fil.1 Filtrations

nml:fil:fil: sec

Rather than define "the" filtration of $\mathfrak{M}$ through Γ, we define when a model $\mathfrak{M}^*$ counts as a filtration of $\mathfrak{M}$. All filtrations have the same set of worlds W^* and the same valuation V^*. But different filtrations may have different accessibility relations R^*. To count as a filtration, R^* has to satisfy a number of conditions, however. These conditions are exactly what we'll require to prove the main result, namely that $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$, provided $\varphi \in \Gamma$.

nml:fil:fil: defn:filtration

Definition fil.1. Let Γ be closed under subformulas and $\mathfrak{M} = \langle W, R, V \rangle$. A *filtration of $\mathfrak{M}$ through Γ* is any model $\mathfrak{M}^* = \langle W^*, R^*, V^* \rangle$, where:

1. $W^* = \{[w] : w \in W\}$;
2. For any $u, v \in W$: (nml:fil:fil: defn:filtration-R)
   a) If Ruv then $R^*[u][v]$; (nml:fil:fil: defn:filtration-R1)
   b) If $R^*[u][v]$ then for any $\Box\varphi \in \Gamma$, if $\mathfrak{M}, u \Vdash \Box\varphi$ then $\mathfrak{M}, v \Vdash \varphi$; (nml:fil:fil: defn:filtration-R2)
   c) If $R^*[u][v]$ then for any $\Diamond\varphi \in \Gamma$, if $\mathfrak{M}, v \Vdash \varphi$ then $\mathfrak{M}, u \Vdash \Diamond\varphi$. (nml:fil:fil: defn:filtration-R3)
3. $V^*(p) = \{[u] : u \in V(p)\}$.

It's worthwhile thinking about what $V^*(p)$ is: the set consisting of the equivalence classes $[w]$ of all worlds w where p is true in $\mathfrak{M}$. On the one hand, if $w \in V(p)$, then $[w] \in V^*(p)$ by that definition. However, it is not necessarily the case that if $[w] \in V^*(p)$, then $w \in V(p)$. If $[w] \in V^*(p)$ we are only guaranteed that $[w] = [u]$ for *some* $u \in V(p)$. Of course, $[w] = [u]$ means that $w \equiv u$. So, when $[w] \in V^*(p)$ we can (only) conclude that $w \equiv u$ for some $u \in V(p)$.

nml:fil:fil: thm:filtrations

Theorem fil.2. *If $\mathfrak{M}^*$ is a filtration of $\mathfrak{M}$ through Γ, then for every $\varphi \in \Gamma$ and $w \in W$, we have $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ if and only if $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$.*

Proof. By induction on φ, using the fact that Γ is closed under subformulas. Since $\varphi \in \Gamma$ and Γ is closed under sub-formulas, all sub-formulas of φ are also $\in \Gamma$. Hence in each inductive step, the induction hypothesis applies to the sub-formulas of φ.

1. $\varphi \equiv \bot$: Neither $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ nor $\mathfrak{M}^*, w \Vdash \varphi$.
2. $\varphi \equiv \top$: Both $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ and $\mathfrak{M}^*, w \Vdash \varphi$.
3. $\varphi \equiv p$: The left-to-right direction is immediate, as $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ only if $w \in V(p)$, which implies $[w] \in V^*(p)$, i.e., $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$. Conversely, suppose $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$, i.e., $[w] \in V^*(p)$. Then for some $v \in V(p)$, $w \equiv v$. Of course then also $\mathfrak{M}, v \Vdash p$. Since $w \equiv v$, w and v make the same formulas from Γ true. Since by assumption $p \in \Gamma$ and $\mathfrak{M}, v \Vdash p$, $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$.
4. $\varphi \equiv \neg\psi$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \nVdash \psi$. By induction hypothesis, $\mathfrak{M}, w \nVdash \psi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \nVdash \psi$. Finally, $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \nVdash \psi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$.

5. $\varphi \equiv (\psi \wedge \chi)$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \psi$ and $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$. By induction hypothesis, $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \psi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \psi$, and $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \chi$. And $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \psi$ and $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \chi$.

6. $\varphi \equiv (\psi \vee \chi)$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \psi$ or $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$. By induction hypothesis, $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \psi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \psi$, and $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \chi$. And $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \psi$ or $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \chi$.

7. $\varphi \equiv (\psi \rightarrow \chi)$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \nVdash \psi$ or $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$. By induction hypothesis, $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \psi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \psi$, and $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \chi$. And $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \nVdash \psi$ or $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \chi$.

8. $\varphi \equiv (\psi \leftrightarrow \chi)$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \psi$ and $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$, or $\mathfrak{M}, w \nVdash \psi$ and $\mathfrak{M}, w \nVdash \chi$. By induction hypothesis, $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \psi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \psi$, and $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \chi$. And $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \psi$ and $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \chi$, or $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \nVdash \psi$ and $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \nVdash \chi$.

9. $\varphi \equiv \Box\psi$: Suppose $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$; to show that $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$, let v be such that $R^*[w][v]$. From Definition fil.1(2b), we have that $\mathfrak{M}, v \Vdash \psi$, and by inductive hypothesis $\mathfrak{M}^*, [v] \Vdash \psi$. Since v was arbitrary, $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$ follows.

   Conversely, suppose $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$ and let v be arbitrary such that Rwv. From Definition fil.1(2a), we have $R^*[w][v]$, so that $\mathfrak{M}^*, [v] \Vdash \psi$; by inductive hypothesis $\mathfrak{M}, v \Vdash \psi$, and since v was arbitrary, $\mathfrak{M}, u \Vdash \varphi$.

10. $\varphi \equiv \Diamond\psi$: Suppose $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$. Then for some $v \in W$, Rwv and $\mathfrak{M}, v \Vdash \psi$. By inductive hypothesis $\mathfrak{M}^*, [v] \Vdash \psi$, and by Definition fil.1(2a), we have $R^*[w][v]$. Thus, $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$.

    Now suppose $\mathfrak{M}^*, [w] \Vdash \varphi$. Then for some $[v] \in W^*$ with $R^*[w][v]$, $\mathfrak{M}^*, [v] \Vdash \psi$. By inductive hypothesis $\mathfrak{M}, v \Vdash \psi$. By Definition fil.1(2c), we have that $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$. □

Problem fil.1. Complete the proof of Theorem fil.2

What holds for truth at worlds in a model also holds for truth in a model and validity in a class of models.

Corollary fil.3. *Let Γ be closed under subformulas. Then:*

1. *If $\mathfrak{M}^*$ is a filtration of $\mathfrak{M}$ through Γ then for any $\varphi \in \Gamma$: $\mathfrak{M} \Vdash \varphi$ if and only if $\mathfrak{M}^* \Vdash \varphi$.*

2. *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a class of models and $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is the class of Γ-filtrations of models in $\mathcal{C}$, then any formula $\varphi \in \Gamma$ is valid in $\mathcal{C}$ if and only if it is valid in $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$.*

Photo Credits

Bibliography