

PLEDGER LEMMA AND THE MODAL SYSTEM S_3^0

BOLESŁAW SOBOCIŃSKI

1 In [8] I defined modal systems $S_{3.02}$, $S_{3.03}$, and $S_{3.04}$ as the systems which are obtained by adding to S_3 the respective axioms

$\perp 1 \quad \mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}pLp\mathcal{C}LMLp\mathcal{C}p$

$\perp 2 \quad \mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}pLp\mathcal{C}LMLp\mathcal{C}p$

$L1 \quad \mathcal{C}LMLp\mathcal{C}pLp$

Remark: It should be noted that either $\perp 1$ or $\perp 2$ can be accepted as a proper axiom of $S_{4.02}$, *cf.* [6], and that $L1$ is a proper axiom of $S_{4.04}$, *cf.*, e.g., [9]. Obviously, these axioms are not consequences of S_4 .

1.1 In [8] it has been established:

(a) that each of the systems $S_{3.02}$, $S_{3.03}$, and $S_{3.04}$ is a proper extension of S_3 and that they do not contain S_4 .

(b) that system $S_{3.04}$ is a subsystem neither of $S_{3.02}$ nor of $S_{3.03}$.

and

(c) that $S_{3.02}$ is a subsystem of $S_{3.03}$.

On the other hand, in [8] the following problems were left open:

(d) is $S_{3.02}$ a proper subsystem of $S_{3.03}$?

and

(e) does $S_{3.04}$ contain $S_{3.02}$ or $S_{3.03}$?

1.2 In [4] G. F. Schumm solved problem (d), proving metalogically that in the field of S_3 axiom $\perp 1$ implies $\perp 2$, and, therefore, $S_{3.02} = S_{3.03}$. Independently, in [3], K. E. Pledger obtained the same result, but used, in some respects, a different method. Namely, he remarked that it is easy to prove metalogically that the following formula (called here the Pledger lemma):

$PL \quad \mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}Lp\mathcal{C}Lqr\mathcal{C}Lp\mathcal{C}Lqr$

is a thesis of system S_3 . Hence, it follows immediately from this fact that