



Logic in AI - Proof theory of Modal Logical Systems

Università di Verona
Imbriani Paolo -VR500437
Professor Margherita Zorzi

January 9, 2025

Contents

1	What is a modal logic?	3
1.1	Semantic Models with Kripke	3
1.2	Logics of Knowledge	3
1.3	Proof Theory, Deductive Systems in Modal Logic	4
1.3.1	General Picture	4
1.4	Position and modalities	4
1.4.1	Position	4
1.5	What adds S4.2?	4
1.6	Beyond S4: the Logic S5	5
1.7	Curry Howard Correspondence and the Intuitionistic	5

1 What is a modal logic?

In Modal logic are added modalities: \Box, \Diamond . If A is a formula then $\Box A$ and $\Diamond A$ are formulas. There are many types of modalities and meaning we can give to this operator such as:

- Temporal
- Epistemic
- Doxastic

1.1 Semantic Models with Kripke

Structure: $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R}, \rho \rangle$

- \mathcal{W} set of possible
- $\rho : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow 2^{AT}$
- $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}$: accessibility relation

There are different axioms in Normal Modal Logic such as:

- Axiom K: $\Box(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\Box A \rightarrow \Box B)$ which is the kernel of the normal modal logic.
- Axiom D: $\Box A \rightarrow \Diamond B$
- Axiom T: $\Box A \rightarrow A$
- Axiom 4: $\Box A \rightarrow \Box \Box A$
- Axiom 5: $A \rightarrow \Box \Diamond A$

And what we can say about these axioms?

- Axiom T, forces the relation R in the Kripke model to be *reflexive*.
- Axiom 4, forces the relation R in the Kripke Model to be *transitive*.
- Axiom D, forces the relation R in the Kripke model to be *serial*.
- Axiom 5, forces the relation R in the Kripke model to be *symmetric*.

1.2 Logics of Knowledge

Epistemic Modal Logic where

- \Box is a Knowledge
- \Diamond is a Belief

this logic is useful when we want to reason inconsistencies.

- If we know something, that is true
- If we know something, we know that we know something

1.3 Proof Theory, Deductive Systems in Modal Logic

There are different deductive styles: sequent calculus, analytic tableaux, natural deduction. And there are several approaches, including: labelled deductive systems and geometric/multidimensional deductive systems. The desiderata is *cut elimination/normalization and modularity*.

Another approach is "Multidimensional" systems, formulae are enriched with a spatial coordinate (index/position) that provides information within the proof. In this way we can treat modalities in analogy as quantifiers are treated in first-order systems. Only modal operators can "change" the spatial position of the formulae.

$$\forall \leftrightarrow \Box$$

$$\exists \leftrightarrow \Diamond$$

1.3.1 General Picture

According to the assumption we make on the spatial coordinate S of formulas A^S we can "tune" the system to a specific (normal) modal logic:

- S is a sequence: by setting some constraints on the rule $\Diamond E$ and $\Diamond I$ one obtains all the logic from K to $S4$
- S is a set, one captures the system $S4.2$.
- S is a singleton set: one captures $S5$.

1.4 Position and modalities

Lemma 1.1. *A formula A interacts with a formula B with respect to variable x if x occurs in free in both A and B .*

We have the possibility to add or remove the \Box operator through modal interaction, "playing" with the spatial coordinate and constraint.

1.4.1 Position

Definition 1.2. A position is a *sequence of uninterpreted tokens*.

We have associative concatenations and a Successor.

1.5 What adds S4.2?

- $S4.2 = S4 + \Diamond\Box A \rightarrow \Box\Diamond A(.2)$

This is still an unexplored country but this Logic describes Knowledge and Belief.

1.6 Beyond S4: the Logic S5

- $S5 = S4 + \phi \rightarrow \Box \Diamond \phi$ or $K + T + D + \Diamond A \rightarrow \Box \Diamond A$.

We obtain soundness and completeness *w.r.t* Hilbert-style.

1.7 Curry Howard Correspondence and the Intuitionistic

Through BHK we can interpret proof as we can compute the proofs.