wedge D) = \mathbf{i} \text{ iff } v_{\Sigma}(C) = \mathbf{i} \text{ and } v_{\Sigma}(D) \neq \mathbf{0} & \text{ by the definition of } v_{\Sigma} \\
\text{iff } (\Sigma \vdash C \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim C) \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash D & \text{ by IH} \\
\text{iff } (\Sigma \vdash C \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash D) \text{ and } (\Sigma \not\vdash D \text{ or } \Sigma \vdash \sim C) & \text{ by simple calculation} \\
\text{iff } (\Sigma \vdash C \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash D) \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash D \rightarrow_d \sim C & \text{ by Lemma 15} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \vdash (C \wedge D) \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim(C \wedge D) & \Sigma \text{ is a theory and by (Ax10)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\Sigma}(C \wedge D) = \mathbf{0} \text{ iff } v_{\Sigma}(C) = \mathbf{0} \text{ or } v_{\Sigma}(D) = \mathbf{0} & \text{ by the definition of } v_{\Sigma} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash C \text{ or } \Sigma \not\vdash D & \text{ by IH} \\
\text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash (C \wedge D) & \Sigma \text{ is a theory}
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 1 (Completeness). For all $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq \text{Form}_r^-$, if $\Gamma \models_3 A$ then $\Gamma \vdash A$.

Proof. Assume $\Gamma \not\vdash A$. Then, by Lemma 14, there is a $\Pi \supseteq \Gamma$ such that Π is maximally non-trivial and $A \notin \Pi$, and by Lemma 17, a three-valued \mathbf{D}_2^- -valuation v_Π can be defined with $I_\Pi(B) \in \mathcal{D}_3$ for every $B \in \Gamma$ and $I_\Pi(A) \notin \mathcal{D}_3$. Thus it follows that $\Gamma \not\models_3 A$, as desired. \square

4 The main result

By making use of the result in the previous section, I prove the main result of this article. To this end, I need one more lemma.

Lemma 18. For all $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq \text{Form}_r^-$, if $\Gamma \models_4 A$ then $\Gamma \models_3 A$.

Proof. Suppose $\Gamma \not\models_3 A$. Then there is a three-valued \mathbf{D}_2^- -interpretation v_0 such that $I_0(B) \in \mathcal{D}_3$ for all $B \in \Gamma$ and $I_0(A) \notin \mathcal{D}_3$. Now, let v_1 be a four-valued \mathbf{D}_2^- -interpretation such that $v_1(p) = v_0(p)$. Then, it holds that $I_1(A) = \mathbf{1}$ iff $I_0(A) = \mathbf{1}$ and $I_1(A) = \mathbf{0}$ iff $I_0(A) = \mathbf{0}$. This can be proved by a simple induction on the complexity of A .

- The base case when $A \in \text{Prop}$ is obvious by definition.
- For induction step, consider the following two cases.
 - If A is of the form $\sim B$, then by IH,

- * $I_1(B) = \mathbf{1}$ iff $I_0(B) = \mathbf{1}$ and
- * $I_1(B) = \mathbf{0}$ iff $I_0(B) = \mathbf{0}$.

Then, by the truth table, it follows that $I_1(\sim B) = \mathbf{0}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_1(B) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by IH) $I_0(B) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_0(\sim B) = \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, $I_1(\sim B) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_1(B) = \mathbf{0}$ iff (by IH) $I_0(B) = \mathbf{0}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_0(\sim B) = \mathbf{1}$.

- If A is of the form $B \rightarrow_d C$, then by IH,

- * $I_1(B) = \mathbf{1}$ iff $I_0(B) = \mathbf{1}$, $I_1(B) = \mathbf{0}$ iff $I_0(B) = \mathbf{0}$, and
- * $I_1(C) = \mathbf{1}$ iff $I_0(C) = \mathbf{1}$, $I_1(C) = \mathbf{0}$ iff $I_0(C) = \mathbf{0}$.

Then, by the truth table, it follows that $I_1(B \rightarrow_d C) = \mathbf{0}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_1(B) \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $I_1(C) = \mathbf{0}$ iff (by IH) $I_0(B) \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $I_0(C) = \mathbf{0}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_0(B \rightarrow_d C) = \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, $I_1(B \rightarrow_d C) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_1(B) = \mathbf{0}$ or $I_1(C) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by IH) $I_0(B) = \mathbf{0}$ and $I_0(C) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_0(B \rightarrow_d C) = \mathbf{1}$.

The case for conjunction is similar to the case for \rightarrow_d . This completes the proof.

Once this is established it is easy to see that the desired result holds since $I_1(A) = \mathbf{0}$ iff $I_0(A) = \mathbf{0}$ is equivalent to $I_1(A) \notin \mathcal{D}_4$ iff $I_0(A) \notin \mathcal{D}_3$. \square

I am now ready to prove the main result.

Theorem 2 (Main Theorem). For all $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq \text{Form}_r^-$, $\Gamma \models_3 A$ iff $\Gamma \models_d A$.

Proof. For the left-to-right direction, if $\Gamma \models_3 A$ then $\Gamma \vdash A$ by Theorem 1. One may then check that if $\Gamma \vdash A$ then $\Gamma \models_d A$. This is tedious but not difficult. For the other direction, if $\Gamma \models_d A$ then it immediately implies that $\Gamma \models_4 A$, by recalling Remark 4. Thus, together with Lemma 18, the desired result is proved. \square

As a corollary of Proposition 11 and Theorems 1 and 2, the following result is obtained.

Corollary 19. For all $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \subseteq \text{Form}_r^-$, $\Gamma \vdash A$ iff $\Gamma \models_d A$.

5 Reflections

5.1 The language \mathcal{L}_l

In the later works related to discussive logics, the language \mathcal{L}_l has been also studied intensively. Here, I note that the above observations carry over to \mathcal{L}_l^- .

- First, the truth condition for the left discussive conjunction within the Kripke semantics is as follows.

$$(\wedge_d^l) \quad v(w, A \wedge_d^l B) = 1 \text{ iff for some } x \in W (v(x, A) = 1) \text{ and } v(w, B) = 1.$$

- Second, the three- and four-valued truth tables for the left discussive conjunction are as follows. Of course, the four-valued truth table is obtained by considering the special case of the Kripke semantics (recall Remark 4), and the three-valued truth table is obtained by “merging” the intermediate values in the four-valued truth table.

$A \wedge_d^l B$	1	i	0	$A \wedge_d^l B$	1	i	j	0
1	1	i	0	1	1	i	j	0
i	1	i	0	i	1	i	j	0
0	0	0	0	j	1	i	j	0
				0	0	0	0	0

- Third, for the proof system, (Ax9) is replaced by the following.

$$\sim(A \wedge_d^l B) \leftrightarrow_d (A \rightarrow_d \sim B) \quad (\text{Ax9}')$$

Based on these, the equivalence of the discussive semantics and the three-valued semantics may be established in a similar manner. For those who are interested in the details, note that for the purpose of establishing the result corresponding to Theorem 2, it suffices to check the following three items.

- Lemma 17, for the completeness result, i.e. if $\Gamma \models_3 A$ then $\Gamma \vdash A$.
- $\Gamma \vdash A$ then $\Gamma \models_d A$.
- Lemma 18, i.e. $\Gamma \models_4 A$ then $\Gamma \models_3 A$.

For the first item, it is enough to check the case related to conjunction, in particular the following two cases.

$$\begin{aligned} v_\Sigma(C \wedge D) = \mathbf{1} & \text{ iff } v_\Sigma(C) \neq \mathbf{0} \text{ and } v_\Sigma(D) = \mathbf{1} && \text{by the definition of } v_\Sigma \\ & \text{ iff } \Sigma \vdash C \text{ and } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim D && \text{by IH} \\ & \text{ iff } \Sigma \not\vdash C \rightarrow_d \sim D && \text{by Lemma 15} \\ & \text{ iff } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim(C \wedge D) && \text{by (Ax9')} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} v_\Sigma(C \wedge D) = \mathbf{i} & \text{ iff } v_\Sigma(C) \neq \mathbf{0} \text{ and } v_\Sigma(D) = \mathbf{i} && \text{by the definition of } v_\Sigma \\ & \text{ iff } \Sigma \vdash C \text{ and } (\Sigma \vdash D \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim D) && \text{by IH} \\ & \text{ iff } (\Sigma \vdash C \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash D) \text{ and } (\Sigma \not\vdash C \text{ or } \Sigma \vdash \sim D) && \text{by simple calculation} \\ & \text{ iff } (\Sigma \vdash C \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash D) \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash C \rightarrow_d \sim D && \text{by Lemma 15} \\ & \text{ iff } \Sigma \vdash (C \wedge D) \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim(C \wedge D) && \Sigma \text{ is a theory and by (Ax9')} \end{aligned}$$

For the second item, this is immediate in view of the new truth condition for the left discussive conjunction within the Kripke semantics.

Finally, for the third item, it is again enough to check the case for conjunction, and the proof runs as follows. If A is of the form $B \wedge_d^l C$, then by IH,

- $I_1(B) = \mathbf{1}$ iff $I_0(B) = \mathbf{1}$, $I_1(B) = \mathbf{0}$ iff $I_0(B) = \mathbf{0}$, and
- $I_1(C) = \mathbf{1}$ iff $I_0(C) = \mathbf{1}$, $I_1(C) = \mathbf{0}$ iff $I_0(C) = \mathbf{0}$.

Then, by the truth table, it follows that $I_1(B \wedge_d^l C) = \mathbf{0}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_1(B) = \mathbf{0}$ or $I_1(C) = \mathbf{0}$ iff (by IH) $I_0(B) = \mathbf{0}$ and $I_0(C) = \mathbf{0}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_0(B \wedge_d^l C) = \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, $I_1(B \wedge_d^l C) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_1(B) \neq \mathbf{0}$ or $I_1(C) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by IH) $I_0(B) \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $I_0(C) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_0(B \wedge_d^l C) = \mathbf{1}$.

Based on these, the proof of Theorem 2 can be repeated to establish the desired result.

5.2 The language \mathcal{L}

If one considers the very first discussive language \mathcal{L} in which the only discussive connective is conditional, a similar result is obtained by considering the negation-conditional fragment. More specifically, the concerned fragment is equivalent to the three-valued semantics induced by the following truth tables:

A	$\sim A$	$A \rightarrow_d B$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$
$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$
\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$
$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$

This can be confirmed by carefully removing the cases for conjunction in the proof of the main result. For those who are interested in the details, note once again that for the purpose of establishing the result corresponding to Theorem 2, it suffices to check the following three items.

- Lemma 17, for the completeness result, i.e. if $\Gamma \models_3 A$ then $\Gamma \vdash A$.
- $\Gamma \vdash A$ then $\Gamma \models_d A$.
- Lemma 18, i.e. $\Gamma \models_4 A$ then $\Gamma \models_3 A$.

In particular, it is enough to check that the previous proofs are not essentially relying on conjunction. For the first item, note first that (Ax10) needs to be replaced by the following three axioms.

$$\sim(A \rightarrow_d B) \rightarrow_d A \quad (\text{Ax10.1})$$

$$\sim(A \rightarrow_d B) \rightarrow_d \sim B \quad (\text{Ax10.2})$$

$$A \rightarrow_d (\sim B \rightarrow_d \sim(A \rightarrow_d B)) \quad (\text{Ax10.3})$$

Then, it suffices to check that if Σ is maximally non-trivial, then $\Sigma \vdash \sim(A \rightarrow_d B)$ iff $(\Sigma \vdash A$ and $\Sigma \vdash \sim B)$. This of course holds even without the maximal non-triviality. For the second and the third items, there is nothing to be checked since they are both already established.

Based on these, the proof of Theorem 2 can be repeated to establish the desired result.

5.3 Discussive negation

Another variation of the main result is obtained by considering a discussive interpretation of negation, a suggestion made by Jerzy Perzanowski as one of the comments of the translator in [19, p.59], and explored further by Ciuciura in [6].³ Here, once again, I note that the above observations carry over to this variant.

- First, the truth condition for the discussive negation within the Kripke semantics is as follows.

$$(\sim_d) \quad v(w, \sim_d A) = 1 \text{ iff for some } x \in W, v(x, A) = 0.$$

³There is, unfortunately, a problem with one of the main results in [6]. See the appendix of [24] for the details.

- Second, the three- and four-valued truth tables for the discussive negation are as follows.

A	$\sim_d A$
$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$
\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{1}$
$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$

A	$\sim_d A$
$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$
\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{1}$
\mathbf{j}	$\mathbf{1}$
$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$

- Third, for the proof system, (Ax8) is replaced by the following.

$$\sim_d A \rightarrow_d (\sim_d \sim_d A \rightarrow_d B)$$

Based on these, the equivalence of the discussive semantics and the three-valued semantics is established in a similar manner. I first note here that given the proof system, the following is obtained.

Lemma 20. If Σ is maximally non-trivial, then $\Sigma \vdash \sim_d \sim_d A$ iff $\Sigma \not\vdash \sim_d A$.

Then, for the purpose of establishing the result corresponding to Theorem 2, it suffices to check the following three items.

- Lemma 17, for the completeness result, i.e. if $\Gamma \models_3 A$ then $\Gamma \vdash A$.
- $\Gamma \vdash A$ then $\Gamma \models_d A$.
- Lemma 18, i.e. $\Gamma \models_4 A$ then $\Gamma \models_3 A$.

For the first item, it is enough to check the case related to negation, in particular the following case since negated formula *never* takes the value \mathbf{i} , and the case when negated formula takes the value $\mathbf{0}$ is already covered by the original Lemma 17.

$$\begin{aligned} v_\Sigma(\sim C) = \mathbf{1} &\text{ iff } v_\Sigma(C) \neq \mathbf{1} && \text{by the definition of } v_\Sigma \\ &\text{ iff } \Sigma \vdash \sim C && \text{by IH} \\ &\text{ iff } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim \sim C && \text{by Lemma 20} \end{aligned}$$

For the second item, this is immediate in view of the new truth condition for the discussive negation within the Kripke semantics.

Finally, for the third item, it is sufficient to check the case for negation, and the proof runs as follows. If A is of the form $\sim B$, then by IH,

- $I_1(B) = \mathbf{1}$ iff $I_0(B) = \mathbf{1}$ and
- $I_1(B) = \mathbf{0}$ iff $I_0(B) = \mathbf{0}$.

Then, by the truth table, it follows that $I_1(\sim B) = \mathbf{0}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_1(B) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by IH) $I_0(B) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_0(\sim B) = \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, $I_1(\sim B) = \mathbf{1}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_1(B) \neq \mathbf{1}$ iff (by IH) $I_0(B) \neq \mathbf{1}$ iff (by the truth table) $I_0(\sim B) = \mathbf{1}$.

Based on these, the proof of Theorem 2 can be repeated to establish the desired result.

5.4 Disjunction

One may wonder about the possibility of adding disjunction to the many-valued semantics. In the case of three-valued semantics, one can prove the completeness in a similar manner.

- First, let \mathbf{D}_2^+ be the expansion of \mathbf{D}_2^- obtained by adding the following axiom schemata.

$$A \rightarrow_d (A \vee B) \quad (\text{Ax13}) \quad (A \rightarrow_d C) \rightarrow_d ((B \rightarrow_d C) \rightarrow_d ((A \vee B) \rightarrow_d C)) \quad (\text{Ax15})$$

$$B \rightarrow_d (A \vee B) \quad (\text{Ax14}) \quad \sim(A \vee B) \leftrightarrow_d (\sim A \wedge_d^r \sim B) \quad (\text{Ax16})$$

The consequence relation $\vdash_{\mathbf{D}_2^+}$ is defined as before.

- Second, the three-valued truth tables for \mathbf{D}_2^+ -valuation are as follows:

A	$\sim A$	$A \vee B$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$	$A \wedge_d^r B$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$	$A \rightarrow_d B$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$
$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$
\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$
$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	\mathbf{i}	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$

The designated values are $\mathbf{1}$ and \mathbf{i} , and the semantic consequence relation \models_3^+ is defined in terms of preservation of designated values.

Then, the main result will carry over to this expansion of \mathbf{D}_2^- . This time, I first note here that given the proof system, the following is obtained.

Lemma 21. If Σ is maximally non-trivial, then $\Sigma \vdash_{\mathbf{D}_2^+} A \vee B$ iff $\Sigma \vdash_{\mathbf{D}_2^+} A$ or $\Sigma \vdash_{\mathbf{D}_2^+} B$.

Then, for the purpose of establishing the soundness and completeness results, the soundness is straightforward. For the completeness result, it suffices to check the additional case for Lemma 17 related to disjunction since other cases are already covered. If $B = C \vee D$, then there are the following three cases.

$$\begin{aligned} v_\Sigma(C \vee D) = \mathbf{1} \text{ iff } v_\Sigma(C) = \mathbf{1} \text{ or } v_\Sigma(D) = \mathbf{1} & \quad \text{by the definition of } v_\Sigma \\ \text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim C \text{ or } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim D & \quad \text{by IH} \\ \text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash (\sim C \wedge \sim D) & \quad \text{by } \Sigma \text{ is a theory} \\ \text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash \sim(C \vee D) & \quad \text{by (Ax16)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} v_\Sigma(C \vee D) = \mathbf{i} \text{ iff } (v_\Sigma(C) \neq \mathbf{1} \text{ and } v_\Sigma(D) = \mathbf{i}) \text{ or} & \\ (v_\Sigma(D) \neq \mathbf{1} \text{ and } v_\Sigma(C) = \mathbf{i}) & \quad \text{by the def. of } v_\Sigma \\ \text{iff } (\Sigma \vdash \sim C \text{ and } (\Sigma \vdash D \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim D)) \text{ or} & \\ (\Sigma \vdash \sim D \text{ and } (\Sigma \vdash C \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim C)) & \quad \text{by IH} \\ \text{iff } (\Sigma \vdash C \text{ or } \Sigma \vdash D) \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash (\sim C \wedge \sim D) & \quad \Sigma \text{ is a theory} \\ \text{iff } \Sigma \vdash C \vee D \text{ and } \Sigma \vdash \sim(C \vee D) & \quad \text{by Lemma 21 and (Ax16)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} v_\Sigma(C \vee D) = \mathbf{0} \text{ iff } v_\Sigma(C) = \mathbf{0} \text{ and } v_\Sigma(D) = \mathbf{0} & \quad \text{by the definition of } v_\Sigma \\ \text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash C \text{ and } \Sigma \not\vdash D & \quad \text{by IH} \\ \text{iff } \Sigma \not\vdash (C \vee D) & \quad \text{by Lemma 21} \end{aligned}$$

Based on these, the desired result is obtained.

Note finally that neither \mathbf{D}_2^+ nor \mathbf{D}_2 contains the other. Indeed, the following may be verified.

- $\vdash_{\mathbf{D}_2} \sim(A \vee \sim A) \rightarrow_d B$ but $\not\vdash_{\mathbf{D}_2^+} \sim(A \vee \sim A) \rightarrow_d B$,
- $\vdash_{\mathbf{D}_2^+} \sim(A \vee B) \leftrightarrow_d (\sim A \wedge_d^r \sim B)$ but $\not\vdash_{\mathbf{D}_2} \sim(A \vee B) \leftrightarrow_d (\sim A \wedge_d^r \sim B)$.

5.5 An application

The main result was obtained rather surprisingly by looking at the semantics for discussive logics without any aim of bridging discussive logics and many-valued logics. However, in view of the relation between discussive semantics and many-valued semantics, one may change the perspective to regard discussive semantics as a tool to make sense of some of the many-valued logics. What I have in mind here are the semantic frameworks such as Michael Dunn’s relational semantics (cf. [11]), Richard and Valerie Routley’s star semantics (cf. [33]), and Graham Priest’s plurivalent semantics (cf. [30, 32]). These can be seen as offering alternative two-valued semantics for many-valued logics, and by doing so these frameworks offer different ways to give intuitive readings to the additional truth values, and understand the semantics for the connectives. Indeed, the first two frameworks offer alternative semantics for the four-valued logic **FDE**, and the last framework offers alternative semantics for **LP** and weak Kleene logic, among many others.⁴

In fact, the idea is already applied successfully to **P**¹ of Antonio Sette which is one of the oldest three-valued paraconsistent logics introduced in [35]. More specifically, with the help of discussive semantics, one may intuitively read the three values with some discussive flavor, and moreover understand the paraconsistent negation as a negative modality. Further details, including a comparison to the so-called society semantics for **P**¹ devised by Walter Carnielli and Mamede Lima-Marques in [5], can be found in [23].

What I would like to add here is one more instance that seems to offer an alternative perspective to a variant of **FDE**, called **NFL** in [37], and compare with **FDE** as well as **ETL**, introduced in [28] (see also [22]). The rest of this subsection is devoted to spell out the details. Note that the language of **FDE**, which consists of a finite set $\{\sim, \wedge, \vee\}$ of propositional connectives and a countable set Prop of propositional variables, is referred to as $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{FDE}}$. Moreover, as expected, the set of formulas defined as usual in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{FDE}}$ is denoted by $\text{Form}_{\mathbf{FDE}}$.

Definition 22. A four-valued Belnap-Dunn-valuation for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{FDE}}$ is a homomorphism from $\text{Form}_{\mathbf{FDE}}$ to $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{f}\}$, induced by the following matrices:

A	$\sim A$	$A \vee B$	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{f}	$A \wedge B$	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{f}
\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{f}
\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{f}
\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{f}
\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{t}	\mathbf{b}	\mathbf{n}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{f}

Then, the semantic consequence relation for **FDE**, $\models_{\mathbf{FDE}}$, is defined in terms of preservation of values **t** and **b** for all four-valued Belnap-Dunn-valuations. Moreover, the semantic consequence relations for **NFL**, $\models_{\mathbf{NFL}}$, and **ETL**, $\models_{\mathbf{ETL}}$, are defined by preserving values **t**, **b** and **n** and the value **t**, respectively, for all four-valued Belnap-Dunn-valuations.

For the purpose of presenting an alternative semantics for **NFL**, I make use of Routleys’ invention.

Definition 23. A Routley interpretation for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{FDE}}$ is a structure $\langle W, g, *, v \rangle$ where W is a set of worlds, $g \in W$, $* : W \rightarrow W$ is a function with $w^{**} = w$, and $v : W \times \text{Prop} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. The function v is extended to $I : W \times \text{Form}_{\mathbf{FDE}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as follows:

- $I(w, p) = v(w, p)$,
- $I(w, \sim A) = 1$ iff $I(w^*, A) \neq 1$,
- $I(w, A \wedge B) = 1$ iff $I(w, A) = 1$ and $I(w, B) = 1$,

⁴For some of the recent discussions on this theme, see [25, 26, 27] which build heavily on [15, 14].

- $I(w, A \vee B) = 1$ iff $I(w, A) = 1$ or $I(w, B) = 1$.

Based on Routley interpretations, three consequence relations can be defined as follows.

Definition 24. For all $A, B \in \text{Form}_{\mathbf{FDE}}$,

- $A \models_{*,\forall} B$ iff for all Routley interpretations $\langle W, g, *, \nu \rangle$, if $I(w, A) = 1$ for all $w \in W$, then $I(w, B) = 1$ for all $w \in W$.
- $A \models_{*,g} B$ iff for all Routley interpretations $\langle W, g, *, \nu \rangle$, if $I(g, A) = 1$, then $I(g, B) = 1$.
- $A \models_{*,\exists} B$ iff for all Routley interpretations $\langle W, g, *, \nu \rangle$, if $I(w, A) = 1$ for some $w \in W$, then $I(w, B) = 1$ for some $w \in W$.

Then, the following results are obtained (the second item is due to Routleys).

Theorem 3. For all $A, B \in \text{Form}_{\mathbf{FDE}}$, (i) $A \models_{*,\forall} B$ iff $A \models_{\mathbf{ETL}} B$; (ii) $A \models_{*,g} B$ iff $A \models_{\mathbf{FDE}} B$; (iii) $A \models_{*,\exists} B$ iff $A \models_{\mathbf{NFL}} B$.

Proof. The strategy is exactly the same as I did for the main result of the paper. I only note that for the first item, a Hilbert-style proof system introduced in [28, §3] can be used. Therefore, I will only outline the case for the third item.

For the left-to-right direction, one should simply consider the Routley interpretations in which the cardinality of W is two. Then, by unpacking the definition of Routley interpretations, $\models_{\mathbf{NFL}}$ is obtained. For the other way around, one may use of the proof system for \mathbf{NFL} , for example the one presented in [36]. Then, what remains to be done is to check the soundness, and this is tedious but not difficult. \square

Remark 25. In view of the recent revival of p - and q -consequence relations (cf. [21, 12, 13]), through a series of papers by Pablo Cobreros, Paul Egré, Dave Ripley, and Robert van Rooij (e.g. [8, 9]), the above result seems to imply that Jaśkowski's idea can be exported to enrich the p - and q -consequence relations by modal vocabularies that are characterized in terms of Kripke models. Whether this is the case, and if so then how this might be developed remains to be seen, and is left as a topic for further investigations.

6 Concluding remarks

Discussive logics are often characterized as typical paraconsistent logics in which the rule of adjunction fails. The failure of adjunction is of course true for the non-discussive conjunction, but false for discussive conjunction. In fact, the negation-free fragment of \mathcal{L}_r and \mathcal{L}_l are both completely classical.

What I hope to have pointed out, as an application of the main result, is an aspect of discussive logics beyond the failure of adjunction. More specifically, it seems that the discussive semantics can be seen as a tool to make sense of certain many-valued semantics that may look rather difficult to have an intuitive grasp of. The key feature of the discussive semantics is this: just require one of the points in the model to force formulas in order to define the validity. Of course, the rule of adjunction will fail for non-discussive conjunction because of this key feature. But, its effect goes well beyond the failure of adjunction since one may consider discussive semantics for languages without conjunction, such as the negation-conditional fragment of \mathbf{D}_2 . It therefore seems that there is more to discussive logics than the failure of adjunction.

Finally, building on this view of discussive logics, there seem to be a number of future directions. For instance, thanks to the simplicity of the key feature, discussive variants can be considered for a wide range of logics with Kripke models. A systematic investigation of this question from both technical as well as philosophical perspective remains to be seen. For the former, a first step is marked by Lloyd Humberstone in [16]. For the latter, the discussion by Priest on Jaina logic in [31] seems to be promising, beside the topics related to p - and q -consequence relations mentioned above.

References

- [1] Ofer Arieli, Arnon Avron & Anna Zamansky (2011): *Maximal and Premaximal Paraconsistency in the Framework of Three-Valued Semantics*. *Studia Logica* 97, pp. 31–60, doi:10.1007/s11225-010-9296-9.
- [2] Arnon Avron (1986): *On An Implication Connective of RM*. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 27(2), pp. 201–209, doi:10.1305/NDJFL/1093636612.
- [3] Diderik Batens & Kristof De Clercq (2004): *A Rich Paraconsistent Extension of Full Positive Logic*. *Logique et Analyse* 185-188, pp. 227–257.
- [4] Walter Carnielli, Joao Marcos & Sandra de Amo (2000): *Formal Inconsistency and Evolutionary Databases*. *Logic and Logical Philosophy* 8, pp. 115–152, doi:10.12775/LLP.2000.008.
- [5] Walter A Carnielli & Mamede Lima-Marques (1999): *Society semantics and multiple-valued logics*. In: *Contemporary Mathematics*, 235, American Mathematical Society, pp. 33–52, doi:10.1090/conm/235/03464.
- [6] Janusz Ciuciura (2006): *A Quasi-Discursive System ND_2^+* . *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 47, pp. 371–384, doi:10.1305/ndjf1/1163775444.
- [7] Janusz Ciuciura (2008): *Frontiers of the discursive logic*. *Bulletin of the Section of Logic* 37(2), pp. 81–92.
- [8] Pablo Cobrerros, Paul Egré, David Ripley & Robert van Rooij (2012): *Tolerant, classical, strict*. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 41(2), pp. 347–385, doi:10.1007/s10992-010-9165-z.
- [9] Pablo Cobrerros, Paul Égré, David Ripley & Robert Van Rooij (2013): *Reaching transparent truth*. *Mind* 122(488), pp. 841–866, doi:10.1093/mind/fzt110.
- [10] Newton C. A. da Costa & Lech Dubikajtis (1977): *On Jaśkowski's Discussive Logic*. In A. I. Arruda, N. C. A. da Costa & R. Chuaqui, editors: *Non Classical Logics, Model Theory and Computability*, North-Holland, pp. 37–56, doi:10.1016/S0049-237X(08)70644-X.
- [11] Michael Dunn (1976): *Intuitive semantics for first-degree entailments and 'coupled trees'*. *Philosophical studies* 29(3), pp. 149–168, doi:10.1007/BF00373152.
- [12] Szymon Frankowski (2004): *Formalization of a plausible inference*. *Bulletin of the Section of Logic* 33(1), pp. 41–52.
- [13] Szymon Frankowski (2004): *p-consequence Versus q-consequence Operations*. *Bulletin of the Section of Logic* 33(4), pp. 197–207.
- [14] Susan Haack (1978): *Philosophy of Logics*. Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/CB09780511812866.
- [15] Hans G. Herzberger (1973): *Dimensions of truth*. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 2(4), pp. 535–556, doi:10.1007/bf00262954.
- [16] Lloyd Humberstone (2008): *Modal formulas true at some point in every model*. *The Australasian Journal of Logic* 6, pp. 70–82, doi:10.26686/ajl.v6i0.1794.
- [17] Stanisław Jaśkowski (1969): *Propositional Calculus for Contradictory Deductive Systems*. *Studia Logica* 24, pp. 143–157, doi:10.1007/BF02134311.
- [18] Stanisław Jaśkowski (1999): *A Propositional Calculus for Inconsistent Deductive Systems*. *Logic and Logical Philosophy* 7, pp. 35–56, doi:10.12775/LLP.1999.003. A new translation of [17].
- [19] Stanisław Jaśkowski (1999): *On the Discussive Conjunction in the Propositional Calculus for Inconsistent Deductive Systems*. *Logic and Logical Philosophy* 7, pp. 57–59, doi:10.12775/LLP.1999.004.
- [20] Jerzy Kotas (1974): *On Quantity of Logical Values in the Discussive D_2 System and in Modular Logic*. *Studia Logica* 33(3), pp. 273–275, doi:doi.org/10.1007/BF02123281.
- [21] Grzegorz Malinowski (1990): *Q-consequence operation*. *Reports on Mathematical Logic* 24, pp. 49–59.

- [22] João Marcos (2011): *The value of the two values*. In J.-Y. Béziau & M.E. Coniglio, editors: *Logic without Frontiers: Festschrift for Walter Alexandre Carnielli on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, College Publication, pp. 277–294.
- [23] Hitoshi Omori (2017): *Sette's Logics, Revisited*. In Alexandru Baltag, Jeremy Seligman & Tomoyuki Yamada, editors: *Proceedings of LORI 2017*, pp. 451–465, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-55665-8_31.
- [24] Hitoshi Omori & Jesse Alama (2018): *Axiomatizing Jaśkowski's Discussive Logic \mathbf{D}_2* . *Studia Logica* 106(6), pp. 1163–1180, doi:10.1007/s11225-017-9780-6.
- [25] Hitoshi Omori & Jonas R. B. Arenhart (2022): *Haack meets Herzberger and Priest*. In: *2022 IEEE 52nd International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic (ISMVL)*, pp. 137–144, doi:10.1109/ISMVL52857.2022.00028.
- [26] Hitoshi Omori & Jonas R. B. Arenhart (2023): *Change of logic, without change of meaning*. *Theoria* 89(4), pp. 414–431, doi:10.1111/theo.12459.
- [27] Hitoshi Omori & Jonas R. B. Arenhart (2024): *Is the de Finetti conditional a conditional?* *Argumenta*, doi:10.14275/2465-2334/20230.omo.
- [28] Andreas Pietz & Umberto Rivieccio (2013): *Nothing but the truth*. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 42(1), pp. 125–135, doi:10.1007/s10992-011-9215-1.
- [29] Graham Priest (1979): *The Logic of Paradox*. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 8(1), pp. 219–241, doi:10.1007/BF00258428.
- [30] Graham Priest (1984): *Hyper-contradictions*. *Logique et Analyse* 27(107), pp. 237–243.
- [31] Graham Priest (2008): *Jaina logic: A contemporary perspective*. *History and Philosophy of Logic* 29(3), pp. 263–278, doi:10.1080/01445340701690233.
- [32] Graham Priest (2014): *Plurivalent Logics*. *The Australasian Journal of Logic* 11(1), pp. 1–13, doi:10.26686/ajl.v11i1.1830.
- [33] Richard Routley & Valerie Routley (1972): *Semantics for first degree entailment*. *Noûs* 6, pp. 335–359, doi:10.2307/2214309.
- [34] George F. Schumm (1975): *A Henkin-style completeness proof for the pure implicational calculus*. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 16(3), pp. 402–404, doi:10.1305/ndjfl/1093891803.
- [35] Antonio Sette (1973): *On the propositional calculus P^1* . *Mathematica Japonicae* 18(3), pp. 173–180.
- [36] Yaroslav Shramko (2019): *First-Degree Entailment and Structural Reasoning*. In Hitoshi Omori & Heinrich Wansing, editors: *New Essays on Belnap-Dunn Logic*, *Synthese Library* 418, Springer, pp. 311–324, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-31136-0_18.
- [37] Yaroslav Shramko, Dmitry Zaitsev & Alexander Belikov (2017): *First-Degree Entailment and its Relatives*. *Studia Logica* 105(6), pp. 1291–1317, doi:10.1007/s11225-017-9747-7.
- [38] Vladimir L. Vasyukov (2001): *A New Axiomatization of Jaśkowski's Discussive Logic*. *Logic and Logical Philosophy* 9, pp. 35–46, doi:10.12775/LLP.2001.003.