

-NoValue-

syn.1 Truth at a World

nml:syn:trw: sec Every modal model determines which modal **fórmulas** count as true at which worlds in it. The relation “model $\mathfrak{M}$ makes **fórmula** φ true at world w ” is the basic notion of relational semantics. The relation is defined inductively and coincides with the usual characterization using truth tables for the non-modal operators.

nml:syn:trw: defn:mmodels **Definição syn.1.** *Truth of a fórmula φ at w in a $\mathfrak{M}$, in symbols: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$, is defined inductively as follows:*

1. $\varphi \equiv \perp$: Never $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \perp$.
2. $\varphi \equiv \top$: Always $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \top$.
3. $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash p$ iff $w \in V(p)$.
4. $\varphi \equiv \neg\psi$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \nVdash \psi$.
5. $\varphi \equiv (\psi \wedge \chi)$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ 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 $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$ (or both).
7. $\varphi \equiv (\psi \rightarrow \chi)$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \nVdash \psi$ or $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$.
8. $\varphi \equiv (\psi \leftrightarrow \chi)$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff either both $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \psi$ and $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$ or neither $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \psi$ nor $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \chi$.
9. $\varphi \equiv \Box\psi$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w' \Vdash \psi$ for all $w' \in W$ with Rww' .
10. $\varphi \equiv \Diamond\psi$: $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w' \Vdash \psi$ for at least one $w' \in W$ with Rww' .

nml:syn:trw: defn:sub:mmodels-box Note that by clause (9), a **fórmula** $\Box\psi$ is true at w whenever there are no w' with Rww' . In such a case $\Box\psi$ is *vacuously* true at w . Also, $\Box\psi$ may be satisfied at w even if ψ is not. The truth of ψ at w does not guarantee the truth of $\Diamond\psi$ at w . This holds, however, if Rww , p.ex., if R is reflexive. If there is no w' such that Rww' , then $\mathfrak{M}, w \nVdash \Diamond\varphi$, for any φ .

Problema syn.1. Consider the model of ???. Which of the following hold?

1. $\mathfrak{M}, w_1 \Vdash q$;
2. $\mathfrak{M}, w_3 \Vdash \neg q$;
3. $\mathfrak{M}, w_1 \Vdash p \vee q$;
4. $\mathfrak{M}, w_1 \Vdash \Box(p \vee q)$;
5. $\mathfrak{M}, w_3 \Vdash \Box q$;

6. $\mathfrak{M}, w_3 \Vdash \Box \perp$;
7. $\mathfrak{M}, w_1 \Vdash \Diamond q$;
8. $\mathfrak{M}, w_1 \Vdash \Box q$;
9. $\mathfrak{M}, w_1 \Vdash \neg \Box \Box \neg q$.

Proposição syn.2.

*nml:syn:trw:
prop:dual*

1. $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \Box \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \neg \Diamond \neg \varphi$.
2. $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \Diamond \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \neg \Box \neg \varphi$.

Prova. 1. $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \neg \Diamond \neg \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \not\Vdash \Diamond \neg \varphi$ by definition of $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash$. $\mathfrak{M}, w \not\Vdash \Diamond \neg \varphi$ iff for some w' with Rww' , $\mathfrak{M}, w' \Vdash \neg \varphi$. Hence, $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \neg \Diamond \neg \varphi$ iff for all w' with Rww' , $\mathfrak{M}, w' \not\Vdash \neg \varphi$. We also have $\mathfrak{M}, w' \not\Vdash \neg \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w' \Vdash \varphi$. Together we have $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \neg \Diamond \neg \varphi$ iff for all w' with Rww' , $\mathfrak{M}, w' \Vdash \varphi$. Again by definition of $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash$, that is the case iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \Box \varphi$.

2. $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \neg \Box \neg \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M} \not\Vdash \Box \neg \varphi$. $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \neg \Box \neg \varphi$ iff for all w' with Rww' , $\mathfrak{M}, w' \Vdash \neg \varphi$. Hence, $\mathfrak{M}, w \not\Vdash \Box \neg \varphi$ iff for some w' with Rww' , $\mathfrak{M}, w' \not\Vdash \neg \varphi$. We also have $\mathfrak{M}, w' \not\Vdash \neg \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, w' \Vdash \varphi$. Together we have $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \neg \Box \neg \varphi$ iff for some w' with Rww' , $\mathfrak{M}, w' \Vdash \varphi$. Again by definition of $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash$, that is the case iff $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \Diamond \varphi$. $\square$

Problema syn.2. Complete the proof of **Proposição syn.2**.

Problema syn.3. Let $\mathfrak{M} = \langle W, R, V \rangle$ be a model, and suppose $w_1, w_2 \in W$ are such that:

1. $w_1 \in V(p)$ if and only if $w_2 \in V(p)$ (for every **variável proposicional** p); and
2. for all $w \in W$: Rw_1w if and only if Rw_2w .

Using induction on **fórmulas**, show that for all **fórmulas** φ : $\mathfrak{M}, w_1 \Vdash \varphi$ if and only if $\mathfrak{M}, w_2 \Vdash \varphi$.

Problema syn.4. Let $\mathfrak{M} = \langle W, R, V \rangle$. Show that $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \neg \Diamond \varphi$ if and only if $\mathfrak{M}, w \Vdash \Box \neg \varphi$.

Créditos das Imagens

Referências Bibliográficas