

NON-CONTINGENCY AXIOMS FOR S4 AND S5

H. MONTGOMERY and R. ROUTLEY

In [3] some contingency and non-contingency bases were developed for normal modal logics. Some of the axioms presented there for extending **T** to **S4** and **S5** are sufficiently strong to give these latter systems when added to the non-normal system **S3**.

The notation of [3] is adopted except that 'Feys' is here further abbreviated to 'F'. 'SD' refers to the rule of detachment for strict implication and ' \rightarrow ' symbolises strict implication.

It is well-known that Gödel's A3, $\Box p \supset \Box \Box p$, added to **S3** gives a system deductively equivalent to **S4**, but that A4, $\Diamond p \supset \Box \Diamond p$ when added to **S3** gives a system weaker than **S5**, namely **S3.5** (Aqvist [1]). However, if instead of A4 the axiom

$$\text{A5. } \Diamond \Box p \supset \Box \Box p$$

is used it is easily seen that both A3 and A4 are deducible, and that A5 is provable in **S5**. For by F36.0, F37.2, A5, SD and SL we have A3; by F37.12, F37.2, A5, SD and SL we have $\Diamond \Box p \supset \Box p$, a contraposited form of A4; and from this and A3, by SL we have immediately A5. Hence (**S3** + A5) is deductively equivalent to **S5**.

By SL an equivalent form of A5 is

$$\text{A6. } \Box \Box p \vee \Box \sim \Box p$$

In terms of the non-contingency operator ' Δ ' defined by

$$\Delta A =_{df} \Box A \vee \Box \sim A$$

the axiom A6 becomes

$$\text{S52. } \Delta \Box p$$

So if the system **S3** be thought of as having the above Df Δ

added, the system (S3+S52) is seen to be deductively equivalent to S5.

Consider the following axioms:

- S41. $\Delta p \supset \Delta \Delta p$
 S44. $\Delta p \supset \Delta \Box p$
 S51. $\Delta \Delta p$
 S52. $\Delta \Box p$

Theorem 1. (S3+S41) is deductively equivalent to S4.

Proof: It suffices to derive A3 in (S3+S41), the theorem then follows from standard results and theorem 8 of [3].

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1. $\Delta p \supset \Delta \Delta p$ | S41 |
| 2. $\Box p \supset \Delta \Delta p$ | 1, Df Δ , SL. |
| 3. $\Box p \supset \Box \Delta p \vee \Box \sim \Delta p$ | 2, Df Δ |
| 4. $\Box p \vee \Box \sim p \supset \Delta p$ | SL, Df Δ . |
| 5. $\Box p \supset \Delta p$ | 4, SL. |
| 6. $\Delta p \supset \sim \Box \sim \Delta p$ | F37.12, F36.0, SD. |
| 7. $\Box p \supset \sim \Box \sim \Delta p$ | 5, 6, SL. |
| 8. $\Box p \supset \Box \Delta p$ | 3, 7, SL. |
| 9. $\Delta p \rightarrow \Box p \vee \Box \sim p$ | F31.11, Df Δ . |
| 10. $\Delta p \rightarrow \sim \sim \Box \sim p \vee \Box p$ | 9, SL, F34.42, SE. |
| 11. $\Delta p \rightarrow \Diamond p \supset \Box p$ | 10, SL, F34.42, SE. |
| 12. $\Box \Delta p \supset \Diamond p \rightarrow \Box p$ | F33.311, 11, SD. |
| 13. $\Diamond p \rightarrow \Box p \rightarrow \Box \Diamond p \supset \Box \Box p$ | F33.311. |
| 14. $\Diamond p \rightarrow \Box p \supset \Box \Diamond p \supset \Box \Box p$ | F37.12, F32.02, 13, SD. |
| 15. $\Box p \supset \Box \Diamond p \supset \Box \Box p$ | 8, 12, 14, SL. |
| 16. $\Box p \supset \Box \Diamond p$ | F33.311, F36.0, SD. |
| 17. $\Box p \supset \Box \Box p$ | 15, 16, SL. |

Theorem 2. (S3+S51) is deductively equivalent to S5.

Proof: Since $\Delta \Delta p \supset \Delta p \supset \Delta \Delta p$ is a theorem of S3 by SL, it follows by theorem 1 that (S3+S51) deductively includes (S3+S41) and hence also system T. It follows by theorem 13 of [3] that (S3+S51) is deductively equivalent to S5.

Theorem 3. (S3+S44) is deductively equivalent to S4.

Proof: It suffices to show that S44 is a theorem of S4 and that A3 is a Theorem of (S3+S44).

- ad* S44
- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 1. | $\Box p \supset \Box \Box p$ | A3. |
| 2. | $\sim p \rightarrow \sim \Box p$ | F31.34, F37.12, SD. |
| 3. | $\Box \sim p \supset \Box \sim \Box p$ | F33.311, 2, SD. |
| 4. | $\Box p \vee \Box \sim p \supset \Box \Box p \vee \Box \sim \Box p$ | 1, 3, SL. |
| 5. | $\Delta p \supset \Delta \Box p$ | 4, Df Δ . |
- ad* A3.
- | | | |
|----|---|------------------|
| 1. | $\Delta p \supset \Delta \Box p$ | S44. |
| 2. | $\Box p \vee \Box \sim p \supset \Box \Box p \vee \Box \sim \Box p$ | 1, Df Δ . |
| 3. | $\Box p \supset \Box \Box p \vee \Box \sim \Box p$ | 2, SL. |
| 4. | $p \supset \sim \Box \sim p$ | F36.0, F34.2. |
| 5. | $\Box p \supset \sim \Box \sim \Box p$ | 4. |
| 6. | $\Box p \supset \Box \Box p$ | 3, 5, SL. |

Theorem 4. (S3+S52) is deductively equivalent to S5.

Proof: A proof has already been sketched in the introductory remarks above. It also follows from Theorem 3 above and the results in [3].

It is not known whether the S3 base can be further weakened. A3 is provable in (S1° + $p \supset \Diamond p$ + S44), but neither $p \rightarrow \Diamond p$ nor $\Box p \rightarrow \Box \Box p$ appear to be provable in this system; T is deductively included in (S1 + A3) but this system may be weaker than S4; S3 appears not to be included in (S1 + A4).

University of Canterbury
University of New England

H. MONTGOMERY
R. ROUTLEY

REFERENCES

- [1] Lennart AQVIST, Results concerning some modal systems that contain S2, *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, Vol. 29 (1964), pp. 79-87.
 [2] R. FEYS, *Modal Logics*, Louvain, 1965.
 [3] H. MONTGOMERY and R. ROUTLEY, Contingency and non-contingency bases for normal modal logics, *Logique et Analyse*, n.s. vol. 9 (1966), pp. 318-328.