

Sub-sub-intuitionistic logic

Jonte Deakin & Jim de Groot

u7480977@anu.edu.au jim@jimdegroot.com

The Australian National University, Canberra, Ngunnawal & Ngambri Country, Australia

Abstract

Sub-sub-intuitionistic logic is obtained from intuitionistic logic by weakening the implication and removing distributivity. It can alternatively be viewed as conditional weak positive logic. We provide semantics for sub-sub-intuitionistic logic by means of semilattices with a selection function, prove a categorical duality for the algebraic semantics of the logic, and use this to derive completeness. We then consider the extension of sub-sub-intuitionistic logic with a variety of axioms.

1 Introduction

Subintuitionistic logics are propositional logics that weaken the laws of intuitionistic implication. Since the 1980s they have been studied widely. Semantically, they can be obtained for example by replacing intuitionistic Kripke frames with Kripke frames that are only transitive [1, 2], have an omniscient element [3], or satisfy no additional constraints at all [4]. To find even weaker logics, interpretations of implication in (monotone) neighbourhood frames have been proposed in e.g. [5, 6, 7]. Logically, all of these correspond to weakening the axioms of intuitionistic logic in various ways [8, 9, 10].

In this paper we weaken intuitionistic logic in an orthogonal direction, namely by removing distributivity. It turns out that this forces us to move to a sub-intuitionistic setting, because defining implication as residuated with respect to conjunction forces distributivity. Therefore we obtain “sub-sub-intuitionistic logic.” Since there is no canonical notion of implication, we define a minimal logical system of sub-sub-intuitionistic logic which can then be extended with additional axioms to obtain an implication of the desired strength.

The fact that there is no single notion of implication comes as no surprise: it is a phenomenon observed and studied in the quantum logic literature [11, 12, 13]. Besides, both non-distributivity [14] as well as non-classical notions of implication [15] are phenomena that play a role in the study of linguistics. With our work, we hope to provide a framework in which abstract non-distributive logics with various types of implications can be investigated and compared.

We approach sub-sub-intuitionistic logic as a modal extension of not-necessarily-distributive positive logic, which we call *weak positive logic*. Weak positive logic was first studied by Dalla Chiara in 1976 [16], in an effort to define a general framework for quantum logics. Subsequently, non-distributive logics have been studied extensively, for example from the perspective of proof theory [16, 17, 18] and semantics [19, 17, 20, 21, 22]. Also, there are various frame semantics and dualities for weak positive logics, using doubly ordered sets [19], polarities [23, 24] and semilattices [25]. Besides in quantum logic, non-distributivity also appears in theoretical computer science [26, 27] and linguistics [28, 29].

In the semilattice semantics from [25], formulas are interpreted as filters of a semilattice. While the intersection of two filters is again a filter, the union of two filters need not be. This leads to a non-standard interpretation of disjunctions, which prevents distributivity. A duality using semilattice semantics can be obtained as a restriction of the duality for semilattices, due to Hofmann, Mislove and Stralka [30].

We choose this semantics as the starting point for our semantic development of sub-sub-intuitionistic logic. Now there are several ways of adapting these with extra structure to interpret implication. For example, we can use a binary relation as in subintuitionistic logic [4], or a ternary relation mimicking relevance logic [31, 32]. Alternatively, we can equip our frames with a (monotone) neighbourhood structure, as used in [6, 7]. But we use yet another way, inspired by conditional logic, because it allows for a binary implication-like operator that satisfies almost no axioms.

Classical conditional logic is the extension of classical propositional logic with a binary operator that preserves finite conjunctions in its second argument. It was introduced by Chellas in 1975 [33] and has since been studied in depth, see for example [34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41]. The semantic mechanism used in conditional logic for interpreting implication is a *selection function*. This is a function s that

assigns to each world x and proposition a a proposition $s(x, a)$ consisting of worlds relevant to x in the context of a . So a selection function frame is a pair (X, s) consisting of a non-empty set X and a function $s : X \times \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$. (Alternatively, this can be viewed as a proposition-indexed collection of relations.) A formula of the form $\varphi \Box \rightarrow \psi$ is then defined to be true at a world x if all $y \in s(x, \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket)$ satisfy ψ , where $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ denotes the set of worlds where φ holds.

We extend the semilattice semantics from [25] with a selection function to obtain frame semantics for sub-sub-intuitionistic logic. Therefore, sub-sub-intuitionistic logic can be viewed as “conditional weak positive logic,” and following the conditional logic literature we shall denote the implication by $\Box \rightarrow$. Since formulas are now interpreted as filters of a semilattice X , the selection function has type $s : X \times \mathcal{F}X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}X$, where $\mathcal{F}X$ denotes the set of filters of X . As in the intuitionistic case [42], we impose coherence conditions between s and the semilattice structure to ensure that all formulas are interpreted as filters. We call the resulting frames *selection L-frames*, extending the terminology from [25].

We prove that the logic is sound with respect to the class of selection L-frames, and we extend them to a notion of *general frames* for the logic. Interestingly, general frames do not only come equipped with a set of *admissible filters*, but also with a restriction on the selection function: its second argument acts only on admissible filters. This mirrors the literature on classical conditional logic [37].

Before proving completeness, we derive a duality between the algebraic semantics of the logic on the one hand, and a topologised version of our frames called *selection L-spaces* on the other hand. This builds on the duality between lattices and so-called L-spaces from [25]. As with general frames, the selection function only acts on certain filters, namely clopen filters.

This leaves us with an interesting phenomenon: when proving completeness in the usual way we need to turn a selection L-space into a selection L-frame. However, the selection function of a selection L-space is only defined for clopen filters. So in order to obtain a frame we need to extend it to act on all filters. We call such an extension a *fill-in* of the selection function. Many different fill-ins exist, and we use one of them to finish the completeness argument.

Finally, we consider a number of axioms with which we can extend the basic logic and give sound and completeness semantics for the resulting logics. Interestingly, these require various notions of fill-in to obtain completeness. We use the extension results to elucidate the relation between sub-sub-intuitionistic logic and intuitionistic conditional logic, and to provide an alternative semantics for intuitionistic logic that is based on semilattices instead of preordered or partially ordered sets.

Outline of the paper

After recalling semilattice semantics for weak positive logic in Section 2, we introduce sub-sub-intuitionistic logic in Section 3, and study its algebraic and relational semantics. In preparation of the duality, we also introduce general frames and morphisms between them in Section 3. In Section 4 we prove a categorical duality between the algebraic semantics of the logic and a topologised version of the frame semantics. We use this to prove completeness of the basic system. We then proceed to investigate a variety of extensions of the logic with additional axioms, give correspondence results and sound and complete semantics for each of these in Section 5. We conclude by pointing out several avenues for further research in Section 6.

2 A primer on weak positive logic

We briefly recall the semantics and duality of weak positive logic given in [25]. Throughout this paper we let Prop be some arbitrary but fixed set of proposition letters. Let $\mathbf{L}(\text{Prop})$ denote the language generated by the grammar

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \top \mid \perp \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi.$$

If no confusion arises we omit reference to Prop and simply write \mathbf{L} . Logics based on \mathbf{L} are defined as as collections of *consequence pairs*, which are expressions of the form $\varphi \triangleleft \psi$ where $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{L}$, similar to positive modal logic [43].

Definition 2.1. Let \mathbf{L} be the smallest set of consequence pairs that is closed under uniform substitution

as well as the following axioms and rules:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
p \trianglelefteq \top, & \perp \trianglelefteq p, & \text{top and bottom} \\
p \trianglelefteq p, & \frac{p \trianglelefteq q \quad q \trianglelefteq r}{p \trianglelefteq r}, & \text{reflexivity and transitivity} \\
p \wedge q \trianglelefteq p, & p \wedge q \trianglelefteq q, & \frac{r \trianglelefteq p \quad r \trianglelefteq q}{r \trianglelefteq p \wedge q}, & \text{conjunction rules} \\
p \trianglelefteq p \vee q, & q \trianglelefteq p \vee q, & \frac{p \trianglelefteq r \quad q \trianglelefteq r}{p \vee q \trianglelefteq r} & \text{disjunction rules}
\end{array}$$

If Γ is a set of consequence pairs then we let $L(\Gamma)$ denote the smallest set of consequence pairs closed under uniform substitution, the axioms and rules mentioned above, and those in Γ . We write $\varphi \vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$ if $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi \in L(\Gamma)$ and $\varphi \dashv\vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$ if $\varphi \vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$ and $\psi \vdash_{\Gamma} \varphi$. If Γ is the empty set then we abbreviate this to $\varphi \vdash \psi$ and $\varphi \dashv\vdash \psi$.

The algebraic semantics of $L(\Gamma)$ is given by lattices. We write \mathbf{Lat} for the category of lattices and homomorphisms.

Definition 2.2. Let A be a lattice with operations $\top_A, \perp_A, \wedge_A, \vee_A$, and induced order \leq_A . A *lattice model* is a pair $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \sigma)$ consisting of a lattice A and an assignment $\sigma : \text{Prop} \rightarrow A$ of the proposition letters. The assignment σ uniquely extends to a map $(\cdot)_{\mathfrak{A}} : \mathbf{L} \rightarrow A$ by interpreting connectives via their lattice counterparts.

We say that a lattice A *validates* a consequence pair $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ if $(\varphi)_{\mathfrak{A}} \leq_A (\psi)_{\mathfrak{A}}$ for all lattice models \mathfrak{A} based on A , and denote this by $A \vDash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$. Given a set of consequence pairs Γ , we write $\mathbf{Lat}(\Gamma)$ for the full subcategory of \mathbf{Lat} whose objects validate all consequence pairs in Γ .

As expected, this gives sound and complete algebraic semantics [25, Theorem 3.5]:

Theorem 2.3. *We have $\varphi \vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$ if and only if $\varphi \vDash_{\Gamma} \psi$.*

Formulas from \mathbf{L} can be interpreted in meet-semilattices with a valuation [44]. The intuition behind this is that the collection of filters on a meet-semilattice is closed under arbitrary intersections. Therefore it forms a complete lattice, but disjunctions are not given by unions. This gives rise to a non-standard interpretation of disjunctions which prevents distributivity.

In this paper, by a *meet-semilattice* we mean a partially ordered set in which every finite subset has a greatest lower bound, called its *meet*. The meet of x and y is denoted by $x \wedge y$, reserving the symbol \wedge for conjunctions of formulas. The empty meet is the top element, denoted by 1 . If $(X, 1, \wedge)$ is a meet-semilattice then we write \preceq for the partial order given by $x \preceq y$ iff $x \wedge y = x$. A *filter* of a meet-semilattice $(X, 1, \wedge)$ is a subset F of X which is upward closed under \preceq and closed under finite meets. Filters are nonempty because they contain the empty meet, 1 .

Definition 2.4. An *L-frame* is a meet-semilattice $(X, 1, \wedge)$. An *L-model* is an L-frame $(X, 1, \wedge)$ together with a valuation V that assigns to each proposition letter p a filter $V(p)$ of $(X, 1, \wedge)$. The interpretation of a formulas from \mathbf{L} at a world x of an L-model $\mathfrak{M} = (X, 1, \wedge, V)$ is defined recursively via

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash p & \text{iff } x \in V(p) \\
\mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash \top & \text{always} \\
\mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash \perp & \text{iff } x = 1 \\
\mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash \varphi \wedge \psi & \text{iff } \mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash \varphi \text{ and } \mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash \psi \\
\mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash \varphi \vee \psi & \text{iff } \exists y, z \in W \text{ s.t. } y \wedge z \preceq x \text{ and } \mathfrak{M}, y \Vdash \varphi \text{ and } \mathfrak{M}, z \Vdash \psi
\end{array}$$

We denote the *truth set* of φ by $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}} := \{x \in X \mid \mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash \varphi\}$.

It can be shown that the truth set of every formula in any L-model \mathfrak{M} is a filter in the underlying L-frame. In particular, the truth set of a formula of the form $\varphi \vee \psi$ is the smallest filter containing both $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}}$ and $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}}$. We can explicitly write this filter as $\{x \in X \mid y \wedge z \preceq x \text{ for some } y \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}} \text{ and } z \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}}\}$.

Definition 2.5. The collection of filters on an L-frame $\mathfrak{X} = (X, 1, \wedge)$ forms a lattice $(\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{X}), X, \{1\}, \cap, \nabla)$ where

$$p \nabla q := \uparrow \{x \wedge y \in X \mid x \in p, y \in q\}.$$

We call this lattice the *complex algebra* of \mathfrak{X} and denote it by \mathfrak{X}^+ .


In fact, the collection of filters on an L-frame forms a complete lattice, with arbitrary meets given by intersections, and arbitrary joins given as follows:

$$\bigvee Q := \bigcup \{q_1 \nabla \cdots \nabla q_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } q_1, \dots, q_n \in Q\}.$$

Definition 2.6. An *L-morphism* between L-frames $(X, 1, \wedge)$ and $(X', 1', \wedge')$ is a semilattice homomorphism $f : X \rightarrow X'$ such that for all $x \in X$ and $y', z' \in X'$:

- $f(x) = 1'$ iff $x = 1$;
- If $y' \wedge z' \preceq' f(x)$, then there exist $y, z \in X$ such that $y' \preceq' f(y)$ and $z' \preceq' f(z)$ and $y \wedge z \preceq x$.

The second condition can be depicted as follows:



An *L-morphism* between L-models $(X, 1, \wedge, V)$ and $(X', 1', \wedge', V')$ is an L-morphism f between the underlying frames such that $V(p) = f^{-1}(V'(p))$ for all $p \in \text{Prop}$.

We obtain a duality for the category of lattices and lattice homomorphisms by using a topologised version of L-frames, called L-spaces.

Definition 2.7. An *L-space* is a tuple $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, \tau)$ such that:

1. $(X, 1, \wedge)$ is a semilattice;
2. (X, τ) is a compact topological space;
3. If a and b are clopen filters of \mathbb{X} , then so is $a \nabla b$;
4. \mathbb{X} satisfies the *HMS separation axiom*:

$$\forall x, y \in X \text{ (if } x \not\preceq y \text{ then there exists a clopen filter } a \text{ s.t. } x \in a \text{ and } y \notin a).$$

An *L-space morphism* is a continuous L-morphism. The category of L-spaces and L-space morphisms is denoted by **LSpace**.

We write $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$ the collection of clopen filters of an L-space \mathbb{X} . By construction, it forms a lattice with top, bottom, meet and join given by X , $\{1\}$, \cap and ∇ .

Definition 2.8. A *clopen valuation* for an L-space \mathbb{X} is a map $V : \text{Prop} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$. We call a pair $\mathbb{M} = (\mathbb{X}, V)$ of an L-space and a clopen valuation an *L-space model*. The interpretation $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{\mathbb{M}}$ of a formula φ in an L-space model $\mathbb{M} = (\mathbb{X}, \sigma)$ is defined as in the underlying L-model (see Definition 2.4).

An L-space model \mathbb{M} *validates* a consequence pair $\varphi \preceq \psi$ if $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{\mathbb{M}} \subseteq \llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathbb{M}}$, and an L-space \mathbb{X} *validates* $\varphi \preceq \psi$ if (\mathbb{X}, V) validates $\varphi \preceq \psi$ for every clopen valuation V . We write $\mathbb{X} \Vdash \varphi \preceq \psi$ (or $\mathbb{M} \Vdash \varphi \preceq \psi$) if an L-space \mathbb{X} (or model \mathbb{M}) validates $\varphi \preceq \psi$.

The assignment \mathcal{F}_{clp} can be extended to a contravariant functor $\mathbf{LSpace} \rightarrow \mathbf{Lat}$ by defining the action of \mathcal{F}_{clp} on an L-space morphism f as $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(f) := f^{-1}$. In the converse direction, we have:

Definition 2.9. Let A be a lattice and write $(\mathcal{F}(A), A, \cap)$ for the semilattice of filters of A . Let τ_A be the topology on $\mathcal{F}(A)$ generated by

$$\{\theta_A(a) \mid a \in A\} \cup \{\theta_A(a)^c \mid a \in A\},$$

where $\theta_A(a) = \{p \in \mathcal{F}(A) \mid a \in p\}$ and $\theta_A(a)^c = \mathcal{F}(A) \setminus \theta_A(a)$. Then the tuple $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(A) := (\mathcal{F}(A), A, \cap, \tau_A)$ is an L-space. Defining $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(h) := h^{-1}$ for a lattice homomorphism h yields the contravariant functor $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}} : \mathbf{Lat} \rightarrow \mathbf{LSpace}$.

We can now state the duality between lattices and L-spaces [25, Theorem 2.14].

Theorem 2.10. *The contravariant functors \mathcal{F}_{clp} and \mathcal{F}_{top} establishes the categorical duality $\mathbf{LSpace} \cong^{op} \mathbf{Lat}$.*

For future reference, we recall the units of the duality. These are given by $\theta : id_{\mathbf{Lat}} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}$ and $\eta : id_{\mathbf{LSpace}} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{top}} \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}$, defined on components via $\theta_A(a) = \{p \in \mathcal{F}(A) \mid a \in p\}$ and $\eta_{\mathbb{X}}(x) = \{a \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X}) \mid x \in a\}$. Besides, we note that for any lattice A , the clopen filters of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(A)$ are exactly the filters of the form $\theta_A(a)$ for some $a \in A$.

3 Weak positive logic with implication

The goal of this paper is to extend weak positive logic with a notion of implication. Taking stock of existing logics such as intuitionistic logic, relevance logic and conditional logic, there appear to be several ways of doing so. Perhaps the most obvious method would be to define implication as residuated with respect to conjunction. Unfortunately, we are stopped dead in our tracks, because this would automatically make our logic distributive.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose we extend \mathbf{L} from Definition 2.1 with a binary operator \rightarrow that satisfies the congruence rules as well as the following residuation rules*

$$\frac{\varphi \wedge \psi \leq \chi}{\varphi \leq \psi \multimap \chi} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\varphi \leq \psi \multimap \chi}{\varphi \wedge \psi \leq \chi}.$$

Then the resulting logic is distributive.

Proof. The given rules would turn our algebraic semantics into Heyting algebras, which are known to be distributive [45, Proposition 1.5.3]. \square

To keep our implication as flexible as possible, and maintain non-distributivity, we choose to mimic the approach of conditional logic. That is, we extend \mathbf{L} with a binary modal operator \multimap that is normal in its second argument, but does not satisfy any axioms for its first argument.

3.1 Adding conditional implication

We extend the language from Section 2 with a binary operator \multimap called *conditional implication*. We use this to formally define sub-sub-intuitionistic logics and their algebraic semantics.

Definition 3.2. Let Prop be some set of proposition letters and define $\mathbf{CL}(\text{Prop})$ to be the language generated by the grammar

$$\varphi ::= p \in \text{Prop} \mid \top \mid \perp \mid \varphi \wedge \psi \mid \varphi \vee \psi \mid \varphi \multimap \psi.$$

We write \mathbf{CL} when Prop is clear from context or irrelevant.

Just like Definition 2.1, sub-sub-intuitionistic logics are formulated as collections of consequence pairs. Henceforth, by “consequence pair” we mean an expression of the form $\varphi \leq \psi$ where φ and ψ are taken from \mathbf{CL} .

Definition 3.3. Let \mathbf{CL} be the smallest collection of consequence pairs that is closed under uniform substitution, the axioms and rules from Definition 2.1, and that also contains the following axioms:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \top \leq p \multimap \top & \text{modal top} \\ p \multimap (q \wedge r) \leq (p \multimap q) \wedge (p \multimap r) & \text{monotonicity} \\ (p \multimap q) \wedge (p \multimap r) \leq p \multimap (q \wedge r) & \text{normality} \end{array}$$

and is closed under the congruence rules:

$$\frac{p \leq q \quad q \leq p}{p \multimap r \leq q \multimap r} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{p \leq q \quad q \leq p}{r \multimap p \leq r \multimap q}.$$

If Γ is a set of consequence pairs then we let $\mathbf{L}(\Gamma)$ denote the smallest set of consequence pairs that contains Γ and is closed under uniform substitution and the axioms and rules mentioned above. We write $\varphi \vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$ if $\varphi \leq \psi \in \mathbf{L}(\Gamma)$ and $\varphi \dashv\vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$ if both $\varphi \vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$ and $\psi \vdash_{\Gamma} \varphi$. If $\Gamma = \emptyset$ then we write $\varphi \vdash \psi$ and $\varphi \dashv\vdash \psi$.

The algebraic semantics of the logic is given by lattices with a binary operator whose second argument preserves finite meets.

Definition 3.4. A *conditional lattice* is a tuple $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee, \Box \rightarrow)$ such that $(A, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee)$ is a lattice and $\Box \rightarrow$ is a binary operator satisfying, for all $a, b, c \in A$:

$$\top = a \Box \rightarrow \top \quad \text{and} \quad (a \Box \rightarrow b) \wedge (a \Box \rightarrow c) = a \Box \rightarrow (b \wedge c). \quad (1)$$

The category of conditional lattices and homomorphisms is denoted by \mathbf{CLat} .

A *conditional lattice model* is a pair $\mathcal{M} = (\mathfrak{A}, \sigma)$ consisting of a conditional lattice \mathfrak{A} and an assignment $\sigma : \text{Prop} \rightarrow A$ of the proposition letters. The assignment σ extends uniquely to a map $(\cdot)_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathbf{CL} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ by interpreting connectives via their conditional lattice counterparts. A conditional lattice model \mathcal{M} *validates* a consequence pair $\varphi \leq \psi$ if $(\varphi)_{\mathcal{M}} \leq (\psi)_{\mathcal{M}}$, where \leq is the order underlying the lattice. A conditional lattice \mathfrak{A} is said to *validate* a consequence pair $\varphi \leq \psi$ if every conditional lattice model of the form (\mathfrak{A}, σ) validates it.

Definition 3.5. Let Γ be a set of consequence pairs. Then $\mathbf{CLat}(\Gamma)$ is defined as the full subcategory of \mathbf{CLat} whose objects validate all consequence pairs in Γ . We write $\varphi \vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$ if every $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{CLat}(\Gamma)$ validates $\varphi \leq \psi$ and abbreviate $\varphi \vdash_{\emptyset} \psi$ to $\varphi \vdash \psi$.

We note that $\mathbf{CLat}(\Gamma)$ forms a variety of algebras, given by the equations defining lattices together with the equations obtained from Γ by replacing \leq with \leq and viewing proposition letters as variables. A standard Lindenbaum argument, akin to that in [25, Section 3.1], can be used to prove that conditional lattices indeed provide the algebraic semantics logics of the form $\mathbf{CL}(\Gamma)$.

Theorem 3.6. Let $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi \leq \psi\}$ be a set of consequence pairs. Then

$$\varphi \vdash_{\Gamma} \psi \quad \text{iff} \quad \varphi \vdash \psi.$$

We complete this subsection by verifying that the logic we have defined does not unexpectedly satisfy distributivity.

Example 3.7. Let $(A, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee)$ be any lattice. Then defining a binary operator $\Box \rightarrow'$ on A by $a \Box \rightarrow' b = \top$ for all $a, b \in A$ yields a conditional lattice $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee, \Box \rightarrow')$. Since the lattice we start with need not be distributive, the same holds for \mathfrak{A} . Therefore $p \wedge (q \vee r) \leq (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$ is not a theorem of \mathbf{CL} .

In a similar way, it can be shown that none of the axioms considered in Section 5 can be derived in \mathbf{CL} .

3.2 Selection L-frames

The standard way of interpreting conditional implication in a classical setting is via a selection function [33, Section 3]. In this context, a selection function frame consists of a non-empty set X of worlds and a function $s : X \times \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$, where $\mathcal{P}X$ denotes the powerset of X . Alternatively the selection function can be viewed as a subset-indexed collection of relations $\{R_a \mid a \subseteq X\}$ [37], or as a ternary relation $R \subseteq X \times X \times \mathcal{P}X$ [38, Definition 3.1].

This approach was adapted to an intuitionistic setting by Weiss [42], who equipped an intuitionistic Kripke frame (X, \leq) with a subset-indexed set of relations $\{R_a \mid a \subseteq X\}$ such that $(\leq \circ R_a) \subseteq (R_a \circ \leq)$ for all relations. However, by the nature of the interpretation of conditional implication, we only need relations R_a where a is upward closed in (X, \leq) . Taking this into account, we may refine Weiss' semantics to an intuitionistic Kripke frame (X, \leq) with a selection function $s : X \times \text{up}(X, \leq) \rightarrow \text{up}(X, \leq)$ such that $x \leq y$ implies $s(y, a) \subseteq s(x, a)$ for all $a \in \text{up}(X, \leq)$. (Here $\text{up}(X, \leq)$ is the collection of upsets of (X, \leq) .)

While classically any subset of a frame may serve as the interpretation of a formula, while intuitionistically only upward closed subsets are used as the interpretations of formulas. Guided by this observation, we define frame semantics for sub-sub-intuitionistic logic by extending L-frames $(X, 1, \wedge)$ with a selection function of the form

$$s : X \times \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge).$$

In order to ensure that all formulas are interpreted as filters, we impose three coherence conditions between the semilattice structure of the frame and the selection function. Thus, we arrive at the following definition.

Definition 3.8. Let $(X, 1, \wedge)$ be an L-frame. A *selection function* is a function $s : X \times \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge)$ such that for all $x, y, z \in X$ and $a \in \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge)$:

$$(S_1) \quad s(1, a) = \{1\};$$

$$(S_2) \quad \text{If } x \preceq y \text{ then } s(y, a) \subseteq s(x, a);$$

$$(S_3) \quad \text{If } z \in s(x \wedge y, a) \text{ then there exist } u \in s(x, a) \text{ and } v \in s(y, a) \text{ such that } u \wedge v \preceq z.$$

A *selection L-frame* is an L-frame with a selection function.

Definition 3.9. A *selection L-model* is a selection L-frame $(X, 1, \wedge, s)$ with a valuation $V : \text{Prop} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge)$. The interpretation of a **CL**-formula at a world $x \in X$ is defined recursively by the clauses from Definition 2.4 with the additional case:

$$\mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash \varphi \Box \rightarrow \psi \quad \text{iff} \quad s(x, \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}}) \subseteq \llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}}.$$

Recall that $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}} = \{x \in X \mid \mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash \varphi\}$ denotes the *truth set* of φ in \mathfrak{M} . When \mathfrak{M} is clear from context we drop the superscript.

We write $\mathfrak{M} \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$, and say that \mathfrak{M} *validates* $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$, if $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}} \subseteq \llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}}$. Similarly, a selection L-frame \mathfrak{X} *validates* $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$, denoted by $\mathfrak{X} \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$, if every model of the form (\mathfrak{X}, V) validates $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$. Finally, if Γ is a set of consequence pairs, then we write $\mathfrak{X} \Vdash \Gamma$ if \mathfrak{X} validates every consequence pair in Γ , and $\varphi \Vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$ if $\mathfrak{X} \Vdash \Gamma$ implies $\mathfrak{X} \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ for all selection L-frames \mathfrak{X} .

We verify that selection L-models do indeed satisfy the persistence condition. In other words, we show that the interpretation of any formula in a selection function L-model forms a filter. We make use of the following lemma, which can be proven using the three selection function conditions from Definition 3.9.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\mathfrak{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s)$ be a selection L-frame. Then for every filter a of $(X, 1, \wedge)$ and all $x, y \in X$ we have $s(x \wedge y, a) = s(x, a) \nabla s(y, a)$.*

Proposition 3.11. *Let $\mathfrak{M} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, v)$ be a selection L-model. Then $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ is a filter on $(X, 1, \wedge)$ for every $\varphi \in \mathbf{CL}$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the complexity of φ . The base cases and the inductive cases for conjunctions and disjunctions are as in [25, Lemma 3.8], so we focus on the case $\varphi = \psi \Box \rightarrow \chi$.

It follows from (S₁) and (S₂) that $\llbracket \psi \Box \rightarrow \chi \rrbracket$ contains 1 and is upwards closed. For closure under meets, suppose $x, y \in \llbracket \psi \Box \rightarrow \chi \rrbracket$. Then $s(x, \llbracket \psi \rrbracket) \subseteq \llbracket \chi \rrbracket$ and $s(y, \llbracket \psi \rrbracket) \subseteq \llbracket \chi \rrbracket$. Lemma 3.10 and the fact that $\llbracket \chi \rrbracket$ is a filter then imply $s(x \wedge y, \llbracket \psi \rrbracket) = s(x, \llbracket \psi \rrbracket) \nabla s(y, \llbracket \psi \rrbracket) \subseteq \llbracket \chi \rrbracket$. Therefore $x \wedge y \in \llbracket \psi \Box \rightarrow \chi \rrbracket$. \square

We close this subsection by showing soundness of $\mathbf{CL}(\Gamma)$ with respect to selection L-frames validating Γ . Completeness will have to wait until we establish a categorical duality in Section 4.

Definition 3.12. The *complex algebra* of a selection L-frame $\mathfrak{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s)$ is the conditional lattice $\mathfrak{X}^+ := (\mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge), \Box \rightarrow)$, where $\mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge)$ is the lattice of filters of $(X, 1, \wedge)$ and $\Box \rightarrow$ is given by

$$p \Box \rightarrow q = \{x \in X \mid s(x, p) \subseteq q\}.$$

Lemma 3.13. *For any selection L-frame $\mathfrak{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s)$, its complex algebra \mathfrak{X}^+ is a conditional lattice.*

Proof. We know that $\mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge)$ forms a lattice (with top element X and conjunction \cap), so we only have to verify that $\Box \rightarrow$ satisfies the equations from (1). For the first equation, note that $a \Box \rightarrow X = \{x \in X \mid s(x, a) \subseteq X\} = X$. For the second equation, let $a, b, c \in \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge)$ and compute

$$\begin{aligned} a \Box \rightarrow (b \cap c) &= \{x \in X \mid s(x, a) \subseteq b \cap c\} \\ &= \{x \in X \mid s(x, a) \subseteq b\} \cap \{x \in X \mid s(x, a) \subseteq c\} = (a \Box \rightarrow b) \cap (a \Box \rightarrow c). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.14. *Let \mathfrak{X} be a selection function L-frame, V any valuation for \mathfrak{X} and $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{CL}$. Then:*

1. $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{(\mathfrak{X}, V)} = \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{(\mathfrak{X}^+, V)}$
2. $(\mathfrak{X}, V) \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ iff $(\mathfrak{X}^+, V) \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$

3. $\mathfrak{X} \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ iff $\mathfrak{X}^+ \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$

Proof. The first item follows from a routine induction on the structure of φ . The second item follows from the first and the fact that \mathfrak{X}^+ is ordered by inclusion. The third item follows from the second and the fact that valuations for \mathfrak{X} correspond bijectively with assignments for \mathfrak{X}^+ . \square

Finally, we can use Lemma 3.14 to prove soundness of $\text{CL}(\Gamma)$ with respect to classes of selection function L-frames.

Theorem 3.15. *Let $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi\}$ be a collection of consequence pairs. Then*

$$\varphi \vdash_{\Gamma} \psi \text{ implies } \varphi \Vdash_{\Gamma} \psi.$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.14(3) that $\varphi \vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$ implies $\varphi \Vdash_{\Gamma} \psi$. Combining this with Theorem 3.6 yields the desired result. \square

3.3 General frames

In modal logic, general frames are obtained by equipping frames with a collection of “admissible” subsets. That is, it adds a collection of designated subsets which are allowed to be interpretations of formulas. They are often used to bridge the gap between frame semantics and algebraic semantics of a logic, see for example [46, Section 1.4].

In our setting, general frames generalise selection L-frames from Definition 3.8 as well as the topologised frames used in the next section. Therefore, they allow us to define a notion of morphism between frames once, and specialise it to the setting of selection L-frames as well as the spaces used for the duality. Additionally, the use of general frames lets us give frame correspondents of formulas for both selection L-frames and topologised frames at once, preventing unnecessary duplication.

Definition 3.16. A *general selection L-frame*, or *general frame* for short, is a tuple $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, A)$ consisting of

- an L-frame $(X, 1, \wedge)$;
- a *selection function* $s : X \times A \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge)$ satisfying (S_1) , (S_2) and (S_3) for all $a \in A$;
- a collection $A \subseteq \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge)$ of *admissible subsets* that contain X and $\{1\}$, and is closed under \cap , ∇ and \boxrightarrow .

An *admissible valuation* is a map $V : \text{Prop} \rightarrow A$, and a general frame together with an admissible valuation is called a *general selection L-model* or *general model*.

The interpretation of formulas in a general model are defined using the clauses from Definitions 2.4 and 3.9. Validity of a consequence pair $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ in a general frame or model is defined as in Definition 3.9. If $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi\}$ is a collection of consequence pairs, then we write $\varphi \Vdash_{\Gamma}^g \psi$ if every general frame validating Γ also validates $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$.

Let $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, A)$ be a general frame and $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathfrak{G}, V)$ a general model. Then the closure conditions on A ensure that $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}} \in A$ for all $\varphi \in \text{CL}$. In fact, the set A forms a conditional lattice.

Definition 3.17. The *complex algebra* of a general frame $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, A)$ is given by $\mathfrak{G}^+ := (A, X, \{1\}, \cap, \nabla, \boxrightarrow)$.

Every selection L-frame $\mathfrak{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s)$ can be viewed as a general frame by letting all filters be admissible, that is, by setting $A = \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \wedge)$. Then any valuation for \mathfrak{X} is admissible, and validity of consequence pairs for \mathfrak{X} and its corresponding general frame coincide. General frames with such a trivial set of admissible subsets are sometimes called *full* (for example, see [37, Section 2]). When convenient, we view selection L-frames as full general frames.

We can generalise Lemma 3.14 and Theorem 3.15 to the setting of general frames.

Lemma 3.18. *Let \mathfrak{G} be a general frame, V an admissible valuation for \mathfrak{G} and $\varphi, \psi \in \text{CL}$. Then:*

1. $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{(\mathfrak{G}, V)} = \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{(\mathfrak{G}^+, V)}$
2. $(\mathfrak{G}, V) \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ iff $(\mathfrak{G}^+, V) \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$
3. $\mathfrak{G} \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ iff $\mathfrak{G}^+ \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$

Theorem 3.19. *Let $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi\}$ be a collection of consequence pairs. Then*

$$\varphi \vdash_{\Gamma} \psi \text{ implies } \varphi \Vdash_{\Gamma}^g \psi.$$

3.4 Selection morphisms

In order to prove a categorical duality for varieties of conditional lattices, we need to think about morphisms between frames. In the classical setting, morphisms between selection function frames were defined implicitly in [47]. Here, we define morphisms between general frames, so that their definition restricts to a notion of morphism between selection L-frames by taking all filters to be admissible, as well as the topologised frames used in Section 4.

Definition 3.20. Let $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ and $\mathfrak{G}' = (X', 1', \lambda', s', A')$ be two general frames. Then a *selection morphism* from \mathfrak{G} to \mathfrak{G}' is an L-morphism f from $(X, 1, \lambda)$ to $(X', 1', \lambda')$ such that, for all $x \in X$ and $a' \in A'$ the following hold:

$$(M_0) \quad f^{-1}(a') \in A;$$

$$(M_1) \quad \text{If } y \in s(x, f^{-1}(a')) \text{ then } f(y) \in s'(f(x), a');$$

$$(M_2) \quad \text{If } y' \in s'(f(x), a') \text{ then there exists an } y \in s(x, f^{-1}(a')) \text{ such that } f(y) \leq y'.$$

Conditions (M_1) and (M_2) can be combined to the equivalent condition

$$s'(f(x), a') = \uparrow f[s(x, f^{-1}(a'))]. \quad (2)$$

However, the separation into two conditions will simplify the proof that selection morphisms preserve and reflect truth of the conditional implication.

Definition 3.21. Let $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathfrak{G}, V)$ and $\mathfrak{M}' = (\mathfrak{G}', V')$ be two general models. Then a *selection model morphism* from \mathfrak{M} to \mathfrak{M}' is a selection morphism $f : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}'$ such that $V = f^{-1} \circ V'$.

Selection morphisms specialise to selection L-frames and models by viewing every filter as admissible. Thus, they are given by L-morphisms that satisfy (M_1) and (M_2) where a' ranges over all filters of the codomain.

Every selection morphism between two (general) frames gives rise to a conditional lattice homomorphism between the corresponding complex algebras.

Lemma 3.22. Let $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ and $\mathfrak{G}' = (X', 1', \lambda', s', A')$ be two general frames and $f : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}'$ a selection morphism. Then $f^{-1} : (\mathfrak{G}')^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}^+$ is a conditional lattice homomorphism.

Proof. It follows from the definition of an L-morphism that f^{-1} is a lattice homomorphism, so we only have to verify that $f^{-1}(a' \boxrightarrow b') = f^{-1}(a') \boxrightarrow f^{-1}(b')$ for all $a', b' \in A'$. Using (2) and the fact that b' is upward closed we find

$$\begin{aligned} x \in f^{-1}(a' \boxrightarrow b') & \text{ iff } s'(f(x), a') \subseteq b' & \text{ iff } f[s(x, f^{-1}(a'))] \subseteq b' \\ & \text{ iff } s(x, f^{-1}(a')) \subseteq f^{-1}(b') & \text{ iff } x \in f^{-1}(a') \boxrightarrow f^{-1}(b'), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the desired equality. \square

We can combine Lemmas 3.18 and 3.22 to show that selection model morphisms preserve and reflect truth of formulas.

Theorem 3.23. Let $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ and $\mathfrak{G}' = (X', 1', \lambda', s', A')$ be two general frames, V and V' two admissible valuations for them, and $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathfrak{G}, V)$ and $\mathfrak{M}' = (\mathfrak{G}', V')$ two general models. If $f : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}'$ is a selection model morphism, then for all $x \in X$ and $\varphi \in \mathbf{CL}$ we have

$$\mathfrak{M}, x \Vdash \varphi \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathfrak{M}', f(x) \Vdash \varphi.$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.22 that $f^{-1} : (\mathfrak{G}')^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}^+$ is a conditional lattice homomorphism. The fact that $V = f^{-1} \circ V'$ then implies that $(\cdot)_{(\mathfrak{G}^+, V)} = f^{-1} \circ (\cdot)_{((\mathfrak{G}')^+, V')}$. Combining this with Lemma 3.18 proves the theorem. \square

4 Duality and completeness

In this section we derive a duality between the category of conditional lattices and a category of certain topologised selection L-frames. We build this on the duality for lattices from Theorem 2.10. Adding the conditional implication to lattices is dually reflected by equipping L-spaces with a selection function that acts on clopen filters. We will see that it can be viewed as a general frame, where the clopen filters are the admissible filters. This allows us to use the notion of a selection morphism from Definition 3.20 to define a suitable notion of morphism between our spaces. In Section 4.2, we use the duality to obtain completeness for the basic system CL with respect to the class of all selection L-frames.

4.1 Spaces and Duality

Our definition of topological semantics takes L-spaces from Definition 2.7 and attaches a *topological selection function*. Recall that we denote the lattice of clopen filters of an L-space \mathbb{X} by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$. We denote the set of closed filters $\mathcal{F}_{\text{closed}}(\mathbb{X})$.

Definition 4.1. Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \lambda, \tau)$ be an L-space. A *topological selection function* is a function $s : X \times \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{closed}}(\mathbb{X})$ such that for all $x, y, z \in X$ and $a, b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$ we have:

- (S₁) $s(1, a) = \{1\}$;
- (S₂) If $x \preceq y$ then $s(y, a) \subseteq s(x, a)$;
- (S₃) If $z \in s(x \lambda y, a)$ then there exist $u \in s(x, a)$ and $v \in s(y, a)$ such that $u \lambda v \preceq z$.
- (S_t) If $a, b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$ then $a \boxrightarrow b := \{x \in X \mid s(x, a) \subseteq b\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$.

A *selection L-space* is an L-space with a topological selection function.

Remark 4.2. Selection function L-spaces can be viewed as general frames in a canonical way. If $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, \tau)$ is a selection L-space then the set $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$ of clopen filters of \mathbb{X} contains X and $\{1\}$ and is closed under \cap and ∇ because \mathbb{X} is based on an L-space. Furthermore, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$ is closed under \boxrightarrow by definition. So $(X, 1, \lambda, s, \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X}))$ is a general frame. We call general frames that arise in this way *descriptive*. We will use this perspective of selection L-spaces as general frames to define morphisms (in Definition 4.3 below), and to transport frame correspondence results from general frames to selection L-spaces in Section 5.

A *selection morphism* between two selection L-spaces \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{X}' is a function f that is a selection morphism between the corresponding general frames. We work this out concretely:

Definition 4.3. Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, \tau)$ and $\mathbb{X}' = (X', 1', \lambda', s', \tau')$ be two selection L-spaces. A *selection morphism* from \mathbb{X} to \mathbb{X}' is a continuous L-frame morphism f such that for all $x \in X$ and all clopen filters a' of \mathbb{X}' :

- (M₁) if $y \in s(x, f^{-1}(a'))$ then $f(y) \in s'(f(x), a')$;
- (M₂) if $y' \in s'(f(x), a')$ then there exists an $y \in s(x, f^{-1}(a'))$ such that $f(y) \leq y'$.

The collection of selection L-spaces and selection morphisms forms a category, which we denote by **SLSpace**.

Definition 4.4. A *selection L-space model* is a selection L-space \mathbb{X} with a valuation $V : \text{Prop} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$. The interpretation of formulas in a selection function L-space model is defined via the clauses from Definitions 2.4 and 3.9. A selection L-space model \mathbb{M} *validates* a consequence pair $\varphi \triangleleft \psi$ if $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{\mathbb{M}} \subseteq \llbracket \psi \rrbracket^{\mathbb{M}}$. A selection L-space \mathbb{X} *validates* a consequence pair $\varphi \triangleleft \psi$ if every selection function L-space model \mathbb{M} of the form (\mathbb{X}, V) validates $\varphi \triangleleft \psi$. We write $\mathbb{X} \Vdash \varphi \triangleleft \psi$ if \mathbb{X} validates $\varphi \triangleleft \psi$.

We claim that the category **SLSpace** is dual to **CLat**. To prove this, we extend the functors \mathcal{F}_{clp} and \mathcal{F}_{top} which establish the duality between L-spaces and lattices to functors between **SLSpace** and **CLat**. By abuse of notation, we denote these functors by \mathcal{F}_{clp} and \mathcal{F}_{top} as well.

We have already seen that taking the complex algebra of a general frame yields a conditional lattice. Therefore the clopen filters of a selection L-space \mathbb{X} form a conditional lattice, which we denote by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$. Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 3.22 that for every selection morphism $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}'$, its inverse f^{-1} is a conditional lattice homomorphism from $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X}')$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$. A routine verification shows that this gives rise to a contravariant functor

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} : \text{SLSpace} \rightarrow \text{CLat}.$$

For the converse, we extend \mathcal{F}_{top} as follows.

Definition 4.5. Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee, \boxrightarrow)$ be a conditional lattice and let $(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}), A, \cap, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$ be the L-space dual to the lattice $(A, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee)$. Then as a consequence of the duality for lattices (from Theorem 2.10) we know that every clopen filter is of the form $\theta_{\mathcal{A}}(a)$ for some $a \in A$. Furthermore, define

$$s_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) \times \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}), A, \cap, \tau_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{closed}}(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}), A, \cap, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$$

by

$$s_{\mathcal{A}}(p, \theta_{\mathcal{A}}(a)) = \uparrow\{b \in A \mid a \boxrightarrow b \in p\}.$$

Then we let $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathcal{A}) := (\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}), A, \cap, s_{\mathcal{A}}, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$.

Note that $s_{\mathfrak{A}}(p, \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a))$ consists of all filters q in $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{A})$ such that $a \sqsupset b \in p$ implies $b \in q$. Therefore we could have equivalently defined

$$s_{\mathfrak{A}}(p, \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)) = \bigcap \{ \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(b) \mid a \sqsupset b \in p \}.$$

We verify that $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathfrak{A})$ is a selection L-space whenever \mathfrak{A} is a conditional lattice.

Lemma 4.6. *For any conditional lattice $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee, \sqsupset)$, the tuple $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathfrak{A}) = (\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{A}), A, \cap, s_{\mathfrak{A}}, \tau_{\mathfrak{A}})$ is a selection L-space.*

Proof. We know from Theorem 2.10 that $(\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{A}), A, \cap, \tau_{\mathfrak{A}})$ is an L-space. Furthermore, $s_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is well defined because principal filters in an L-space are automatically closed [25, Lemma 2.8], so we only need to verify (S₁) to (S_t) from Definition 4.1

Condition (S₁). Recall that A is the top element of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathfrak{A})$, and that clopen filters are precisely the filters of the form $\theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$, for $a \in A$. Now we find

$$s_{\mathfrak{A}}(A, \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)) = \uparrow \{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in A \} = \uparrow \{ A \} = \{ A \},$$

because $a \sqsupset b \in A$ for all $a, b \in A$.

Condition (S₂). Let $p, q \in \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{A})$ be two filters of A such that $p \subseteq q$. Then we have $\{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in p \} \subseteq \{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in q \}$, and hence

$$s_{\mathfrak{A}}(q, \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)) = \uparrow \{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in q \} \subseteq \uparrow \{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in p \} = s_{\mathfrak{A}}(p, \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)).$$

Condition (S₃). Let $p, q, r \in \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{A})$ and suppose $r \in s_{\mathfrak{A}}(p \cap q, \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a))$. Let $p' = \{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in p \}$ and $q' = \{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in q \}$. Then $p' \in s_{\mathfrak{A}}(p, \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a))$, $q' \in s_{\mathfrak{A}}(q, \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a))$ and by construction $p' \cap q' = \{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in p \cap q \} \subseteq r$.

Condition (S_t). Let $\theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$ and $\theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(b)$ be two clopen filters of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathfrak{A})$. For any $p \in \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{A})$ we have

$$s_{\mathfrak{A}}(p, \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)) \subseteq \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(b) \quad \text{iff} \quad \{ c \in A \mid a \sqsupset c \in p \} \in \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(b) \quad \text{iff} \quad a \sqsupset b \in p.$$

Therefore $\theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) \sqsupset \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(b) = \{ p \in \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{A}) \mid s_{\mathfrak{A}}(p, \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)) \subseteq \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(b) \} = \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a \sqsupset b)$, which is clopen in $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathfrak{A})$ by definition. \square

We now know that the \mathcal{F}_{top} defines an assignment $\text{CLat} \rightarrow \text{SLSpace}$ on objects. We now extend this to morphisms.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee, \sqsupset)$ and $\mathfrak{A}' = (A', \top', \perp', \wedge', \vee', \sqsupset')$ be two conditional lattices, and $h : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}'$ a conditional lattice homomorphism. Then $h^{-1} : \mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathfrak{A}') \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathfrak{A})$ is a selection morphism between selection L-spaces.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{F}_{top} extends the similarly named functor $\text{Lat} \rightarrow \text{LSpace}$, we know from Theorem 2.10 that h^{-1} is an L-morphism. Furthermore, it follows that $(h^{-1})^{-1}(\theta_{\mathfrak{A}'}(a)) = \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(h(a))$ hence $(h^{-1})^{-1}$ is continuous. So we only have to prove that (M₁) and (M₂) hold.

Condition (M₁). Suppose $q' \in s_{\mathfrak{A}'}(p', (h^{-1})^{-1}(\theta_{\mathfrak{A}'}(a)))$. Since

$$s_{\mathfrak{A}'}(p', (h^{-1})^{-1}(\theta_{\mathfrak{A}'}(a))) = s_{\mathfrak{A}'}(p', \theta_{\mathfrak{A}'}(h(a))) = \uparrow \{ b' \in A' \mid h(a) \sqsupset b' \in p' \}$$

we have $\{ b' \in A' \mid h(a) \sqsupset b' \in p' \} \subseteq q'$. This implies that

$$\{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in h^{-1}(p') \} = \{ b \in A \mid h(a) \sqsupset h(b) \in p' \} \subseteq h^{-1}(q'),$$

so that $h^{-1}(q') \in s_{\mathfrak{A}}(h^{-1}(p'), \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a))$ by definition.

Condition (M₂). Let $q \in s_{\mathfrak{A}}(h^{-1}(p'), \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a))$. Then $\{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in h^{-1}(p') \} \subseteq q$. We have seen that $s_{\mathfrak{A}}(h^{-1}(p'), (h^{-1})^{-1}(\theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a))) = \uparrow \{ b' \in A' \mid h(a) \sqsupset b' \in p' \}$ so to verify (M₂) it suffices to show that $h^{-1}(\{ b' \in A' \mid h(a) \sqsupset b' \in p' \}) \subseteq q$. To see that this is indeed the case, compute

$$\begin{aligned} h^{-1}(\{ b' \in A' \mid h(a) \sqsupset b' \in p' \}) &= \{ b \in A \mid h(a) \sqsupset h(b) \in p' \} \\ &= \{ b \in A \mid a \sqsupset b \in h^{-1}(p') \} \subseteq q. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that h^{-1} is a selection morphism. \square

We now know that setting $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(h) = h^{-1}$ yields a contravariant assignment from CLat to SLSpace . A routine verification shows that this yields contravariant functor

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}} : \text{CLat} \rightarrow \text{SLSpace}.$$

This brings us to the duality for conditional lattices.

Theorem 4.8. *The functors \mathcal{F}_{clp} and \mathcal{F}_{top} establish a dual equivalence:*

$$\text{SLSpace} \equiv^{op} \text{CLat}.$$

Proof. Define transformations $\theta : \text{id}_{\text{CLat}} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \circ \mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}$ and $\eta : \text{id}_{\text{SLSpace}} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{top}} \circ \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}$ on components by

$$\theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) = \{p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathfrak{A}) \mid a \in p\} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{\mathbb{X}}(x) = \{a \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X}) \mid x \in a\}.$$

We claim that it suffices to show that θ and η are isomorphisms on components. Since they are defined as in Theorem 2.10, it follows that they are natural isomorphisms. Moreover, since the functors \mathcal{F}_{clp} and \mathcal{F}_{top} extend the functors from Theorem 2.10, it also follows automatically that the triangle identities hold, that is, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \eta_{\mathbb{X}} \circ \theta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}} = \text{id}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X})$ for all selection L-spaces \mathbb{X} , and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}} \theta_{\mathfrak{A}} \circ \eta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}} \mathfrak{A}} = \text{id}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}} \mathfrak{A})$ for every conditional lattice \mathfrak{A} . This then implies that \mathcal{F}_{clp} and \mathcal{F}_{top} establish a dual equivalence. For the remainder of the proof, fix a conditional lattice $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee, \square \rightarrow)$ and a selection L-space $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, \tau)$.

The map $\theta_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is an isomorphism. Since θ is a map between varieties of algebras, it suffices to show that it is a bijective homomorphism. We know from the duality for lattices that $\theta_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is an isomorphism between the underlying lattices, hence bijective. So we only have to show that it preserves conditional implications, meaning $\theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a \square \rightarrow b) = \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) \square \rightarrow \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(b)$, where $\square \rightarrow$ is defined in the dual selection L-space. But this was already shown in the proof of Lemma 4.6. So $\theta_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is a bijective conditional lattice homomorphism, hence an isomorphism.

The map $\eta_{\mathbb{X}}$ is an isomorphism. We know from the duality for lattices that $\eta_{\mathbb{X}}$ is an isomorphism between the underlying L-spaces. This implies that it is a bijective L-space morphism. It can be shown that the isomorphisms in SLSpace are precisely the bijective selection morphisms, so we only have to show that $\eta_{\mathbb{X}}$ satisfies (M₁) and (M₂).

For condition (M₁), let $x, y \in X$ and let $\theta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(a)$ be any clopen filter of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X}))$ (where $a \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$). Suppose $y \in s(x, \eta_{\mathbb{X}}^{-1}(\theta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(a)))$. It follows from the triangle equalities for η and θ that $\eta_{\mathbb{X}}^{-1}(\theta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})}(a)) = a$, so $y \in s(x, \eta_{\mathbb{X}}^{-1}(\theta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(a))) = s(x, a)$. We need to show that $\eta_{\mathbb{X}}(y) \in s_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(\eta_{\mathbb{X}}(x), \theta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(a))$. By definition

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(\eta_{\mathbb{X}}(x), \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)) &= \uparrow \{b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X} \mid a \square \rightarrow b \in \eta_{\mathbb{X}}(x)\} \\ &= \uparrow \{b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X} \mid x \in a \square \rightarrow b\} = \uparrow \{b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X} \mid s(x, a) \subseteq b\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $y \in s(x, a)$, it follows that $\{b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X} \mid s(x, a) \subseteq b\} \subseteq \eta_{\mathbb{X}}(y)$. This proves that $\eta_{\mathbb{X}}(y) \in s_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(\eta_{\mathbb{X}}(x), \theta_{\mathfrak{A}}(a))$, as desired.

For condition (M₂), let $x \in X$ and let $\theta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(a)$ be a clopen filter of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X}))$. Suppose y' is an element of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X}))$ such that $y' \in s_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(\eta_{\mathbb{X}}(x), \theta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(a))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} y' &\supseteq \{b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X} \mid a \square \rightarrow b \in \eta_{\mathbb{X}}(x)\} = \{b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X} \mid x \in a \square \rightarrow b\} \\ &= \{b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X} \mid s(x, a) \subseteq b\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since η is an L-space isomorphism, it is bijective. Therefore y' must be of the form $\eta_{\mathbb{X}}(y)$ for some $y \in X$. Now it suffices to show that $y \in s(x, \eta_{\mathbb{X}}^{-1}(\theta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(a)))$. We have seen that $s(x, \eta_{\mathbb{X}}^{-1}(\theta_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X}}(a))) = s(x, a)$, so we only need to show that $y \in s(x, a)$. By assumption we have $\{b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X} \mid s(x, a) \subseteq b\} \subseteq \eta_{\mathbb{X}}(y)$, which implies $y \in \bigcap \{b \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X} \mid s(x, a) \subseteq b\} = s(x, a)$. Therefore η is a selection morphism, hence an isomorphism. This completes the proof of the duality. \square

4.2 Completeness via duality

We leverage the duality from Theorem 4.8 to get completeness for CL with respect to selection L-frames. First, we prove a completeness result for selection L-spaces.

Theorem 4.9. *Let Γ be a set of consequence pairs. Then the logic $\text{CL}(\Gamma)$ is sound and complete with respect to the class of selection L-spaces that validate all consequence pairs in Γ .*

Proof. Soundness was proven in Theorem 3.15. For completeness, suppose that $\varphi \leq \psi$ is not derivable in $\text{CL}(\Gamma)$. Then by Theorem 3.6 there exists a conditional lattice \mathcal{A} that validates all consequence pairs in Γ , but not $\varphi \leq \psi$. Let \mathbb{X} be the selection L-space dual to \mathcal{A} . Then $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{A} , so it follows from Lemma 3.18 (and the fact that we can view selection L-spaces as general frames) that \mathbb{X} validates all consequence pairs in Γ but not $\varphi \leq \psi$. This proves completeness. \square

In order to transfer the completeness result for selection L-spaces to one for selection L-frames, we need a way to go from spaces to frames. In normal modal logic this is easy: simply forget about the topology. However, when working with selection functions the situation is more precarious. Indeed, a topological selection function is defined only on clopen filters, so discarding the topology leaves us with an “incomplete” selection function. We remedy this by “filling in” the gaps. This can be done in several ways, one of which is defined next.

Definition 4.10. Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, \tau)$ be a conditional L-space. Define

$$s_1 : X \times \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X, 1, \lambda)$$

by

$$s_1(x, p) = \begin{cases} s(x, p) & \text{if } p \text{ is a clopen filter} \\ \{1\} & \text{if } p \text{ is a non-clopen filter} \end{cases}$$

We define the *top fill-in* or the κ_1 -*fill-in* of \mathbb{X} as $\kappa_1\mathbb{X} := (X, 1, \lambda, s_1)$.

Evidently, every clopen valuation for \mathbb{X} is also a valuation for $\kappa_1\mathbb{X}$. Moreover, if V is a clopen valuation then formulas in (\mathbb{X}, V) are interpreted in the same way as in $(\kappa_1\mathbb{X}, V)$, because only the action of s_1 on clopen filters is used to determine the interpretation of formulas. Therefore:

Lemma 4.11. *Let \mathbb{X} be a selection L-space such that $\mathbb{X} \not\models \varphi \leq \psi$. Then $\kappa_1\mathbb{X} \not\models \varphi \leq \psi$.*

Using this, we obtain completeness of CL with respect to selection L-frames.

Theorem 4.12. *The logic CL is sound and complete with respect to the class of all selection L-frames.*

Proof. Soundness was proven in Theorem 3.15. For completeness, suppose $\varphi \leq \psi$ is not derivable in CL . Then there exists a selection L-space \mathbb{X} that does not validate $\varphi \leq \psi$, so that by Lemma 4.11 $\kappa_1\mathbb{X}$ does not validate $\varphi \leq \psi$. \square

While the top fill-in allows us to prove completeness for CL , we do not automatically get completeness for logics of the form $\text{CL}(\Gamma)$. Indeed, while \mathbb{X} may validate all consequence pairs in Γ , this need not be the case for $\kappa_1\mathbb{X}$. In the next section we explore how we can modify the fill-in to obtain completeness for various extensions of CL .

5 Extensions

To showcase the versatility of the semantic framework of sub-sub-intuitionistic, we consider various extensions of the basic logic CL with axioms (that is, with consequence pairs). We provide completeness results for each of these, as well as certain combinations of axioms. We use a strategy similar to that in Section 4.2 with two additional steps:

1. For each axiom, we find a frame condition corresponding to validity of the axiom. We prove these correspondence results with respect to general frames and then to selection L-frames and -spaces.
2. We show that validity of the axiom under consideration (or the corresponding frame condition) is preserved when moving from a selection L-space to a selection L-frame.

This reveals an interesting phenomenon: there may be several ways to extend a topological selection function to a selection function that is defined on all filters, and some of them may not preserve validity of the axiom under consideration. In Section 5.4 we shall see an example of an axiom that is not preserved under the top fill-in (from Definition 4.10). That is, there exists a selection L-space \mathbb{X} validating the axiom while $\kappa_1\mathbb{X}$ does not. We can still obtain completeness, but we have to use a different type of fill-in.

We use the completeness results for extensions of CK to elucidate the connection between sub-sub-intuitionistic logic and intuitionistic conditional logic [42] in Section 5.3, and to derive an alternative (semilattice-based) semantics for intuitionistic logic in Section 5.5.

Where possible, the naming of the axioms we consider follows that of classical counterparts from [38]. We refer to [38] for a discussion of the axioms. All correspondence results are given in the appendix.

5.1 Some simple completeness results

We begin our investigation of extensions of CL with four axioms whose completeness we can prove in a way similar to Theorem 4.12, using the top fill-in. As announced, to achieve this we give correspondence conditions for each of the axioms, and we show that these are preserved by taking the top fill-in of a selection L-space, a property we call κ_1 -persistence.

Consider the following axioms:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(refl)} & \top \trianglelefteq p \square \rightarrow p \\ \text{(cond)} & p \trianglelefteq (\top \square \rightarrow p) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ll} \text{(veq)} & p \trianglelefteq q \square \rightarrow p \\ \text{(cs)} & p \wedge q \trianglelefteq p \square \rightarrow q \end{array}$$

We find the following frame correspondence conditions.

Proposition 5.1. *A general frame $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ validates $\mathbf{ax} \in \{\text{refl}, \text{cond}, \text{veq}, \text{cs}\}$ if and only if it satisfies the frame condition (\mathbf{ax} -corr) given by:*

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(refl-corr)} & s(x, a) \subseteq a \quad \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } a \in A; \\ \text{(cond-corr)} & x \in a \text{ implies } s(x, X) \subseteq a \quad \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } a \in A; \\ \text{(veq-corr)} & x \in a \text{ implies } s(x, b) \subseteq a \quad \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } a, b \in A; \\ \text{(cs-corr)} & x \in a \cap b \text{ implies } s(x, a) \subseteq b \text{ for all } x \in X \text{ and } a, b \in A. \end{array}$$

Furthermore, if \mathfrak{G} is full or descriptive then (veq-corr) and (cs-corr) are equivalent to, respectively,

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(veq-corr')} & s(x, a) \subseteq \uparrow x \quad \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } a \in A; \\ \text{(cs-corr')} & x \in a \text{ implies } s(x, a) \subseteq \uparrow x \quad \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } a \in A; \end{array}$$

Next, we show that satisfaction of the correspondence conditions is preserved when moving from selection L-space \mathbb{X} to the selection L-frame $\kappa_1\mathbb{X}$. In the context of normal modal logic, this property is sometimes called d -persistence [46, Definition 5.84]. Correspondingly, we call the move from spaces to frames κ_1 -persistence.

Lemma 5.2. *The axioms **refl**, **cond**, **veq** and **cs** are all κ_1 -persistent.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, \tau)$ be a selection L-space. Suppose \mathbb{X} satisfies (refl-corr). Then we have $s(x, a) \subseteq a$ for all $x \in X$ and all clopen filters a of \mathbb{X} . We need to prove that $s_1(x, a) \subseteq a$ for all filters a of $(X, 1, \lambda)$. If a is a clopen filter, then we have $s_1(x, a) = s(x, a) \subseteq a$. If not, then $s_1(x, a) = \{1\} \subseteq a$ because all filters contain 1. So $\kappa_1\mathbb{X}$ satisfies (refl-corr). This proves that **refl** is κ_1 -persistent. The cases for **cond** and **veq** are similar, using ($\text{veq-corr}'$) for the latter.

To prove κ_1 -persistence of **cs** we use the correspondence condition ($\text{cs-corr}'$). Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, \tau)$ be a conditional L-space that satisfies ($\text{cs-corr}'$). We show that $x \in a$ implies $s_1(x, a) \subseteq \uparrow x$ for every filter a of $(X, 1, \lambda)$. Let a be such a filter and $x \in a$. If a is a clopen filter of \mathbb{X} , then we have $s_1(x, a) = s(x, a) \subseteq \uparrow x$. If not, then $s_1(x, a) = \{1\} \subseteq \uparrow x$. \square

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\mathbf{Ax} \subseteq \{\text{refl}, \text{cond}, \text{veq}, \text{cs}\}$. Then the logic $\text{CL}(\{\mathbf{Ax}\})$ is sound and complete with respect to the class of selection L-frames that satisfy (\mathbf{ax} -corr) for each $\mathbf{ax} \in \mathbf{Ax}$.*

Proof. Soundness follows from Proposition 5.1. Completeness can be shown as in Theorem 4.12, using the fact that Lemma 5.2 implies that a selection L-space validating \mathbf{Ax} gives rise to a selection L-frame validating \mathbf{Ax} . \square

We have seen four axioms that are all κ_1 -persistent. But there might be other ways to extend a topological selection function to a selection function that preserves the axioms. For example, if $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, \tau)$ is a selection L-space we could define

$$s_r(x, a) = \begin{cases} s(x, a) & \text{if } a \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}} \mathbb{X} \\ a & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and define $\kappa_r\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \lambda, s_r)$. Then **refl**, **cond** and **veq** are κ_r -persistent as well.

In the next subsection we will see some axioms that are persistent for any transformation from selection L-spaces to selection L-frames obtained by extending the selection function and forgetting the topology.

5.2 Fill-in agnostic axioms

We say that an axiom is *all-persistent* if its validity is preserved by any extension of a topological selection function of a selection L-space to a selection function for the underlying L-frame. Such axioms are nice because they can be combined with other axioms that require more specialised fill-ins. Moreover, it turns out that every $\Box \rightarrow$ -free axiom is all-persistent. This affords us the possibility to add, for example, distributivity or modularity to a large range of logics.

We consider the following axioms and class of axioms:

- (det) $(\top \Box \rightarrow p) \leq p$ (prop) any $\Box \rightarrow$ -free consequence pair
(expl) $\top \leq (\perp \Box \rightarrow p)$

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, A)$ be a general conditional L-frame. Then \mathfrak{G} validates **det** if and only if it satisfies*

$$\text{(det-corr)} \quad s(x, X) \subseteq a \text{ implies } x \in a \quad \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } a \in A;$$

and \mathfrak{G} validates **expl** if and only if it satisfies

$$\text{(expl-corr)} \quad s(x, \{1\}) = \{1\} \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

Moreover, if \mathfrak{G} is full or descriptive then it validates **det** if and only if it satisfies

$$\text{(det-corr')} \quad x \in s(x, X) \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

Lemma 5.5. *The axioms **det**, **expl** and **prop** are all-consistent.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, \tau)$ be a selection L-space and let \hat{s} be a selection function for $(X, 1, \wedge)$ such that $\hat{s}(x, a) = s(x, a)$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$. Write $\hat{\kappa}\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, \hat{s})$. If \mathbb{X} validates **det**, then it satisfies $x \in s(x, X)$ for all $x \in X$. Since X is a clopen filter of \mathbb{X} , we have $\hat{s}(x, X) = s(x, X) \ni x$ for all $x \in X$, so $\hat{\kappa}\mathbb{X}$ satisfies **(det-corr')** hence validates **det**. The case for **expl** is similar, making use of the fact that $\{1\}$ is a clopen filter by definition.

The case for **prop** follows from [25, Lemma 3.21] and the fact that the interpretation of $\Box \rightarrow$ -free formulas does not rely on the (topological) selection function. \square

Theorem 5.6. *Let $\text{Ax} \subseteq \{\text{refl}, \text{cond}, \text{veq}, \text{cs}, \text{det}, \text{expl}, \text{prop}\}$. Then $\text{CL}(\text{Ax})$ is sound and complete with respect to the class of conditional L-frames that validate **ax** for each $\text{ax} \in \text{Ax}$.*

Proof. This is similar to Theorem 5.3, using Lemma 5.5 for the new axioms. \square

Like Theorem 5.3, Theorem 5.6 can also be formulated in terms of the a class of frames satisfying **(ax-corr)** for each $\text{ax} \in \text{Ax}$, where for each $\Box \rightarrow$ -free axiom has a frame correspondent [25, Theorem 3.32].

5.3 Sub-sub-intuitionistic logic versus intuitionistic conditional logic

We use Theorem 5.6 to investigate the extension of CL with a specific instance of **prop**, namely the distributivity axiom $p \wedge (q \vee r) \leq (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$. This gives rise to a minimal system of conditional logic over a *distributive* positive base, so we will call the resulting logic PCL for positive conditional logic. This logic is of particular interest because of the way it relates to the intuitionistic conditional logic ICK, introduced by Weiss [42]: intuitionistic conditional logic is a conservative extension of PCL. Before proceeding, we recall the definition of intuitionistic conditional logic.

Definition 5.7. Let $\text{Int}_{\Box \rightarrow}(\text{Prop})$ be the language given by the grammar

$$\varphi ::= p \in \text{Prop} \mid \top \mid \perp \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \rightarrow \varphi \mid \varphi \Box \rightarrow \varphi,$$

where Prop is some arbitrary but fixed set of proposition letters. Intuitionistic conditional logic [42] is the logic ICK obtained by extending an axiomatisation of intuitionistic logic with the axioms

$$\begin{aligned} p \Box \rightarrow \top, & & (p \Box \rightarrow (q \wedge r)) \rightarrow ((p \Box \rightarrow q) \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow r)), \\ & & ((p \Box \rightarrow q) \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow r)) \rightarrow (p \Box \rightarrow (q \wedge r)), \end{aligned}$$

the congruence rules, and closing it under modus ponens and uniform substitution. The algebraic semantics of ICK is given by Heyting algebras with a binary operator $\Box \rightarrow$ satisfying the condition above. These are called *conditional Heyting algebras*.

We assume that PCL and ICK are defined over the same set of proposition letters. In order to describe the frames for PCL, we define what it means for a semilattice to be distributive.

Definition 5.8. A semilattice $(X, 1, \wedge)$ is called *distributive* if for all $x, y, z \in X$ such that $x \wedge y \preceq z$ we can find $u, v \in X$ such that $x \preceq u$ and $y \preceq v$ and $z = u \wedge v$.

Now as a consequence of [25, Example 3.33] and Theorem 5.6 we have:

Theorem 5.9. *The logic PCL is sound and complete with respect to the class of distributive selection L-frames.*

We aim to prove that ICK is a conservative extension of PCL, in the sense that a consequence pair $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ is derivable in PCL if and only if the formula $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ is derivable in ICK. We prove this algebraically by making use of the fact that the complex algebra of any distributive selection L-frame can be equipped with a Heyting implication. This yields a conditional Heyting algebra [42, Definition 3].

Lemma 5.10. *Let $\mathfrak{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s)$ be a distributive selection L-frame. Then the complex algebra \mathfrak{X}^+ satisfies the frame distributivity law, that is, we have*

$$p \cap \bigvee \{q_i \mid i \in I\} = \bigvee \{p \cap q_i \mid i \in I\}$$

for every filter $p \in \mathfrak{X}^+$ and family of filters $\{q_i \mid i \in I\} \subseteq \mathfrak{X}^+$.

Proof. We have $q_i \subseteq \bigvee \{q_i \mid i \in I\}$ for all $i \in I$, so that each $p \cap q_i$ is contained in $p \cap \bigvee \{q_i \mid i \in I\}$. Therefore $p \cap \bigvee \{q_i \mid i \in I\}$ is an upper bound for the disjunction on the right hand side, which proves the right-to-left inclusion.

For the converse, suppose $x \in p \cap \bigvee \{q_i \mid i \in I\}$. Then $x \in p$ and $x \in \bigvee \{q_i \mid i \in I\}$, and by definition of \bigvee we can find a finite $I' \subseteq I$ such that $x \in \bigvee \{q_i \mid i \in I'\}$ (see e.g. [25, Section 2.1]). Distributivity of \mathfrak{X} implies distributivity of \mathfrak{X}^+ , so that we find

$$x \in p \cap \bigvee \{q_i \mid i \in I'\} = \bigvee \{p \cap q_i \mid i \in I'\} \subseteq \bigvee \{p \cap q_i \mid i \in I\}.$$

This proves the inclusion from left to right. □

Theorem 5.11. *Let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{CL}$ be two formulas and $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ a consequence pair. Then*

$$\mathbf{PCL} \vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbf{ICK} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi.$$

Proof. If $\mathbf{PCL} \vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$, then $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ is valid on all distributive conditional lattices. In particular, this means that for every distributive conditional lattice \mathfrak{A} and every assignment σ of the proposition letters, we have $\langle \varphi \rangle_{(\mathfrak{A}, \sigma)} \leq \langle \psi \rangle_{(\mathfrak{A}, \sigma)}$. In particular, this holds for all conditional Heyting algebras, which implies that $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ is valid on all conditional Heyting algebras. Therefore we have $\mathbf{ICK} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ [42, Theorem 5].

For the converse direction, we argue by contrapositive. Suppose that $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ is not derivable in PCL. Then there exists a distributive selection L-frame \mathfrak{X} that does not validate it. Therefore its complex algebra \mathfrak{X}^+ does not validate $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$, so there exists an assignment σ of the proposition letters to the complex algebra such that $\langle \varphi \rangle_{(\mathfrak{X}^+, \sigma)} \not\leq \langle \psi \rangle_{(\mathfrak{X}^+, \sigma)}$. As a consequence of Lemma 5.10 the distributive lattice underlying \mathfrak{X}^+ is a frame, hence carries a Heyting algebra structure [48, Proposition 3.10.2]. Therefore \mathfrak{X}^+ is a conditional Heyting algebra. The residuation property then implies that $\top_{\mathfrak{X}^+} \not\leq \langle \varphi \rangle \rightarrow \langle \psi \rangle = \langle \varphi \rightarrow \psi \rangle$, so that \mathfrak{X}^+ is a conditional Heyting algebra invalidating $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$. This implies that $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ is not derivable in ICK. □

5.4 Two more extensions and the principal fill-in

We now consider the extension of CL with any of the following axioms:

$$\text{(pnp)} \quad p \wedge (p \square \rightarrow \perp) \trianglelefteq \perp \qquad \text{(mp)} \quad p \wedge (p \square \rightarrow q) \trianglelefteq q$$

The axiom **pnp** reflects the idea that whenever p is true at some world, then it can not at the same time imply falsum. Intuitively this means that $p \square \rightarrow \perp$ behaves somewhat like a negation of p , albeit a very weak one. The axiom **mp** can be viewed as a local version of modus ponens.

From a technical point of view these axioms are interesting because they are not κ_1 -persistent. This is illustrated by the following example.

Example 5.12. Let $\mathbb{N}_\infty = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ be the set of natural numbers with an additional point ∞ , and let τ be the collection of subsets of \mathbb{N} together with the cofinite subsets of \mathbb{N}_∞ that contain ∞ . Then $(\mathbb{N}_\infty, \tau)$ is compact (it is the one-point compactification of \mathbb{N} equipped with the discrete topology.)

Order \mathbb{N}_∞ by the reverse natural ordering, that is, we let $n \preceq m$ if $n = \infty$ or $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \leq n$. Then \mathbb{N}_∞ forms a semilattice where $x \wedge y$ is simply the maximum of the two. It is easy to see that $(\mathbb{N}_\infty, 0, \wedge)$ is a distributive semilattice. The clopen filters of $(\mathbb{N}_\infty, 0, \wedge, \tau)$ are precisely the subsets of the form $\uparrow_{\preceq} n := \{x \in \mathbb{N}_\infty \mid n \preceq x\} = \{0, \dots, n\}$. As a consequence, the collection of clopen filters is closed under ∇ , because $(\uparrow_{\preceq} n) \nabla (\uparrow_{\preceq} m) = \uparrow_{\preceq} (n \wedge m)$. Finally, $(\mathbb{N}_\infty, 0, \wedge, \tau)$ satisfies the HMS separation axiom because if $n \not\preceq m$ then $\uparrow_{\preceq} n$ is a clopen filter containing n but not m . So $(\mathbb{N}_\infty, 0, \wedge, \tau)$ is an L-space.

Define a selection function s by $s(n, a) = \uparrow n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_\infty$ and clopen filters a . Then the conditional L-space validates **pnp** and **mp** because it satisfies the correspondence conditions from Proposition 5.13. However, if we transform this to a conditional L-frame $(\mathbb{N}_\infty, 0, \wedge, s_1)$, using the selection function s_1 as defined in Lemma 5.2 then this is no longer the case. For example, take the number $2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and the (non-clopen) filter $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{N}_\infty$. Then we have $2 \in \mathbb{N}$ while $2 \notin \{0\} = s_1(2, \mathbb{N})$.

Another reason for extending CL with the axioms above is that they give rise to logics that lie between CL and intuitionistic logic. In fact, they are closely related to the equational definition of Heyting algebras [49, Section II.1, Example 11], and we shall see in the next section that extending CL with these two axioms and **refl** gives rise to intuitionistic logic. We move on to the correspondence results.

Proposition 5.13. *Let $\mathfrak{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, A)$ be a general conditional L-frame. Then \mathfrak{X} validates $\mathbf{ax} \in \{\mathbf{mp}, \mathbf{veq}\}$ if and only if it satisfies $(\mathbf{ax}\text{-corr})$, given by:*

- (**pnp**-corr) *if $x \in a$ and $s(x, a) = \{1\}$ then $x = 1$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in A$;*
- (**mp**-corr) *if $x \in a$ and $s(x, a) \subseteq b$ then $x \in b$ for all $x \in X$ and $a, b \in A$.*

Moreover, if \mathfrak{G} is full or descriptive then it validates **mp** if and only if it satisfies

- (**mp**-corr') *$x \in a$ implies $x \in s(x, a)$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in A$.*

As witnessed by Example 5.12, we cannot use κ_1 -persistence to derive completeness results for the extension of CL with **pnp**, **mp**. Instead, we use the *principal fill-in*, or κ_\uparrow -*fill-in*, and κ_\uparrow -persistence, defined next.

Definition 5.14. Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, \tau)$ be a conditional L-space. Define

$$s_\uparrow(x, a) = \begin{cases} s(x, a) & \text{if } a \text{ is a filter that is clopen in } \mathbb{X} \\ \uparrow x & \text{if } a \text{ is a non-clopen filter} \end{cases}$$

and let $\kappa_\uparrow \mathbb{X} := (X, 1, \wedge, s_\uparrow)$. A consequence pair $\varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ is called κ_\uparrow -*persistent* if $\mathbb{X} \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$ implies $\kappa_\uparrow \mathbb{X} \Vdash \varphi \trianglelefteq \psi$, for every selection L-space \mathbb{X} .

To see that s_\uparrow does indeed define a selection function on $(X, 1, \wedge)$ we need to verify (S_1, S_2, S_3) for non-clopen a (the case for clopen a it taken care of by the fact that s is a topological selection function). The first two are immediate, and the last follows from the fact that $\uparrow x \nabla \uparrow y = \uparrow(x \wedge y)$.

Lemma 5.15. *The axioms **pnp**, **mp** and **veq** are κ_\uparrow -persistent.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, \tau)$ be a selection L-space and suppose that it validates **pnp**. We show that $\kappa_\uparrow \mathbb{X}$ satisfies (**pnp**-corr). Let a be any filter of $\kappa_\uparrow \mathbb{X}$ and $x \in a$ such that $s_\uparrow(x, a) = \{1\}$. If a is clopen then we have $x = 1$ because \mathbb{X} satisfies (**pnp**-corr). If not, then we have $s_\uparrow(x, a) = \uparrow x \subseteq \{1\}$, which also forces $x = 1$. So $\kappa_\uparrow \mathbb{X}$ satisfies (**pnp**-corr), hence validates **pnp**.

The cases for **mp** and **veq** can be handled similarly. \square

We arrive at a completeness theorem akin to Theorem 5.3.

Theorem 5.16. *Let $\mathbf{Ax} \subseteq \{\mathbf{pnp}, \mathbf{mp}, \mathbf{veq}, \mathbf{det}, \mathbf{expl}, \mathbf{prop}\}$. Then the logic $\mathbf{CL}(\mathbf{Ax})$ is sound and complete with respect to the class of conditional L-frames that validate \mathbf{ax} for each $\mathbf{ax} \in \mathbf{Ax}$.*

5.5 Semilattice semantics for intuitionistic logic

Lastly, we consider the extension of CL with the axioms [refl](#), [mp](#) and [veq](#). This is particularly interesting, because the algebraic semantics of $\text{CL}(\{\text{refl}, \text{mp}, \text{veq}\})$ is given by the class of Heyting algebras. Therefore we obtain an alternative semantics for intuitionistic logic which is based on semilattices.

In fact, it will turn out that we can forget about the selection function, and use distributive semilattices as a sound and complete semantics for intuitionistic logic! This simplifies existing semantics for intuitionistic logic from the literature that use (semi)lattices, such as those in [\[50, 51\]](#).

Proposition 5.17. *The algebraic semantics of $\text{CK}(\{\text{refl}, \text{mp}, \text{veq}\})$ is given by the variety of Heyting algebras.*

Proof. The inequalities induced by the additional axioms are valid in every Heyting algebra and imply the those equationally defining Heyting algebras, such as those in [\[49, Section II.1, Example 11\]](#). \square

Lemma 5.18. *Let $\mathfrak{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, A)$ be a full or descriptive general conditional L-frame. Then \mathfrak{X} validates [refl](#), [mp](#) and [veq](#) if and only if*

$$s(x, a) = a \cap \uparrow x \quad \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } a \in A. \quad (\text{refl-mp-veq-corr})$$

Proof. It suffices to show that $s(x, a) = a \cap \uparrow x$ if and only if [\(refl-corr\)](#), [\(veq-corr'\)](#) and [\(mp-corr'\)](#) are satisfied for x and a . If $s(x, a) = a \cap \uparrow x$, then it is easy to see that each of these holds. Conversely, the first and last conditions imply $s(x, a) \subseteq a \cap \uparrow x$. For the reverse inclusion, if $y \in a \cap \uparrow x$ then $y \in a$ and $x \preceq y$ so that $y \in s(y, a) \subseteq s(x, a)$ by [\(mp-corr'\)](#) and [\(S₂\)](#) respectively. \square

We characterise exactly which L-frames we can equip with such a selection function.

Lemma 5.19. *Let $(X, 1, \wedge)$ be an L-frame and define a selection function s by $s(x, p) = p \cap \uparrow x$. Then s is a selection function if and only if $(X, 1, \wedge)$ is distributive.*

Proof. Suppose s is a selection function and $x, y, z \in X$ are such that $x \wedge y \preceq z$. Then $z \in s(x \wedge y, \uparrow z)$ so by [Lemma 3.10](#) $z \in s(x, \uparrow z) \nabla s(y, \uparrow z)$. Therefore we can find $u \in s(x, \uparrow z)$ and $v \in s(y, \uparrow z)$ such that $u \wedge v \preceq z$. Since $s(x, \uparrow z) = \uparrow z \cap \uparrow x$ we find $x \preceq u$ and $z \preceq u$, and similarly $y \preceq v$ and $z \preceq v$. This implies $u \wedge v \preceq z \preceq u \wedge v$, so that $u \wedge v = z$. This proves distributivity.

For the converse, note that $s(1, p) = p \cap \uparrow 1 = \{1\}$ because 1 is the largest element of the frame and $1 \in p$ for any filter p . Furthermore, it follows immediately from the definition of s that $x \preceq y$ implies $s(y, p) \subseteq s(x, p)$. So [\(S₁\)](#) and [\(S₂\)](#) are satisfied. Lastly, to prove that [\(S₃\)](#) holds we use that $(X, 1, \wedge)$ is distributive. Suppose $z \in s(x \wedge y, p) = p \cap \uparrow(x \wedge y)$. Then $z \in p$ and $x \wedge y \preceq z$, so that distributivity gives two worlds u, v above x and y respectively such that $u \wedge v = z$. Clearly $u, v \in p$, so that $u \in s(x, p)$ and $v \in s(y, p)$, as desired. \square

Theorem 5.20. *The logic $\text{CL}(\{\text{refl}, \text{mp}, \text{veq}\})$ is sound and complete with respect to the class of L-frames satisfying [\(refl-mp-veq-corr\)](#).*

Proof. Soundness follows from [Lemma 5.18](#). For completeness suppose $\varphi \leq \psi$ is not derivable in $\text{CL}(\{\text{refl}, \text{mp}, \text{veq}\})$. Then there exists a conditional L-space $\mathbb{X} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, \tau)$ satisfying $s(x, a) = a \cap \uparrow x$ for all $x \in X$ and clopen filters a . As a consequence of the fact that every Heyting algebra is distributive [\[45, Proposition 1.5.3\]](#), the dual conditional lattice $\mathcal{F}_{\text{clp}}(\mathbb{X})$ is distributive, and hence $(X, 1, \wedge)$ is a distributive semilattice. [Lemma 5.19](#) then informs us that setting $\hat{s}(x, p) = p \cap \uparrow x$ yields a conditional L-frame $(X, 1, \wedge, \hat{s})$. Since \hat{s} extends s , the valuation for \mathbb{X} that invalidates $\varphi \leq \psi$ does the same for $(X, 1, \wedge, \hat{s})$. This proves completeness. \square

We note that in this semantics we have:

$$\begin{aligned} x \Vdash \varphi \Box \rightarrow \psi & \text{ iff } s(x, \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket) \subseteq \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \\ & \text{ iff } \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \cap \uparrow x \subseteq \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \\ & \text{ iff } \forall y \succ x(y \Vdash \varphi \text{ implies } y \Vdash \psi) \end{aligned}$$

which should remind the reader of the usual interpretation of implication in intuitionistic Kripke frames. Furthermore, in light of [Lemma 5.19](#) we can do away with the selection function altogether.

Thus, we can interpret intuitionistic logic in distributive semilattices with a valuation that assigns to each proposition letter a filter of the semilattice. Let $(X, 1, \wedge, V)$ be such a distributive semilattice with a valuation, then the interpretation of an intuitionistic formula φ is defined recursively by:

$$x \Vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall y \succ x (y \Vdash \varphi \text{ implies } y \Vdash \psi)$$

together with the conditions from Definition 2.4. We call this the *semilattice semantics* of intuitionistic logic. We obtain the following theorem as a consequence of Theorem 5.20.

Theorem 5.21. *Intuitionistic logic is sound and complete with respect to semilattice semantics.*

6 Future work

We studied non-distributive positive logic with a weak notion of implication. Guided by the semantics for (classical) conditional logic, we provided a semantic framework for the logic given by semilattices with a selection function. By augmenting these frames with a topology, a duality for (the algebraic semantics of) the logic was derived, which we then used to prove completeness.

We started with a weak form of implication so that one can modularly add additional axioms. We showcased this flexibility by giving sound and complete semantics for the extension of CL with (combinations of) a number of axioms. This revealed an interesting phenomenon, namely the need to extend a topological selection function (whose second argument only takes clopen filters) to a selection function that can handle all filters. We also discovered that there seems to be no canonical fill-in to handle all axioms, as different axioms sometimes require different fill-ins in their completeness proofs.

The work in this paper opens up many avenues for future work, some of which we briefly discuss below.

Extensions with more complex axioms The axioms considered in Section 5 are all relatively simple in the sense that they contain at most one occurrence of $\Box \rightarrow$. In future work, we intend to investigate other extensions, such as transitivity and cautious monotonicity:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(tr)} \quad & (p \Box \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \Box \rightarrow r) \leq (p \Box \rightarrow r) \\ \text{(cm)} \quad & (p \Box \rightarrow q) \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow r) \leq ((p \wedge q) \Box \rightarrow r). \end{aligned}$$

Sahlqvist correspondence and canonicity Sahlqvist correspondence for classical modal logic identifies a large class of axioms for which one can mechanically find a frame correspondent. Sahlqvist completeness subsequently proves completeness for the extension of modal logic with a set of Sahlqvist formulas with respect to the class of Kripke frames satisfying the corresponding frame conditions, see for example [46, Sections 3.6 and 5.6]. Similar results have been proven for a wide range of logics, including both weak positive logic and its modal extension investigated in [25].

It would be interesting to see to what extent we can obtain similar results for CL. The multitude of fill-ins for topological selection functions may make this more challenging, as each fill-in may require its own formula shape. Related work in the intuitionistic setting was recently presented in [52].

Filtrations Filtrations provide a method of turning a model that falsifies some formula or consequence pair into a finite model, such that it still falsifies the given formula or consequence pair. Therefore they can be used to obtain finite model properties. While filtrations for classical conditional logics are well understood [37, 36], it appears that the non-distributivity of CL frustrates attempts to carry over the same definitions in our setting. Further research is required to resolve this, and therewith obtain a finite model property.

Diamond-like conditional implication Throughout this paper we focussed on a conditional implication whose second argument behaves like a “normal box,” in the sense that it preserves finite meets. But one could wonder what happens if we add another implication, $\Diamond \rightarrow$ whose second argument behaves like a diamond. This is particularly interesting because in the modal extension of weak positive logic studied in [25], boxes and diamonds relate in an unexpected way: whereas boxes are normal and diamonds are only monotone, and their interaction is described by one of the two interaction axioms of (distributive) positive modal logic [43].

References

- [1] A. Visser, “A propositional logic with explicit fixed points,” *Studia Logica*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 155–175, 1981.
- [2] A. Visser, *Aspects of Diagonalization and Provability*. PhD thesis, University of Utrecht, 1981. [ilic-hds:HDS-22](#).
- [3] G. Restall, “Subintuitionistic logics,” *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logics*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 116–129, 1994.
- [4] G. Corsi, “Weak logics with strict implication,” *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 389–406, 1987.
- [5] D. d. Jongh and F. S. Maleki, “Subintuitionistic logics and the implications they prove,” *Indagationes Mathematicae*, vol. 29, pp. 1525–1545, 2018.
- [6] D. de Jongh and F. S. Maleki, “Two neighborhood semantics for subintuitionistic logics,” in *Proc. TbiLLC 2018*, (Berlin, Heidelberg), Springer, 2019.
- [7] J. d. Groot and D. Pattinson, “Monotone subintuitionistic logic: Duality and transfer results,” *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 213–242, 2022.
- [8] K. Sasaki, “Formalization for the consequence relation of Visser’s propositional logic,” *Reports on Mathematical Logic*, vol. 33, pp. 65–78, 1999.
- [9] Y. Suzuki and H. Ono, “Hilbert-style proof system for BPL,” 1997. Technical report, IS-RR-97-0040F.
- [10] H. Wansing, “Displaying as temporalizing: Sequent systems for subintuitionistic logics,” in *Logic, Language and Computation*, (Dordrecht), pp. 159–178, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- [11] G. M. Hardegree, “The conditional in quantum logic,” *Synthese*, vol. 29, no. 1/4, Logic and Probability in Quantum Mechanics, pp. 63–80, 1974.
- [12] M. L. D. Chiara and R. Giuntini, “Quantum logics,” 2008. [arxiv:0101028v2](#).
- [13] Y. Younes and I. Schmitt, “On quantum implication,” *Quantum Machine Intelligence*, vol. 1, pp. 53–63, 2019.
- [14] L. Champollion, “Distributivity in formal semantics,” *Annual review of linguistics*, vol. 5, pp. 289–308, 2019.
- [15] D. Lewis, *Counterfactuals*. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- [16] M. L. D. Chiara, “A general approach to non-distributive logics,” *Studia Logica*, vol. 35, pp. 139–162, 1976.
- [17] G. Restall and F. Paoli, “The geometry of non-distributive logics,” *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 1108–1126, 2005.
- [18] R. Cockett and R. Seely, “Finite sum-product logic,” *Theory and Applications of Categories*, vol. 8, 2001.
- [19] A. Urquhart, “A topological representation theory for lattices,” *Algebra Universalis*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 45–58, 1978.
- [20] M. Gehrke, “Generalized Kripke frames,” *Studia Logica*, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 241–275, 2006.
- [21] W. Conradie, A. Palmigiano, C. Robinson, and N. Wijnberg, “Non-distributive logics: from semantics to meaning,” 2021. [arxiv:2002.04257](#).
- [22] J. d. Groot, “Non-distributive positive logic as a fragment of first-order logic over semilattices,” *Journal of Logic and Computation*, vol. 34, pp. 180–196, 2024.
- [23] G. Hartung, “A topological representation of lattices,” *Algebra Universalis*, vol. 29, pp. 273–299, 1992.
- [24] C. Hartonas and J. M. Dunn, “Stone duality for lattices,” *Algebra universalis*, vol. 37, pp. 391–401, 1997.
- [25] N. Bezhanishvili, A. Dmitrieva, J. de Groot, and T. Moraschini, “Positive modal logic beyond distributivity,” *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 175, no. 2, p. 103374, 2024.
- [26] J. Y. Girard, “Linear logic,” *Theoretical computer science*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 1–101, 1987.
- [27] M. Moortgat, “Categorical type logics,” in *Handbook of logic and language*, pp. 93–177, Elsevier, 1997.
- [28] J. Lambek, “The mathematics of sentence structure,” *The American Mathematical Monthly*, vol. 65, pp. 154–170, 1958.
- [29] H. d. Vries, “Two kinds of distributivity,” *Natural Language Semantics*, pp. 173–197, 2017.
- [30] K. H. Hofmann, M. Mislove, and A. Stralka, *The Pontryagin duality of compact 0-dimensional semi-lattices and its applications*. Berlin, New York: Springer, 1974.
- [31] R. Routley and R. Meyer, “The semantics of entailment,” *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, vol. 68, pp. 199–243, 1973.
- [32] J. M. Dunn and G. Restall, “Relevance logic,” in *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*, vol. 6, pp. 1–128, Dordrecht: Springer, 2002.
- [33] B. F. Chellas, “Basic conditional logic,” *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 133–153, 1975. [jstor:30226114](#).
- [34] B. F. Chellas, *Modal Logic: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- [35] D. M. Gabbay, “Theoretical foundations for non-monotonic reasoning in expert systems,” in *Logics and Models of Concurrent Systems*, (Berlin, Heidelberg), pp. 439–457, Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- [36] D. Nute, “Topics in conditional logic,” *Studia Logica*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 175–176, 1988.
- [37] K. Segerberg, “Notes on conditional logic,” *Studia Logica*, vol. 48, pp. 157–168, Jun 1989.
- [38] M. Unterhuber and G. Schurz, “Completeness and correspondence in Chellas-Segerberg semantics,” *Studia Logica*, vol. 102, pp. 891–911, 2014.
- [39] A. Baltag and G. Cinà, “Bisimulation for conditional modalities,” *Studia Logica*, vol. 106, pp. 1–33, 2018.
- [40] M. Girlando, *On the Proof Theory of Conditional Logics*. PhD thesis, Aix-Marseille Université and University of Helsinki, 2019.
- [41] M. Girlando, S. Negri, and G. Sbardolini, “Uniform labelled calculi for conditional and counterfactual logics,” in *Proc. WoLLIC 2019*, (Berlin, Heidelberg), pp. 248–263, Springer, 2019.
- [42] Y. Weiss, “Basic intuitionistic conditional logic,” *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 447–469, 2019.
- [43] J. M. Dunn, “Positive modal logic,” *Studia Logica*, vol. 55, pp. 301–317, 1995. [jstor:20015820](#).
- [44] A. Dmitrieva, “Positive modal logic beyond distributivity: duality, preservation and completeness,” Master’s thesis, Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, University of Amsterdam, 2021. [ilic-MoL:2021-18](#).

- [45] L. Esakia, *Preliminary Notions and Necessary Facts*, ch. 1, pp. 1–15. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Verlag, July 2019.
- [46] P. Blackburn, M. d. Rijke, and Y. Venema, *Modal Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [47] C. Kupke and D. Pattinson, “Coalgebraic semantics of modal logics: An overview,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 412, no. 38, pp. 5070–5094, 2011.
- [48] S. Vickers, *Topology via Logic*. New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- [49] S. Burris and H. P. Sankappanavar, *A Course in Universal Algebra*. Springer, post-2012 edition ed., 1981.
- [50] G. A. Kavvos, “Two-dimensional Kripke semantics II.” arxiv:[2406.03578v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.03578v1), 2024.
- [51] Y. Komori, “A new semantics for intuitionistic predicate logic,” *Studia Logica*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 9–17, 1986. jstor:[20015243](https://www.jstor.org/stable/20015243).
- [52] B. Dufty and J. de Groot, “Conditional Esakia duality,” 2024. Abstract presented at TACL.

A Correspondence results

A.1 Correspondence results for Section 5.1

The next four lemmas prove the four correspondence results from Proposition 5.1.

Lemma A.1. *A general frame $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ validates (refl) $\top \trianglelefteq p \square \rightarrow p$ if and only if it satisfies (refl-corr): $s(x, a) \subseteq a$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in A$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathfrak{G} satisfies (refl-corr) and let V be an admissible valuation for \mathfrak{G} . Then $V(p) \in A$ and by assumption $s(x, V(p)) \subseteq V(p)$ for all $x \in X$. This implies $x \Vdash p \square \rightarrow p$ for all x , hence the $(\mathfrak{G}, V) \Vdash \top \trianglelefteq p \square \rightarrow p$. Since V is arbitrary, we find that \mathfrak{G} validates $\top \trianglelefteq p \square \rightarrow p$.

For the converse, suppose \mathfrak{G} does not satisfy (refl-corr). Then there exist $x \in X$ and $a \in A$ such that $s(x, a) \not\subseteq a$. Let V be a valuation of the proposition letters such that $V(p) = a$. Then $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \not\Vdash p \square \rightarrow p$. This implies that \mathfrak{G} does not validate $\top \trianglelefteq p \square \rightarrow p$. \square

Lemma A.2. *A general frame $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ validates (cond) $p \trianglelefteq (\top \square \rightarrow p)$ if and only if it satisfies (cond-corr): $x \in a$ implies $s(x, X) \subseteq a$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in A$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathfrak{G} satisfies (cond-corr) and let V be an admissible valuation for \mathfrak{G} . Suppose $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p$, then $x \in V(p)$ so by assumption $s(x, X) \subseteq V(p)$ thus $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash \top \square \rightarrow p$. Since x and V are arbitrary this proves that \mathfrak{G} validates $p \trianglelefteq (\top \square \rightarrow p)$.

For the converse, suppose \mathfrak{G} does not satisfy (cond-corr). Then there exist $x \in X$ and $a \in A$ such that $x \in a$ and $s(x, X) \not\subseteq a$. Let V be a valuation such that $V(p) = a$. Then $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p$, but $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \not\Vdash \top \square \rightarrow p$ so \mathfrak{G} does not validate $p \trianglelefteq \top \square \rightarrow p$. \square

Lemma A.3. *A general frame $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ validates (veq) $p \trianglelefteq q \square \rightarrow p$ if and only if it satisfies (veq-corr): $x \in a$ implies $s(x, b) \subseteq a$ for all $x \in X$ and $a, b \in A$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathfrak{G} satisfies (veq-corr) and let V be an admissible valuation for \mathfrak{G} and suppose $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p$. Then $x \in V(p)$. so by assumption $s(x, V(q)) \subseteq V(p)$, hence $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p \square \rightarrow q$. Since x and V are arbitrary this proves that \mathfrak{G} validates $p \trianglelefteq q \square \rightarrow p$.

For the converse, suppose \mathfrak{G} does not satisfy (veq-corr). Then there exist $x \in X$ and $a, b \in A$ such that $x \in a$ and $s(x, b) \not\subseteq a$. Let V be a valuation of the proposition letters such that $V(p) = a$ and $V(q) = b$. Then $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p$ but $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \not\Vdash q \square \rightarrow p$ and so \mathfrak{G} does not validate $p \trianglelefteq q \square \rightarrow p$. \square

Lemma A.4. *A general frame $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ validates (cs) $p \wedge q \trianglelefteq p \square \rightarrow q$ if and only if it satisfies (cs-corr): $x \in a \cap b$ implies $s(x, a) \subseteq b$ for all $x \in X$ and $a, b \in A$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathfrak{G} satisfies (cs-corr) and let V be an admissible valuation for \mathfrak{G} . Suppose $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p \wedge q$. Then $x \in V(p) \cap V(q)$ so by assumption $s(x, V(p)) \subseteq V(q)$, hence $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p \square \rightarrow q$. Since x and V are arbitrary this proves that \mathfrak{G} validates $p \wedge q \trianglelefteq p \square \rightarrow q$.

For the converse, suppose \mathfrak{G} does not satisfy (cs-corr). Then there exist $x \in X$ and $a, b \in A$ such that $x \in a \cap b$ while $s(x, a) \not\subseteq b$. Let V be a valuation of the proposition letters such that $V(p) = a$ and $V(q) = b$. Then $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p \wedge q$ but $x \not\Vdash p \square \rightarrow q$, so \mathfrak{G} does not validate $p \wedge q \trianglelefteq p \square \rightarrow q$. \square

We now prove the “moreover” part of Proposition 5.1 for general frames that satisfy the HMS separation axiom. This suffices because both full and descriptive general frames satisfy it.

Lemma A.5. *Let $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ be a general frame that satisfies the HMS separation axiom. Then \mathfrak{G} validates (veq) $p \trianglelefteq q \square \rightarrow p$ if and only if it satisfies (veq-corr’): $s(x, a) \subseteq \uparrow x$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in A$.*

Proof. The direction from right to left follows from the fact that any general frame that satisfies (veq-corr’) also satisfies (veq).

For the converse, suppose \mathfrak{G} does not satisfy (veq-corr’). Then there exists $x \in X$ and $a \in A$ such that $s(x, a) \not\subseteq \uparrow x$. So there must be some $y \in s(x, a)$ such that $x \not\leq y$. As a consequence of the HMS separation axiom we can find some $b \in A$ containing x but not y . In particular this implies $s(x, a) \not\subseteq b$. Now let V be a valuation for \mathfrak{G} such that $V(p) = b$ and $V(q) = a$. Then $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p$ because $x \in b = V(p)$, but $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \not\Vdash q \square \rightarrow p$ because $s(x, V(q)) \not\subseteq V(p)$. \square

Lemma A.6. *Let $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ be a general frame that satisfies the HMS separation axiom. Then \mathfrak{G} validates (cs) $p \wedge q \trianglelefteq p \square \rightarrow q$ if and only if it satisfies (cs-corr’): $x \in a$ implies $s(x, a) \subseteq \uparrow x$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in A$.*

Proof. The direction from right to left follows from the fact that any general frame that satisfies $(\text{cs-corr})'$ also satisfies (cs-corr) .

For the converse, suppose \mathfrak{G} does not satisfy (refl-corr) . Then there exist $x \in X$ and $a \in A$ such that $x \in a$ while $s(x, a) \not\subseteq \uparrow x$. So there must be some $y \in s(x, a)$ such that $x \not\leq y$. As a consequence of the HMS separation axiom we can find some $b \in A$ containing y but not x . Now let V be a valuation of the proposition letters such that $V(p) = a$ and $V(q) = b$. Then by construction we have $x \Vdash p \wedge q$ but $x \not\Vdash p \Box \rightarrow q$, so \mathfrak{G} does not validate $p \wedge q \leq p \Box \rightarrow q$. \square

A.2 Correspondence results for Section 5.2

Lemma A.7. *A general frame $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ validates $(\text{det}) (\top \Box \rightarrow p) \leq p$ if and only if it satisfies (det-corr) : if $s(x, X) \subseteq a$ then $x \in a$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in A$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathfrak{G} satisfies (det-corr) . Let $x \in X$ and let V be an admissible valuation for \mathfrak{G} . If $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash \top \Box \rightarrow p$ then $s(x, X) \subseteq V(p)$ and since $V(p) \in A$ the assumption tells us that $x \in V(p)$. Therefore $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p$. $x \in s(x, X)$ by assumption we find $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p$. Since this holds for all worlds and valuations, \mathfrak{G} validates det .

For the converse, suppose that (det-corr) does not hold. Then there exist $x \in X$ and $a \in A$ such that $s(x, X) \subseteq a$ while $x \notin a$. Let V be a valuation such that $V(p) = a$. Then we have $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash \top \Box \rightarrow p$ while $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \not\Vdash p$, so \mathfrak{G} does not validate det . \square

Lemma A.8. *A general frame $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ validates $(\text{expl}) \top \leq (\perp \Box \rightarrow p)$ if and only if it satisfies (expl-corr) : $s(x, \{1\}) = \{1\}$ for all $x \in X$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathfrak{G} satisfies (expl-corr) . Let $x \in X$ and V be an admissible valuation for \mathfrak{G} . By assumption $s(x, \{1\}) = \{1\} \subseteq p$ and so $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash \perp \Box \rightarrow p$. Since this holds for all worlds and valuations, \mathfrak{G} validates (expl) .

For the converse, suppose that (expl-corr) does not hold. Then there exist $x \in X$ such that $s(x, \{1\}) \neq \{1\}$. Let V be any valuation, then $(\mathfrak{M}, V), x \not\Vdash \perp \Box \rightarrow \perp$. So \mathfrak{G} does not validate (expl) . \square

For the moreover part we use either the discreteness of a full general frame, or the compactness of a descriptive one.

Lemma A.9. *Let $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ be a general frame that is either full or descriptive. Then \mathfrak{G} validates $(\text{det}) (\top \Box \rightarrow p) \leq p$ if and only if it satisfies $(\text{det-corr})'$: $x \in s(x, X)$ for all $x \in X$.*

Proof. If \mathfrak{G} satisfies $(\text{det-corr})'$ then it also satisfies (det-corr) , so by Lemma A.7 it validates det . Conversely, if \mathfrak{G} does not satisfy $(\text{det-corr})'$ then there exists a world $x \in X$ such that $x \notin s(x, X)$. Now we can find an admissible filter a containing $s(x, X)$ but not x :

- if \mathfrak{G} is full we can take $a = s(x, X)$;
- if \mathfrak{G} is descriptive then we can use compactness to find such an a .

Let V be a valuation such that $V(p) = a$. Then $(\mathfrak{G}, V) \Vdash \top \Box \rightarrow p$ but $(\mathfrak{G}, V) \not\Vdash p$, so det is not valid on \mathfrak{G} . \square

A.3 Correspondence results for Section 5.4

The next lemmas prove Proposition 5.13.

Lemma A.10. *A general frame $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ validates $(\text{pnp}) p \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow \perp) \leq \perp$ if and only if it satisfies (pnp-corr) : if $x \in a$ and $s(x, a) = \{1\}$ then $x = 1$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in A$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathfrak{G} satisfies (pnp-corr) . Let $x \in X$ and let V be a valuation for \mathfrak{G} . If $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow \perp)$ then $x \in V(p)$ and $s(x, V(p)) = \{1\}$. So by assumption $x = 1$, hence $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash \perp$.

If \mathfrak{G} does not satisfy (pnp-corr) , then there exist $x \in X$ and $a \in A$ such that $x \in a$ and $s(x, a) = \{1\}$ but $x \neq 1$. Now if V is a valuation such that $V(p) = a$, we have $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow \perp)$ while $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \not\Vdash \perp$. \square

Lemma A.11. *A general frame $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \lambda, s, A)$ validates $(\text{mp}) p \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow q) \leq q$ if and only if it satisfies (mp-corr) : $x \in a$ and $s(x, a) \subseteq b$ implies $x \in b$ for all $x \in X$ and $a, b \in A$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathfrak{G} satisfies **(mp-corr)**. Let $x \in X$ and let V be a valuation for \mathfrak{G} . If $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow q)$, then $x \in V(p)$ and $s(x, V(p)) \subseteq V(q)$ so $x \in V(q)$ hence $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash q$. Since x and V were arbitrary, \mathfrak{G} validates **(mp)**.

For the converse, suppose that **(mp-corr)** does not hold. Then there exist $x \in X$ and $a, b \in A$ such that $x \in a$ and $s(x, a) \subseteq b$, but x is not in b . Let V be a valuation such that $V(p) = a$ and $V(q) = b$, then $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow q)$, but $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \not\Vdash q$. So \mathfrak{G} does not validate **(mp)**. \square

We now prove the “moreover” part of Proposition 5.13.

Lemma A.12. *Let $\mathfrak{G} = (X, 1, \wedge, s, A)$ be a general frame that is either full or descriptive. Then \mathfrak{G} validates **(mp)** $p \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow q) \triangleleft q$ if and only if it satisfies **(mp-corr')**: $x \in a$ implies $x \in s(x, a)$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in A$.*

Proof. If \mathfrak{G} satisfies **(mp-corr')** then it also satisfies **(mp-corr)**, so by Lemma A.11 it validates **mp**.

Conversely, suppose there exist $x \in X$ and $a \in A$ such that $x \in a$ but $x \notin s(x, a)$. Then in the same way as in Lemma A.9 we can find a filter b containing $s(x, a)$ which does not contain x . Let V be a valuation such that $V(p) = a$ and $V(q) = b$. Then $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \Vdash p \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow q)$ but $(\mathfrak{G}, V), x \not\Vdash q$, so **mp** is not valid. \square