

## Tutorial Exercises 3 (mjs)

### (Canonical models for normal systems)

1. A relation  $R$  is ‘serially reflexive’ when  $w R w'$  implies  $w' R w'$  for all  $w, w'$ . Show that the logic  $K \cup \{\Box(\Box A \rightarrow A)\}$  is determined by the class of serially reflexive frames.
2. Suppose the logic  $\Sigma$  has box operators  $K_a$  and  $K_b$  and is interpreted on frames  $\langle W, R_a, R_b \rangle$ . Show that if

$$\vdash_{\Sigma} K_b p \rightarrow K_a \neg K_b \neg p$$

then the canonical frame  $\langle W^{\Sigma}, R_a^{\Sigma}, R_b^{\Sigma} \rangle$  for  $\Sigma$  has the property that

$$w R_a^{\Sigma} w' \text{ and } w'' R_b^{\Sigma} w' \text{ implies } w R_b^{\Sigma} w''$$

for all  $w, w', w''$ .

3. As in previous question, but show that

$$\vdash_{\Sigma} K_a(K_b A \rightarrow K_a K_b A)$$

implies the canonical frame has the property:

$$u R_a^{\Sigma} w \text{ and } w R_a^{\Sigma} w' \text{ and } w' R_b^{\Sigma} w'' \text{ implies } w R_b^{\Sigma} w''$$

for all  $u, w, w', w''$ .

4. Prove that the normal modal logic  $KT5$  is determined by the class of equivalence frames.  
( $KT5 = KT45 = KTB5 = KTB4$  is the logic  $S5$ .)
5.  $S5$  is also determined by the class of universal frames. (A relation  $R$  is universal when  $w R w'$  for all worlds  $w, w'$ .) Show however that the canonical relation for  $S5$  is not universal.

*Hint:* consider either  $\{p\}$  or  $\{\Box p\}$  ( $p$  any atom), and observe that both these sets are obviously  $S5$ -consistent.

6. *From the 2003 exam:*

The system  $S4.2$  is a normal modal logic of type  $KT4G$ , i.e., the smallest normal system containing the schemas  $T$  and  $4$  and the following schema:

$$G. \quad \Diamond \Box A \rightarrow \Box \Diamond A$$

A relation  $R$  is said to be *strongly convergent* when, for all  $w, w'$  there exists a  $v$  such that  $w R v$  and  $w' R v$ .

Using the canonical model, show that  $S4.2=KT4G$  is complete with respect to the class of reflexive, transitive, strongly convergent Kripke models.

You may assume without proof that

$$\{A \mid \Box A \in \Gamma\} \cup \{A \mid \Box A \in \Gamma'\}$$

is  $KT4G$ -consistent for any maximal  $KT4G$ -consistent sets  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma'$ .

(But see the comment in the next question.)

7. *Harder* Actually,  $\{A \mid \Box A \in \Gamma\} \cup \{A \mid \Box A \in \Gamma'\}$  in the previous question is not necessarily  $KT4G$ -consistent. That doesn't affect the argument in the previous question — it was simplified to make a short exam question. In fact,  $KT4G$  is determined by the class of reflexive, transitive frames which satisfy the property (‘incestual’ or ‘Church-Rosser’) that, for all  $u, w, w'$  such that  $u R w$  and  $u R w'$  there exists a  $v$  such that  $w R v$  and  $w' R v$ .

Modify the argument in the previous question to show that this is so.