



No title

Francesca Poggiolesi

► **To cite this version:**

| Francesca Poggiolesi. No title. 2019. hal-02091633

HAL Id: hal-02091633

<https://hal.science/hal-02091633>

Preprint submitted on 5 Apr 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Francesca Poggiolesi
Grounding axioms for (relevant) implication

Abstract

Most of the logics of grounding that have so far been proposed contain grounding axioms, or grounding rules, for the connectives of conjunction, disjunction and negation, but little attention has been dedicated to the implication connective. The present paper aims at repairing this situation by proposing adequate grounding axioms for relevant implication. Because of the interaction between negation and implication, new grounding axioms concerning negation will also arise.

1 Introduction

In the last ten years the notion of grounding has become a vibrant area of research, with the concept being studied from several different perspectives: some papers retrace the history of grounding (e.g. see ??), others deal with the metaphysics of grounding (e.g. see ??), others analyse the properties enjoyed by the notion of grounding (e.g. ??). Yet another approach concerns the logic of grounding: several different logics attempting to identify the structure underlying the notion of grounding have been developed. These logics differ in that they treat the notion of grounding either as a connective (e.g. see ???), or as a predicate (e.g. ?), or as a meta-linguistic relation (see ?). They converge in that they present grounding axioms, or grounding rules, for the classical connectives of conjunction, disjunction and negation. However, perhaps unsurprisingly, little has been said about the connective of implication. More precisely, ? is the only author who has explicitly formulated the grounding rules for implication, which are the following ones:

$$\frac{B}{A \rightarrow B \text{ because } B} \rightarrow^1 \quad \frac{\neg A}{A \rightarrow B \text{ because } \neg A} \rightarrow^2$$

These rules should be read in the following way. Suppose that B is true, then $A \rightarrow B$ is true because of B (or B is the ground of $A \rightarrow B$); suppose that $\neg A$ is true, then $A \rightarrow B$ is true because of $\neg A$ (or $\neg A$ is the ground of $A \rightarrow B$). Thus the grounds of $A \rightarrow B$ are $\neg A$ or B .

Let us confront these formal grounds for implication with some intuitions that might naturally arise when considering ordinary-language conditionals. Let us for example take into account the following three sentences:

1. “If the glass is thrown, then it falls,”

2. “If the ball is pushed, it will roll,”
3. “If snow is white, it is not black.”

What are the reasons for the truth of these sentences which all have the form “if A , then B ”? For the first conditional the answer seems to be the law of gravity: it is *because* there is the law of gravity that if the glass is thrown, then it falls. For the second conditional, the ground seems to be “the ball is a sphere:” it is *because* the ball is a sphere that if it is pushed, then it rolls. And for the third and last condition the answer seems to be “snow only has one color:” it is *because* snow only has one color that if it is white, it is not black.

These examples suggest an intuitive pattern concerning the grounds of conditionals: the ground of a conditional of the form “if A , then B ” is neither $\neg A$ nor B but a sentence C such that from A and C , B follows¹. These intuitions formulated in a completely non-formal way seem to be both natural and reasonable. Moreover, they only apply to a certain type of conditionals, namely indicative conditionals characterized by a connection between antecedent and consequent. This connection is very important since it precisely represents that which is grounded.

There is thus a contrast between, on the one hand, Schnieder’s rules according to which the grounds of an implication are basically its truth-conditions, and, on the other hand, the intuitions that the grounds of an implication is a sentence C such that the consequent (of the implication) follows from the antecedent (of the implication) and C . Instead of arguing which interpretation of the grounds of a conditional is the most adequate – this might be interesting task for further research – we will follow an analysis recently put forward in ? according to which there actually is a way to accommodate these two divergent approaches at the formal level: indeed while Schnieder’s rules are suited for the material implication and thus find their natural habitat in classical logic, the insights that we have just illustrated are suited for relevant implication and should thus be further developed in the framework of relevance logic (e.g. see ???). The aim of the present work is precisely this, namely to further develop the insights just exposed and to formulate adequate grounding axioms for relevant implication.

To develop our approach, we will rely on the work of ?, who presents a definition of the notion of complete and immediate formal grounding, which naturally motivates and justifies grounding axioms for the classical connectives. In this paper we will modify Poggiolesi’s definition in order to develop natural and justified grounding axioms for the relevant implication.

Another reason for starting from Poggiolesi’s approach is that her way of treating the grounds of sentences in negative form is in sync with previous intuitions about the grounds of indicative conditionals being characterized by a connection between antecedent and consequent. Indeed, Poggiolesi’s analysis is faithful to the intuition that the ground of a sentence like “it is not raining”

¹From now on, we use the term *following from* in ?’s sense. B follows from A, C if there is a deduction of B from A, C which actually uses A, C (and A, C alone).

is the sentence “it is sunny,” which is such that from “it is sunny” and “it is raining” a contradiction *follows*. At the formal level, this is captured by grounding axioms that all internalize the following schema: the ground of a formula $\neg A$ is a formula B (having a certain g-complexity) such that from A and B a contradiction is (relevantly) derivable.² This similarity suggests that Poggioli’s framework may be a fruitful starting point for our project.

Note that as the approach of ? only provides complete³ and immediate grounds for the classical connectives, our proposal, being based on it, will only provide complete and immediate grounds for (relevant) implication. The study of other types of grounds - complete and mediate, partial and immediate, partial and mediate - for implication is left for further research. Finally, our study being the first framework where negation and (relevant) implication interact, we will also enhance the complete and immediate grounding principles governing negation, notably adding principles regulating the complete and immediate grounds of negation of implication.

The paper is organized as follows. In *Section 2* we will briefly remind the reader the definition of the notion of complete and immediate grounding in the classical framework developed by ?. In *Section 3* we will adapt this definition for the framework of relevant logic. While in *Section 4* we will discuss the grounding principles concerning implication which emerge from the account of Section 3, in *Section 5* we will discuss the grounding principles concerning the negation of implication which emerge from the account of Section 3. In *Section 6* we will draw some conclusions.

2 A definition of the notion of complete and immediate formal grounding in a classical framework

We use this section to briefly recall the definition proposed in ? of the notion of complete and immediate formal grounding, which will play an important role in the sequel. Two very simple ideas motivate it. The first consists in organizing all formulas of the propositional classical language in a grounding hierarchy: each level of the hierarchy contains formulas of different complexity, with complexity increasing from bottom to top. Since the account is concerned with the notion of complete and immediate grounding, of particular interest are those formulas that belong to different levels of the hierarchy and are linked by the relation of being *completely and immediately less g-complex*.

Once all formulas are organized into the hierarchy, the task is to identify the formulas, among those entering into the relation of being completely and immediately less g-complex, that stand in a dependence relation. But how is

²Even if Poggioli’s approach is developed in classical logic, the derivations she uses for negative formulas are clearly relevant.

³Note that complete grounds are different from full grounds, which are often advocated in the literature. On the difference, see ??.

the dependence relation formally defined? By the two clauses of *positive* and *negative* derivability. Positive derivability states that the conclusion should be derivable from its grounds, while negative derivability states that the negation of the conclusion should be derivable from the negation of each ground. ? defends positive and negative derivability as the formal counterparts of a dependence relation. Thus, according to Poggioli's approach, a grounding relation is nothing but a dependence relation (given by positive and negative derivability) with an asymmetry or directionality, which is given by the increase of complexity from the grounds to the conclusion.

Note that the account put forward in ? involves a distinction between grounds and robust conditions, which can be described briefly on the example of a disjunction like $A \vee B$, in a situation where the formula A is true. In this case, A is certainly a ground for $A \vee B$; but in order for A to be the *complete* ground for $A \vee B$, it is necessary to specify that B is false (i.e. that B is not also a ground for $A \vee B$); in other terms, it is the falsity of B that ensures that, or is a (*robust*) *condition* for A to be the complete ground for $A \vee B$. Thus, A is the complete and immediate formal ground for $A \vee B$ under the robust condition that B is false.⁴ The reader is referred to ? for a detailed explanation and discussion of the idea of robust conditions in a grounding framework. Robust conditions are denoted by square brackets and will be introduced in Proposition ??.

We now present the formalism inspired by these ideas. We refer the reader to ? for an even more detailed explanation of the notions introduced here.

Definition 2.1. The classical language \mathcal{L}^c is composed of a denumerable stock of propositional atoms (p, q, r, \dots), the logical operators \neg, \wedge and \vee , the parentheses $(,)$ and the square brackets $[,]$. The connectives \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow are defined as usual; the symbol \perp is defined as $A \wedge \neg A$.

Once the classical language \mathcal{L}^c is given, we can standardly define, by means of the classical Hilbert system **C** (e.g. see ?), the notion of classical derivability. We will write $M \vdash_C A$ to denote the fact that the formula A is derivable in the Hilbert system for classical logic **C** from the multiset⁵ of formulas M .

We now introduce the key notion of g-complexity, which is a way of assigning a number to each formula of the language \mathcal{L}^c . The way that number is calculated reflects deep grounding-relevant features. As we will see, g-complexity straightforwardly leads to the identification of the relation of *being completely and immediately less g-complex*: a multiset M will be completely and immediately less g-complex than a formula A when the sum of the g-complexity of its members is one less than the g-complexity of A .

Definition 2.2. As it is standard, we call atoms as well as negation of atoms *literals*. l, l', \dots denote literals.

⁴Even if it is not spelled out in these terms, a similar idea can be found in ?.

⁵We work with multisets of formulas rather than with sets of formulas because we need to take into account the number of occurrences of each formula of M .

Definition 2.3. The g-complexity of a formula $A \in \mathcal{L}^c$, $gcm(A)$, is defined in the following way:

- $gcm(l) = 0$,
- $gcm(\neg\neg A) = gcm(A) + 1$,
- $gcm(A \circ B) = gcm(\neg(A \circ B)) = gcm(A) + gcm(B) + 1$.

where the symbol \circ stands for either conjunction or disjunction.

To understand the notion of g-complexity, it must be kept in mind that grounding is concerned entirely with truths. Accordingly, the appropriate notion of complexity should track relationships among the truths expressed by the formulas if they were true. If A and B express truths, then the truth expressed by $A \wedge B$ or $A \vee B$ is obtained from the previous truths using a single operation, just as the formulas $A \wedge B$ and $A \vee B$ are constructed from the formulas A and B using a single connective. Counting the connective in this case is faithful to the relationship of interest among truths and indeed $gcm(A \circ B) = gcm(A) + gcm(B) + 1$.

By contrast, the negation is different, because there is no sense in which the (true) negation of a truth is constructed from a truth itself. Consider for instance the formulas p and $\neg p$ (namely the literals). p is atomic thus has g-complexity 0, but does that mean that $\neg p$ should count as having g-complexity 1? That would be justified if the truth $\neg p$ (when it is a truth) was constructed from the truth p ; but this is not the case in general, not least because when one of the formulas is a truth, the other (often) is not. From the point of view of grounding, which deals solely in truths, there is no truth from which $\neg p$ can be formally constructed, so, like p , it is atomic. Similar points hold for formulas of the form A , $\neg A$, where A is either a conjunction or a disjunction: the complexity of the latter cannot be counted as one more than the complexity of the former, since it is not reducible to it. Therefore in the formula $\neg A$ (where A does not itself start with a negation), the only g-complexity to count is that of A . This is precisely what Definition ?? does, by setting the complexity of $A \circ B$ and $\neg(A \circ B)$ on the same level.

The case of the double negation, however, is different. A formula like $\neg\neg A$, if true, can be reduced to another, simpler truth, namely A . Moreover, such reduction is direct: there is no “intermediate” truth that one passes through to obtain the former from the latter. Thus, it makes sense to count the g-complexity of $\neg\neg A$ as equal to that of A plus one.

Let us now move to the notion of *being completely and immediately less g-complex*. In order to define this notion, we first need to introduce other notions, namely that of *converse* of a formula, and the relations of *a-c* equivalence and \cong . (The notion of converse of a formula and the relation \cong will be directly used to define the relation of “being completely and immediately less g-complex”; the relation of *a-c* equivalence serves to define the relation \cong).

Definition 2.4. Let D be a formula. The *converse* of D , written D^* , is defined in the following way

$$D^* = \begin{cases} \neg^{n-1}E, & \text{if } D = \neg^n E \text{ and } n \text{ is odd} \\ \neg^{n+1}E, & \text{if } D = \neg^n E \text{ and } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

where the principal connective of E is not a negation, $n \geq 0$ and 0 is taken to be an even number.⁶

Note that the advantage of working with the notion of converse of a formula A rather than the negation of the formula A is that, while negation might increase the g-complexity of A , the converse of A is a formula B which has the same g-complexity as A . Let us provide some examples that help to clarify Definition ???. If $D = \neg\neg\neg\neg p$, then its converse, D^* , is $\neg\neg\neg\neg p$. If $D = \neg(A \wedge B)$, then its converse, D^* , is $(A \wedge B)$; finally, if $D = (A \vee B)$, then its converse, D^* , is $\neg(A \vee B)$. From now on we will use capital letters to refer to formulas of the language \mathcal{L}^c and their converse.

Definition 2.5. Let D be a formula. We write \underline{D} to indicate that either D or D^* . Thus,

- if we write that a multiset $M = \{\underline{D}\}$, then $M = \{D\}$ or $M = \{D^*\}$.
- If we write that $M = \{\underline{D}, \underline{E}\}$, we mean that $M = \{D, E\}$ or $M = \{D^*, E\}$, or $M = \{D, E^*\}$, or $M = \{D^*, E^*\}$.

Definition 2.6. Consider a formula A . We will say that A is *a-c equiv* (for associatively and commutatively equivalent) to B , if, and only if, A can be obtained from B by applications of associativity and commutativity of conjunction and disjunction.

Let us provide some examples of formulas that are *a-c equiv*. If A is of the form $E \wedge F$, then the formula $F \wedge E$ is *a-c equiv* to it. To take another example, if A is of the form $\neg((B \vee C) \wedge (D \vee F))$ the formulas $\neg((C \vee B) \wedge (D \vee F))$, $\neg((B \vee C) \wedge (F \vee D))$, $\neg((C \vee B) \wedge (F \vee D))$ are *a-c equiv* to it.

Definition 2.7. For any two formulas A, B , $A \cong B$ if, and only if:

A is *a-c equiv* to B or A is *a-c equiv* to B^*

As extensively discussed in ?, two formulas A and B stand in the relation denoted by \cong when they *are about*, or *pertain to*, or *concern* the same issue. The relation \cong is thus analogous (though not equivalent) to the notion of factual equivalence discussed in ??.

Definition 2.8. Given a multiset of formulas M and a formula C of the classical language \mathcal{L}^c , we say that M is *completely and immediately less g-complex* than C , if, and only if:

- $C \cong' \neg\neg B$ and $M = \{\underline{B}\}$, or

⁶Note that $\neg^0 E$ is just E . Also we keep the term *converse* for continuity with Poggiolesi's work. However, one should not confuse $*$ with an idempotent operator.

- $C \cong' (B \circ D)$ and $M = \{\underline{B}, \underline{D}\}$

The multiset M is completely and immediately less g-complex than the formula C since it contains *all* those ‘subformulas’⁷ of C which are such that the sum of their g-complexity is *one less than* that of C .

Definition 2.9. For any consistent multiset of formulas $C \cup M$ such that C and M are formulated in the classical language \mathcal{L}^c , we say that, under the robust condition C (that may be empty), M *completely and immediately formally grounds* A , in symbols $[C] M \mid\sim A$, if and only if:

- $M \vdash_C A$
- $C, \neg(M) \vdash_C \neg A$
- $C \cup M$ is completely and immediately less g-complex than A in the sense of Definition ??.

where $\neg(M) := \{\neg B \mid B \in M\}$ and C is a robust condition for a formula A , if its converse (together with an appropriate robust condition) is a ground of A .

Under the robust condition C , the multiset M completely and immediately formally grounds A if, and only if, (i) A is derivable from M – positive derivability; (ii) $\neg A$ is derivable from $\neg(M)$ plus C – negative derivability; (iii) $C \cup M$ is completely and immediately less g-complex than A .⁸

3 A definition for the notion of complete and immediate grounding in a relevant framework

We will use this section to provide a definition of the notion of complete and immediate grounding that conservatively extends Definition ?? and properly deals with relevant implication. First of all note that one of the main characteristics of Definition ?? lies in its flexibility: since grounding is relative to the notion of derivability and g-complexity, grounding is also relative to the logic in which derivability and g-complexity are defined. Poggiolesi uses classical derivability and a notion of g-complexity conceived for classical connectives since she

⁷For the rigorous definition of subformula in a grounding framework see ?.

⁸Note that if this definition, together with the classical language on which it is based, was extended to cover the grounds of material implication, then they would seemingly be similar to those for the disjunction connective and thus in line (though formulated in a different framework) with the grounds put forward by ?. However, as almost everyone who learns the principles of classical logic for the first time experiences a feeling of dissatisfaction with material implication and thus comes to be convinced that this connective does not really represent the conditional that we actually use, in an analogous way, when thinking of the grounds of conditionals in the natural language (see the Introduction), it seems that these are different from those that emerge in the classical setting. Because of this difference, the grounds for conditionals merits further examination and this is precisely what we will do in the rest of the paper, combining the relevance approach with Poggiolesi’s account.

is interested in the grounding analysis of classical connectives. But if in the definition we use derivability in a relevance logic and a g-complexity conceived for relevant connectives, we will end up with a grounding relation appropriate for a relevant framework. In what follows, we will consider a grounding relation in terms of derivability in the relevant Hilbert system **R**, see ???; this will naturally provides grounding axioms for the relevant conditional of **R**. We chose to work with **R** since amongst relevance logics it is probably the most well-known. Of course if one is interested in the grounds of some other types of implication, one needs simply replace the Hilbert axiomatisation underlying derivability.

Definition 3.1. The relevant language \mathcal{L}^r is composed of a denumerable stock of propositional atoms (p, q, r, \dots) , the logical operators \neg, \wedge, \vee and \rightarrow , the parentheses $(,)$ and the square brackets $[,]$. Propositional formulas are standardly constructed and the set of propositional formulas so defined is denoted by \mathbb{PF} .

Once the relevant language \mathcal{L}^r , together with a set of propositional formulas \mathbb{PF} , is given, we can introduce the Hilbert system **R**, whose axioms and rules are shown in Figure 2. The notion of derivability in **R** is standardly defined; we will write $M \vdash_R A$ to denote the fact that the formula A is derivable from the multiset of formulas M in the system **R**.

An important property of the relevant system **R** that we will use later is the deduction theorem, namely :

Theorem 3.2. *For any formula A and multiset $M \in \mathcal{L}^r$, we have that: $M \vdash_R A$ if, and only if, $\vdash_R \bigwedge M \rightarrow A$*

Proof. See (?, p.17). □

As explained by ?, the system **R** has both an algebraic semantics and a Kripke-style semantics. The former has been introduced by ?, whilst the latter has been developed by ??? and ?. Routler and Meyer’s approach is probably the most well-known (see ?) and it is based on the idea of interpreting the conditional by means of a ternary relation $Rijz$ such that $i \models A \rightarrow B$ if, and only if, $\forall j, z \in W$ (if $Rijz$ and $j \models A$, then $z \models B$). In this approach, while the connectives of conjunction and disjunction are treated classically, the negation connective is treated by an unary operation $+$ on worlds, such that for each world i , there is a world i^+ , $i \models \neg A$ if, and only if, $i^+ \not\models A$.⁹ We will not dwell on details here; a clear and rigorous explanation can be found in ?. Let us however underline two important results that will be useful later. First of all, by denoting with \mathcal{R}^+ the class of relevant frames of ?, the following soundness and completeness result is provable.

Theorem 3.3. *For any formula $A \in \mathcal{L}^r$, we have that: A is provable in the relevant system **R** if, and only if, A is valid in the class of frames \mathcal{R}^+ .*

⁹Differently from worlds of Kripke semantics, worlds of the relevant approach can be either inconsistent or incomplete. This is due to fact that formulas as $p \wedge \neg p \rightarrow q$ or $p \rightarrow q \vee \neg q$ are not wanted to be proved to be valid. And for that matter, we need worlds to be able to satisfy both p and $\neg p$, or to not satisfy neither q nor $\neg q$.

Figure 1: Truth in a relevant model \mathcal{M}

T1	A is true in \mathcal{M} if, and only if, $\neg\neg A$ is,
T2	$A \wedge B$ is true in \mathcal{M} if, and only if, A is and B is,
T3	$A \vee B$ is true in \mathcal{M} if, and only if, A is or B is.

Figure 2: Hilbert-style axiomatisation of relevant logic **R**

A1.1	$A \rightarrow A$	A1.2	$(A \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B))) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$	A1.3	$A \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow B)$
				A1.4	$(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow ((B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C))$
A2.1	$A \wedge B \rightarrow A$	A2.2	$A \wedge B \rightarrow B$	A2.3	$((A \rightarrow B) \wedge (A \rightarrow C)) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B \wedge C)$
A3.1	$A \rightarrow A \vee B$	A3.2	$B \rightarrow A \vee B$	A3.3	$(A \vee B \rightarrow C) \leftrightarrow (A \rightarrow C) \wedge (B \rightarrow C)$
A4.1	$\neg\neg A \rightarrow A$	A4.2	$(A \rightarrow \neg B) \rightarrow (B \rightarrow \neg A)$	A5	$((A \wedge B) \vee C) \rightarrow ((A \wedge B) \vee (A \wedge C))$
MP	$A \rightarrow B, A \vdash_R B$				
IC	$A, B \vdash_R A \wedge B$				

Proof. See (?, p.70-77). □

Moreover, let \mathcal{R}^+ be a relevant frame and \mathcal{M} a model based on that frame. Then the facts listed in Figure ?? hold in a model \mathcal{M} .

In what follows we will formulate a definition of the notion of complete and immediate formal grounding in a relevant framework. In order to contain the complexity of the issue, we restrict our language to those implicative formulas which contain conjunction, disjunction and negation, but are not in their turn composed of other implications. We leave the grounding analysis of these formulas for future research.

Definition 3.4. Given the set \mathbb{PF} of all formulas of the language \mathcal{L}^r we isolate the subset $\mathbb{PF}_{\rightarrow}$ that only contains those formulas that do not contain nested implications, i.e. if there is an implication, it does not itself contain another.

3.1 Positive and negative derivability in a relevant framework

The first two ingredients of Proposition ?? are positive and negative derivability, with derivability defined in classical logic. Now we are no longer interested in

classical derivability but in derivability in the system **R**. As concerns positive derivability, in the classical framework, following Definition ??, the condition for a multiset of formulas M to completely and immediately ground a formula A , under a robust condition C (which may be empty), is that A is classically derivable from M . Now in the relevant framework, the condition becomes that A is relevantly derivable from the *conjunction* of the elements of M , denoted by $\bigwedge M$. The need for such a change can be explained with an example. Consider a true disjunction $A \vee B$ and suppose that both A and B are true. Then even in a relevant framework it seems plausible to say that both A and B completely and immediately ground $A \vee B$. This fits with the fact that $A \vee B$ is relevantly derivable from A but also from B . However since the relevant logic **R** does not contain the weakening axiom $((A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \wedge C \rightarrow B))$, the derivation from A, B to $A \vee B$, which needs that axiom to be carried out, is (unfairly, because it does not show any irrelevancy) blocked. Therefore, to remedy the situation one simple solution is to use the conjunction $A \wedge B$; indeed from $A \wedge B$, $A \vee B$ is derivable in **R**.

For negative derivability, the situation is analogous. In the classical framework, following Definition ??, the condition for a multiset of formulas M to completely and immediately ground a formula A , under a robust condition C (which may be empty), is that A is classically derivable from $\neg(M), C$, where $\neg(M)$ stands for the negation of each element of M . In the relevant framework, the condition becomes that A is relevantly derivable from C and the conjunction of the negation of each element of M , denoted by $\bigwedge \neg(M)$. The motivation for this condition is analogous to that offered for positive derivability. Consider a true conjunction $A \wedge B$. Even in a relevant framework it seems plausible to say that both A and B completely ground $A \wedge B$. This fits with the fact that $\neg(A \wedge B)$ is relevantly derivable from $\neg A$ but also from $\neg B$. However, since the relevant logic **R** does not contain the weakening axiom, the derivation from $\neg A, \neg B$ to $\neg(A \wedge B)$ which needs that axiom to be carried out, is (unfairly, because it does not show any irrelevancy) blocked. The solution to this situation is to use the conjunction $\neg A \wedge \neg B$; indeed from $\neg A \wedge \neg B$, $\neg(A \wedge B)$ is derivable in **R**.

The proposed versions of positive and negative derivability adapted for a relevant framework have been intuitively motivated. In Section 3, Theorem ??, we will prove that they are adequate to preserve their role in the definition of the grounding relation.

3.2 G-complexity

The third ingredient of Definition ?? is the notion of being completely and immediately less g-complex, which provides the directionality or asymmetry of grounds: in a grounding relation the grounds must always be less g-complex than their conclusion. As we have seen, in order to define this notion, Poggiolesi proceeds into two steps. First, she defines the notion of g-complexity, which assigns to each formula a count of the complexity as appropriate for grounding. Successively and on the basis of g-complexity, she defines the relation of *being completely and immediately less g-complex* between a multiset of formulas M

and a formula A : this relation is a central ingredient of the final account for the notion of complete and immediate formal grounding.

We will follow an analogous procedure to extend both the notion of g-complexity and the relation of being completely and immediately less g-complex, in such a way that also formulas containing (relevant) implications are taken into account.

Definition 3.5. The g-complexity of a formula $A \in \mathbb{PF}_{\rightarrow}$, $gcm'(A)$, is defined in the following way:

- $gcm'(l) = 0$,
- $gcm'(\neg\neg A) = gcm'(A) + 1$,
- $gcm'(\underline{A \rightarrow B}) = (gcm'(A), gcm'(B))$,
- $gcm'(\underline{A \circ B}) = gcm'(A) + gcm'(B) + 1$.

where the symbol \circ stands for either conjunction or disjunction, and we adopt the convention (for the first and third items) that the sum of two elements at least one of which is a pair does not reduce. (So, for instance, $(1, 2) + (2, 1)$ and $(1, 2) + 3$ cannot be further reduced, whilst $(1, 2) + 1 + 2$ is equal to $(1, 2) + 3$.)

For formulas that do not contain implication, note that this notion of g-complexity is identical to that introduced in the framework of classical logic (Definition ??). Indeed, it is straightforward to see (also in view of principles T1-T3) that if the notion of g-complexity tracks the relationships between formulas expressing truths, then the passage from a classical to a relevant background logic has no effect as far as atoms and the connectives of negation, conjunction and disjunction are concerned.

Turning to the implication, let us begin by considering the case where antecedent and consequent are atoms, i.e. the implication of the form $p \rightarrow q$. Note that, if this implication is true, unlike say the conjunction $p \wedge q$, it is *not* constructed from the truths p and q . Rather, by the very idea of relevance, the truth is related to the link between p and q , and that link is not formally reducible to p nor to q . The use of an ordered pair allows us to capture this situation, whilst nevertheless keeping track of the fact that $p \rightarrow q$ involves p and q (rather than other formulas). So, in this case, since the g-complexity of both p and q is 0, the g-complexity of $p \rightarrow q$ will be the ordered pair $(0, 0)$. Generalizing this reflection to any implication of the form $A \rightarrow B$, we obtain as its g-complexity the ordered pair composed of the g-complexity of A and the g-complexity of B . Indeed, the truth of a relevant implication like $A \rightarrow B$ is not built up from the truth of its antecedent and the truth of its consequent (as it is the case for material implication!), yet continues to involve them. The g-complexity reflects this situation, insofar as it involves the g-complexities of the A and B without putting them together and adding one.

Note that this notion of g-complexity treats implication in an analogous way to negation. As we have seen in the previous section, the g-complexity

of a formula of the type $\neg A$ (where A does not contain as main connective a negation) is equal to the g-complexity of A . This is because, on the one hand, if true, the truth $\neg A$ does not build upon the truth of A , so we cannot count its g-complexity as that of A plus one. And, on the other hand, $\neg A$ is still composed of the elements of A , and thus the elements of A should determine its g-complexity. The situation is the same for an implication, such as $A \rightarrow B$. On the one hand, if true, the truth is not constructed up from the truth of A and the truth of B ; hence its g-complexity cannot be counted as the g-complexity of A plus that of B plus one. On the other hand, $A \rightarrow B$ is composed by the elements of A and the elements of B , so they should determine its g-complexity. Defining the g-complexity of $A \rightarrow B$ as the ordered pair of their g-complexities does just this.

Let us provide some examples of g-complexity: $gcm'((p \wedge q) \wedge \neg \neg(q \vee (r \vee s))) = 5$; $gcm'((\neg(s \vee (t \wedge r)) \rightarrow (p \wedge \neg q))) = (2, 1)$; $gcm'(\neg \neg(\neg(s \vee (t \wedge r)) \rightarrow (p \wedge \neg q))) = (2, 1) + 1$.¹⁰

Recall from the previous Section that beyond the notion of g-complexity, the definition of the relation of *being completely and immediately less g-complex* required the notion of converse of a formula, as well as the relations \cong and *a-c equiv*. Whilst the former remains as in Definition ??, the latter have to be adapted to the a relevant framework, as follows.

Definition 3.6. Let D be a formula. As before, we write \underline{D} to indicate that either D or D^* . Therefore, we still have items 1 and 2 of Definition ??, plus the following one:

- if we write that $M = \{\underline{A \rightarrow B}\}$, we mean that $M = \{A \rightarrow B\}$ or $M = \{(A \rightarrow B)^*\}$ or $M = \{A^* \rightarrow B\}$ or $M = \{(A^* \rightarrow B)^*\}$, or $M = \{A \rightarrow B^*\}$ or $M = \{(A \rightarrow B^*)^*\}$, or $M = \{A^* \rightarrow B^*\}$ or $M = \{(A^* \rightarrow B^*)^*\}$.

Definition 3.7. Consider a formula $A \in \mathbb{PF}_{\rightarrow}$. We will say that A is *a-c equiv'* (for associatively and commutatively equivalent) to B , if, and only if, A can be obtained from B by applications of associativity and commutativity of conjunction and disjunction.

The notion of *a-c equiv'* naturally extends the notion *a-c equiv* by also taking into account formulas containing implications. For example, if A is of the form $G \rightarrow ((B \vee C) \vee (D \vee F))$, then the formulas $G \rightarrow ((B \vee D) \vee (C \vee F))$, $G \rightarrow ((D \vee B) \vee (F \vee C))$, $G \rightarrow ((B \vee F) \vee (D \vee C))$ are all *a-c equiv'* to it.

Definition 3.8. For any $A, B \in \mathbb{PF}_{\rightarrow}$, $A \cong' B$ if, and only if:

$$A \text{ is } a\text{-c } equiv' \text{ to } B \text{ or } A \text{ is } a\text{-c } equiv' \text{ to } B^*$$

We finally have all the elements to introduce the notion of *completely and immediately less g-complex*, which will be a key notion in the account of the notion of complete and immediate formal grounding

¹⁰Note that g-complexity does not respect logical equivalence, since the g-complexity of p, p is not the same as the g-complexity of $p \wedge p$. This fact is taken into account and explained in the diversified syntax introduced in ?.

Definition 3.9. Given a multiset of formulas M and a formula $C \in \mathbb{PF}_{\rightarrow}$, we say that M is *completely and immediately less g-complex* than C (in a relevant framework), if, and only if:

- $C \cong' \neg\neg B$ and $M = \{\underline{B}\}$, or
- $C \cong' (B \circ D)$ and $M = \{\underline{B}, \underline{D}\}$, or
- $C \cong' \neg\neg A \rightarrow B$ or $C \cong' A \rightarrow \neg\neg B$ and $M = \{\underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{B}\}$, or
- $C \cong' \underline{A} \circ \underline{B} \rightarrow C$ and $M = \{\underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{C}, \underline{B} \rightarrow \underline{C}\}$, or
- $C \cong' A \rightarrow \underline{B} \circ \underline{C}$ and $M = \{\underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{B}, \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{C}\}$.

In the above cases one of the following combinations applies. If $gcm'(C)$ is a number m , then $gcm'(M)$, where $gcm'(M)$ is the sum of the g-complexity of each of its members, is $m - 1$. If $gcm'(C)$ is of the form $p + m$ where p is a pair and m is a number, then $gcm'(M)$ is $p + m - 1$. If $gcm'(C)$ is the pair (s, t) , then $gcm'(M)$ will be one of these items:

- $\{(s - 1, t)\}$ or $\{(s, t - 1)\}$
- $\{(s', t), (s'', t)\}$, where $s = s' + s'' + 1$
- $\{(s, t'), (s, t'')\}$, where $t = t' + t'' + 1$

Therefore, for any type of g-complexity the formula C might have, the g-complexity of M will adapt consequently, in each case being the multiset containing *all* those ‘subformulas’ of C which are such that C has g-complexity $+1$ with respect to M .

Let us provide some examples that help to clarify this notion.

- the multisets $\{(p \wedge q) \wedge r\}$, $\{\neg((q \wedge p) \wedge r)\}$ are both completely and immediately less g-complex than the formulas $\neg\neg(r \wedge (q \wedge p))$ and $\neg\neg\neg(r \wedge (q \wedge p))$;
- the multisets $\{(p \vee q), r\}$, $\{\neg(p \vee q), r\}$, $\{(p \vee q), \neg r\}$, $\{\neg(p \vee q), \neg r\}$ are all completely and immediately less g-complex than the formulas $(p \vee q) \wedge r$ and $(q \vee p) \wedge r$, as well as than the formulas $\neg((p \vee q) \wedge r)$, $\neg((q \vee p) \wedge r)$.
- the multisets $\{s \rightarrow p, s \rightarrow r\}$, $\{\neg(s \rightarrow p), s \rightarrow r\}$, $\{s \rightarrow p, \neg(s \rightarrow r)\}$, $\{\neg(s \rightarrow p), \neg(s \rightarrow r)\}$, $\{\neg s \rightarrow p, s \rightarrow r\}$, $\{\neg(\neg s \rightarrow p), s \rightarrow r\}$, $\{\neg s \rightarrow p, \neg(s \rightarrow r)\}$, $\{\neg(\neg s \rightarrow p), \neg(s \rightarrow r)\}$, $\{s \rightarrow p, \neg s \rightarrow r\}$, $\{\neg(s \rightarrow p), \neg s \rightarrow r\}$, $\{s \rightarrow p, \neg(\neg s \rightarrow r)\}$, $\{\neg(s \rightarrow p), \neg(\neg s \rightarrow r)\}$, ... are all completely and immediately less g-complex than $s \rightarrow p \circ r$, $\neg(s \rightarrow p \circ r)$, $s \rightarrow \neg(p \circ r)$, $\neg(s \rightarrow \neg(p \circ r))$, where $\circ = \{\wedge, \vee\}$.

3.3 The definition of complete and immediate formal grounding in a relevant framework

We now have all the elements to introduce a definition for the notion of complete and immediate grounding in a relevant framework.

Definition 3.10. For any formula $A \in \mathbb{PF}_{\rightarrow}$, and for any consistent multiset of formulas $C \cup M$ such that C and $M \in \mathbb{PF}_{\rightarrow}$, we say that, under the robust condition C (that may be empty), M *completely and immediately formally grounds* A in a relevant framework, in symbols $[C] M \mid \sim_R A$, if and only if:¹¹

- $\bigwedge M \vdash_R A$,
- $C, \bigwedge \neg(M) \vdash_R \neg A$,
- $\{C, M\}$ is completely and immediately less g-complex than A according to Definition ??,

where C is a robust condition for a formula A , if its converse (together with an appropriate robust condition) is a ground of A .

This definition of complete and immediate formal grounding adapts Poggioli's Definition ?? to the relevant framework. The notion of g-complexity describes the grounding hierarchy in which formulas, including relevant implications, are organized, while the notions of positive and negative derivability tell us which formulas in each step of this hierarchy enter into a dependence relation. The fact that in both positive and negative derivability the premises are in conjunctive form is motivated by the issue of relevance as discussed in the previous section.

We will now prove that Definition ?? conservatively extends Definition ??: the principles concerning negation, conjunction and disjunction in the classical framework remain the same in the relevant framework. In the next section we will study the grounding principles governing relevant implication and negation of relevant implication that emerge from Definition ??.

Lemma 3.11. *Given a multiset M and a formula A such that both only contain the connectives of conjunction, disjunction and negation, we have that M is completely and immediately less g-complex than A according to Definition ?? if,*

¹¹Note that when the multiset M is composed of only one formula, then positive and negative derivability amounts to an equivalence relation. This is typically the case of the two formulas A and $\neg\neg A$, which although equivalent, are such that A completely and immediately grounds $\neg\neg A$ and not viceversa. While other accounts of grounding (e.g. ??) take this asymmetry as primitive, Definition ?? (exactly as Definition ??) explains why A grounds $\neg\neg A$ and not viceversa: because only in one case the g-complexity increases from the grounds to the conclusion.

an only if, M is completely and immediately less g -complex than A according to Definition ??.

Proof. By a straightforward analysis of cases. \square

Theorem 3.12. *For any consistent multiset of formulas $M \cup C$ and a formula A , both $M \cup C$ and A only containing the connectives of conjunction, disjunction and negation, we have that, under the robust condition C (which may be empty), M completely and immediately grounds A according to Definition ?? if, and only if, under the robust condition C (which may be empty), M completely and immediately grounds A according to Definition ??.*

Proof. Let us consider first the right-to-left direction. Suppose that under the robust condition C , M completely and immediately grounds A according to Definition ?. Then we have that: (i) $\bigwedge M \vdash_R A$; (ii) $C, \bigwedge \neg(M) \vdash_R \neg(A)$, and (iii) $\{C, M\}$ is completely and immediately less g -complex than A according to Definition ?. If $\bigwedge M \vdash_R A$, then by logic we also have $\bigwedge M \vdash_C A$. From that and $M \vdash_C \bigwedge M$, by transitivity we have (i)' $M \vdash_C A$. From (ii) by logic we have that $C, \bigwedge \neg(M) \vdash_C \neg(A)$; from such result and $M \vdash_C \bigwedge M$, by transitivity, we have that (ii)' $C, \neg(M) \vdash_C \neg(A)$. From (iii) by Lemma ??, we have that (iii)' $\{C, M\}$ is completely and immediately less g -complex than A according to Definition ?. From (i)', (ii)' and (iii)', we have that, under the robust condition C , M completely and immediately grounds A according to Definition ?.

Let us now consider the left-to-right direction. Suppose that under the robust condition C , M completely and immediately grounds A according to Definition ?. Then we have that: (i) $M \vdash_C A$; (ii) $C, \neg(M) \vdash_C \neg(A)$, and (iii) $\{C, M\}$ is completely and immediately less g -complex than A , according to Definition ?. Consider (i); by analysis of cases, we have two possible situations: either $M \vdash_R A$ or there exist two disjoint subsets M', M'' such that $M' \cup M'' = M$ and $M' \vdash_R A$ and $M'' \vdash_R A$. In either of these cases, given that $\bigwedge M \vdash_R B$, where $B \in M$, by transitivity, we get (i)' $\bigwedge M \vdash_R A$.

By applying an analogous procedure on (ii), we get (ii)' $C, \bigwedge \neg M \vdash_R A$. From (iii), by Lemma ??, we have that (iii)' $\{C, M\}$ is completely and immediately less g -complex than A according to Definition ?. From (i)', (ii)' and (iii)', we have that, under the robust condition C , M completely and immediately ground A according to Definition ?. \square

4 Grounding axioms for relevant implication

The goal of this section is to examine the grounding axioms for relevant implication that arise from Definition ?.

Recall that, beyond the account of grounding for implication contained in Definition ?, we also have the informal intuition with which this paper began: that the ground of an ordinary-language conditional of the form “if A , then B ” is a sentence C such that from A and C , B follows. It may be seen as a test

of any account of grounding for implication – and hence for the formal account developed in the previous sections – that it match these pre-formal intuitions. The aim will thus be to check whether the grounds M for formulas containing the relevant implication of the form $A \rightarrow B$ emerging from Definition ?? are such that from M and A , B follows. Of course, such a match can only corroborate the adequacy of the account.

Recall furthermore that, under Definition ?? (just as for Definition ??), the complete and immediate grounds of a formula of the form $\neg A$ depends on the form of the formula A . For instance, $\neg p$, the negation of an atom, has no *formal* grounds, since $\neg p$ has g-complexity 0. By contrast, negations of conjunctions or disjunctions – formulas of the form $\neg(A \vee B)$ or $\neg(A \wedge B)$ – have different formal grounds. It seems safe to claim that this way of treating the grounds of formulas whose main connective is a negation is accepted in the contemporary literature, e.g. see ??.

According to Definition ??, what holds for formulas of the form $\neg A$ also holds for implications of the form $A \rightarrow B$. The complete and immediate formal grounds of these formulas will depend on what type of formulas A and B are. In cases where both A and B are atoms, which is to say $A \rightarrow B$ has the form $p \rightarrow q$, then no *formal* ground can be formulated; $p \rightarrow q$ has g-complexity $(0,0)$. All the other cases are of one of the following types:

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. $\neg\neg A \rightarrow B$ | 2. $A \rightarrow \neg\neg B$ | | |
| 3. $A \rightarrow B \wedge C$ | 4. $A \rightarrow \neg(B \vee C)$ | 5. $A \vee B \rightarrow C$ | 6. $\neg(A \wedge B) \rightarrow C$ |
| 7. $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$ | 8. $\neg(A \vee B) \rightarrow C$ | 9. $A \rightarrow B \vee C$ | 10. $A \rightarrow \neg(B \wedge C)$ |

To analyze the complete and immediate formal grounds that emerge from Definition ?? for each of the types of implication **1-10**, we begin with the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *The following formula $A \rightarrow \neg\neg A$ is provable in the Hilbert system R .*

Proof. The proofs is the following.

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------------|
| a. | $(\neg\neg\neg A \rightarrow \neg A) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow \neg\neg\neg\neg A)$ | A4.2 |
| b. | $(\neg\neg\neg A \rightarrow \neg A)$ | A4.1 |
| c. | $(A \rightarrow \neg\neg\neg\neg A)$ | MP(a, b) |
| d. | $\neg\neg\neg\neg A \rightarrow \neg\neg A$ | A4.1 |
| e. | $A \rightarrow \neg\neg A$ | A1.4 + MP(c, d) |

□

Now let us consider each of the types of implication **1-10** in turn.

1-2. We only examine **1**; the analysis of **2** is analogous. Consider the sentence “if it is not the case that it is not raining, then the road will be wet.” It seems intuitively reasonable to claim that the complete and immediate ground of this

conditional is the sentence “if it is raining, the road will be wet.” Indeed from this ground and “it is not the case that it is not raining” (namely the antecedent of the implication), “the road will be wet” (namely the consequent of the implication) follows. But this is precisely what emerges from Definition ???. Indeed, formalizing “if it is not the case that it is not raining, the road will be wet” by $\neg\neg A \rightarrow B$, and “if it is raining, the road will be wet” by $A \rightarrow B$, we now show that the multiset $\{A \rightarrow B\}$ and the formula $\neg\neg A \rightarrow B$ enjoys positive and negative derivability, as well as the relation of being completely and immediately less g-complex.

Positive derivability. We need to prove that $A \rightarrow B \vdash_R \neg\neg A \rightarrow B$. Assume $A \rightarrow B$. Then by applying MP to axiom A4.1, $\neg\neg A \rightarrow A$, and axiom A1.4 $(\neg\neg A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\neg\neg A \rightarrow B))$, we obtain $(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\neg\neg A \rightarrow B)$. By applying again MP to $(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\neg\neg A \rightarrow B)$ and the assumption $A \rightarrow B$, we obtain $\neg\neg A \rightarrow B$.

Negative derivability. We need to prove $\neg(A \rightarrow B) \vdash_R \neg(\neg\neg A \rightarrow B)$. By the deduction theorem, i.e. Theorem ??, and axiom A4.2, this is the same as proving $\neg\neg A \rightarrow B \vdash_R A \rightarrow B$. Assume $\neg\neg A \rightarrow B$. Then by applying MP to the formula $A \rightarrow \neg\neg A$ (see Lemma ??) and axiom A1.4, $(A \rightarrow \neg\neg A) \rightarrow ((\neg\neg A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B))$, we obtain $(\neg\neg A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$. By applying again MP to the assumption $\neg\neg A \rightarrow B$ and $(\neg\neg A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$, we obtain $A \rightarrow B$.

G-complexity. It is straightforward to verify that $\{A \rightarrow B\}$ is completely and immediately less g-complex than $\neg\neg A \rightarrow B$ according to Definition ??.

Hence the multiset $\{A \rightarrow B\}$ is the complete and immediate formal ground of the formula $\neg\neg A \rightarrow B$ according to Definition ???. This matches our intuitions.

3-4. We only examine **3**; the analysis of **4** is analogous. Consider the sentence “if it is raining, then the road will be wet and slippery.” It sounds intuitively acceptable to claim that the complete and immediate formal grounds of this implication are the sentences “if it is raining, then the road will be wet” and “if it is raining, then the road will be slippery.” Indeed, from these grounds and “it is raining” (namely the antecedent of the implication), “the road will be wet and slippery” (namely the consequent of the implication) follows. But this is precisely what emerges from Definition ???. Let us indeed formalize the sentence “if it is raining, then the road will be wet and slippery” with the formula $A \rightarrow B \wedge C$; then the sentence “if it is raining, then the road will be wet” with the formula $A \rightarrow B$, and finally the sentence “if it is raining, then the road will be slippery” with the sentence $A \rightarrow C$. We now show that the multiset $\{A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C\}$ and the formula $A \rightarrow B \wedge C$ enjoy positive and negative derivability as well as the relation of being completely and immediately less g-complex.

Positive derivability. We need to show that $A \rightarrow B \wedge A \rightarrow C \vdash_R A \rightarrow B \wedge C$. Assume $A \rightarrow B \wedge A \rightarrow C$. By applying MP to this assumption and the axiom A2.3, $(A \rightarrow B \wedge A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B \wedge C)$, we obtain $A \rightarrow B \wedge C$.

Negative derivability. We need to show that $\neg(A \rightarrow B) \wedge \neg(A \rightarrow C) \vdash_R \neg(A \rightarrow$

$B \wedge C$). By the deduction theorem, i.e. Theorem ??, and axiom A4.2, this is the same as proving $A \rightarrow B \wedge C \vdash_R A \rightarrow B \vee A \rightarrow C$. Assume $A \rightarrow B \wedge C$. By applying MP to this assumption and axiom A1.4, $(A \rightarrow B \wedge C) \rightarrow ((B \wedge C \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B))$, we obtain $(B \wedge C \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$. By applying again MP to axiom 2.1, $B \wedge C \rightarrow B$, and $(B \wedge C \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$, we obtain $A \rightarrow B$. By applying MP to $A \rightarrow B$ and axiom A3.1, $(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow B) \vee (A \rightarrow C))$, we obtain $(A \rightarrow B) \vee (A \rightarrow C)$.

G-complexity. It is straightforward to verify that $\{A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C\}$ is completely and immediately less g-complex than $A \rightarrow B \wedge C$ according to Definition ??.

Hence the multiset $\{A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C\}$ is the complete and immediate formal ground of the formula $A \rightarrow B \wedge C$ according to Definition ??. This matches our intuitions.

5-6. We only examine **5**; the analysis of **6** is analogous. Consider the sentence “if it is raining or it is snowing, then the road will be wet.” It seems intuitively acceptable to claim that the complete and immediate grounds of this implication are “if it is raining, then the road will be wet” and “if it is snowing, then the road will be wet.” Indeed, from these grounds and “it is raining or it is snowing” (namely the antecedent of the implication), “the road will be wet” (namely the consequent of the implication) follows. But this is precisely what emerges from Definition ??. Let us indeed formalize the sentence “if it is raining or it is snowing, then the road will be wet” with the formula $A \vee B \rightarrow C$; the sentence “if it is raining, then the road will be wet” with the formula $A \rightarrow C$, and finally the sentence “if it is snowing, then the road will be slippery” with the formula $B \rightarrow C$. We now show that the multiset $\{A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C\}$ and the formula $A \vee B \rightarrow C$ enjoy positive and negative derivability as well as the relation of being completely and immediately less g-complex.

Positive derivability. We need to show that $A \rightarrow C \wedge B \rightarrow C \vdash_R A \vee B \rightarrow C$. Assume $A \rightarrow C \wedge B \rightarrow C$. By applying MP to this assumption and (one side of) the axiom A3.3, $(A \rightarrow C \wedge B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \vee B \rightarrow C)$, we obtain $A \vee B \rightarrow C$.

Negative derivability. We need to show that $\neg(A \rightarrow C) \wedge \neg(B \rightarrow C) \vdash_R \neg(A \vee B \rightarrow C)$. By the deduction theorem, i.e. Theorem ??, and axiom A4.2, this is the same as proving $A \vee B \rightarrow C \vdash_R A \rightarrow C \vee B \rightarrow C$. Assume $A \vee B \rightarrow C$. By applying MP to this assumption and (one side of) axiom A3.3, $(A \vee B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow C) \wedge (B \rightarrow C))$, we obtain $(A \rightarrow C) \wedge (B \rightarrow C)$. By applying MP to this and the formula $((A \rightarrow C) \wedge (B \rightarrow C)) \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow C) \vee (B \rightarrow C))$ (which is easily shown to be provable in **R**), we get the desired result.

G-complexity. It is straightforward to verify that $\{A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C\}$ is completely and immediately less g-complex than $A \vee B \rightarrow C$ according to Definition ??.

Hence the multiset $\{A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C\}$ is the complete and immediate formal ground of the formula $A \vee B \rightarrow C$ according to Definition ??. This matches our intuitions.

For cases **1-6**, the grounding axioms emerging from Definition ?? correspond to pre-theoretical intuitions; moreover, this is also the case for formulas that are *a-c equiv'* to those in **1-6**. So Definition ?? captures adequately the grounds for

Figure 3: Complete and immediate formal grounds for relevant implication

Conclusion	Complete and Immediate Formal Grounds
$\neg\neg A \rightarrow B$	$A \rightarrow B$
$A \rightarrow \neg\neg B$	$A \rightarrow B$
$A \rightarrow B \wedge C$	$\{A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C\}$
$A \rightarrow \neg(B \vee C)$	$\{A \rightarrow B^*, A \rightarrow C^*\}$
$A \vee B \rightarrow C$	$\{A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C\}$
$\neg(A \wedge B) \rightarrow C$	$\{A^* \rightarrow C, B^* \rightarrow C\}$

a large spectrum of cases. We now consider the more subtle **7-10**.

7-8. We analyze in detail case **7**; case **8** can be treated analogously. Consider first the sentence: “if Andrew is a man and Andrew is unmarried, then Andrew is a bachelor.” Note that the sentences “if Andrew is a man, then Andrew is a bachelor” and “if Andrew is unmarried, then Andrew is a bachelor” cannot serve as its grounds, since they are quite simply not true: Andrew is a bachelor if both conditions – being a man and being unmarried – are realized, not if only one is. Indeed, the ground of “if Andrew is a man and Andrew is unmarried, then Andrew is a bachelor” does not seem to be expressible by one of its subsentences; rather, it would seem to consist in the meaning of the word ‘bachelor’ itself. Why is it true that if Andrew is a man and Andrew is unmarried, then Andrew is a bachelor? The only plausible answer seems to be: because this is what ‘bachelor’ means.

Now consider the sentence: “if John recycles and uses public transport, he acts ecologically.” By contrast with the previous case, “if John recycles, he acts ecologically” and “if John uses public transport, he acts ecologically” do intuitively appear to be the complete and immediate grounds of this sentence.

Both of the sentences in these examples can be formalized in the same way in the language of relevance logic, namely by $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$. But only in the second example do $A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C$ seem to be grounds; in the first example, they are not. Thus it would seem that whether or not they are the grounds of a specific instance of $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$ depends not only on the form of the formula, but on the content of the particular formula in question. Hence $A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C$ *cannot* be *formal* grounds of $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$ (since, although in specific cases, these formulas are the grounds, in other examples, they are not). Definition ?? faithfully reflects this conclusion. Although $\{A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C\}$ is completely and immediately less g-complex than $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$, and $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$ is relevantly derivable from $A \rightarrow C \wedge B \rightarrow C$, $\neg(A \wedge B \rightarrow C)$ is *not* relevantly derivable from $\neg(A \rightarrow C) \wedge \neg(B \rightarrow C)$.¹² Thus negative derivability is not respected and $\{A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C\}$ is not the complete and immediate ground for $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$ according to Definition ??.

Note in passing that one might have the intuition that the two examples involve two different readings of conjunction: in the first case, intensional, and in the second, extensional (e.g. see ?). This leaves open the possibility that in a

¹²It is classically derivable but in the derivation weakening is used.

richer logic, with a richer language containing two conjunctions, with sentences involving different readings being formalized with different conjunctions, $\{A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C\}$ may be the grounds for $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$ for one of the conjunctions but not for the other. We leave the exploration of such a possibility for future research, focussing in this paper on the standard relevant logic **R**, for a language containing a single conjunction.

Finally, another possibility for grounds for $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$ permitted by the notion of completely and immediately less g-complex, is $A \rightarrow C$ under the robust condition $\neg B \rightarrow C$. (Analogous points holds for the possibility of it being grounded by $B \rightarrow C$ under the robust condition $\neg A \rightarrow C$). Indeed, beyond being completely and immediately less g-complex, one can derive $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$ from $A \rightarrow C$, and $\neg(A \wedge B \rightarrow C)$ from $\neg(A \rightarrow C)$ and $\neg B \rightarrow C$. However, Definition ?? also contains the condition that the converse of the robust condition should ground (together with a robust condition) the conclusion, and this condition is not met here. Indeed, $(\neg B \rightarrow C)^*$ cannot be a ground for $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$, because there is no way to relevantly derive $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$ from $(\neg B \rightarrow C)^*$.

In summary then, according to Definition ?? there are no complete and immediate *formal* grounds for formulas of the form $A \wedge B \rightarrow C$. In the light of examples where no grounds which are subsentences seem to be had, this seem to match our intuitions.

9-10. We analyze in detail case **9**; case **10** can be treated analogously. Consider first the sentence “if John is your grandfather, then he is the father of your father or the father of your mother.” Note that the sentences “if John is your grandfather, then he is the father of your father,” and “if John is your grandfather, then he is the father of your mother” cannot serve as its grounds, since they are quite simply not true: if John is your grandfather, then the whole disjunction - he is the father of your father or the father of your mother - is a consequence of it, not just one disjunct. Indeed, the ground of “if John is your grandfather, then he is the father of your father or the father of your mother” does not seem to be expressible by one of its subsentences; rather it would seem to consist in the meaning of the word ‘grandfather’ itself. Why is true that if John is your grandfather, then he is the father of your father or the father of your mother? The only plausible answer seems to be: because this is what ‘grandfather’ means.

Now consider the sentence “if it rains, then the road will be slippery or wet.” By contrast with the previous case, “if it rains, the road will be slippery” and “if it rains, the road will be wet” do intuitively appear to be the complete and immediate grounds of this sentence.

Both of the sentences in these examples can be formalized in the same way in the language of relevance logic, namely by $A \rightarrow B \vee C$. But only in the second example do $A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C$ seem to be its grounds; in the first example, they are not. Thus it would seem that whether or not they are the grounds of a specific instance of $A \rightarrow B \vee C$ depends not only on the form of the formula, but on the content of the particular formula in question. Hence $A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C$ *cannot* be *formal* grounds of $A \rightarrow B \vee C$ (since, although in specific cases,

these formulas are the grounds, in other examples, they are not). Definition ?? faithfully reflects this conclusion. Although $\{A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C\}$ is completely and immediately less g-complex than $A \rightarrow B \vee C$, and $A \rightarrow B \vee C$ is relevantly derivable from $A \rightarrow B \wedge A \rightarrow C$, $\neg(A \rightarrow B \vee C)$ is *not* relevantly derivable from $\neg(A \rightarrow B) \wedge \neg(A \rightarrow C)$.¹³ Thus negative derivability is not respected and $\{A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C\}$ is not the complete and immediate ground for $A \rightarrow B \vee C$ according to Definition ??.

Note again that one might have the intuition that the two examples involve two different readings of disjunction: in the first case, intensional, and in the second, extensional (e.g. see ?). This leaves open the possibility that in a richer logic, with a richer language containing two disjunctions, with sentences involving different readings being formalized with different disjunctions, $\{A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C\}$ may be the grounds for $A \rightarrow B \vee C$ for one of the disjunctions but not for the other. We leave the exploration of such a possibility for future research, focussing in this paper on the standard relevant logic **R**, for a language containing a single disjunction.

Finally, another possibility for grounds for $A \rightarrow B \vee C$ permitted by the notion of completely and immediately less g-complex is $A \rightarrow B$ under the robust condition $A \rightarrow \neg C$. (Analogous points holds for the possibility of it being grounded by $A \rightarrow C$ under the robust condition $A \rightarrow \neg B$). Indeed, beyond being completely and immediately less g-complex, one can derive $A \rightarrow B \vee C$ from $A \rightarrow B$, and $\neg(A \rightarrow B \vee C)$ from $\neg(A \rightarrow B)$ and $A \rightarrow \neg C$. However, Definition ?? also contains the condition that the converse of a robust condition should ground (together with a new robust condition) the conclusion, and this condition is not met here. Indeed, $(A \rightarrow \neg B)^*$ cannot be a ground for $A \rightarrow B \vee C$, since there is no way to relevantly derive $A \rightarrow B \vee C$ from $(A \rightarrow \neg B)^*$.

In summary then, according to Definition ?? there are no complete and immediate *formal* grounds for formulas of the form $A \rightarrow B \vee C$. In the light of examples where no grounds which are subsentences seem to be had, this seem to match our intuitions.

5 Grounding axioms for negated relevant implication

As pointed out at the beginning of the previous section, according to Definition ?? (but also to Definition ??), the complete and immediate grounds of a formula of the form $\neg A$ depends on the form of the formula A . The existing literature on grounding, when considering the grounds of $\neg A$, focus on the cases of A being an atom, a negation, a conjunction or a disjunction. Since implication is generally not examined, neither is its negation. By contrast, here, given that we treat the grounds of relevant implication, we also need to treat the grounds of the negation of a relevant implication. But since, as we have seen in the

¹³It is classically derivable but in the derivation weakening is used.

previous section, the grounds of a relevant implication depend in their turn on the form of the antecedent and the consequent, the same goes for the complete and immediate grounds of the negation of a relevant implication. The cases are analogous to those analyzed previously. If both antecedent and consequent are atoms, so the formula has the form $\neg(p \rightarrow q)$, then it has no *formal* ground, since $p \rightarrow q$ has g-complexity $(0,0)$. All the other cases are of one of the following types:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{1}'. \neg(\neg\neg A \rightarrow B) & \mathbf{2}'. \neg(A \rightarrow \neg\neg B) \\
\mathbf{3}'. \neg(A \rightarrow B \wedge C) & \mathbf{4}'. \neg(A \rightarrow \neg(B \vee C)) \\
\mathbf{5}'. \neg(A \vee B \rightarrow C) & \mathbf{6}'. \neg(\neg(A \wedge B) \rightarrow C) \\
\mathbf{7}'. \neg(A \wedge B \rightarrow C) & \mathbf{8}'. \neg(\neg(A \vee B) \rightarrow C) \\
\mathbf{9}'. \neg(A \rightarrow (B \vee C)) & \mathbf{10}'. \neg(A \rightarrow \neg(B \wedge C))
\end{array}$$

As we have underlined at the beginning of this paper, according to Poggioli's account, when we analyze the grounds of ordinary-language sentences featuring the negation, an intuitive pattern emerges: the ground of a formula of the form “it is not the case that A ” is a sentence B such that from A and B , a contradiction follows. Our approach extends that of Poggioli; hence, the complete and immediate grounds M for a negative implication of the form $\neg(A \rightarrow B)$ emerging from Definition ?? will be such that from M and $A \rightarrow B$ a contradiction follows.¹⁴ This is actually the case but not to burden the paper, we omit an extended discussion.

Let us now analyze in detail cases **1'-10'**.

1'-2'. We only examine **1'**; the analysis of **2'** is analogous. Consider the sentence “it is not the case that if it is not the case that it is not sunny, then the road will be slippery.” It seems intuitively reasonable to claim that the complete and immediate ground of this conditional is the sentence “it is not the case if it is sunny, then the road will be slippery.” This is precisely what emerges from Definition ?. Indeed, formalizing “it is not the case that if it is not the case that it is not sunny, then the road will be slippery” by $\neg(\neg\neg A \rightarrow B)$, and “it is not the case that if it is sunny, then the road will be slippery” by $\neg(A \rightarrow B)$, we can show that $\{\neg(A \rightarrow B)\}$ and $\neg(\neg\neg A \rightarrow B)$ enjoys positive and negative derivability, as well as the relation of being completely and immediately less g-complex. The proof of such fact can be developed in the same way as the proof of case **1** of the previous section. Hence the multiset $\{\neg(A \rightarrow B)\}$ is the complete and immediate formal ground of the formula $\neg(\neg\neg A \rightarrow B)$ according to Definition ?? and this seems to match our intuitions.

3'-4'. We only examine **3'**; the analysis of **4'** is analogous. Consider the following

¹⁴We still use *follow* in ?'s sense. A contradiction follows from $M, A \rightarrow B$ if there is a deduction of the contradiction from $M, A \rightarrow B$ which actually uses $M, A \rightarrow B$ (and $M, A \rightarrow B$ alone).

three sentences:

- (i) “it is not the case that if it is snowing, then the road will be dry and safe,”
- (ii) “it is not the case that if it is snowing, then the road will be wet and safe,”
- (iii) “it is not the case that if it is snowing, then the road will be dry and dangerous.”

As for (i), the complete and immediate grounds seem to be “it is not the case that if it is snowing, then the road will be dry” and “it is not the case that if it is snowing, then the road will be safe;” as for (ii), under the robust condition that “if it is snowing, then the road will be wet,” “it is not the case that if it is snowing, the road will be safe” is the complete and immediate ground for “it is not the case that if it is snowing, then the road will be wet and safe.” Finally as for (iii), under the robust condition that “if it is snowing, the road will be dangerous,” “it is not the case that if it is snowing, the road will be dry” is the complete and immediate ground for “it is not the case that if it is snowing, the road will be dry and dangerous.” At the formal level, the formula to be grounded is an implication of the form $\neg(A \rightarrow B \wedge C)$: in (i) the complete and immediate ground is the multiset $\{\neg(A \rightarrow B), \neg(A \rightarrow C)\}$; in (ii) the ground is the multiset $\{\neg(A \rightarrow C)\}$ under the robust condition $A \rightarrow B$; in (iii) the ground is the multiset $\{\neg(A \rightarrow B)\}$ under the robust condition $A \rightarrow C$. We will verify that in case (ii) the ground $\{\neg(A \rightarrow C)\}$ together with the robust condition $A \rightarrow B$ satisfy positive and negative derivability, but also the relation of being completely and immediately less g-complex with the conclusion $\neg(A \rightarrow B \wedge C)$. The analysis of cases (i) and (iii) is analogous.

Positive derivability. We need to show that $\neg(A \rightarrow B) \vdash_R \neg(A \rightarrow B \wedge C)$. By the deduction theorem, i.e. Theorem ??, and axiom A4.2, this is equivalent to showing $A \rightarrow B \wedge C \vdash_R A \rightarrow B$. Assume $A \rightarrow B \wedge C$. By applying MP to this assumption and axiom A1.4, $(A \rightarrow B \wedge C) \rightarrow ((B \wedge C \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B))$, we obtain $(B \wedge C \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$. By applying MP to this and axiom A.2.1, $B \wedge C \rightarrow B$, we obtain $A \rightarrow B$.

Negative derivability. We need to show that $A \rightarrow C, \neg\neg(A \rightarrow B) \vdash_R \neg\neg(A \rightarrow B \wedge C)$. Because in relevant logic **R**, we have that $A \leftrightarrow \neg\neg A$, this is equivalent to show $A \rightarrow C, A \rightarrow B \vdash_R A \rightarrow B \wedge C$. Assume $A \rightarrow C, A \rightarrow B$; by applying the rule IC, we get $A \rightarrow C \wedge A \rightarrow B$. By applying modus ponens to this formula and the axiom A2.3, $((A \rightarrow C) \wedge (A \rightarrow B)) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B \wedge C)$ we obtain $A \rightarrow B \wedge C$.

G-complexity. It is straightforward to verify that $\{\neg(A \rightarrow B), A \rightarrow C\}$ is completely and immediately less g-complex than $\{\neg(A \rightarrow B \wedge C)\}$ according to Definition ??.

Hence, under the robust condition $A \rightarrow C$, the multiset $\{\neg(A \rightarrow B)\}$ is the complete and immediately formal ground of the formula $\neg(A \rightarrow B \wedge C)$ according

to Definition ???. It is straightforward to verify that this matches our intuitions.

5'-6'. We only examine **5'**; the analysis of **6'** is analogous. Consider the following three sentences:

- (i) “it is not the case that if it is raining or cold, then we will go to the sea,”
- (ii) “it is not the case that if it is sunny or cold, then we will go to the sea,”
- (iii) “it is not the case that if it is raining or hot, then we will go to the sea.”

As for (i), the complete and immediate grounds seem to be “it is not the case that if it is raining, then we will go to the sea” and “it is not the case that if it is cold, then we will go to the sea;” as for (ii), under the robust condition that “if it is sunny, then we will go to the sea,” “it is not the case that if it is cold, then we will go to the sea” is the complete and immediate ground for “it is not the case that if it is sunny or cold, then we will go to the sea.” Finally, as for (iii), under the robust condition that “if it is hot, we will go to the sea”, “it is not the case that if it is raining, then we will go to the sea” is the complete and immediate ground for “it is not the case that if it is raining or hot, then we will go to the sea.” At the formal level, in (i) - (iii) the formula to be grounded is an implication of the form $\neg(A \vee B \rightarrow C)$: in (i) the complete and immediate ground is the multiset $\{\neg(A \rightarrow C), \neg(B \rightarrow C)\}$; in (ii) the complete and immediate ground is the multiset $\{\neg(A \rightarrow C)\}$ under the robust condition $B \rightarrow C$; in (iii) the complete and immediate ground is the multiset $\{\neg(B \rightarrow C)\}$ under the robust condition $A \rightarrow C$. We will verify that in case (ii) the ground $\{\neg(A \rightarrow C)\}$ together with the robust condition $B \rightarrow C$ satisfy positive and negative derivability, but also the relation of being completely and immediately less g-complex with the conclusion $\neg(A \vee B \rightarrow C)$. The analysis of cases (i) and (iii) is analogous.

Positive derivability. We need to show that $\neg(A \rightarrow C) \vdash_R \neg(A \vee B \rightarrow C)$. By the deduction theorem, i.e. Theorem ??, and axiom A4.2, this is the same as proving $A \vee B \rightarrow C \vdash_R A \rightarrow C$. Assume $A \vee B \rightarrow C$. By applying MP to this assumption and (one side of) axiom A3.3, $(A \vee B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow C) \wedge (B \rightarrow C))$, we obtain $A \rightarrow C \wedge B \rightarrow C$. By applying modus ponens to this and axiom A2.1, $((A \rightarrow C) \wedge (B \rightarrow C)) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C)$, we obtain $A \rightarrow C$.

Negative derivability. We need to show that $B \rightarrow C, \neg\neg(A \rightarrow C) \vdash_R \neg\neg(A \vee B \rightarrow C)$. Because in relevant logic **R**, we have that $A \leftrightarrow \neg\neg A$, this is equivalent to show $A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C \vdash_R A \vee B \rightarrow C$. Assume $A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C$; by applying the rule IC, we get $A \rightarrow C \wedge B \rightarrow C$. By applying MP to this formula and (one side of) the axiom A3.3, $((A \rightarrow C) \wedge (B \rightarrow C)) \rightarrow (A \vee B \rightarrow C)$, we obtain $A \vee B \rightarrow C$.

G-complexity. It is straightforward to verify that $\{\neg(A \rightarrow C), B \rightarrow C\}$ is completely and immediately less g-complex than $\{\neg(A \vee B \rightarrow C)\}$ according to Definition ??.

Figure 4: Complete and immediate formal grounds for negation of relevant implication

Conclusion	Complete and Immediate Formal Grounds
$\neg(\neg\neg A \rightarrow B)$	$\neg(A \rightarrow B)$
$\neg(A \rightarrow \neg\neg B)$	$\neg(A \rightarrow B)$
$\neg(A \rightarrow B \wedge C)$	$\{\neg(A \rightarrow B), \neg(A \rightarrow C)\}$ $\{\neg(A \rightarrow B)\}[A \rightarrow C]$ $\{\neg(A \rightarrow C)\}[A \rightarrow B]$
$\neg(\neg(A \wedge B) \rightarrow C)$	$\{\neg(A^* \rightarrow C), \neg(B^* \rightarrow C)\}$ $\{\neg(A^* \rightarrow C)\}[B^* \rightarrow C]$ $\{\neg(B^* \rightarrow C)\}[A^* \rightarrow C]$
$\neg(A \vee B \rightarrow C)$	$\{\neg(A \rightarrow C), \neg(B \rightarrow C)\}$ $\{\neg(A \rightarrow C)\}[B \rightarrow C]$ $\{\neg(B \rightarrow C)\}[A \rightarrow C]$
$A \rightarrow \neg(B \vee C)$	$\{\neg(A \rightarrow B^*), \neg(A \rightarrow C^*)\}$ $\{\neg(A \rightarrow B^*)\}[A \rightarrow C^*]$ $\{\neg(A \rightarrow C^*)\}[A \rightarrow B^*]$

Hence, under the robust condition $B \rightarrow C$, the multiset $\{\neg(A \rightarrow C)\}$ is the complete and immediate formal ground of the formula $\neg(A \rightarrow B \wedge C)$ according to Definition ?? . It is straightforward to verify that this matches our intuitions.

For cases **1'-6'**, the grounding axioms emerging from Definition ?? correspond to pre-theoretical intuitions; moreover, this is also the case for formulas that are *a-c equiv'* to those in **1'-6'**. So Definition ?? captures adequately the grounds for a large spectrum of cases. Items 7'-10' are more difficult to treat and present the same problems as the corresponding cases 7-10.¹⁵ On the one hand, at the intuitive level, it seems hard to settle the questions of what grounds formulas of the form 7-10 since the connectives of conjunction and disjunction can received an extensional as well as an intentional readings, and this double reading leads to the identification of different grounds. On the other hand, following Definition ??, there is no formula which is completely and immediately less g-complex than formulas of the form 7'-10' and also enjoys positive and negative derivability with them. Therefore at the intuitive levels well as according to Definition ??, it does not seem possible to formulate *formal* grounds this type of negative relevant implications.

¹⁵We omit here all the details that we have developed for cases 7-10, since they are quite similar to them. The interested reader can straightforwardly reconstruct them on her own.

6 Conclusions

This paper tackles an issue that has been largely ignored in the literature on grounding, namely that of the grounds of non-material implications. We have put forward grounding axioms for relevant implications and negations of relevant implications, which faithfully capture some basic intuitions concerning natural-language conditionals. Moreover, these axioms naturally follow from a definition of the notion of complete and immediate formal grounding which conservatively extends the notion put forward by ? for classical logic without implication. Therefore, the axioms are not only justified by the formal context provided by the Definition, but they also reflect some natural insights.

It seems to us that this work opens up some interesting questions. Let us just mention two. On the one hand it calls for a logic validating the axioms for relevant implication and negation of relevant implication that we have put forward in this paper. On the other hand, it calls for a wider reflection on the way the grounds of the main connectives vary from one logic to another.