



Exercises

1. Give a derivation in K of $\vdash (\diamond\phi \wedge \Box(\phi \rightarrow \psi)) \rightarrow \diamond\psi$.

Answer:

1. $(a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (\neg b \rightarrow \neg a)$ tauto from prop1
2. $(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\neg\psi \rightarrow \neg\phi)$ subst, 1
3. $\Box(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow \Box(\neg\psi \rightarrow \neg\phi)$ DISTR, 2
4. $\Box(\neg\psi \rightarrow \neg\phi) \rightarrow \Box\neg\psi \rightarrow \Box\neg\phi$ modal distribution
5. $\Box(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow \Box\neg\psi \rightarrow \Box\neg\phi$ PROP, 3, 4
6. $\Box(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow \neg\diamond\psi \rightarrow \neg\diamond\phi$ rewriting formula
7. $\Box(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow \diamond\phi \rightarrow \diamond\psi$ PROP
8. $\diamond\phi \wedge \Box(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow \diamond\psi$ PROP

In step 5 we use the prop1 tautology $(a \rightarrow b) \wedge (b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow c)$.

In step 7 we use the prop1 tautology $(a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow \neg c \rightarrow \neg b)$.

In step 8 we use the prop1 tautology $(a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow (b \wedge a \rightarrow c)$.

2. Give a derivation in K of $(\Box\phi \vee \Box\psi) \rightarrow \Box(\phi \vee \psi)$.

Answer:

1. $a \rightarrow (a \vee b)$ tautology from prop1
2. $\phi \rightarrow (\phi \vee \psi)$ subst, 1
3. $\Box\phi \rightarrow \Box(\phi \vee \psi)$ DISTR, 2
4. $b \rightarrow (a \vee b)$ tautology from prop1
5. $\psi \rightarrow (\phi \vee \psi)$ subst, 4
6. $\Box\psi \rightarrow \Box(\phi \vee \psi)$ DISTR, 5
7. $(\Box\phi \vee \Box\psi) \rightarrow \Box\phi \vee \Box\psi$ PROP 3, 6

In step 7 we use $(a \rightarrow c) \wedge (b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow (a \vee b) \rightarrow c$

3. Give a derivation in T of $\Box p \rightarrow \neg\Box\neg p$.

1. $\Box p \rightarrow p$ A1
2. $\Box\neg p \rightarrow \neg p$ subst, 1
3. $p \rightarrow \neg\Box\neg p$ PROP
4. $\Box p \rightarrow \neg\Box\neg p$ PROP

In step 3 we use $(a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (\neg b \rightarrow \neg a)$.

In step 4 we use $(a \rightarrow b) \wedge (b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow a \rightarrow c$.

4. Indicate and explain an error in the following derivation in T :

1. $q \rightarrow \Box q$ (necessitation)
2. $\Box p \rightarrow \Box \Box p$ (substitution, 1)

Answer:

Step 1 is incorrect: necessitation is: if ϕ derivable then $\Box \phi$ derivable.
Not $\phi \rightarrow \Box \phi$ derivable.

5. Indicate and explain the error(s) in the following derivation in T :

1. p (assumption)
2. $\Box p$ (necessitation, 1)
3. $p \rightarrow \Box p$ (PROP, 1, 3)
4. $\Box q \rightarrow \Box \Box q$ (substitution, 3)

Answer:

Step 3 is incorrect: we do not have an introduction rule for implication available.

6. Show that $\neg \Box \neg \Box p \rightarrow p$ is not derivable in $S4$.

Answer:

We use the soundness and completeness theorem: ϕ is derivable in $S4$ if and only if ϕ is valid in all reflexive-transitive frames.

We give a reflexive and transitive frame in which $\neg \Box \neg \Box p \rightarrow p$ is not valid/ Take $\mathcal{F} = (W, R)$ with $W = \{x, y\}$ and $R = \{(x, x), (y, y), (x, y)\}$. This is a reflexive and transitive frame. We use the valuation V with $V(p) = \{y\}$. Now we have: $y \models \Box p$, so $y \not\models \neg \Box p$. so $x \not\models \Box \neg \Box p$, so $x \models \neg \Box \neg \Box p$. But $x \not\models p$. Because we have given a valuation V and a state $x \in W$ such that $\mathcal{F}, V, x \not\models \neg \Box \neg \Box p \rightarrow p$, we conclude that $\mathcal{F} \not\models \neg \Box \neg \Box p \rightarrow p$.

We conclude (using soundness) that ϕ is not derivable in $S4$.

7. Give a derivation in $S5$ of $\neg \Box \neg \Box p \rightarrow p$.

8. Prove or disprove the validity of the following formulas in the temporal frame $\mathcal{N} = (\mathbb{N}, <)$ of the natural numbers $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \dots\}$ with the usual ordering $<$:

- (a) $\Diamond \Box p \rightarrow \Box \Diamond p$

Answer:

We prove that $\diamond\Box p \rightarrow \Box\diamond p$ is valid in the frame $\mathcal{N} = (\mathbb{N}, <)$. Let V be an arbitrary valuation on \mathcal{N} , let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be an arbitrary point of the model (\mathcal{N}, V) and assume $n \models \diamond\Box p$. We must prove $n \models \Box\diamond p$. By the assumption there is $m > n$ such that $m \models \Box p$. So, for all $k > m$ we have $k \models p$. In order to show that $n \models \Box\diamond p$, we let $x > n$ and prove $x \models \diamond p$. In the point $y = x + m$ we have $y \models p$ because $y > m$. Hence $x \models \diamond p$ as $y > x$.

(b) $\Box\diamond p \rightarrow \diamond\Box p$

9. Show that the formula

$$\lambda = \diamond p \wedge \diamond q \rightarrow \diamond(p \wedge \diamond q) \vee \diamond(p \wedge q) \vee \diamond(\diamond p \wedge q)$$

defines right-linearity, that is, for all (not necessarily temporal) frames $\mathcal{F} = (W, R)$:

$$\mathcal{F} \models \lambda \quad \text{if and only if} \quad R \text{ is right-linear}$$

A relation R is right-linear if $Rxy \wedge Rxz$ implies $Ryz \vee y = z \vee Rzy$ for all x, y, z .

Answer:

We show that, for all frames $\mathcal{F} = (W, R)$,

$$\mathcal{F} \models \lambda \iff R \text{ is right-linear,}$$

where $\lambda = \diamond p \wedge \diamond q \rightarrow \diamond(p \wedge \diamond q) \vee \diamond(p \wedge q) \vee \diamond(\diamond p \wedge q)$.

(\Leftarrow) Let \mathcal{F} be right-linear. Let V be an arbitrary valuation on \mathcal{F} , let x be an arbitrary point of the model (\mathcal{F}, V) , and assume $x \models \diamond p \wedge \diamond q$. We have to prove $x \models \diamond(p \wedge \diamond q) \vee \diamond(p \wedge q) \vee \diamond(\diamond p \wedge q)$. From $x \models \diamond p$ we get a point y with Rxy such that $y \models p$, and from $x \models \diamond q$ we get a point z with Rxz such that $z \models q$. By right-linearity of the frame there are three possible situations, namely Ryz or $y = z$ or Rzy . In all three cases, one of the disjuncts of the right-hand side of the implication λ holds in x :

- if Ryz , then $y \models p \wedge \diamond q$ and so $x \models \diamond(p \wedge \diamond q)$;
- if $y = z$, then $y \models p \wedge q$ and so $x \models \diamond(p \wedge q)$;
- if Rzy , then $z \models \diamond p \wedge q$ and so $x \models \diamond(\diamond p \wedge q)$;

and so we have shown that $x \models \diamond(p \wedge \diamond q) \vee \diamond(p \wedge q) \vee \diamond(\diamond p \wedge q)$.

(\Rightarrow) We prove this direction by contraposition, i.e., assuming that \mathcal{F} is *not* right-linear, we show that $\mathcal{F} \not\models \lambda$. \mathcal{F} not right-linear means there exist points a, b, c such that $Rab, Rac, \neg Rbc, b \neq c$, and $\neg Rcb$. Our task is to find a valuation V on \mathcal{F} , and a point x such that $\mathcal{F}, V, x \not\models \lambda$. This means that, in the model we are after, we want $x \models \diamond p, x \models \diamond q, x \not\models \diamond(p \wedge \diamond q), x \not\models \diamond(p \wedge q)$, and $x \not\models \diamond(\diamond p \wedge q)$. The right candidate for x seems to be a . The first two requirements ($a \models \diamond p, a \models \diamond q$) we can then fulfill by making p true in b and q true in c . The other requirements are met by forcing that p is *only* true in b and that q is *only* true in c . So we put $V(p) = \{b\}$ and $V(q) = \{c\}$. Then we have $b \not\models \diamond q$ (due to $\neg Rbc$) and $c \not\models \diamond p$ (due to $\neg Rcb$). Hence a has no R -successor that satisfies $p \wedge \diamond q$ (the only successor that has p is b , but $b \not\models \diamond q$), a has no R -successor that satisfies $p \wedge q$ (simply because $b \neq c$), and a has no R -successor that satisfies $\diamond p \wedge q$ (the only successor that has q is c , but $c \not\models \diamond p$). We conclude $a \not\models \diamond(p \wedge \diamond q) \vee \diamond(p \wedge q) \vee \diamond(\diamond p \wedge q)$, and so $a \not\models \lambda$. Hence λ is not valid outside the class of right-linear frames. (And so if it is valid, we are inside the class.)

10. Show that right-branching is not modally definable.

A relation R is right-branching if there exist x, y, z such that $x < y$ and $x < z$ but $\neg(y < z) \wedge y \neq z \wedge \neg(z < y)$.

Answer:

Done in exercise class 5.

11. Show that $\diamond p \rightarrow \diamond \diamond p$ defines density.

A relation R is dense if for all x, z we have: if $x < z$ then there is y such that $x < y$ and $y < z$.

Answer:

Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, <)$ be a (not necessarily temporal) frame We show that

$$\mathcal{T} \text{ is dense} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \mathcal{T} \models \diamond p \rightarrow \diamond \diamond p,$$

in two parts:

(\Leftarrow) Assume that $\mathcal{T} = (T, <)$ is a dense frame, that is, for all $x, y \in T$ with $x < y$ there is a $z \in T$ such that $x < z < y$. In order to show that $\mathcal{F} \models \diamond p \rightarrow \diamond \diamond p$, we consider an arbitrary valuation V on \mathcal{T} ,

and an arbitrary point $t \in T$, and assume $\mathcal{T}, V, t \models \Diamond p$. We have to prove $\mathcal{T}, V, t \models \Diamond \Diamond p$. By the assumption $t \models \Diamond p$ there is $v > t$ such that $v \models p$. By the frame being dense, there is a point u between t and v , so $t < u < v$. Now it holds that $u \models \Diamond p$ (due to $u < v$ and $v \models p$) and so $t \models \Diamond \Diamond p$ (due to $t < u$ and $u \models \Diamond p$).

(\Rightarrow) Assume $\mathcal{T} = (T, <)$ is *not* dense. We prove that $\mathcal{T} \not\models \Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond \Diamond p$. By the assumption, there are points t, v such that $t < v$ with no point in between, i.e., there is no point u such that $t < u < v$. We falsify the formula in t by defining a valuation V such that $t \models \Diamond p$ and $t \not\models \Diamond \Diamond p$. We take $V(p) = \{v\}$. Then indeed $t \models \Diamond p$ (as $t < v$ and $v \models p$). Moreover, $t \not\models \Diamond \Diamond p$ since there is no point u with $t < u$ and $u \models \Diamond p$, because that would require $u < v$ (since by the definition of V , p only holds in v), and the existence of a point u with $t < u < v$ was excluded.