

Some results in non-monotonic proof-theoretic semantics

Antonio Piccolomini d' Aragona

University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany
antonio.piccolomini-daragona@uni-tuebingen.de

Abstract

I explore the relationships between Prawitz's approach to non-monotonic proof-theoretic validity, which I call *reducibility semantics*, and some later proof-theoretic approaches, which I call *standard base semantics* and *Sandqvist's base semantics* respectively. I show that, if suitable conditions are met, reducibility semantics and standard base semantics are equivalent, and that, if Sandqvist's variant is complete over reducibility semantics, then also the inverse holds. Finally, notions of “point-wise” soundness and completeness (called base-soundness and base-completeness) are discussed against some known principles from the proof-theoretic literature, as well as against monotonic proof-theoretic semantics. Intuitionistic logic is proved not to be “point-wise” complete on any kind of non-monotonic proof-theoretic semantics. The way in which this result is proved, as well as the overall behaviour of “point-wise” soundness and completeness, is significantly different in the non-monotonic framework as compared to what happens in the monotonic one—where the notions at issue can be used too to prove the “point-wise” incompleteness of intuitionistic logic.

Keywords Proof-theoretic semantics, non-monotonicity, consequence, completeness

1 Introduction

Proof-theoretic semantics (henceforth PTS) is a formal, proof-based semantics stemming from Prawitz's normalisation results for Gentzen's Natural Deduction [4, 5, 21, 26]. In its original formulation, due to Prawitz himself [22, 23], PTS is based on argument structures and reductions for non-introduction inferences, which are in turn used for defining valid arguments, i.e., linguistic representations of proofs. Argumental validity is relativised to theories governing deduction at the atomic level, and it is later on generalised by universally quantifying over all such theories, so as to account for logical argumental validity. The notion of (logical) consequence is a derived one, as it is understood in terms of existence of a (logically) valid argument from suitable assumptions to a suitable conclusion. I will call this kind of PTS *reducibility semantics*.

In the current mainstream approach, (logical) consequence is defined outright instead, so that argument structures and reductions are left out. The constructivist burden is all put on atomic theories, as the latter are understood (also by Prawitz) as fixing the meaning of the non-logical terminology in terms of the inferential role played by this terminology in atomic deduction. This type of PTS, which I shall refer to as *standard base semantics*, has been investigated extensively in recent years, while a variant of it due to Sandqvist [24]—whence *Sandqvist’s base semantics*—deals with disjunction in an “elimination-like” fashion, i.e., it explains the validity of a disjunction not in terms of validity of either disjunct, but in terms of categorical validity of atoms under hypothetical validity of atoms under both disjuncts.

All the three approaches to PTS mentioned so far can be developed mainly in two ways: *monotonically* or *non-monotonically*. The distinction boils down to how one deals with the “open” case, that is, validity of an argument with non-empty set of assumptions (in the case of reducibility semantics), or consequence of A from $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ (in the case of the two base semantics). Monotonic approaches adopt a closure condition throughout arbitrary extensions of an underlying atomic theory while, in the non-monotonic framework, the reference to extensions is left out, and the closure condition always operates on one and the same atomic theory.

Many completeness and incompleteness results have been proved for the monotonic version of both base semantics and its Sandqvist’s variant [2, 18, 20, 24, 27, 28, 29]. In [17], I investigated some relationships between the different kinds of monotonic PTS. I also proved some equivalence and connection results, and applied them to issues of completeness of logics over these semantics. This led me to define notions of “point-wise” soundness and completeness, called base-soundness and base-completeness, and to discuss some of their properties against the kinds of PTS at issue here, and against the results one could prove about them, or about their relation. This paper is a follow-up where I aim at showing how and to what extent the results presented in [17] can be applied to the non-monotonic context. I think this is a relevant topic, for at least two reasons.

First, Prawitz has used a monotonic approach only in [22], and the non-monotonic version instead from then on. Hence, he seems to prefer non-monotonic PTS over the monotonic variant. The ultimate reason of this is that, as said, the atomic theories which argumental validity and consequence are defined over, are also taken as “models”, i.e., as systems which fix the meaning of the non-logical terminology by showing how this terminology behaves at the level of atomic derivability. Contrarily to the Tarskian idea that non-logical meaning is determined by mappings from the language onto (mostly set-theoretic) structures, this is more consonant with broad constructivist desiderata. It can be for example looked at as nothing but a full-application of Gentzen’s well-known idea that the meaning of the logical constants is defined by special rules for these constants (specifically, introduction rules) [6]: that the meaning of the non-logical dictionary stems from the deductive behaviour of this dictionary at the atomic level, just means that this meaning is given by atomic rules which pertain to those non-logical signs. On a more general plan, the idea is also in line with Dummett’s requirement for a verificationist theory where meaning determination is not detached from linguistic practice [3], hence with (an interpretation of) Wittgenstein’s slogan that “meaning is use” [31]. This said, it is easy to see what might “go wrong” to Prawitz’s eyes when

a monotonic approach is endorsed: to require that an argument should be valid or that a consequence should hold over arbitrary extensions of a given atomic theory, may not completely capture the idea that that validity and consequence depend on a *fixed* meaning of the non-logical terminology. For, as soon as we change the base, we also change the meaning of this terminology.

The second reason why non-monotonic PTS is of interest has to do with how advocates of the *monotonic* approach normally defend their position. They remark that it is part of our understanding of argumental validity and of deductive consequence that these notions are stable over extensions of one’s knowledge base—on this, see e.g. [19]. We can certainly agree on that, while also remarking, however, that this defense requires changing the way we look at (the hierarchy of) atomic theories: they are no longer (or not only) “models”, but inference-networks representing one’s epistemic states. From this point of view, monotonic and non-monotonic PTS are nothing but sides of the same coin, in the sense that they capture complementary intuitions about argumental validity and deductive consequence. Roughly put, a proof can be said to be epistemically convincing because of *two* components at least: the meaning of the sentential and sub-sentential expressions it involves, and the validity of the inferences of which it is made. Depending on whether one takes one or the other aspect to be more prominent, one will have a more semantically, respectively, more deductively oriented perspective on proof-based approaches to meaning. Monotonic PTS is more deductively oriented, whereas non-monotonic PTS constitutes a semantic counter-part where it is very natural to say that an argument is valid or that a consequence holds relative to a given atomic theory, while failing on extensions of this theory—just like, for example, the induction principle holds only because of the special structure of the set of the natural numbers (i.e., because of the rules governing the numerical signs), and is thus not expected to hold on all the extensions of this set, e.g., on the real numbers.¹

There is however an independent interest—which abstracts from the monotonic/non-monotonic split—in comparing reducibility semantics, on the one hand, with standard base semantics and Sandqvist’s semantics, on the other. This articulates into two points again.

The first point is mainly about the relationship between reducibility semantics and standard base semantics. As said, in reducibility semantics the notion of (logical) consequence is defined in a derivative way, based on a prior notion of argumental validity. Thus, the (logical) consequence relation is always “witnessed” by (the existence of) a suitable argument structure, equipped with suitable reductions for non-introduction inferences. In standard base semantics, instead, argument structures and reductions are left out, so it becomes very natural to wonder whether the removal of the (logical) consequence “witness” also implies some loss in constructivity. This is not to suspect, of course, that standard base semantics *is not* constructive, as constructivity is in a sense secured by the special kind of “models” which this approach shares with reducibility semantics. However, the fact that the holding of a (logical) consequence relation is not grounded on a valid argument “witnessing” that the relation does hold, might make one suspicious about the fact that standard base semantics is in a way “less” constructive

¹This situation is not random, as it can be shown to stem from some formal and conceptual symmetries that induce an order relation among potential approaches to PTS—I have dealt with this in [15].

than reducibility semantics. I shall show below that, to a large extent, this is in fact not the case.

What I just said applies to the comparison of reducibility semantics and Sandqvist's base semantics as well, for the latter does without argument structures and reductions too. But a second point of interest enters the scene here. In *monotonic* PTS, intuitionistic logic can be proved to be complete over Sandqvist's approach (with "models" of a special kind), and incomplete over standard base semantics and reducibility semantics (independently of the kind of "models", but including those where Sandqvist's completeness obtains). Now, given that the "models" underlying both approaches overlap (and, incidentally, given the acknowledged harmony of introduction and elimination rules, in view of the fact that Sandqvist's semantics differs from the other two only in that it is an at least partially elimination-based approach), the completeness/incompleteness mismatch makes it worth investigating whether the two frameworks are comparable at the level of consequence over a "model" and, if not, where this divergence comes from. It is easy to realise that this question has a more general interest, *although* no (in)completeness result for Sandqvist's *non-monotonic* PTS is known so far.

The main aim of this paper is thus that of comparing non-monotonic reducibility semantics, on the one hand, with standard and Sandqvist's non-monotonic base semantics on the other. The main result is that the former is to a large extent equivalent with standard non-monotonic base semantics, and comparable with Sandqvist's non-monotonic base semantics only in a "conditionally" global way—in a sense to be explained below.

However, as the references to monotonic PTS above show, a second aim of this paper is that of comparing the monotonic and the non-monotonic approaches relative to the comparability of the three kinds of PTS at issue here. In fact, all the comparability results proved for the monotonic picture hold, *mutatis mutandis*, in the non-monotonic picture as well. It is therefore natural to wonder whether this applies also to the *consequences* of these results. In the monotonic framework, the interaction of these results with the notions of base-soundness and base-completeness mentioned above, has some quite interesting consequences concerning sufficient conditions for reducibility semantics and standard base semantics to be equivalent to Sandqvist's semantics, as well as for given logics to be complete over reducibility semantics and standard base semantics. These conditions are however of little use with intuitionistic logic (and a group of other logics too), essentially because the latter can be proved to be base-incomplete (with respect to "models" of any kind) over any of the PTS approaches under consideration here. Base-incompleteness of intuitionistic logic also holds in the non-monotonic approach but, due to non-monotonicity, the reasons for this lie in broader results of a different kind than those used for proving the same in monotonic PTS. Thus, the discussion on base-soundness and base-completeness leads to a further appreciation of the differences between monotonic and non-monotonic PTS.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, I introduce the atomic theories which reducibility semantics, standard base semantics, and Sandqvist's base semantics are to be defined over. In Section 3, I define the three semantics themselves (in a non-monotonic way), and prove basic facts about them. In Section 4, I prove results which provide a comparison of the three approaches (in the sense hinted at above). In Section 5, I introduce notions of "point-wise" soundness and completeness, and investigate their behaviour as compared to that of their monotonic counter-parts.

2 Language and atomic bases

I will restrict myself to a propositional language, defined as follows.

Definition 1. The language \mathcal{L} is given by the grammar:

$$X := p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots \mid \perp \mid X \wedge X \mid X \vee X \mid X \rightarrow X$$

where \perp is an atomic constant symbol for absurdity and $\neg X := X \rightarrow \perp$.

I shall indicate the set of the atomic formulas and the set of the formulas of \mathcal{L} respectively by $\text{ATOM}_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\text{FORM}_{\mathcal{L}}$. I shall use capital Latin letters A, B, C, \dots for formulas, and capital Greek letters $\Gamma, \Delta, \Theta, \dots$ for sets of formulas.

Definition 2. Any $A \in \text{ATOM}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is an atomic rule of level 0. Given atomic rules whose maximal level is $k - 1$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{C}_1 & & \mathfrak{C}_n \\ A_1 & \dots & A_n \end{array}$$

where each \mathfrak{C}_i may be empty ($i \leq n$),

$$\frac{\begin{array}{ccc} [\mathfrak{C}_1] & & [\mathfrak{C}_n] \\ A_1 & \dots & A_n \end{array}}{A}$$

with $A \in \text{ATOM}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is an atomic rule of level k .

As usual, square brackets indicate that the rule discharges the corresponding assumptions. However, what is assumed (and thus discharged) here are not atomic formulas only, but also atomic rules of a lower level than the rule which discharges them—more precisely, an atomic rule of level k discharges atomic rules of level $\leq k - 2$, see [18, 19, 20].

Definition 3. An atomic base of level k is a set of atomic rules of maximal level k .

Derivations in \mathfrak{B} can be defined by standard induction—see e.g. [18]. The derivability relation over \mathfrak{B} is indicated by $\vdash_{\mathfrak{B}}$, while the derivation set of \mathfrak{B} is indicated by $\text{DER}_{\mathfrak{B}}$. Atomic bases are assumed to be always consistent, i.e., $\forall \mathfrak{B} (\not\vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} \perp)$.

3 Non-monotonic proof-theoretic semantics

I shall not follow a chronological order, but start from base semantics instead. This is because, as we shall see, the equivalence and connection results that I will establish between reducibility semantics and base semantics are mostly oriented towards proving how (in)completeness results proved *for the latter* can be applied *to the former*.

In what follows, Γ is always understood as a *finite* set. This is to avoid some compactness issues that emerge when comparing reducibility semantics and base semantics—pointed out by [28]—and is sufficient for raising my points and prove a number of results.

3.1 Base semantics

Consequence over an atomic base in standard base semantics is defined as follows.

Definition 4. A is a consequence of Γ on \mathfrak{B} , written $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}} A \iff$

- $\Gamma = \emptyset \implies$
 - $A \in \text{ATOM}_{\mathcal{L}} \implies \vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A$
 - $A = B \wedge C \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}} B \text{ and } \models_{\mathfrak{B}} C$
 - $A = B \vee C \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}} B \text{ or } \models_{\mathfrak{B}} C$
 - $A = B \rightarrow C \implies B \models_{\mathfrak{B}} C$
- $\Gamma \neq \emptyset \implies (\models_{\mathfrak{B}} \Gamma \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}} A)$

where $\models_{\mathfrak{B}} \Gamma$ means $\forall B \in \Gamma (\models_{\mathfrak{B}} B)$.

Sandqvist's (non-monotonic) version obtains by changing the disjunction-clause.

Definition 5. A is a consequence of Γ on \mathfrak{B} in Sandqvist's sense, written $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A \iff$

- $\Gamma = \emptyset \implies$
 - $A \in \text{ATOM}_{\mathcal{L}} \implies \vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A$
 - $A = B \wedge C \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s B \text{ and } \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s C$
 - $A = B \vee C \implies \forall D \in \text{ATOM}_{\mathcal{L}} (B \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s D \text{ and } C \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s D \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s D)$
 - $A = B \rightarrow C \implies B \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s C$
- $\Gamma \neq \emptyset \implies (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s \Gamma \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A)$

Let \Vdash be either \models or \models^s . \Vdash is non-monotonic in the sense that there are Γ, A and \mathfrak{B} such that $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A$ but, for some extension \mathfrak{C} of \mathfrak{B} , $\Gamma \not\Vdash_{\mathfrak{C}} A$ —where an extension of an atomic base is a super-set of the base. E.g., take $\Gamma = \{p_1\}, A = p_2, \mathfrak{B} = \emptyset$ and $\mathfrak{C} = \{p_1\}$.

Definition 6. $\Gamma \Vdash A \iff \forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A)$.

Intuitionistic logic (henceforth IL) can be shown to be incomplete over \models , via what Piecha and Schroeder-Heister have called the *import principle*: if Γ does not contain \vee , there is an atomic base Γ° such that $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}} A \iff \models_{\mathfrak{B} \cup \Gamma^\circ} A$ —see [20].² From this, the logical validity of Harrop rule, which is admissible but not derivable in IL [8], can be shown to follow relative to \models . The interest of Sandqvist's variant lies instead in the

² Γ° can be built from Γ via replacement of $A \rightarrow B \wedge C$ with $(A \rightarrow B) \wedge (A \rightarrow C)$, and of $A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C)$ with $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$. This turns the elements of Γ into higher-level clauses, which can then be easily associated to higher-level atomic rules. The reason why Γ is required not to contain \vee is that \vee introduces alternative options as to whether a result is proved out of one or the other disjunct. Hence, it might not be possible to single out a unique base from a given set of assumptions. This is also roughly connected to the fact that the disjunction property of constructive systems may fail if the assumptions set is not \vee -free. Let me also remark that IL is also incomplete over monotonic \models (independently of the level of the atomic bases) via what Piecha and Schroeder-Heister have called the *export principle*, see footnote 7. Monotonic \models has been proved in [28] to be a semantics for inquisitive logic. I shall come back to this in Section 4.3.

fact that, in the monotonic framework, intuitionistic logic is complete on it for atomic bases of level ≥ 2 [24]—more on this in Section 4.3. Sandqvist’s picture may have an interest in the non-monotonic format too since, as suggested in [27], it is an approach which prioritises elimination rules—on elimination-based approaches see also [11].³

3.2 Reducibility semantics

As said, in reducibility semantics we do not start from outright notions of consequence between Γ and A , but from the notion of (logically) valid argument. Thus, some preliminary notions are required, in particular, those of argument structure and reduction for non-introduction rule. The need of defining argumental validity first, and based on that the notion of consequence, as well as the need of introducing a number of preliminary notions, explains why the section on reducibility semantics is going to be much longer than that of base semantics.

Definition 7. *An argument structure is a pair $\langle T, f \rangle$ where T is a finite tree with nodes labelled by either atomic axioms, in which case they are always top-nodes, or else by formulas of \mathcal{L} , and f is a function defined on a sub-set Γ of the top-nodes of T other than the atomic axioms such that, for every $\mu \in \Gamma$, $f(\mu)$ is below μ in T . The top-nodes and the root of T are called, respectively, the assumptions and the conclusion of $\langle T, f \rangle$.*

Here, f is to be understood as a function indicating where some of the assumptions are discharged. Observe that, since we want our argument structures to implement atomic rules which discharge, not only formulas, but also rules of lower level, we should allow f to be defined, not only on some top-nodes, but also on some arches of T . However, I shall abstract from these details here—see [17].

Definition 8. *Given $\mathcal{D} = \langle T, f \rangle$, we say that \mathcal{D} is closed if the domain of f coincides with the set of the top-nodes of T other than atomic axioms, otherwise we say that \mathcal{D} is open. If \mathcal{D} has undischarged assumptions Γ and conclusion A , we say it is an argument structure from Γ to or for A , which we also indicate as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ \mathcal{D} \\ A \end{array}$$

The notion of (*immediate*) *sub-structure* of an argument structure can be easily defined. The same applies to the notion of *replacement* of a sub-structure \mathcal{D}^* of an argument

³A remark is in order concerning Sandqvist’s non-monotonic PTS. In Sandqvist’s paper [24], \perp is not an atomic constant symbol for absurdity, as we are treating it here, but a 0-ary propositional connective explained by a clause which states that \perp holds on an atomic base iff every atom holds on the base. This approach can be equated with the one where \perp is an atomic constant symbol by postulating that atomic bases always contain an “atomic explosion rule”. In *monotonic* PTS, this issue plays a crucial role, as there intuitionistic logic is complete over Sandqvist’s variant (with atomic bases of a special kind), and incomplete over the standard one. When comparing the different kinds of PTS relative to (in)completeness issues, we must hence find a common ground for the comparison to go through without problems—see [17]. For what is at stake in this paper, though, this aspect seems to me to be less important. As far as I know, no completeness or incompleteness results are available for Sandqvist’s *non-monotonic* PTS, hence we can compare it with reducibility semantics by touching upon (in)completeness issues up to a limited extent only. In what follows I shall therefore abstract from this issue. I shall come back to this in Section 4.3.

structure \mathcal{D} with an argument structure \mathcal{D}^{**} —written $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{D}^{**}/\mathcal{D}^*]$ —although in this case one may have to take care of potential re-indexing of the discharge functions of \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}^{**} . Once again, I will abstract from these details here.

Definition 9. Given \mathcal{D} from $\Gamma = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ to A , and a function σ from formulas to argument structures such that $\sigma(A_i)$ is a (closed) argument structure for A_i ($i \leq n$), we say that $\mathcal{D}^\sigma = \mathcal{D}[\sigma(A_1), \dots, \sigma(A_n)/A_1, \dots, A_n]$ is a (closed) instance of \mathcal{D} .

Definition 10. An inference is a triple $\langle \langle \mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n \rangle, A, \delta \rangle$ ($n \geq 0$) where δ is an extension of the discharge functions associated to the \mathcal{D}_i -s ($i \leq n$). The argument structure associated to the inference is indicated by the figure

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n}{A} \delta$$

and is obtained by conjoining the trees of the \mathcal{D}_i -s via a root-node A , and by adding δ to the discharge functions of the \mathcal{D}_i -s ($i \leq n$). An inference rule is a set of inferences.

I shall assume that rules can be always identified via some meta-linguistic descriptions, as in the case of the standard introduction rules in Gentzen’s calculus:

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \wedge_I \quad \frac{A_i}{A_1 \vee A_2} \vee_I, i = 1, 2 \quad \frac{[A]}{A \rightarrow B} \rightarrow_I$$

This means that, although rules are identified as mere sets of inferences, we take these sets to be recursive.

Definition 11. \mathcal{D} is canonical iff it is associated to an instance of an introduction rule, while it is non-canonical otherwise.

Definition 12. Given a rule R , a reduction for R is a function ϕ defined on the set \mathbb{D} of the argument structures associated to the elements of some sub-set of R such that, $\forall \mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{D}$,

1. \mathcal{D} is from Γ to $A \implies \phi(\mathcal{D})$ is from $\Gamma^* \subseteq \Gamma$ to A
2. $\forall \sigma$, ϕ is defined on \mathcal{D}^σ , and $\phi(\mathcal{D}^\sigma) = \phi(\mathcal{D})^\sigma$.

A set of reductions will be indicated by \mathfrak{J} . An *extension* of \mathfrak{J} is any set of reductions \mathfrak{J}^+ such that $\mathfrak{J} \subseteq \mathfrak{J}^+$. In what follows, I shall not distinguish simple extensions, from what [23] calls *consistent* extensions of sets of reductions. In other words, we shall abstract from whether we are allowing or not for what [25] calls *alternative justifications* for argument structures.⁴ Similarly, I shall put no restrictions on the kind of functions which reductions may be, in particular, I shall not *a priori* require them to be necessarily *constructive* functions of a schematic kind, as seemingly done in [23]. I will quickly come back to this point in the concluding remarks—for a preliminary address, see [16].

⁴A consistent extension of \mathfrak{J} is any $\mathfrak{J}^+ \supseteq \mathfrak{J}$ such that, for every $\phi \in \mathfrak{J}^+ - \mathfrak{J}$, if ϕ is a reduction for R , then no $\phi^* \in \mathfrak{J}$ is a reduction for R . Morally, each rule is justified by at most one reduction in each set, and clashes of justifications are not permitted. Or again, justification of rules throughout reduction of structures is a completely deterministic process.

Definition 13. \mathcal{D} immediately reduces to \mathcal{D}^* via \mathfrak{J} iff, for some sub-structure \mathcal{D}^{**} of \mathcal{D} , there is $\phi \in \mathfrak{J}$ such that $\mathcal{D}^* = \mathcal{D}[\phi(\mathcal{D}^{**})/\mathcal{D}^{**}]$. The binary relation of \mathcal{D} reducing to \mathcal{D}^* via \mathfrak{J} —written $\mathcal{D} \leq_{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{D}^*$ —is the reflexive-transitive closure of \mathcal{D} immediately reducing to \mathcal{D}^* relative to \mathfrak{J} .

Definition 14. An argument is a pair $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{J} \rangle$. It is closed (resp. open) iff \mathcal{D} is so.

Definition 15. $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{J} \rangle$ is valid on $\mathfrak{B} \iff$

- \mathcal{D} is closed \implies
 - the conclusion of \mathcal{D} is atomic $\implies \mathcal{D} \leq_{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{D}^*$ with $\mathcal{D}^* = \langle T, f \rangle$ and $T \in \text{DER}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ closed
 - the conclusion of \mathcal{D} is not atomic $\implies \mathcal{D} \leq_{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{D}^*$ with \mathcal{D}^* canonical whose immediate sub-structures are valid on \mathfrak{B} when paired with \mathfrak{J}
- \mathcal{D} is open with undischarged assumptions $A_1, \dots, A_n \implies \forall \sigma, \forall A_i (i \leq n)$, if $\langle \sigma(A_i), \mathfrak{J}^+ \rangle$ is closed valid on \mathfrak{B} ($i \leq n$), then $\langle \mathcal{D}^\sigma, \mathfrak{J}^+ \rangle$ is closed valid on \mathfrak{B} .

Argumental validity on an atomic base as defined here is non-monotonic, since there are $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{J} \rangle$ and \mathfrak{B} such that $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{J} \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} but, for some extension \mathfrak{C} of \mathfrak{B} , $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{J} \rangle$ is not valid on \mathfrak{C} . E.g., take $\mathfrak{J} = \mathfrak{B} = \emptyset$, $\mathfrak{C} = \{p_1\}$, and let \mathcal{D} be the one-step argument structure from assumption p_1 to conclusion p_2 .

Definition 16. $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{J} \rangle$ is valid iff $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{J} \rangle$ is valid on every \mathfrak{B} .

Definition 17. A is a consequence of Γ on \mathfrak{B} in the sense of reducibility semantics—written $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A$ —iff there is $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{J} \rangle$ from Γ to A which is valid on \mathfrak{B} . A is a logical consequence of Γ in the sense of reducibility semantics—written $\Gamma \models^{\alpha} A$ —iff there is a valid $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{J} \rangle$ from Γ to A .

Observe that it is not *a priori* clear whether logical consequence is tantamount to consequence on every atomic base, i.e., whether the existence on each atomic base of an argument from Γ to A which is valid on that base, also implies the existence of a simply valid argument from Γ to A . However, the following is trivially provable.

Proposition 1. $\Gamma \models^{\alpha} A \implies \forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A)$.

Whether we also have the inverse of this implication is in fact tantamount to the question whether logical consequence in reducibility semantics is fully equivalent to logical consequence in standard base semantics. I deal with this in the next section, where it is also shown that the issue is strictly interrelated with the question whether the inversion of the following implication holds.

Proposition 2. $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A \implies (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} \Gamma \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A)$.

Proof. Suppose $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A$, i.e., that there is a

Γ
 \mathcal{D}
 A

which is valid on \mathfrak{B} when paired with \mathfrak{J} . Suppose $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} \Gamma$ with $\Gamma = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$, and take any closed $\langle \mathcal{D}_i, \mathfrak{J}^+ \rangle$ for A_i ($i \leq n$) which is valid on \mathfrak{B} . By Definition 15,

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n \\ \Gamma \\ \mathcal{D} \\ A \end{array}$$

is closed valid on \mathfrak{B} when paired with \mathfrak{J}^+ , whence $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A$. \square

4 Reducibility semantics vs base semantics

Let us discuss the mutual relations of \models , \models^s and \models^{α} (possibly over an atomic base).

4.1 Reducibility semantics vs standard base semantics

I start from showing that, when suitable conditions are met, reducibility semantics is equivalent to standard base semantics when consequence over a specific atomic base is at issue. For this to be done, the following preliminary results must be proved, showing that Prawitz's reducibility semantics yields in fact a standard consequence relation over a "model".

Proposition 3. *The following facts hold:*

1. $A \in \text{ATOM}_{\mathcal{L}} \implies (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A \iff \vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A)$
2. $A = B \wedge C \implies (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A \iff \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B \text{ and } \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} C)$
3. $A = B \vee C \implies (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A \iff \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B \text{ or } \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} C)$
4. $A = B \rightarrow C \implies (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A \iff B \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} C)$
5. $(\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} \Gamma \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A) \implies \Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A$

Proof. The only non-trivial part is point 5. When $\Gamma = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$, let $\tau = \langle \mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n \rangle$ be a sequence of closed argument structures for A_1, \dots, A_n respectively such that, for some \mathfrak{J}_i , $\langle \mathcal{D}_i, \mathfrak{J}_i \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} ($i \leq n$). By assumption, there is then a closed argument structure for A , say \mathcal{D}_A^{τ} , such that, for some \mathfrak{J}_A^{τ} , $\langle \mathcal{D}_A^{\tau}, \mathfrak{J}_A^{\tau} \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} . Consider now the rule $\{\langle \langle \mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n \rangle, A \rangle\}$, to whose only element the closed argument structure

$$\mathcal{D} = \frac{\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}_1 & & \mathcal{D}_n \\ A_1 & \dots & A_n \end{array}}{A}$$

is associated, and consider the mapping $\phi^{\tau}(\mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{D}_A^{\tau}$. Next, let \mathbb{F} be the set of all the reductions which satisfy Definition 12. Then, we have $\phi^{\tau} \in \mathbb{F}$ since (a) both \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}_A^{τ} are closed, so condition 1 in Definition 12 is satisfied, and (b) for every σ , $\mathcal{D}^{\sigma} = \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}_A^{\tau, \sigma} = \mathcal{D}_A^{\tau}$, so $\phi^{\tau}(\mathcal{D}^{\sigma}) = \phi^{\tau}(\mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{D}_A^{\tau} = \mathcal{D}_A^{\tau, \sigma} = \phi^{\tau}(\mathcal{D})^{\sigma}$, so condition 2 in Definition 12 is satisfied too. But then, the open argument structure

$$\mathcal{D}^* = \frac{A_1 \quad \dots \quad A_n}{A}$$

is valid on \mathfrak{B} when \mathbb{F} is its reduction-set. To see this, take any sequence $\tau = \langle \mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n \rangle$ of closed argument structures for A_1, \dots, A_n respectively such that, for some \mathfrak{J}_i , $\langle \mathcal{D}_i, \mathfrak{J}_i \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} , and let $\sigma(A_i) = \mathcal{D}_i$ ($i \leq n$). We must now prove that $\langle \mathcal{D}^{*,\sigma}, \mathbb{F} \cup \bigcup_{i \leq n} \mathfrak{J}_i \rangle$ is closed valid for A on \mathfrak{B} which, because $\mathfrak{J}_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ ($i \leq n$), can be simplified to showing that $\langle \mathcal{D}^{*,\sigma}, \mathbb{F} \rangle$ is closed valid for A on \mathfrak{B} , i.e., that $\mathcal{D}^{*,\sigma}$ reduces via \mathbb{F} to a closed canonical argument structure for A whose immediate sub-structures are valid on \mathfrak{B} when paired with \mathbb{F} . But reducibility is transitive—see [23]—so we can limit ourselves to showing that $\mathcal{D}^{*,\sigma}$ reduces through \mathbb{F} to a closed argument structure for A which is valid on \mathfrak{B} relative to \mathbb{F} . Now, since \mathbb{F} contains a reduction ϕ^τ as above, $\mathcal{D}^{*,\sigma}$ reduces via \mathbb{F} to a closed \mathcal{D}_A^τ as above, namely, such that, for some \mathfrak{J}_A^τ , $\langle \mathcal{D}_A^\tau, \mathfrak{J}_A^\tau \rangle$ is closed valid for A on \mathfrak{B} —in particular, $\phi(\mathcal{D}^{*,\sigma}) = \mathcal{D}^{*,\sigma}[\mathcal{D}_A^\tau / \mathcal{D}^{*,\sigma}]$. Given that $\mathfrak{J}_A^\tau \subseteq \mathbb{F}$, we have that $\langle \mathcal{D}_A^\tau, \mathbb{F} \rangle$ is also closed valid for A on \mathfrak{B} . \square

Some remarks are now in order concerning the proof of point 5 of Proposition 3. First of all, observe that the mapping ϕ^τ used in the proof is just a “pointer” that sends a given sequence of closed argument structures for A_1, \dots, A_n onto some other closed argument structure for A whose existence is guaranteed by the assumption $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^\alpha \Gamma \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^\alpha A$. This “pointer” may of course not really “build” the closed argument structure for A out of the given closed argument structures for A_1, \dots, A_n . In fact, it might well be an instance on specific inputs of a constant function κ , say $\Gamma = \{p\}$ and $A = B \rightarrow B$, where we require that, for every closed argument structure \mathcal{D} for q , given the argument structures

$$\mathcal{D}^* = \frac{\mathcal{D}}{q} \quad \mathcal{D}^{**} = \frac{[B]}{B \rightarrow B}$$

we have $\kappa(\mathcal{D}^*) = \mathcal{D}^{**}$. In general, however, if we do not allow for classical logic in the meta-language, different sequences τ_1, τ_2 of closed argument structures for A_1, \dots, A_n may “point” to different closed argument structures for A , so that $\phi^{\tau_1} \neq \phi^{\tau_2}$.⁵ What is important for the theorem to go through is that \mathbb{F} contains *all* these “pointers”. Clearly, one could choose the smaller set containing just the “pointers” plus the reduction-sets associated to the closed argument structures for A_1, \dots, A_n, A . This would certainly be a more constructive choice, but still not an entirely constructive one. I say more about this in the Concluding Remarks. When on the contrary we allow for classical logic in the meta-language, then the situation is smoother, and in fact we need not pass through specific sequences of closed argument structures for A_1, \dots, A_n —see [16]. For, if there is A_i ($i \leq n$) such that there is no closed argument for A_i valid on \mathfrak{B} , then the argument structure \mathcal{D}^* in the proof above can be justified by the empty function, so by the empty reduction-set. Otherwise, there is some closed valid argument $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{J} \rangle$ for A , so we can consider the rule R consisting of all the argument structures obtained by appending \mathcal{D}^* to arbitrary argument structures for A_1, \dots, A_n , and define the following constant

⁵Thus nothing changes if, instead of defining a ϕ^τ for each argument structure obtained by appending the argument structure \mathcal{D}^* in the proof to a sequence $\tau = \langle \mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n \rangle$ of closed argument structures for A_1, \dots, A_n respectively, we define a single ϕ for the rule consisting of all these argument structures in such a way that, if the instance ι of the rule is obtained by appending \mathcal{D}^* to the sequence τ , then $\phi(\iota) = \phi^\tau(\iota)$.

function κ , working as a reduction for R : for every instance ι of R , $\kappa(\iota) = \mathcal{D}$. Then, $\langle \mathcal{D}^*, \kappa \cup \mathfrak{J} \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} . I shall come back to this too in the Concluding Remarks.

Proposition 3 obviously implies equivalence between the notions of consequence over a base in, respectively, standard base semantics and reducibility semantics.

Theorem 1. $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}} A \iff \Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A$.

The equivalence between the two approaches at issue relative to *logical* consequence is instead obtained by combining Theorem 1 with Proposition 1, plus the following.

Proposition 4. $\forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A) \implies \Gamma \models^{\alpha} A$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of point 5 of Proposition 3. Assume $\Gamma = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$. We know that, for every \mathfrak{B} , we have an argument structure

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_1 & \dots & A_n \\ & \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}} & \\ & A & \end{array}$$

such that $\langle \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}, \mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{B}} \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} for some $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}$. Thus, for all \mathfrak{B} , the set \mathbb{F} of all the reductions satisfying Definition 12 contains $\phi_{\mathfrak{B}}$ which, given closed $\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}^i$ -s with conclusion A_i such that, for some $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^i$, $\langle \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}^i, \mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^i \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} ($i \leq n$), maps the argument structure

$$\mathcal{D}^{\sigma} = \frac{\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}^1 & & \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}^n \\ A_1 & \dots & A_n \end{array}}{A}$$

onto the argument structure

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}^* = \frac{\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}^1 & & \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}^n \\ A_1 & \dots & A_n \end{array}}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}}$$

We want to prove that $\langle \mathcal{D}^{\sigma}, \mathbb{F} \cup \bigcup_{i \leq n} \mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^i \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} which, since $\mathbb{F} \cup \bigcup_{i \leq n} \mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^i = \mathbb{F}$, can be reduced to showing that $\langle \mathcal{D}^{\sigma}, \mathbb{F} \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} . \mathcal{D}^{σ} reduces via $\phi_{\mathfrak{B}} \in \mathbb{F}$ to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}^*$ which, by assumption, is such that $\langle \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}^*, \mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{B}} \cup \bigcup_{i \leq n} \mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^i \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} . But $\mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{B}} \cup \bigcup_{i \leq n} \mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{B}}^i \subseteq \mathbb{F}$, thus $\langle \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}^*, \mathbb{F} \rangle$ is also valid on \mathfrak{B} . \square

All the remarks concerning the proof of point 5 in Proposition 3 apply to the proof of Proposition 4 too.⁶ Then, we easily obtain the following.

Theorem 2. $\Gamma \models A \iff \Gamma \models^{\alpha} A$.

⁶The advantage of adopting classical logic in the meta-language in the case of proof of point 5 in Proposition 3—i.e., the possibility of defining a single constant function rather than a class of input-dependent “pointers”—is of no use here since, even with classical logic in the meta-language, a constant function is now required for each atomic base, and there is *a priori* no guarantee that these constant functions are identical to one another. As proved in [16], if one relaxes the notion of reduction allowing reductions to contain such non-regimentable classes of “pointers”, then excluded middle can be shown to be logically valid over \models^{α} , i.e., classical logic is sound over \models^{α} —hence intuitionistic logic is incomplete over \models^{α} .

Proof. By Definition 6, $\Gamma \models A \iff \forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}} A)$. By Theorem 1, $\forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}} A) \iff \forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A)$. By Propositions 1 and 4, $\forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A) \iff \Gamma \models^{\alpha} A$. \square

For what said at the end of Section 3.1, i.e., that IL is incomplete over \models when atomic bases have unlimited complexity [18], from Theorem 2 we then obtain the following.

Theorem 3. *IL is incomplete over \models^{α} .*

Before moving to the next topic, let me comment a little bit more upon the results I have been focusing on in this section. However easy their proofs are (and under the constraint that consequence is always taken to hold between a formula and a *finite* set of formulas), Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 provide a seemingly interesting link between standard base semantics and reducibility semantics. As already hinted at in the Introduction, the latter can be seen as a sort of “realizer-interpretation” of the former—see [7]—in the sense that, whenever $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}} A$ or $\Gamma \models A$ hold, a “witness” can be found in terms of an open argument from Γ to A which is valid on \mathfrak{B} , i.e., $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A$, or logically valid, i.e., $\Gamma \models^{\alpha} A$, respectively. Conversely, standard base semantics might be understood as a sort of type-abstraction from reducibility semantics, meaning that, whenever we are given an open argument “witnessing” either $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A$ or $\Gamma \models^{\alpha} A$, we disregard *how* the connection between Γ and A is established, and just look at the input and output types of it, i.e., $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}} A$ and $\Gamma \models A$ respectively.

Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 confirm this rough intuition—thus implying incompleteness of IL over \models^{α} as per Theorem 3. If one thinks about that, however, this is far from trivial. To my mind, the distinction between reducibility semantics and standard base semantics is best understood if, *mutatis mutandis*, we look at how truth is dealt with in another major constructivist framework, i.e., Martin-Löf’s intuitionistic type theory [10]. Leaving atomic bases aside, let us concede that closed valid arguments for A , or open valid arguments for A from $\Gamma = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$, can be read in terms of proof-objects involved in type-theoretic judgements of the form

$$\begin{array}{l} a : A \\ b(x_1, \dots, x_n) : A \ (x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n) \end{array}$$

respectively. The first judgement says that a is a proof-object of type A —namely, of proposition A , given the Curry-Howard isomorphism and the underlying *formulas-as-types conception* [9]. The second judgement says instead that $b(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is a proof-object of type A , whenever a_i is a proof-object of type A_i ($i \leq n$). In intuitionistic type theory, we also have judgements of the form

$$\begin{array}{l} A \text{ true} \\ A \text{ true} \ (A_1 \text{ true}, \dots, A_n \text{ true}) \end{array}$$

where the second judgement says that A is true whenever A_i is true ($i \leq n$), and where **true** behaves according to the following rules respectively—in the right-hand rule I allow myself for a type-theoretic notational abuse, which is however harmless in the present context:

$$\frac{a : A}{A \text{ true}} \text{ T} \quad \frac{b(x_1, \dots, x_n) : A \ (x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n)}{A \text{ true} \ (A_1 \text{ true}, \dots, A_n \text{ true})} \text{ DT}$$

Thus, in Martin-Löf's intuitionistic type theory, `true` is always explained in terms of a given proof-object, which can be exhibited as a truth-maker of the proposition whose truth is being asserted. This is similar to what happens in reducibility semantics, where the consequence relation is not primitive, but defined as existence of a suitable valid argument. In standard base semantics, we start instead from the consequence relation outright, without requiring something more primitive. Sticking to the comparison with Martin-Löf's intuitionistic type theory, it is thus as if we started from a notion of truth which is not explained in terms of the rules T and DT above, say

$$\frac{A \text{ true}^*}{A \text{ true}^* (A_1 \text{ true}^*, \dots, A_n \text{ true}^*)}.$$

If one accepts this reconstruction, the question about the relation between reducibility semantics and standard base semantics can be thus understood in rough type-theoretic terms as the question whether at least one of the following rules is acceptable:

$$\frac{A \text{ true} (A_1 \text{ true}, \dots, A_n \text{ true})}{A \text{ true}^* (A_1 \text{ true}^*, \dots, A_n \text{ true}^*)} \quad \frac{A \text{ true}^* (A_1 \text{ true}^*, \dots, A_n \text{ true}^*)}{A \text{ true} (A_1 \text{ true}, \dots, A_n \text{ true})}$$

hence whether at least one of the following rules is acceptable:

$$\frac{b(x_1, \dots, x_n) : A (x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n)}{A \text{ true}^* (A_1 \text{ true}^*, \dots, A_n \text{ true}^*)} \quad \frac{A \text{ true}^* (A_1 \text{ true}^*, \dots, A_n \text{ true}^*)}{b(x_1, \dots, x_n) : A (x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n)}$$

with $n \geq 0$. As far as this goes, Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 say that, to a large extent, the questions can be answered positively.

4.2 Reducibility semantics vs Sandqvist's base semantics

Let us now turn to the relation between \models^α and \models^s . We remark that, since \models^α has been proved to be equivalent to \models , the results we shall be presenting here also hold when we replace \models^α with \models .

Because of the fact that Sandqvist's base semantics explains disjunction in an elimination like way, we will not have full equivalence here, but a weaker result. For seeing this, given an arbitrary \mathfrak{B} , consider the statement

$$\forall \Gamma \forall A (\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A \implies \Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^\alpha A). \quad (1)$$

Then, we can prove the following.

Theorem 4. $\forall \mathfrak{B} ((1) \implies \forall \Gamma \forall A (\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^\alpha A \implies \Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A))$.

Proof. Take an arbitrary \mathfrak{B} , assume (1), and suppose $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Then:

- $A \in \text{ATOM}_{\mathcal{L}} \implies (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^\alpha A \iff \vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A \iff \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A)$ hence, *a fortiori*,

$$\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^\alpha A \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A$$

- assume now the induction hypothesis, i.e., for every A^* whose complexity is less than the complexity of A , $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^\alpha A^* \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A^*$.

(\wedge) $A = B \wedge C \implies$ similar to the implicational case

(\rightarrow) $A = B \rightarrow C \implies (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B \rightarrow C \iff B \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} C \iff (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} C))$.
Assume $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s B$, and instantiate (1) on \emptyset and B , thereby having $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B$. So,
 $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} C$ whence, by induction hypothesis, $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s C$, whence

$$(\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s B \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s C) \iff B \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s C \iff \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s B \rightarrow C$$

so that

$$\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B \rightarrow C \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s B \rightarrow C$$

(\vee) $A = B \vee C \implies (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B \vee C \iff \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B \text{ or } \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} C)$. Take an arbitrary $D \in \text{ATOM}_{\mathcal{L}}$, and assume $B \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s D$ and $C \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s D$. Assume $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B$. By induction hypothesis, $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s B$, whence $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s D$. The same obtains when assuming $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} C$. So, by discharging the assumptions $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B$ and $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} C$, we have $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s D$ and, by arbitrariness of D ,

$$\forall D \in \text{ATOM}_{\mathcal{L}} (B \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s D \text{ and } C \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s D \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s D) \iff \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s B \vee C$$

whence

$$\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B \vee C \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s B \vee C$$

Supposing now $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$, we have $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A \iff (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} \Gamma \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A)$. Assume $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s \Gamma$, and instantiate (1) on \emptyset and all the elements of Γ , so as to have $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} \Gamma$, whence $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A$. For what shown previously, this implies $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A$, so

$$(\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s \Gamma \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A) \iff \Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A$$

whence

$$\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A \implies \Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A.$$

It is now sufficient to quantify on Γ and A , discharge (1), and quantify on \mathfrak{B} . \square

Thus, contrarily to what happens with the comparison between \models and \models^{α} , a “local” comparison is not possible between \models^{α} and \models^s —by “local” I mean that, for *each* Γ and A , $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A$ implies $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A$, and vice versa. The only comparability we can hope for is a “conditionally global” one, i.e., *if we can go everywhere* from Sandqvist to Prawitz, *then we can also go everywhere* from Prawitz to Sandqvist.

This depends, of course, on the “elimination-based” approach which \models^s handles \vee with, and which blocks that kind of smoothly inductive reasoning involved in the proof of Theorem 1 above. Observe that going inductively from Prawitz to Sandqvist relative to \vee might not be beyond reach: if $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A \vee B$, $A \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s C$ and $B \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s C$, and if by induction $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A$ and $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s B$, then $A \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s C$ and $B \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s C \implies \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s C$. The inverse fails, however, because from the last implication we may not be able to infer $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s A$ or $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^s B$, so that we cannot apply induction to conclude $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} A$ or $\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^{\alpha} B$ (incidentally, this is the selling point of Sandqvist’s proof of intuitionistic completeness for his variant of base semantics). Which means that the direction Sandqvist-to-Prawitz is not granted in the case of the other logical constants either, whence it must be assumed as a “global condition” over all Γ and A .

Of course, the “conditionally global” comparability of \models^α and \models^s may not be without value. For example, it may shed light on mutual properties of \models^α and \models^s *at the level of logical validity*, or it may provide us with insights concerning the relative soundness and completeness of given logics over one or the other approach. This is what happens in the monotonic framework, after introducing notions of “point-wise” soundness and completeness. But now, significant differences between monotonic and non-monotonic PTS emerge, as I point out in the Section 5.

4.3 Connection with (in)completeness results

In the next section, I will deal with the difference between monotonic and non-monotonic PTS relative to the comparability results of this section—as well as relative to some notions of “point-wise” soundness and completeness which I will introduce in due course. But the distinction between monotonic and non-monotonic PTS relative to the results discussed in this section can be also discussed with reference to the issue of the completeness or incompleteness of given logics over standard or Sandqvist’s base semantics, and reducibility semantics. To my knowledge, the only concrete result of this kind that we have in the non-monotonic framework is Piecha and Schroeder-Heister’s proof that IL is incomplete over \models [20], from which we drew Theorem 3, so IL is incomplete over \models^α too—relevant results for a (partly elimination-based) approach are to be found also in [30]. It is instead unsettled which logic is *complete* over \models (hence, as per Theorem 2, over \models^α), and this also applies to Sandqvist’s non-monotonic base semantics, although in this case a proof of incompleteness of IL is missing.⁷

In monotonic PTS, the situation is much richer instead. As proved in [18, 20], IL is generally incomplete over monotonic standard base semantics (and over monotonic reducibility semantics, since a result similar to Theorem 2 can be proved in monotonic PTS too).⁸ Also, Stafford proved in [28] that inquisitive logic is complete over \models when the complexity of the atomic bases is ≥ 2 and, under the same circumstances, Sandqvist proved in [24] that IL is instead complete over his own variant of base semantics.

As shown in [17], the completeness and incompleteness results for monotonic PTS can be combined with the monotonic variant of Theorem 2 (and with notions of “point-wise” soundness and completeness mentioned below) to obtain non-trivial insights relative to such issues as whether the three kinds of monotonic PTS at issue in this paper are or not base-comparable—where base-comparability roughly means that, when A is

⁷One should specify (as I will do in the Concluding Remarks too) that we are here taking the PTS-notions of consequence as defined relative to atomic bases *with no upper bound* on the complexity level. But these notions can be defined also relative to atomic bases whose complexity level *does have* an upper bound, say, consequence over bases whose level is *at most* some positive number n . In Piecha and Schroeder-Heister’s incompleteness proof it is essential to require that the complexity be unlimited, since the proof is based on a function which translates sets Γ of disjunction-free formulas into atomic bases Γ° : left-nested implications in elements of Γ will normally make the level of Γ° increase, and since there might be as many left-nested implication as one may want, no complexity constraint can be put on atomic bases. But of course, one might well have (in)completeness results which depend on the uppermost complexity level of the atomic bases, say a given logic is complete over one of the three PTS notions of consequence at issue in this paper, *provided the bases* have level at most (or at least) some fixed valued n , and so on. While we do have something similar in monotonic PTS (see below), we again have nothing similar in the non-monotonic context.

⁸The expression “generally” means here that the result holds both when the complexity of atomic bases is allowed to be unlimited, and when it is instead limited by some upper bound.

a consequence on Γ on a given base over one of these three approaches, then A is also a consequence of Γ on that base in another approach. But due to the lack of suitable completeness or incompleteness results, no such use of Theorem 4 seems to be available in the case of non-monotonic PTS (the same holds for the notions of “point-wise” soundness and completeness, but for different reasons). This does not mean, however, that future completeness or incompleteness results for non-monotonic PTS might show consequences of Theorem 4 other than that of providing a connection between \models^s and \models^α (and, via Theorem 2, with \models^s and \models).

5 On base-soundness and base-completeness

Let me now turn to a comparison between the comparability results established in Section 4, and analogous results which can be proved for the monotonic variants of \models , \models^α and \models^s . In particular, I aim at showing in this section how some notions of “point-wise” soundness and completeness behave in non-monotonic PTS, and at drawing from this certain conclusions on the differences between the monotonic and the non-monotonic approaches.

The general point is the following: “point-wise” soundness and completeness have similar effects in both the frameworks—in particular, IL is not base-complete over any of the kinds of PTS at issue in this paper—though to a *limited extent* only. More specifically, while these notions can be used in the monotonic picture to obtain some positive information about the connection between standard base semantics and reducibility semantics, on the one hand, and Sandqvist’s base semantics on the other, they will have no such effect in the non-monotonic context. And the reason of this difference is in turn that, relative to the “point-wise” notions, some general results can be proved in non-monotonic PTS which, due to the monotonicity constraint, will fail in the monotonic variant.

Let us write \models_M , \models_M^α and \models_M^s the *monotonic* variants of \models , \models^α and \models^s respectively—these obtain from Definitions 4, 5 and 15, and from Proposition 3, by requiring consequence over \mathfrak{B} when $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ to range over arbitrary extensions of \mathfrak{B} . Now, a result in all ways identical to Theorem 4 can be proved for these monotonic variants too—where one has of course to bring extensions of atomic bases in, namely, the global invertibility from Sandqvist to Prawitz and vice versa holds for any extension of a given atomic base. In turn, this can be used in combination with notions of base-soundness and base-completeness of given logics over PTS, to single out a sufficient condition for \models_M^α (or \models_M) and \models_M^s to be equivalent at the level of logical validity, as well as for a logic to be complete over \models_M^α (or \models_M).

Base-completeness is defined as follows—in the definition, \Vdash stands for $\models_{(M)}^\alpha$, $\models_{(M)}$, or $\models_{(M)}^s$, while Σ is a super-intuitionistic logic, i.e., a recursive set of super-intuitionistic rules with a derivability relation \vdash_Σ , possibly implementing an atomic base \mathfrak{B} , in which case derivability is written $\vdash_{\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}}$ —see [17] for precise definitions.

Definition 18. Σ is base-complete over \Vdash iff $\forall \Gamma \forall A \forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A \implies \Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}} A)$.

Completeness is clearly the same as base-completeness, but without reference to atomic bases.

Definition 19. Σ is complete over \Vdash iff $\forall \Gamma \forall A (\Gamma \Vdash A \implies \Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} A)$.

From this one easily proves what follows.

Proposition 5. Σ base-complete over $\Vdash \implies \Sigma$ complete over \Vdash .

Proof. Assume $\Gamma \Vdash A$. So $\forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A)$. Instantiate this on the empty base \mathfrak{B}^0 , i.e., $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}^0} A$. By base-completeness, $\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}^0} A$ but, since \mathfrak{B}^0 is empty, we have $\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}^0 = \Sigma$, so $\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} A$. \square

As for base-soundness, we have instead what follows—the proof of Proposition 6 in the monotonic context would be slightly different, see [17].

Definition 20. Σ is base-sound over \Vdash iff $\forall \Gamma \forall A \forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}} A \implies \Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A)$.

Definition 21. Σ is sound over \Vdash iff $\forall \Gamma \forall A (\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} A \implies \Gamma \Vdash A)$.

If we assume that Σ is monotonic, i.e., for every extension Ω of Σ , $\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} A \iff \Gamma \vdash_{\Omega} A$, we can prove the following.

Proposition 6. Σ base-sound over $\Vdash \implies \Sigma$ sound over \Vdash .

Proof. If $\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} A$, by monotonicity, $\forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}} A)$. By base-soundness, $\forall \mathfrak{B} (\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A)$, i.e., $\Gamma \Vdash A$. \square

Proposition 7. *IL* is base-sound over \Vdash .

Corollary 1. *IL* is sound over \Vdash (see e.g. [23]).

Now, the monotonic versions of Theorem 4, Definitions 18, 19, 20 and 21, Proposition 5, 6 and 7, and Corollary 1, jointly yield that \models_M^{α} (or \models_M) and \models_M^s are equivalent at the level of logical validity if there is a Σ which is base-complete over \models_M^s and base-sound over \models_M^{α} (or \models_M). The same condition is sufficient for completeness over \models_M^{α} (or \models_M)—see [17]. These facts, though, cannot yield any “positive” information about *IL* over \models_M^{α} (or \models_M), as *IL* can be shown *not to be* base-complete over monotonic \Vdash for any (either limited or unlimited) upper bound on the complexity of atomic bases. This is proved by taking into account what de Campos Sanz, Piecha and Schroeder-Heister called the *export principle* [18], the latter being a general method for shifting from consequence over an atomic base \mathfrak{B} to logical consequence and back, via a translation of \mathfrak{B} into a set of disjunction-free formulas \mathfrak{B}^* , thus $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}} A \iff \Gamma, \mathfrak{B}^* \Vdash A$.

The idea is now asking whether a given logic Σ on atomic base \mathfrak{B} enjoys the export principle, provided one is allowed to assume or discharge (through rules in \mathfrak{B}), not only sets of formulas Γ , but also sets of atomic rules \mathfrak{C} , i.e., $\Gamma, \mathfrak{C} \vdash_{\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}} A \iff \Gamma, \mathfrak{C}^*, \mathfrak{B}^* \vdash_{\Sigma} A$. *IL* enjoys this property, and this implies that base-completeness of *IL* over monotonic \Vdash (with an either limited or unlimited upper bound on the complexity of atomic bases) is tantamount to completeness over \Vdash plus \Vdash enjoying the export principle (relative to the given bound on the complexity of atomic bases). Which means that base-completeness of *IL* over monotonic \Vdash is always a void notion, as Piecha and Schroeder-Heister proved in general that export principle plus completeness of *IL* over \Vdash imply

incompleteness of IL over \Vdash [20]. This extends to any Σ which enjoys the export principle and does not derive Harrop rule—the latter being Piecha and Schroeder-Heister’s counterexample to completeness of IL over \models_M .

The same results would hold, *mutatis mutandis*, in the non-monotonic context too. The situation would be here even smoother, because one can immediately observe that non-monotonic \Vdash *does not* enjoy the export principle.⁹ Thus, this would extend from IL to any logic which enjoys the export principle, whether it derives Harrop rule or not—as the full use of Piecha and Schroeder-Heister’s incompleteness theorem is no longer needed.

However, one needs not go through all this, for now, a major difference between the monotonic and the non-monotonic approaches occurs. This depends on the following result—below, we say that Σ is *closed under substitutions* iff for every $\Gamma, A, A_1, \dots, A_n$, if the propositional variables of $\Gamma \cup \{A\}$ are p_1, \dots, p_n , then

$$\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} A \iff \Gamma[A_1, \dots, A_n/p_1, \dots, p_n] \vdash_{\Sigma} A[A_1, \dots, A_n/p_1, \dots, p_n]$$

and \Vdash is again restricted to $\models, \models^{\alpha}$ and \models^s .

Proposition 8. *Σ is consistent and closed under substitutions $\implies \Sigma$ not base-complete over \Vdash .*

Proof. Suppose that Σ is consistent, closed under substitutions, and base-complete over \Vdash . By base-completeness, $p \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}^0} q \implies p \vdash_{\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}^0} q$. But $\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}^0 = \Sigma$, so that $p \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}^0} q \implies p \vdash_{\Sigma} q$. As the antecedent of this implication holds, we infer $p \vdash_{\Sigma} q$. By closure under substitutions, hence, for every A and B , $A \vdash_{\Sigma} B$, which cannot be by the consistency assumption. Hence, Σ is not base-complete over \Vdash . \square

Corollary 2. *IL is not base-complete over \Vdash .*¹⁰

⁹The translation $*$ from atomic bases to sets of disjunction free formulas and back is defined by induction on the level of the atomic rules:

- R is of level 0 $\implies R^* = R$
- R is of level k , hence has the form

$$\frac{\begin{array}{ccc} [\mathfrak{C}_1] & & [\mathfrak{C}_n] \\ A_1 & \dots & A_n \end{array}}{A}$$

where each

$$\frac{\mathfrak{C}_i}{A_i}$$

is a rule R_i of level at most $k - 1 \implies R^* = \bigwedge_{i \leq n} R_i^* \rightarrow A$.

Then, when $\mathfrak{B} = \{R_1, \dots, R_n\}$, we put $\mathfrak{B}^* = \{R_1^*, \dots, R_n^*\}$. Based on the above given definition of what it means for \Vdash to enjoy the export principle, we see immediately what follows.

Fact. *Non-monotonic \Vdash does not enjoy the export principle*

For otherwise, from $p \Vdash_{\mathfrak{B}^0} q$, we would have $p, (\mathfrak{B}^0)^* \Vdash q$, i.e., $p \Vdash q$, which is clearly false.

¹⁰Let me remark that, when atomic bases have unlimited complexity, as we are assuming here, then the base-incompleteness of IL over \models and \models^{α} follows easily from Theorems 2 and 3, plus (by contraposition) Proposition 5. The requirement that the complexity be unlimited is mandatory, because the incompleteness

Proposition 8 and Corollary 2 jointly show that the conditions for base-incompleteness of arbitrary logics over non-monotonic proof-theoretic consequence are much weaker than those required for the monotonic case, and that base-incompleteness of IL in the non-monotonic framework obtains in a much smoother way than over the monotonic counter-part. But besides that, they also seem to suggest that the result about the sufficient condition for equivalence between \models_M^α (or \models_M) and \models_M^s and for completeness over \models_M^α (or \models_M)—which I mentioned above, i.e., existence of a Σ which is base-complete over \models_M^s and base-sound over \models_M^α (or \models_M)—is quite trivial in the non-monotonic case. For, if Σ is consistent and closed under substitutions, the implication is vacuously true as Σ cannot be base-complete over \models^s , and if Σ is inconsistent, the implication is again vacuously true, since Σ cannot in this case be base-sound over \models^α (or \models), because $\not\models^\alpha \perp$ (resp. $\not\models \perp$). Thus, one might think that the only case in which such a condition could be informative is the one where Σ is not closed under substitutions. But this is false, due to the following result—where \models^1 and \models^2 are either \models , or \models^α , or \models^s , and are not necessarily distinct.

Proposition 9. Σ sound over $\models^1 \implies \Sigma$ not base-complete over \models^2 .

Proof. Suppose Σ base-complete over \models^2 . Thus, for all \mathfrak{B} , $p \models_{\mathfrak{B}}^2 q \implies p \vdash_{\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}} q$. Since $p \models_{\mathfrak{B}^0}^2 q$, we have $p \vdash_{\Sigma \cup \mathfrak{B}^0} q$, i.e., $p \vdash_{\Sigma} q$. Since Σ is sound over \models^1 , we have $p \models^1 q$, which is false—consider the base which consists of axiom p only. Thus, Σ cannot be base-complete over \models^2 . \square

Corollary 3. Σ base-sound over $\models^1 \implies \Sigma$ not base-complete over \models^2 .

Observe that base-incompleteness of IL over non-monotonic \models also stems from Proposition 9 plus Corollary 1—respectively, Corollary 3 plus Proposition 7. Let me remark, to conclude, that both Proposition 8 and Corollary 2, and Proposition 9 and Corollary 3, as well as the consequences they imply on the comparison between monotonic and non-monotonic PTS, obviously depend on the non-monotonicity of the consequence relations at issue. For, in the *monotonic* context, we do not have $p \models_{\mathfrak{B}^0} q$, as now the consequence relation must hold for arbitrary extensions of \mathfrak{B}^0 , including that consisting of just axiom p .

6 Concluding remarks

To conclude, I just want to observe first of all that the results I presented so far—except for Theorem 3—also hold if we assume that atomic bases have *limited* complexity—say, when the consequence relation is restricted to atomic bases whose complexity is *at most* n . Although I did not put any restriction of this kind, and allowed atomic bases to contain rules of *any* complexity, this is completely immaterial as concerns the proposed comparison between \models , \models^α and \models^s —as said, except for Theorem 3.

result as per Theorem 3 employs the Import principle (see Section 3.1 and footnote 2), which in turn accounts for arbitrarily many left-nested implications in assumption sets. Anyway, Corollary 2 has an independent interest, since it will hold also when one puts an upper bound on the complexity of the atomic bases, say consequence over atomic bases of level *at most* some given n . On this, see also the Concluding Remarks.

Next, let me deal quickly with some limitations which the results presented in this paper may undergo when further constraints are put on the definitions of reducibility semantics.

The reduction set \mathbb{F} used for justifying the equivalence between reducibility semantics and standard base semantics—i.e., Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 respectively—may be looked upon as not constructive enough. More specifically, \mathbb{F} is obviously not liable to a description as, say, a recursive set of recursive rewriting rules for argument structures. One may appeal to a smaller set, say \mathbb{S} , of the functions $\phi_{\mathfrak{B}}$ such that, given any closed \mathcal{D}_i for A_i such that, for some \mathfrak{J}_i , $\langle \mathcal{D}_i, \mathfrak{J}_i \rangle$ is valid on \mathfrak{B} , map instances \mathcal{D}^σ with $\sigma(A_i) = \mathcal{D}_i$ ($i \leq n$) of

$$\mathcal{D} = \frac{A_1 \quad \dots \quad A_n}{A}$$

onto a closed \mathcal{D}_A for A such that $\langle \mathcal{D}_A, \mathfrak{J}_A \rangle$ is also valid on \mathfrak{B} for some \mathfrak{J}_A . However, although any such $\phi_{\mathfrak{B}}$ may be looked upon as constructive, \mathbb{S} may again not be expressible as a recursive set of recursive rewriting rules. This seems to hold even when, using classical logic in the meta-language, one observes that $\phi_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is either a “pointer” which maps every \mathcal{D}^σ onto a fixed closed \mathcal{D}_A for A —if every A_i is provable on \mathfrak{B} ($i \leq n$)—or the empty function ϕ_\emptyset —if there is A_i not provable on \mathfrak{B} ($i \leq n$)—i.e., for every σ ,

$$\phi_{\mathfrak{B}}(\mathcal{D}^\sigma) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_A & \text{if } \forall i \leq n (\models_{\mathfrak{B}}^\alpha A_i) \\ \phi_\emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

—for more on this, see [16] while, for a general discussion about what a good reduction is, see [1]. Thus, under a stricter reading of what reductions and sets of reductions are to be, which yields a stricter reading of reducibility semantics, indicated by $\models_{\mathfrak{S}}^\alpha$, it is not clear how to attain point 5 of Proposition 3 and Proposition 4, hence Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Proposition 5 too—for a first discussion on this, see [13, 14, 16]. In fact, more constructive examples of reductions for justifying non-intuitionistically derivable rules can be provided, again by adapting to a Prawitzian framework with argument structures and reductions the results proved by de Campos Sanz, Piecha and Schroeder-Heister (both in the monotonic and in the non-monotonic context)—see [2, 18, 20]—or possibly via *Pezlar’s selector* for the Split rule—see [12]. These issues can be dealt with in future works—for a preliminary discussion, see again [16].

Be that as it may, even with a stricter notion of reduction, it is still possible to prove an inversion result between $\models_{\mathfrak{S}}^\alpha$ and \models similar to the one proved for \models^α and \models^s . Take any arbitrary \mathfrak{B} and consider the statement

$$\forall \Gamma \forall A (\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}} A \implies \Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{S}, \mathfrak{B}}^\alpha A). \quad (2)$$

Then we have what follows.

Theorem 5. $\forall \mathfrak{B} ((2) \implies \forall \Gamma \forall A (\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{S}, \mathfrak{B}}^\alpha A \implies \Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{B}} A)).$

The proof is in all ways similar to that of Theorem 4.

References

- [1] S. Ayhan. What are acceptable reductions? Perspectives from proof-theoretic semantics and type theory. *Australasian journal of logic*, 20(3):412–428, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.26686/ajl.v20i3.7692>.
- [2] W. de Campos Sanz and T. Piecha. A critical remark on the BHK interpretation of implication. *Philosophia Scientiae*, 18(3):13–22, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.4000/philosophiascientiae.965>.
- [3] M. Dummett. *The logical basis of metaphysics*. Harvard University Press, 1993.
- [4] N. Francez. *Proof-theoretic semantics*. College Publications, 2015.
- [5] G. Gentzen. Untersuchungen über das logische Schließen i, ii. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 39:176–210, 405–431, 1935. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01201353>.
- [6] G. Gentzen. Untersuchungen über das logische Schließen i, ii. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 39:176–210, 405–431, 1935. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01201353>.
- [7] A. Gheorghiu and D. Pym. From proof-theoretic validity to base-extension semantics for intuitionistic propositional logic. *arXiv:2210.05344*, 2022.
- [8] R. Harrop. Concerning formulas of the types $A \rightarrow B \vee C$, $A \rightarrow (\exists x)B(x)$ in intuitionistic formal systems. *Journal of symbolic logic*, 25:27–32, 1960. doi:10.2307/2964334.
- [9] W. Howard. The formulae-as-types notion of construction. In J. Seldin and R. Hindley, editors, *To H.B. Curry: Essays on combinatory logic, lambda calculus and formalism*, pages 479–490. Academy Press, 1980.
- [10] P. Martin-Löf. *Intuitionistic type theory*. Bibliopolis, 1984.
- [11] H. Oliveira. On Dummett’s pragmatist justification procedure. *Erkenntnis*, 86:429–455, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-019-00112-7>.
- [12] I. Pezlar. Constructive validity of a generalised Kreisel-Putnam rule. *Studia Logica*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11225-024-10129-x>.
- [13] A. Piccolomini d’Aragona. *Dag Prawitz’s theory of grounds*. PhD Dissertation, Aix-Marseille University, Sapienza University of Rome, HAL Id: tel-02482320, 2019.
- [14] A. Piccolomini d’Aragona. *Prawitz’s epistemic grounding. An investigation into the power of deduction*. Synthese Library, Springer, 2023.
- [15] A. Piccolomini d’Aragona. The proof-theoretic square. *Synthese*, 201(219), 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-023-04203-5>.

- [16] A. Piccolomini d’Aragona. A note on schematic validity and completeness in Prawitz’s semantics. In F. Bianchini, V. Fano, and P. Graziani, editors, *Current topics in logic and the philosophy of science. Papers from SILFS 2022 postgraduate conference*. College Publications, 2024.
- [17] A. Piccolomini d’Aragona. A comparison of three kinds of monotonic proof-theoretic semantics and the base-incompleteness of intuitionistic logic. Submitted.
- [18] T. Piecha, W. de Campos Sanz, and P. Schroeder-Heister. Failure of completeness in proof-theoretic semantics. *Journal of philosophical logic*, 44:321–335, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10992-014-9322-x>.
- [19] T. Piecha and P. Schroeder-Heister. Atomic systems in proof-theoretic semantics: two approaches. In J. Redmon, O. Pombo Martins, and A. Nepomuceno Fernández, editors, *Epistemology, knowledge and the impact of interaction*, pages 47–62. Springer, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26506-3>.
- [20] T. Piecha and P. Schroeder-Heister. Incompleteness of intuitionistic propositional logic with respect to proof-theoretic semantics. *Studia Logica*, 107(1):47–62, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11225-018-9823-7>.
- [21] D. Prawitz. *Natural deduction. A proof-theoretical study*. Almqvist & Wiskell, 1965.
- [22] D. Prawitz. Ideas and results in proof theory. In J. E. Fenstad, editor, *Proceedings of the second Scandinavian logic symposium*, pages 235–307. Elsevier, 1971. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X\(08\)70849-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X(08)70849-8).
- [23] D. Prawitz. Towards a foundation of a general proof-theory. In P. Suppes, L. Henkin, A. Joja, and G. C. Moisil, editors, *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress for Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science, Bucharest, 1971*, pages 225–250. Elsevier, 1973. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X\(09\)70361-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X(09)70361-1).
- [24] T. Sandqvist. Base-extension semantics for intuitionistic sentential logic. *Logic journal of the IGPL*, 23(5):719–731, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jigpal/jzv021>.
- [25] P. Schroeder-Heister. Validity concepts in proof-theoretic semantics. *Synthese*, 148:525–571, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-004-6296-1>.
- [26] P. Schroeder-Heister. Proof-theoretic semantics. In E. N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2018.
- [27] P. Schroeder-Heister. Prawitz’s conjecture: a reassessment. *Theoria*, 2024.
- [28] W. Stafford. Proof-theoretic semantics and inquisitive logic. *Journal of philosophical logic*, 50:1199–1229, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10992-021-09596-7>.

- [29] W. Stafford and V. Nascimento. Following all the rules: intuitionistic completeness for generalised proof-theoretic validity. *Analysis*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1093/analys/anac100>.
- [30] R. Takemura. Investigation of Prawitz’s completeness conjecture in phase semantic framework. *Journal of Humanities and Sciences Nihon University*, 23(1):1–19, 2017.
- [31] L. Wittgenstein. *Philosophical investigations*. Blackwell, 1953.