

**INTRODUCTION TO MODAL LOGIC**  
**EXERCISE CLASS 7:**  
**NORMAL MODAL LOGICS AND HILBERT STYLE DERIVATIONS**

18 OCTOBER, 2018

- (1) Define *Sahlqvist antecedent* as the one built from  $\perp$ ,  $\top$ , boxed atoms and negative formulas by applying  $\diamond$  and  $\wedge$ . *Simple Sahlqvist formulas*<sup>1</sup> and *Sahlqvist formulas* are defined as in the notes using this new definition of a Sahlqvist antecedent.
- (a) (3.7.4 Blackburn et al.) Suppose  $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$  is a simple Sahlqvist formula in this new sense. Show that the formula  $\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$  is locally equivalent (on frames) to a simple Sahlqvist formula, namely to  $\diamond(\varphi \wedge \neg\psi) \rightarrow q$ , where  $q$  does not occur in  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ .
- (b) Show that if  $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \psi_1$  and  $\varphi_2 \rightarrow \psi_2$  are modal formulas, then  $(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \psi_1) \vee (\varphi_2 \rightarrow \psi_2)$  is locally equivalent (on frames) to the modal formula  $(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) \rightarrow (\psi_1 \vee \psi_2)$ .
- (c) Deduce that every Sahlqvist formula in this new sense is locally equivalent to a simple Sahlqvist formula in this new sense.
- (2) Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of frames and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a class of models.
- (a) Show that
- $$\text{Log}(\mathcal{C}) := \{\varphi : \forall \mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{C} (\mathbb{F} \Vdash \varphi)\}$$
- is a normal modal logic.
- (b) Is the set of formulas
- $$\text{Th}(\mathcal{M}) := \{\varphi : \forall \mathbb{M} \in \mathcal{M} (\mathbb{M} \Vdash \varphi)\}$$
- a normal modal logic?
- (3) Let  $\Lambda$  be a normal modal logic and let  $\varphi, \varphi', \psi, \psi'$  and  $\chi$  be formulas in the language of basic modal logic. Show that
- (a) If  $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$  is (a substitution instance of) a propositional tautology, then  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi$  implies  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \psi$ .
- (b) If  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi$  and  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \psi$  then  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi \wedge \psi$ .
- (c) If  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi \rightarrow \psi$  and  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \psi \rightarrow \chi$  then  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi \rightarrow \chi$ .
- (d) If  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi \rightarrow \psi$  and  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi' \rightarrow \psi'$  then  $\vdash_{\Lambda} (\varphi \wedge \varphi') \rightarrow (\psi \vee \psi')$
- (4) Let  $\Lambda$  be a normal modal logic and let  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  be formulas in the language of basic modal logic. Prove that
- (a)  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi \rightarrow \psi$  implies  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\psi$ ,

---

<sup>1</sup>This is now different from the definition of simple Sahlqvist formulas given in Blackburn et al. 3.47.

- (b)  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi \rightarrow \psi$  implies  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \diamond\varphi \rightarrow \diamond\psi$ ,
- (c)  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \Box(\varphi \wedge \psi) \leftrightarrow (\Box\varphi \wedge \Box\psi)$ ,
- (d)  $\vdash_{\Lambda} \diamond(\varphi \vee \psi) \leftrightarrow (\diamond\varphi \vee \diamond\psi)$ .

- (5) (Equivalent replacement). Let  $\varphi[\psi]$  be a formula that contains  $\psi$  as a subformula. Let  $\varphi[\chi]$  denote the formula where  $\psi$  in  $\varphi[\psi]$  is replaced with the formula  $\chi$ . Show that

$$\vdash_{\Lambda} \psi \leftrightarrow \chi \text{ implies } \vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi[\psi] \leftrightarrow \varphi[\chi],$$

for any normal modal logic  $\Lambda$ .

- (6) Show that  $\not\vdash_{\mathbf{S4}} p \rightarrow \Box\diamond p$  and that  $\not\vdash_{\mathbf{K}} \Box p \vee \Box\neg p$ . Recall that  $\mathbf{S4} = \mathbf{K} + (\Box p \rightarrow p) + (\Box p \rightarrow \Box\Box p)$ .

- (7) A normal modal logic  $\Lambda$  is *Halldén complete* if for every pair of formulas  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  with no common variables we have that

$$\vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi \vee \psi \text{ implies } \vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi \text{ or } \vdash_{\Lambda} \psi.$$

Is the normal modal logic  $\mathbf{K}$  Halldén complete? Give proof or counter-example.