

- FRANCISCO MARTINEZ HERRERA, *Justifications and the Lewis argument on ECQ: a relevant note*.

Instituto de Investigaciones Filosóficas IIF, Circuito Maestro Mario de la Cueva s/n, Ciudad Universitaria, Coyoacán, UNAM, Mexico.

*E-mail:* fmh.azgar@gmail.com.

Taking into account the usual Lewis' independent argument on ECQ, we use Justification Logic as proposed in Artemov [1] [2] to give a simple formalization of the argument. Then, we proceed to clarify the meaning of the classical argument and finally argue that the hypothetical proof-structure shown by means of justification terms provides a clearer, simpler and more explanatory representation of the grounds of some typical arguments to reject ECQ coming from relevant logicians [3, 5, 8].

[1] ARTEMOV, SERGEI, *The logic of justification*, *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 01(2008), no. 4, pp. 477–513.

[2] ———, *Operational modal logic*, *Mathematical Sciences Institute, Cornell University*, vol. 95 (1995), no. 29, pp. XX–XXX.

[3] ANDERSON, A. AND BELNAP, *Entailment, The logic of relevance and necessity I*, Princeton University Press, 1975.

[4] BLACKBURN P., DE RIJKE M., AND VENEMA Y, *Modal Logic: Graph. Darst.*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[5] DUNN, J. M. AND RESTALL, G., *Relevance Logic, Handbook of philosophical logic* (Gabbay, D. M., and Guenther, F., editors), Springer, Dordrecht, 2002, pp. 1–128.

[6] FITTING, M., *Paraconsistent logic, evidence, and justification*, *Studia Logica*, vol. 105 (2017), no. 6, pp. 1141–1166.

[7] LEWIS, D., *Papers in philosophical logic*, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[8] MARES, E. AND MEYER, R. K., *Relevant Logics*, (Lou Goble, editors), Blackwell, Oxford, 2001, pp. 1100–1156.

[9] MARTIN, CHRISTOPHER J., *Williams Machine*, *Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 83(1986), no. 10, pp. 564–572.

[10] PRIEST, G., *An introduction to non-classical logic: From if to is.*, Cambridge University Press., 2008.

[11] STUDER, T., *Lectures on justification logic*, Lecture notes, 2012.