

**INTRODUCTION TO MODAL LOGIC 2016  
HOMEWORK 3**

- Deadline: October 18 — at the **beginning** of class.
- Grading is from 0 to 100 points.
- Success!

- (1) (30pt) Suppose that  $\gamma(x), \delta(x)$  are first-order formulas. We say that  $\gamma(x)$  *semantically entails*  $\delta(x)$  (Notation:  $\gamma(x) \models \delta(x)$ ) provided that for any model  $\mathfrak{M} = (W, R, V)$  and any  $w \in W$ ,

$$\mathfrak{M} \models \gamma(x)[w] \text{ implies } \mathfrak{M} \models \delta(x)[w].$$

We say that  $\gamma(x)$  *entails*  $\delta(x)$  *along bisimulation* provided that for any models  $\mathfrak{M} = (W, R, V)$  and  $\mathfrak{M}' = (W', R', V')$ , and any  $w \in W, w' \in W'$ ,

$$(\mathfrak{M}, w \approx \mathfrak{M}', w' \text{ and } \mathfrak{M} \models \gamma(x)[w]) \text{ implies } \mathfrak{M}' \models \delta(x)[w'].$$

A modal formula  $\varphi$  is called a *modal interpolant* of  $(\gamma(x), \delta(x))$  provided that

$$\gamma(x) \models \text{ST}_x(\varphi) \text{ and } \text{ST}_x(\varphi) \models \delta(x).$$

In the following let  $\alpha(x)$  and  $\beta(x)$  be first-order formulas.

- (a) Show that if  $\alpha(x)$  entails  $\beta(x)$  along bisimulation, then  $\alpha(x) \models \beta(x)$ .  
(**BONUS!**) (10pt) Show that the converse does not hold.
- (b) Suppose that the pair  $(\alpha(x), \beta(x))$  has a modal interpolant. Show that  $\alpha(x)$  entails  $\beta(x)$  along bisimulation.
- (c) In fact, the converse of (b) is true (but non-trivial to show), i.e. if  $\alpha(x)$  entails  $\beta(x)$  along bisimulation then the pair  $(\alpha(x), \beta(x))$  has a modal interpolant. Show that this implies (the non-obvious direction of) the van Benthem Characterization Theorem.

- (2) (40pt) Show that Grzegorzczuk's formula

$$\Box(\Box(p \rightarrow \Box p) \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p$$

characterizes the class of frames  $\mathfrak{F} = (W, R)$  satisfying (i)  $R$  is reflexive, (ii)  $R$  is transitive and (iii) there are no infinite paths  $x_0 R x_1 R x_2 R \dots$  such that for all  $i$  we have  $x_i \neq x_{i+1}$ .

- (3) (30pt) Show that the following properties of frames are not modally definable,:
- (a) antisymmetry  $\forall xy(Rxy \wedge Ryx \rightarrow x = y)$ ,
  - (b) acyclicity (there is no finite path from any  $x$  to itself).