

## 1 A translation of $K_3$ into Modal Logic

In [1] a translation from any formula  $A$  of  $K_3$  to a formula  $A^\square$  of modal logic is specified as follows:

- $\neg$  stands for  $K_3$  negation and  $\sim$  stands for classical negation
- $(p)^\square := \square p$
- $(\neg p)^\square := \square \sim p$
- $(A \wedge B)^\square := A^\square \wedge B^\square$
- $(A \vee B)^\square := A^\square \vee B^\square$ <sup>1</sup>

(Note: no translation for the negation of arbitrary formulas is given, but we can just convert  $K_3$  formulas into negation normal form.)

The sequent  $A \vdash B$  is provable in  $K_3$  iff the translated formula  $A^\square \supset B^\square$  is a consequence of the ‘Deontic’ axiom **D**:

$$\square p \supset \diamond p$$

where only *non-modal* inference steps are used.

The reason why this holds is that the proofs in  $K_3$  essentially carry over into modal logic, and the fundamental  $\sim (p \wedge \neg p)$  becomes  $\sim (\square p \wedge \square \sim p)$ , easily seen to be equivalent to **D**. After the transformation  $\square p$  and  $\square \sim p$  still behave like distinct variables.

This translation is very simple, but it is interesting to see how various three-valued inferences translate into modal formulas. For example, the sequent  $p \vdash q \vee \neg q$  becomes  $\square p \supset (\square q \vee \square \sim q)$ , which is not provable from **D**. On the other hand, the correct  $\neg p \vdash \sim p$  becomes  $\square \sim p \supset \sim \square p$ , essentially the same as **D**.

It is not necessary to be very specific about the target modal language. [1, p. 73.]

I take this to mean that the normal modal logic  $K + \mathbf{D}$  will do.

## 2 A translation of $LP$ into Modal Logic

The following seems to work. We have the same translation:

- $\neg$  stands for  $LP$  negation and  $\sim$  stands for classical negation
- $(p)^\square := \square p$
- $(\neg p)^\square := \square \sim p$

---

<sup>1</sup>There is a typo in the text, which has  $(A \vee B)^\square := A^\square \vee B$

- $(A \wedge B)^\square := A^\square \wedge B^\square$
- $(A \vee B)^\square := A^\square \vee B^\square$

The sequent  $A \vdash B$  is provable in  $LP$  iff the translated formula  $A^\square \supset B^\square$  is provable in the normal modal logic  $K + \mathbf{CD}$ , where  $\mathbf{CD}$  is the ‘Uniqueness’ axiom:

$$\Diamond A \supset \Box A$$

Here are some examples:

- $p \wedge \neg p \not\vdash_{LP} q$ 
  - $p^\square \wedge \neg p^\square \vdash q^\square$
  - $\Box p \wedge \Box \sim p \not\vdash \Box q$
- $q \vdash_{LP} p \vee \neg p$ 
  - $q^\square \vdash p^\square \vee \neg p^\square$
  - $\Box q \vdash \Box p \vee \Box \sim p$
- $p \wedge (\neg p \vee q) \not\vdash_{LP} q$ 
  - $p^\square \wedge (\neg p^\square \vee q^\square) \not\vdash q^\square$
  - $\Box p \wedge (\Box \sim p \vee \Box q) \not\vdash \Box q$

## References

- [1] Busch, Douglas, ‘Sequent Formalizations of Three-Valued Logic’. In Patrick Doherty (ed.) *Partiality, Modality and Nonmonotonicity*. CSLI Publications, 1996, pp. 45-75.