Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic Volume XX, Number 3, July 1979 NDJFAM

## MODAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THREE VALUED LOGICS. I

## MICHAEL J. DUFFY

**0** Introduction The present paper\* extends a result of Peter Woodruff's reported in [1], to the effect that the three-valued logic L of Łukasiewicz may be interpreted as a modal system. Woodruff obtains his result by constructing a mapping from the wffs of L to those of the modal system S5. A definition is then produced which gives directions for the construction of interpretations of L from interpretations of S5, and it is further shown that no interpretation of L fails to be thus obtainable. The result is of interest especially because it has been argued that L cannot plausibly be viewed as a modal system, even though Łukasiewicz himself viewed it as one.<sup>1</sup> Here the question of the existence of modal interpretations of L via other mappings into S5 is explored. In order that the present paper be self-contained, no familiarity with [1] is presupposed; but the reader familiar with that work will appreciate this author's indebtedness to it.

In what follows, we use 'p's and 'q's as syntactic variables for wffs of both L and S5, trusting the context to signal which system is under discussion. It will be convenient to use the bracketless Polish notation, presumed to be familiar.

**1** The Systems L and  $S5^2$  We suppose L to be constructed from a denumerably infinite set of atoms, the set of wffs then being the least set that both contains the atoms and has Cpq and Np as members whenever p and q are members. An interpretation I for L is any function from the set of wffs to  $\{1, \frac{1}{2}, 0\}$  such that I(Np) = 1 - I(p) and  $I(Cpq) = \min(1, 1 - (I(p) - I(q)))$ . A wff p of L is valid (contravalid) if, for every I, I(p) = 1(0); otherwise p

<sup>\*</sup>This paper and the forthcoming sequel formed part of a thesis "Three-Valued Logics with Modal Interpretations" written under the direction of Professor Hugues Leblanc and submitted to the Graduate School of Temple University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy with Philosophy as the major subject in March 1976. The author is deeply indebted to Professor Leblanc for countless suggestions and helpful criticisms. I would also like to thank the members of my committee for sound advice on various topics: Jack Nelson, John Paulos, D. Paul Snyder, and William A. Wisdom. Thanks are also due to Peter Woodruff for encouraging comments and criticisms.