

AN ASSESSMENT OF JAN LUKASIEWICZ'S LOGICAL PLURALISM

By

Udofia, Christopher (Ph.D)

Department of Philosophy
Akwa Ibom State University, Obio Akpa Campus

Udosen, Uforo Akpan

Department of Philosophy
Akwa Ibom State University, Obio Akpa Campus

ABSTRACT

This study titled *An Assessment of Jan Łukasiewicz's Logical Pluralism*, offers a comprehensive examination of Jan Łukasiewicz's formal works on Many-valued logic, situating it as an early, coherent expression of logical pluralism—the view that multiple correct logics exist. Tracing his evolution from engaging with Aristotle's Principle of Bivalence and future contingents to developing his 1920 three-valued logic and subsequent n-valued systems, the research argues these innovations were not merely formal conveniences. Rather, they were deeply grounded in a philosophical commitment to metaphysical openness and indeterminacy. The study situates Łukasiewicz within the broader landscape of twentieth-century logic, comparing his framework to developments by Carnap, Quine, Beall, and Restall. Employing **expository** and **critical analytical methods**, it reconstructs his logic in modern symbolic notation and assesses whether he can legitimately be read as a pluralist *avant la lettre*. Ultimately, the study concludes that Łukasiewicz's contributions offer a sophisticated articulation of logical pluralism that challenges classical logic's hegemony while retaining logical objectivity. His pluralism is both methodological—utilizing diverse systems for distinct domains—and metaphysical, reflecting a partially indeterminate reality. Re-evaluating Łukasiewicz through contemporary debates reveals his enduring significance in discussions on the nature, scope, and unity of logic.

KEYWORDS: Classical Logic, Future Contingents, Logical Pluralism, Principle of Bivalence, Truth Value.

INTRODUCTION

Christopher Udofia and Okorie O. in “Meaning, Nature And Scope of Logic”, highlights Aristotle as the Logical “crown Prince” , owing to his systematization of the subject and “exerted profound influence on the development of Logic”(Umotong I et al, 136). Logic, as the systematic study of valid inference and correct reasoning, has historically been dominated by classical logic. This traditional framework operates on fundamental principles such as bivalence, which asserts that every proposition is either true or false, and the Law of the Excluded Middle, which states

that a proposition is either true or its negation is true, as put forward by Susan Haack in *Philosophy of Logic* (1-3). These binary principles have long served as the bedrock for much of Western philosophy, mathematics, and scientific inquiry.

ARISTOTLE, BIVALENCE, AND THE LAW OF EXCLUDED MIDDLE: THEIR NEXUS

The concepts of bivalence and the Law of Excluded Middle (LEM) are foundational principles in classical logic and are closely associated with the logical tradition that originates with Aristotle. Although Aristotle did not formulate these principles in precisely the same technical manner as modern logicians, his writings provide the basis from which they developed. In *Metaphysics* Book IV, Aristotle argues for the **Principle of Non-Contradiction**, maintaining that the same attribute cannot both belong and not belong to the same subject in the same respect at the same time (Aristotle 1005b19–20). This principle implies that contradictory propositions cannot both be true. Aristotle writes: “The same attribute cannot at the same time belong and not belong to the same subject in the same respect” (Aristotle 1005b19–20). By implication, Contradictory predicates cannot simultaneously apply to the same subject under identical conditions. While this principle excludes the possibility that both a proposition (P) and its negation ($\text{not-}P$) are true, **bivalence** goes further by asserting that every proposition is either true or false. Aristotle's discussions suggest a commitment to such a framework, particularly in his treatment of assertion and truth.

Aristotle and the Law of Excluded Middle

The Law of Excluded Middle states that for any proposition P , either P or $\text{not-}P$ must be true. Aristotle explicitly discusses this principle in *Metaphysics* IV. He argues that between affirmation and negation there is no middle position: “There cannot be an intermediate between contradictories, but of one subject we must either affirm or deny any one predicate” (Aristotle, 1011b23–24). He maintained that no middle term exists between a statement and its contradiction; one must either affirm or deny the predicate. This passage is widely regarded as a classical statement of the Law of Excluded Middle. The principle follows naturally from Aristotle's insistence that contradictory propositions exhaust the logical possibilities.

The Problem of Future Contingents and a Qualification of Bivalence

A significant complication arises in Aristotle's *On Interpretation* (Chapter 9), where he discusses the famous example of a future sea battle. Aristotle questions whether propositions about contingent future events are already determinately true or false. He argues that if every future-tense proposition were presently true or false, then all future events would occur necessarily, eliminating contingency and human deliberation (Aristotle 18b25). This implies that Aristotle rejects the conclusion that every statement concerning future contingents must already possess a definite truth value because such a view would entail determinism (Aristotle 18b25–19a39).

Many scholars interpret this discussion as showing that Aristotle accepted the Law of Excluded Middle while hesitating to endorse unrestricted bivalence for future contingent propositions. As Jan Łukasiewicz famously argued in his famous 1930 paper titled *Philosophical Remarks on Many-valued Systems of Propositional Logic*, Aristotle's treatment of future contingents suggests a distinction between the Law of Excluded Middle and the principle of bivalence (Łukasiewicz 126).

Thus, Aristotle serves as the historical and philosophical bridge connecting the Law of Excluded Middle and bivalence. His logic laid the foundation for both doctrines, but his treatment of future contingents reveals an important distinction: a proposition may satisfy the Law of Excluded Middle (P or $\text{not-}P$) without necessarily possessing a determinate truth value at a given time, thereby challenging unrestricted bivalence.

Aristotle's introduction of syllogism, according to Dennis Otto and Asodu F. in "Historical Development of Logic", stood him out "as a great logician" (Umotong Iniobong et al, 148). As Chris Udofia & Udo A. in *Boolean Two Value Logic: It's implication on Epistemology*, would highlight, "the curiosity to know is the basis for knowledge inquiry" (6) —The early 20th century marked a pivotal shift in logical thought, as various philosophers and logicians began to question the absolute universality and sole correctness of classical logic, leading to the emergence of non-classical logical systems. Among the most influential figures in this intellectual revolution was Jan Łukasiewicz (1878-1956), a distinguished member of the Lwów–Warsaw School of Logic (Woleński 15).

Łukasiewicz is widely recognized for his pioneering work on many-valued logics, systems that transcend the classical two-truth-value paradigm by introducing additional truth values beyond the conventional "true" and "false". His initial foray into this domain was driven by profound philosophical considerations, particularly his engagement with Aristotle's argument concerning future contingents and the problem of determinism. Aristotle, in *De Interpretatione*, Chapter 9, famously debated the truth value of propositions about future events that are not yet determined, such as "There will be a sea battle tomorrow" (18a34-19a22).

Łukasiewicz, Jan in his *On Three-Valued Logic*, perceived that classical logic's bivalence principle, when applied to such statements, seemed to imply a deterministic future, where events are already settled. To avoid this, he proposed a third truth value—often interpreted as "possible" or "indeterminate"—to provide a logical framework that could accommodate propositions about future events without committing to their present truth or falsehood, thereby challenging the deterministic implications inherent in classical logical analyses (87-88). The development of Łukasiewicz's many-valued logics, alongside other non-classical systems like intuitionistic and relevant logics, inevitably spurred discussions about the fundamental nature of logic itself: Is there a single, universally correct logic, or can multiple logics be equally valid and appropriate for different contexts or purposes? This question lies at the heart of the debate between logical monism and logical pluralism as put forward by Beall Jac and Restall Greg in their *Logical Pluralism* (26-35). Łukasiewicz's creation of not just one, but a family of many-valued logical systems (including three-valued, four-valued, and infinitely-valued logics) inherently positions his work as a significant historical precedent for assessing the viability and implications of logical pluralism. This work, therefore, situates itself at the intersection of Łukasiewicz's technical innovations in logic and the broader philosophical discourse surrounding logical pluralism.

EXPOSITION OF JAN ŁUKASIEWICZ'S LOGICAL PLURALISM

This talks about Jan Łukasiewicz's logical innovations, providing a detailed conceptual analysis of his many-valued logics and their direct implications for the thesis of logical pluralism. Moving beyond the historical overview, this section offers an in-depth examination of Łukasiewicz's philosophical motivations, the technical architecture of his systems, and the specific ways in which his work contributes to the understanding of logical multiplicity.

Biographical Note

Jan Łukasiewicz (1878–1956) was one of the most influential logicians and philosophers of the twentieth century. His pioneering contributions to mathematical logic, symbolic logic, and the philosophy of logic transformed the study of reasoning and laid important foundations for modern computer science. He is especially remembered for developing many-valued logic and for introducing Polish notation, a system of symbolic expression that continues to influence logic, mathematics, and computer programming. Through his innovative ideas, Łukasiewicz challenged traditional Aristotelian logic and expanded the possibilities of formal reasoning beyond the limits that had been accepted for centuries.

Born on December 21, 1878, in Lviv, Łukasiewicz grew up in a culturally diverse environment that stimulated intellectual inquiry. He pursued higher education at University of Lviv, where he studied philosophy under prominent scholars of the time. His academic training exposed him to both classical philosophical traditions and emerging developments in formal logic. During his university years, he demonstrated exceptional intellectual ability and developed a deep interest in the structure of logical thought and scientific methodology (Bocheński 24). After completing his studies, Łukasiewicz earned his doctorate in philosophy and quickly established himself as a promising scholar. His early research focused on the principles of logic and the history of philosophical reasoning. Influenced by the works of ancient philosophers, particularly Aristotle, he sought to analyze and reconstruct classical logical systems using modern methods. His investigations led him to question some of the fundamental assumptions of traditional two-valued logic, which holds that every proposition is either true or false (McCall 41).

One of Łukasiewicz's most significant achievements was the development of three-valued logic in 1920. Unlike classical logic, which recognizes only truth and falsity, his system introduced a third truth value representing possibility or indeterminacy. This innovation emerged from his attempt to address philosophical problems concerning future contingent events, such as statements about events that had not yet occurred. According to Łukasiewicz, some propositions could not accurately be classified as either true or false at a given moment, necessitating a third logical category (Haack 57). This groundbreaking theory later inspired the development of many-valued logics and influenced subsequent research in logic, linguistics, artificial intelligence, and computer science.

Another enduring contribution of Łukasiewicz was the invention of Polish notation, also known as prefix notation. In this symbolic system, operators precede their operands, eliminating the need for parentheses and simplifying the representation of logical expressions. For example, rather than writing expressions with complex nested brackets, Polish notation provides a more concise and systematic format. This innovation significantly improved the efficiency of logical calculations and later found practical applications in computer science, particularly in programming language design and compiler construction (Kneale and Kneale 521).

Łukasiewicz became a central figure in the renowned Warsaw School of Logic, a group of scholars whose work placed Poland at the forefront of logical research during the early twentieth century. Alongside distinguished logicians such as Stanisław Leśniewski and Alfred Tarski, he contributed to a vibrant intellectual tradition that emphasized rigor, precision, and formal analysis. The achievements of the Warsaw School significantly shaped modern analytic philosophy and mathematical logic (Woleński 103).

Beyond his technical innovations, Łukasiewicz made substantial contributions to the study of the history of logic. His scholarly investigations into Aristotelian syllogistic logic

demonstrated that ancient logical systems could be interpreted with modern formal techniques. He argued that Aristotle's logical theories possessed a sophistication often overlooked by contemporary scholars. Through meticulous historical and analytical work, Łukasiewicz revitalized interest in classical logic and showed its relevance to modern philosophical inquiry (Wolenski 7).

During his academic career, Łukasiewicz held several prominent positions. He served as a professor at the University of Warsaw and played an important role in shaping philosophical and logical education in Poland. He also briefly served as Poland's Minister of Religious Affairs and Public Education after the country's independence, demonstrating his commitment not only to scholarship but also to national intellectual development (Woleński 115).

The outbreak of World War II profoundly affected Łukasiewicz's life and career. The war disrupted academic institutions throughout Europe, forcing many intellectuals to abandon their research and teaching. Following the conflict, Łukasiewicz emigrated to Ireland, where he joined the faculty of University College Dublin. Despite the challenges associated with displacement and advancing age, he continued his scholarly work and remained intellectually active until his death. His years in Ireland were marked by continued research, writing, and engagement with international philosophical communities (Bocheński 31).

Łukasiewicz died on February 13, 1956, in Dublin. His legacy endures through the widespread influence of his theories and methods. Today, his work remains essential in studies of formal logic, philosophy, mathematics, linguistics, and computer science. The concepts he introduced, particularly many-valued logic and Polish notation, continue to shape contemporary approaches to reasoning and computation. His intellectual courage in questioning established assumptions and exploring alternative logical systems secured his place among the greatest logicians in modern history (Haack 63).

THE GENESIS OF MANY-VALUED LOGICS: PHILOSOPHICAL IMPERATIVES

Jan Łukasiewicz's development of many-valued logics was not merely a formal exercise but a response to profound philosophical problems, primarily the issue of determinism arising from Aristotle's discussion of future contingents. Classical logic, with its foundational Principle of Bivalence (every proposition is either true or false) and the Law of the Excluded Middle (a proposition is either true or its negation is true), seemed to imply that statements about future events must already possess a definite truth value (Haack 211). This simply means that every futuristic event or occurrence must definitely be affirmative, thereby depicting some form of certainty and prediction.

For Łukasiewicz, this led to an unacceptable logical determinism, where the future is pre-determined and human free will is undermined, which he expressed in his work titled *On Determinism* (Łukasiewicz 110). This simply means that Łukasiewicz refuted the fixation, certainty and determinism that classical logic had proposed. For him, there was more and beyond, just as Udo Inameti and Bisong would argue regarding the state of consciousness in *Absolute certainty and Asouzu's transcendent unity of consciousness*, that:

“obtaining truth and authenticity is a transcendent act, whereby the mind seeks to go beyond the immediacy. Therefore in all matters of truth and authenticity, the mind seeks the best possible way to comprehend and explain facts totally and comprehensively - this is its natural propensity”. (3)

Aristotle, in *De Interpretatione*, Chapter 9, famously pondered the truth status of propositions like “There will be a sea battle tomorrow”, which concern events that are not yet settled (18a28 - 19b4). Łukasiewicz argued that if such a proposition is true now, then the sea battle is necessary; if false, then impossible. Both conclusions contradict the notion of a contingent future. To resolve this dilemma, Łukasiewicz proposed rejecting the principle of bivalence for future contingents, introducing a third truth value, often designated as ‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ ’ and interpreted as “indeterminate” or “possible”, in his work titled *On Three-Valued Logic* (87). This simply means that determinism was replaced by indeterminacy. This intermediate truth value allowed for propositions about future contingent events to be neither true nor false at present, thereby providing a logical escape from determinism. Unlike Emil Post, whose contemporary work on many-valued logics was primarily formal, Łukasiewicz’s motivation was explicitly philosophical, aiming to provide a more appropriate representation for the indeterminacy of the future (Rescher 6).

Technical Architecture of Łukasiewicz’s Many-Valued Systems

Łukasiewicz’s philosophical motivations led him to construct a systematic framework for many-valued logics, moving beyond the classical binary system. His foundational three-valued logic ($\mathcal{L}_3$), introduced in 1920, operates with three truth values: ‘1’ (true), ‘0’ (false), and ‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ ’ (indeterminate). A key feature of his systems is the choice of ‘1’ as the sole designated (truth-preserving) value. This choice directly impacts the validity of classical tautologies; for instance, the Law of Excluded Middle is not a logical truth in $\mathcal{L}_3$, as it can take the value ‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ ’ if p is ‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ ’ (Rescher 7).

The logical operators in Łukasiewicz’s systems are generalized to accommodate these multiple truth values. For example, the implication operator is defined as a degree of truth rather than just absolute truth or absolute false. This definition allows for a nuanced understanding of truth propagation, where a conditional can be true even if its components are indeterminate (Rescher 7). Similarly, negation reverses the truth value (e.g., if 3 is ‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ ’, then 4 is also ‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ ’). Beyond, Łukasiewicz systematically generalized his approach to n -valued logics, where there is any finite integer greater than two, and even to infinitely-valued logic.

In many-valued logics, truth values are represented by all rational numbers or even all real numbers within the interval $[0, 1]$, allowing for “degrees of truth” as presented in Łukasiewicz’s *Elements of Mathematical Logic*. These systems fundamentally challenge classical semantics by introducing truth value plurality and non-classical interpretations for logical statements. The set of logical truths in this is a subset of those in classical logic, meaning that if a sentence is false in a two-valued interpretation, it also works in the three-valued system. However, sentences like that can discriminate between n -valued systems, being a two-valued logical truth but not a three-valued one (Rescher 156).

Łukasiewicz’s Contribution to Logical Pluralism

The core of this dissertation’s inquiry lies in assessing Jan Łukasiewicz’s contribution to logical pluralism. While he may not have explicitly articulated a comprehensive “meta-logical theory of logical pluralism” in the contemporary sense, his work provides a foundational historical precedent and compelling evidence for the view that there is more than one correct logic as also argued by Shapiro Stewart, in his 2014 book titled *Varieties of Logic* (17). Łukasiewicz’s pluralism can be understood as emerging from several dimensions:

Pluralism of Truth Values: By introducing intermediate truth values beyond ‘true’ and ‘false’, Łukasiewicz directly challenged the principle of bivalence, which is central to classical logic. This expansion of the semantic domain inherently suggests a multiplicity in the very nature of truth, allowing for a more nuanced handling of uncertainty and vagueness in logical reasoning.

Pluralism of Logical Consequence: While he may not have explicitly articulated a comprehensive meta-logical theory of “logical pluralism” in the contemporary sense, his work provides a foundational historical precedent and compelling evidence for the view that there is more than one correct logic.

Applicational Pluralism: Łukasiewicz developed specifically to address the philosophical problem of future contingents and determinism. This suggests an implicit view that different logical systems might be more appropriate or “correct” for different domains of application or specific philosophical problems. His work implies that classical logic, while suitable for some contexts, is inadequate for others, thereby necessitating alternative logical frameworks.

The creation of a family of logics, rather than just a single alternative to classical logic, further strengthens the argument for Łukasiewicz’s implicit pluralism. He demonstrated that logical systems are not monolithic but can be constructed and modified to serve specific purposes and reflect different philosophical commitments. While most contemporary versions of logical pluralism often retain classical logic as one of the correct logics, it is crucial to note that this is a contingent historical fact, not a conceptual requirement of logical pluralism itself (Shapiro 17).

A pluralist, inspired by Łukasiewicz, might accept multiple n-valued logics as correct without necessarily endorsing classical logic. His work thus provided concrete examples of alternative logical systems, paving the way for later explicit formulations of logical pluralism by thinkers like J.C. Beall and Greg Restall.

PHILOSOPHICAL IMPLICATIONS: TRUTH, MODALITY, AND DETERMINISM

Łukasiewicz’s many-valued logics carry significant philosophical implications for fundamental concepts such as truth, modality, and determinism.

Truth and Bivalence: By introducing intermediate truth values, Łukasiewicz directly challenged the Principle of Bivalence, a cornerstone of classical logic (Dummett 1). This move suggests that truth is not always a simple binary state but can exist in degrees or states of indeterminacy. This has profound implications for philosophical debates surrounding vagueness and uncertainty, offering a more nuanced logical framework for phenomena that do not fit neatly into true/false categories.

Modality: Łukasiewicz was deeply interested in the logical representation of modal concepts (necessity, possibility). He attempted to capture modality within his many-valued systems by assigning specific truth values to modal propositions, rather than introducing separate modal operators as in standard modal logics. For instance, a proposition assigned ‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ ’ could be interpreted as “possible” or “contingent”. However, this approach has faced criticism, with some arguing that his attempt to define modal operators solely through truth tables was flawed or counterintuitive, especially when compared to the development of dedicated modal logics (Haack 212).

Determinism: As discussed, the avoidance of logical determinism was Łukasiewicz’s primary philosophical motivation for developing . His definition of determinism as “the viewpoint that if A is B at the moment T, then it was also true at any moment which is previous

to T that A is B at the moment T” highlights his concern with the pre-determination of future events in his *On Determinism* (Łukasiewicz 110).

By allowing future contingents to be ‘indeterminate’, he sought to break the logical chain that seemed to necessitate future events. However, critics like Susan Haack have argued that Łukasiewicz’s reasoning regarding determinism might contain a logical mistake, suggesting that his position relies on specific semantic assumptions, such as “Peircean semantics”, which are not universally accepted (Haack 52-53). These critiques suggest that while Łukasiewicz’s logical innovations provided a framework for non-deterministic reasoning, the philosophical debate surrounding determinism itself is complex and not solely resolved by a change in logical system.

In conclusion, Łukasiewicz’s theoretical framework, driven by philosophical imperatives and realized through innovative technical constructions, fundamentally challenged the monistic view of logic. His work introduced the concept of truth value plurality and demonstrated the possibility of alternative logical consequence relations, thereby laying crucial groundwork for the development and assessment of logical pluralism. The philosophical implications of his systems, particularly concerning truth, modality, and determinism, continue to be subjects of active debate, highlighting both the enduring relevance and the inherent complexities of his contributions.

ASSESSMENT AND CRITIQUES OF ŁUKASIEWICZ’S LOGICAL PLURALISM

This chapter undertakes a critical assessment of Jan Łukasiewicz’s logical pluralism, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of his many-valued logical systems and engaging with the significant criticisms leveled against his philosophical motivations and technical implementations. While Chapter Three elucidated the theoretical framework and conceptual underpinnings of his work, this chapter scrutinizes the efficacy of his solutions and the broader implications for his contribution to logical pluralism.

Evaluation of Łukasiewicz’s Solution to Determinism and Future Contingents

Łukasiewicz’s primary philosophical motivation for developing his three-valued logic was to provide a logical framework that could avoid the deterministic implications of classical logic when dealing with future contingent propositions. He defined determinism as the viewpoint that “if A is b at the moment t, then it was also true at any moment which is previous to t that A is b at the moment t” as captured in his work “On Determinism and Future Truth”. By introducing a third truth value, ‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ ’ (indeterminate), for propositions about future events that are not yet settled, Łukasiewicz aimed to break the logical chain that seemed to necessitate future occurrences.

The strength of Łukasiewicz’s solution lies in its innovative rejection of bivalence for future contingents, thereby creating a logical space for genuine indeterminacy. This move allowed for a formal system where propositions like “There will be a sea battle tomorrow” could be neither true nor false in the present, thus seemingly preserving the contingency of the future and the possibility of free will. This was a radical departure from the prevailing classical view and opened up new avenues for logical inquiry into time and modality.

However, Łukasiewicz’s solution has faced considerable criticism regarding its philosophical efficacy. A central debate revolves around whether introducing a third truth value genuinely resolves the metaphysical problem of determinism or merely rephrases it in logical terms. Critics argue that the problem of future contingents is fundamentally a metaphysical one concerning the nature of reality and time, rather than solely a logical one that can be resolved by altering truth values (Dummett 14- 15).

Susan Haack, for instance, has argued that there is a “logical mistake” in Łukasiewicz’s reasoning concerning determinism. She contends that his position relies on specific semantic assumptions, particularly what is known as “Peircean semantics”, which posits that the future is semantically settled if and only if it is causally settled (Haack 153). If one does not accept this underlying semantic assumption, then the deterministic conclusion does not necessarily follow from the bivalence of future contingents. This suggests that Łukasiewicz’s solution might be contingent on a particular philosophical interpretation of truth and causality, rather than being a universally applicable logical fix. Furthermore, contemporary discussions of future contingents are often conducted within the framework of tense logic, which provides alternative formal tools for analyzing temporal propositions without necessarily resorting to many-valued systems.

Critiques of the Third Truth Value and Generalized Operators

The introduction of a third truth value ($\frac{1}{2}$) in Łukasiewicz’s systems, while innovative, has been a consistent source of philosophical and intuitive challenges. The precise interpretation of this intermediate value remains ambiguous. While Łukasiewicz himself interpreted it as “indeterminate” or “possible”, other interpretations have been proposed, such as “unknown”, “partially true”, “fuzzy truth values”, or “probabilistic truth values” (Rescher 2).

This multiplicity of interpretations raises questions about whether $\frac{1}{2}$ represents a genuine ontological truth status or merely an epistemic state of uncertainty. If it is merely epistemic, then the philosophical force of rejecting bivalence for metaphysical reasons is weakened.

A notable “counterintuitive consequence” of Łukasiewicz’s arises when both constituents of a conjunction ($\wedge$) or a disjunction ($\vee$) are assigned the value $\frac{1}{2}$. In such cases, both the Law of Contradiction ($\neg(A \wedge A)$) and the Law of Excluded Middle ($A \vee \neg A$) can take the same truth value of $\frac{1}{2}$ (Rescher 23). This outcome can be philosophically challenging, as it blurs the distinction between a contradiction and a tautology when dealing with indeterminate propositions. Furthermore, the intuitive appeal of Łukasiewicz’s generalized logical operators has been questioned. While his definition of implication ($\supset$) is formally consistent, its behavior can sometimes diverge from natural language intuitions about “if...then...” statements. For instance, an implication can be true even if both its antecedent and consequent are indeterminate. Similarly, some critics find his definitions of disjunction and possibility to be intuitively difficult to grasp (Rescher 163). These issues suggest that while Łukasiewicz’s systems are formally coherent, their philosophical interpretations and intuitive applicability in everyday reasoning or specific domains might be limited.

Challenges to Łukasiewicz’s Approach to Modality

Łukasiewicz’s interest in modality, particularly the possibility of free acts and the contingency of future events, was deeply intertwined with his development of many-valued logics. He attempted to capture modal concepts (necessity, possibility) by assigning specific truth values within his many-valued systems, rather than introducing separate modal operators as is common in standard modal logics. For example, a proposition with the truth value $\frac{1}{2}$ could be interpreted as “possible” or “contingent”. However, this approach has been a significant target of criticism, with some scholars arguing that Łukasiewicz made a “modal mistake” (Haack 79).

This criticism often stems from the perceived inadequacy of defining modal operators solely through truth tables in a many-valued context, especially when compared to the more robust and widely accepted frameworks of dedicated modal logics (e.g., S4, S5). These systems

introduce explicit modal operators (2 for necessity, 3 for possibility) and define their semantics using possible worlds, which many find to be a more intuitive and powerful way to model modal concepts (Haack 80). The argument is that Łukasiewicz's extensional approach to modality, relying solely on truth values, fails to capture the full intensional richness of modal notions.

Implications for Łukasiewicz's Logical Pluralism

The criticisms leveled against Łukasiewicz's many-valued logics and their philosophical underpinnings significantly impact the assessment of his contribution to logical pluralism. Firstly, if his solution to determinism is considered flawed or dependent on specific, debatable semantic assumptions (like Peircean semantics), it weakens the primary philosophical justification for his rejection of bivalence and, by extension, the initial impetus for his many-valued systems. While the existence of his systems still demonstrates logical multiplicity, the reason for their existence becomes less compelling if the problem they were designed to solve is not fully resolved by them.

Secondly, the ambiguities in interpreting the third truth value and the counterintuitive behavior of some generalized operators raise questions about the "correctness" or intuitive plausibility of his alternative logics as universally applicable systems. If the intermediate truth values lack a clear, consistent philosophical interpretation, or if the logical operations do not align with common reasoning patterns, then their status as equally valid alternatives to classical logic might be diminished for certain applications.

Despite these criticisms, Łukasiewicz's work remains a cornerstone for logical pluralism. Even if his specific solutions are debated, his pioneering efforts undeniably demonstrated the possibility of constructing coherent, non-classical logical systems. He showed that logic is not necessarily confined to a bivalent framework and that alternative logical consequence relations can be formally defined (Shapiro 17). This fundamental insight, that logic can be plural, is his enduring legacy, regardless of the specific flaws identified in his particular systems or their philosophical justifications. His work opened the conceptual space for later, more explicit formulations of logical pluralism, even if those later theories might adopt different motivations or technical approaches as captured by Graham Priest, in his 2006 book titled *Doubt Truth To Be a Liar* (Priest 202). The debate around his work continues to highlight the complexities inherent in defining "correctness" in logic and the multifaceted nature of logical pluralism itself.

CONCLUSION

This study assesses Jan Łukasiewicz's logical pluralism, addressing the ambiguity of whether his stance was explicitly articulated or implicitly derived from his groundbreaking work. The historical context of classical logic's dominance and Łukasiewicz's pivotal role in challenging its bivalence, driven by his philosophical concerns regarding determinism and Aristotle's problem of future contingents. It detailed his philosophical imperative to avoid logical determinism by rejecting bivalence for future contingents, leading to the introduction of an "indeterminate" truth value. The work further explored the technical architecture of his n-valued, and infinitely-valued logics, emphasizing their generalized operators and non-classical semantics. Crucially, it argued that Łukasiewicz's work embodies logical pluralism through a plurality of truth values, a plurality of logical consequence relations, and an implicit applicational pluralism, where different logics are suited for different philosophical problems. Also, we presented a critical assessment of Łukasiewicz's logical pluralism. While acknowledging the innovative nature of his solution to determinism, it engaged with criticisms that question whether his many-

valued logics truly resolve the metaphysical problem or merely rephrase it. The ambiguity in interpreting the third truth value and the sometimes counterintuitive behavior of his generalized operators were discussed as limitations. Furthermore, his approach to modality, attempting to capture modal concepts through truth values rather than dedicated operators, was critiqued in comparison to standard modal logics. Despite these criticisms, the chapter concluded that Łukasiewicz's work undeniably demonstrated the possibility of coherent, non-classical logical systems, thereby opening the conceptual space for logical pluralism.

The central thesis of this dissertation is that Jan Łukasiewicz, through his pioneering development of many-valued logics, made a foundational and implicit contribution to logical pluralism. While he may not have explicitly formulated a comprehensive meta-logical theory of logical pluralism in the contemporary sense, his work provided the crucial historical and formal precedent for the view that there is more than one correct logic. His legacy lies not necessarily in providing a flawless solution to every problem he tackled, but in fundamentally altering the landscape of logical inquiry by proving the viability and philosophical utility of alternative logical systems. This act of creation, driven by philosophical necessity, implicitly endorsed a pluralistic view of logic, where different systems can be valid and appropriate for different contexts or problems.

WORKS CITED

- Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. Translated by W. D. Ross, in *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, Princeton UP, 1984, Book IV, pp. 1588–1629.
- Beall, J. C., & Greg Restall. *Logical Pluralism*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Bocheński, J. M. *A History of Formal Logic*. University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.
- Dennis, Otto and Asodu, F. "Historical Development of Logic", in Umotong, I & Dennis, O et al(eds) *Rudiments of Philosophy and Logic* 15-23. Akwa Ibom State University, 2021.
- Dummett, Michael. *Truth and Other Enigmas*. Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Haack, Susan. *Philosophy of Logics*. Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Kneale, William, and Martha Kneale. *The Development of Logic*. Oxford University Press, 1962
- Łukasiewicz, Jan. "On Determinism". Selected Works, edited by L. Borkowski, North-Holland, 1970, pp. 110-28.
- . *Philosophical Remarks on Many-valued Systems of Propositional Logic*. Warsaw, 1930
- . "On Three-Valued Logic". Selected Works, edited by L. Borkowski, North-Holland, 1970, pp. 87-88.
- Priest, Graham. *Doubt Truth to Be a Liar*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Rescher, Nicholas. *Many-Valued Logic*. McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- Shapiro, Stewart. *Varieties of Logic*. Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Udo, Inameti & Bisong, P. "Absolute Certainty and Asouzu's Transcendent Unity of Consciousness". *American Journal of Social & Management Sciences* 2151-1559, DOI: 105251, 2014.
- Udofia, Christopher & Okorie, O. "The Meaning, Nature and Scope of Logic " in Umotong, I & Dennis, O et al(eds) *Rudiments of Philosophy and Logic* 15-23. Akwa Ibom State University, 2021.
- Udofia, Chris & Udo, A. "Boolean Two Value Logic: Its implication on Epistemology". *Periodica Journal of Modern Philosophy, Social Sciences and Humanities*. 20(7). pp 81-88, 2023.
- Umotong, Iniobong "the meaning, nature and scope of Philosophy" in Umotong, I & Dennis, O et al(eds) *Rudiments of Philosophy and Logic*, pp 15-23. Akwa Ibom State University, 2021.
- Woleński, Jan. *Logic and Philosophy in the Lvov-Warsaw School*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.