Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic Volume XXI, Number 1, January 1980 NDJFAM

## DEDUCTIVE COMPLETENESS AND CONDITIONALIZATION IN SYSTEMS OF WEAK IMPLICATION

## M. RICHARD DIAZ, Jr.

I wish to investigate the conditions under which certain systems of implication satisfy deductive completeness of the kind associated with the deduction theorem (in the sense of Curry and Feys [2]). The systems that I investigate have received considerable attention in the last two decades: the implication fragment of Relevance Logic,  $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow$  (Church's Weak Implication); the implication fragment of strict implication,  $\mathbf{S4} \rightarrow$ ; the implication fragment of Anderson and Belnap's System of Entailment,  $\mathbf{E} \rightarrow$ ; and the system of Ticket Entailment,  $\mathbf{T} \rightarrow$ . None of these systems satisfy deductive completeness except under certain conditions which may be interpreted as the satisfaction of conditions of relevance (for  $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow$ ), modality (for  $\mathbf{S4} \rightarrow$ ), relevance and modality (for  $\mathbf{E} \rightarrow$ ), and inference ticket/inference distinctions ( $\mathbf{T} \rightarrow$ ). Thus we might say that they are each deductively complete for an extended notion of deductive completeness.

In Section 2, I formulate natural deduction systems  $NR \rightarrow$ ,  $NS4 \rightarrow$ ,  $NE \rightarrow$ , and  $NT \rightarrow$  which are deductively equivalent respectively to  $R \rightarrow$ ,  $S4 \rightarrow$ ,  $E \rightarrow$ , and  $T \rightarrow$ . Each system involves only two rules, one of which is *modus ponens* and one a form of conditionalization. The conditionalization rule in each case is based on the deduction theorem of the corresponding axiom system. Furthermore, each system is the result of adding a further restriction to only the rule of conditionalization for the previous system. In this form we can see more clearly the relationship between the systems and intuitionistic implication ( $H \rightarrow$ ); and what relevance, necessity, and ticket entailment amount to. Finally, in Section 3, I show how to formulate  $T \rightarrow$  in terms of a restriction on the rule for *modus ponens*, and how adding this restriction to *modus ponens* in  $E \rightarrow$ ,  $R \rightarrow$ ,  $S4 \rightarrow$ , and  $H \rightarrow$  affects these systems.

Let **S** be a deductive system with an implication operator,  $\supset$ , which satisfies the rule *modus ponens* (MP):  $A, A \supset B \models_{\overline{S}} B$ . Curry and Feys [2] called such a system deductively complete if, whenever from a premise B, and possibly other premises, we can derive A, then we can derive  $B \supset A$  from these other premises alone. It has been shown by Gentzen [3] that

Received February 7, 1978