

Modal Logic

Eric Pacuit, University of Maryland

September 27, 2023

Logics: Soundness and Completeness

A **logic** is a set of formulas \mathbf{L} satisfying certain closure conditions. We write $\vdash_{\mathbf{L}} \varphi$ iff $\varphi \in \mathbf{L}$.

Rule of inference: “From $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ infer φ ”, denoted
$$\frac{\varphi_1 \quad \varphi_2 \quad \cdots \quad \varphi_n}{\varphi},$$
 where $n \geq 0$. A logic is closed under a rule of inference means that if $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_n\} \subseteq \mathbf{L}$, then $\varphi \in \mathbf{L}$.

Uniform Substitution (US)

$$\frac{\varphi}{\psi}$$

where ψ is obtained from φ by uniformly replacing propositional atoms in φ by arbitrary formulas (i.e., $\psi = \varphi^\sigma$, where σ is a substitution).

Uniform Substitution (US)

$$\frac{\varphi}{\psi}$$

where ψ is obtained from φ by uniformly replacing propositional atoms in φ by arbitrary formulas (i.e., $\psi = \varphi^\sigma$, where σ is a substitution).

Axiom Schemes vs. Axioms:

- ▶ The logic contains all instances of $\alpha \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \alpha)$
- ▶ The logic contains the axiom $p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow p)$ and is closed under uniform substitution

Propositional Calculus (PC)

A modal formula φ is called a **(propositional) tautology** if $\varphi = (\alpha)^\sigma$ where σ is a substitution, α is a formula of propositional logic and α is a tautology.

For example, $\Box p \rightarrow (\Diamond(p \wedge q) \rightarrow \Box p)$ is a tautology because $a \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a)$ is a tautology in the language of propositional logic and

$$(a \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a))^\sigma = \Box p \rightarrow (\Diamond(p \wedge q) \rightarrow \Box p)$$

where $\sigma(a) = \Box p$ and $\sigma(b) = \Diamond(p \wedge q)$.

Propositional Calculus (PC)

RPL $\frac{\varphi_1 \quad \varphi_2 \quad \cdots \quad \varphi_n}{\varphi}$, where φ is a tautological consequence of $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ (i.e., $(\varphi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_n) \rightarrow \varphi$ is a propositional tautology).

Propositional Calculus (PC)

$$\rightarrow 1. \alpha \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \alpha)$$

$$\rightarrow 2. (\alpha \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \gamma)) \rightarrow ((\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \gamma))$$

$$\rightarrow 3. \perp \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$\wedge 1. (\alpha \wedge \psi) \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$\wedge 2. (\alpha \wedge \beta) \rightarrow \beta$$

$$\wedge 3. \alpha \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow (\alpha \wedge \beta))$$

$$\vee 1. \alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \vee \beta)$$

$$\vee 2. \beta \rightarrow (\alpha \vee \beta)$$

$$\vee 3. (\alpha \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow ((\beta \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow ((\alpha \vee \beta) \rightarrow \perp))$$

$$\text{DN. } ((\alpha \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \perp) \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$\text{MP. (Modus Ponens) } \frac{\alpha \quad \alpha \rightarrow \beta}{\beta}$$

Normal Modal Logic

A **normal modal logic** is a logic that:

- ▶ contains all instances of propositional tautologies

- ▶ is closed under modus ponens:
$$\frac{\varphi \quad \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$$

Normal Modal Logic

A **normal modal logic** is a logic that:

- ▶ contains all instances of propositional tautologies

- ▶ is closed under modus ponens:
$$\frac{\varphi \quad \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$$

- ▶ contains all instances of

 - ▶ *K*: $\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\psi)$

 - ▶ *Dual*: $\Diamond\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\Box\neg\varphi$

- ▶ is closed under necessitation (N):
$$\frac{\varphi}{\Box\varphi}$$

Normal Modal Logic

A **normal modal logic** is a logic that:

- ▶ contains all instances of propositional tautologies

- ▶ is closed under modus ponens: $\frac{\varphi \quad \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$

- ▶ contains all instances of

 - ▶ *K*: $\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\psi)$

 - ▶ *Dual*: $\Diamond\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\Box\neg\varphi$

- ▶ is closed under necessitation (N): $\frac{\varphi}{\Box\varphi}$

- ▶ is closed under uniform substitution: $\frac{\varphi}{\psi}$, where ψ is obtained from φ by uniformly replacing propositional atoms in φ by arbitrary formulas

An equivalent definition of a normal modal logic: A **normal modal logic** is a logic that:

- ▶ contains all instances of propositional tautologies
- ▶ is closed under modus ponens:
$$\frac{\varphi \quad \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$$
- ▶ contains all instances of
 - ▶ *Dual*: $\Diamond\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\Box\neg\varphi$
- ▶ is closed under *RK*:
$$\frac{(\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n) \rightarrow \varphi}{(\Box\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Box\varphi_n) \rightarrow \Box\varphi} \quad (n \geq 0)$$

An equivalent definition of a normal modal logic: A **normal modal logic** is a logic that

► contains all instances of propositional tautologies

► is closed under modus ponens:
$$\frac{\varphi \quad \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$$

► contains all instances of

► *Dual*: $\Diamond\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\Box\neg\varphi$,

► *M*: $\Box(\varphi \wedge \psi) \rightarrow (\Box\varphi \wedge \Box\psi)$

► *C*: $(\Box\varphi \wedge \Box\psi) \rightarrow \Box(\varphi \wedge \psi)$

► *N*: $\Box\top$

► is closed under *RE*:
$$\frac{\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi}{\Box\varphi \leftrightarrow \Box\psi}$$

Examples

1. The set of all formulas is a normal modal logic (the *inconsistent* logic).

Examples

1. The set of all formulas is a normal modal logic (the *inconsistent* logic).
2. Let \mathcal{F} be a frame. The set $\text{Log}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\varphi \mid \mathcal{F} \models \varphi\}$ is a normal modal logic.

Examples

1. The set of all formulas is a normal modal logic (the *inconsistent* logic).
2. Let \mathcal{F} be a frame. The set $\text{Log}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\varphi \mid \mathcal{F} \models \varphi\}$ is a normal modal logic.
3. Let F be a set of frames. The set $\text{Log}(F) = \{\varphi \mid \mathcal{F} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \mathcal{F} \in F\}$ is a normal logic.

Examples

1. The set of all formulas is a normal modal logic (the *inconsistent* logic).
2. Let \mathcal{F} be a frame. The set $\text{Log}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\varphi \mid \mathcal{F} \models \varphi\}$ is a normal modal logic.
3. Let F be a set of frames. The set $\text{Log}(F) = \{\varphi \mid \mathcal{F} \models \varphi \text{ for all } \mathcal{F} \in F\}$ is a normal logic.
4. Let \mathbf{K} be the smallest normal modal logic: The smallest set of formulas containing all propositional tautologies, all instances of K , all instances of $Dual$, closed under Modus Ponens, and closed under Necessitation.

Modal Logics

PC: All propositional tautologies

N: The rule of necessitation: $\frac{\varphi}{\Box\varphi}$

Some Axioms

$$K \quad \Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\psi)$$

$$D \quad \Box\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\varphi$$

$$T \quad \Box\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$$

$$4 \quad \Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\Box\varphi$$

$$5 \quad \neg\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\neg\Box\varphi$$

$$L \quad \Box(\Box\varphi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow \Box\varphi$$

Modal Logics

PC: All propositional tautologies

N: The rule of necessitation: $\frac{\varphi}{\Box\varphi}$

Some Axioms

<i>K</i>	$\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\psi)$
<i>D</i>	$\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\varphi$
<i>T</i>	$\Box\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$
<i>4</i>	$\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\Box\varphi$
<i>5</i>	$\neg\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\neg\Box\varphi$
<i>L</i>	$\Box(\Box\varphi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow \Box\varphi$

Some Normal Modal Logics

K	$K + PC + N$
T	$K + T + PC + N$
K4	$K + 4 + PC + N$
S4	$K + T + 4 + PC + N$
S5	$K + T + 4 + 5 + PC + N$
KD45	$K + D + 4 + 5 + PC + N$
GL	$K + L + PC + N$

Suppose that \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{L}' are two modal logics. We say that \mathbf{L}' **extends** \mathbf{L} when $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{L}'$. For example,

Suppose that \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{L}' are two modal logics. We say that \mathbf{L}' **extends** \mathbf{L} when $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{L}'$. For example,

Examples:

- ▶ $\mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathbf{T} \subseteq \mathbf{S4} \subseteq \mathbf{S5}$
- ▶ Let $\mathbb{F}_{ref} = \{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is reflexive}\}$. Then, $\mathbf{T} \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathbb{F}_{ref})$
- ▶ Let $\mathbb{F}_{ref,trans} = \{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is reflexive and transitive}\}$. Then, $\mathbf{S4} \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathbb{F}_{ref,trans})$
- ▶ Let $\mathbb{F}_{equiv} = \{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is an equivalence relation}\}$. Then, $\mathbf{S5} \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathbb{F}_{equiv})$

$\mathbb{F} \subseteq \mathbb{F}'$. Then, $\text{Log}(\mathbb{F}') \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathbb{F})$

$\mathbb{F} \subseteq \mathbb{F}'$. Then, $\text{Log}(\mathbb{F}') \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathbb{F})$

GL $\subseteq \text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans. and converse well-founded}\})$

K4 $\subseteq \text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans.}\})$

$\text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans.}\}) \subseteq \text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans. and converse well-founded}\})$

$\mathbb{F} \subseteq \mathbb{F}'$. Then, $\text{Log}(\mathbb{F}') \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathbb{F})$

GL $\subseteq \text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans. and converse well-founded}\})$

K4 $\subseteq \text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans.}\})$

$\text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans.}\}) \subseteq \text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans. and converse well-founded}\})$

What is the relationship between **GL** and **K4**?

$\mathbb{F} \subseteq \mathbb{F}'$. Then, $\text{Log}(\mathbb{F}') \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathbb{F})$

GL $\subseteq \text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans. and converse well-founded}\})$

K4 $\subseteq \text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans.}\})$

$\text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans.}\}) \subseteq \text{Log}(\{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is trans. and converse well-founded}\})$

What is the relationship between **GL** and **K4**? **K4** \subseteq **GL**

$\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\Box\varphi$ is a *consequence* of $\Box(\Box\varphi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow \Box\varphi$

Logical consequence

Suppose that Γ is a set of formulas and \mathbb{F} is a set of frames. We write $\mathcal{M}, w \models \Gamma$ iff $\mathcal{M}, w \models \alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$.

Logical consequence

Suppose that Γ is a set of formulas and \mathbb{F} is a set of frames. We write $\mathcal{M}, w \models \Gamma$ iff $\mathcal{M}, w \models \alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$.

Local: $\Gamma \models_{\mathbb{F}} \varphi$ iff for all frames $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$, for all models \mathcal{M} based on \mathcal{F} and all states w in \mathcal{M} ,

$$\mathcal{M}, w \models \Gamma \text{ implies } \mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$$

Logical consequence

Suppose that Γ is a set of formulas and \mathbb{F} is a set of frames. We write $\mathcal{M}, w \models \Gamma$ iff $\mathcal{M}, w \models \alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$.

Local: $\Gamma \models_{\mathbb{F}} \varphi$ iff for all frames $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$, for all models \mathcal{M} based on \mathcal{F} and all states w in \mathcal{M} ,

$$\mathcal{M}, w \models \Gamma \text{ implies } \mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$$

Global: $\Gamma \models_{\mathbb{F}}^g \varphi$ iff for all frames $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$, for all models \mathcal{M} based on \mathcal{F} ,

$$\mathcal{M} \models \Gamma \text{ implies } \mathcal{M} \models \varphi$$

$$\{p\} \not\models \Box p$$

$$\{p\} \models^g \Box p$$

$$\{p\} \not\models \Box p$$

$$\{p\} \models^g \Box p$$

Examples

- ▶ $\models (\Box p \wedge \Diamond q) \rightarrow \Diamond(p \wedge q)$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow \Diamond p\} \models \Diamond \top$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow p\} \models \Box p \rightarrow \Diamond p$

$$\{p\} \not\models \Box p$$

$$\{p\} \models^g \Box p$$

Examples

- ▶ $\models (\Box p \wedge \Diamond q) \rightarrow \Diamond(p \wedge q)$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow \Diamond p\} \models \Diamond \top$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow p\} \models \Box p \rightarrow \Diamond p$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow p, \Box p \rightarrow \Box \Box p, p \rightarrow \Box \Diamond p\} \models \Diamond p \rightarrow \Box \Diamond p$

$$\{p\} \not\models \Box p$$

$$\{p\} \models^g \Box p$$

Examples

- ▶ $\models (\Box p \wedge \Diamond q) \rightarrow \Diamond(p \wedge q)$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow \Diamond p\} \models \Diamond \top$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow p\} \models \Box p \rightarrow \Diamond p$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow p, \Box p \rightarrow \Box \Box p, p \rightarrow \Box \Diamond p\} \models \Diamond p \rightarrow \Box \Diamond p$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow \Diamond p, \Diamond p \rightarrow \Box \Diamond p\} \models \Box(\Box p \rightarrow p)$

$$\{p\} \not\models \Box p$$

$$\{p\} \models^g \Box p$$

Examples

- ▶ $\models (\Box p \wedge \Diamond q) \rightarrow \Diamond(p \wedge q)$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow \Diamond p\} \models \Diamond \top$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow p\} \models \Box p \rightarrow \Diamond p$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow p, \Box p \rightarrow \Box \Box p, p \rightarrow \Box \Diamond p\} \models \Diamond p \rightarrow \Box \Diamond p$
- ▶ $\{\Box p \rightarrow \Diamond p, \Diamond p \rightarrow \Box \Diamond p\} \models \Box(\Box p \rightarrow p)$
- ▶ $\{\Box(\Box p \rightarrow p) \rightarrow \Box p\} \models \Box p \rightarrow \Box \Box p$