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Abstract

For each natural number \( n \) we study the modal logic determined by the class of transitive Kripke frames in which there are no strictly ascending chains and no cycles of length greater than \( n \). The case \( n = 0 \) is the Gödel-Löb provability logic. Each logic is axiomatised by adding a single axiom to K4, and is shown to have the finite model property and be decidable.

We then consider a number of extensions of these logics, including restricting to reflexive frames to obtain a corresponding sequence of extensions of S4. When \( n = 1 \), this gives the famous logic of Grzegorczyk, known as S4Grz, which is the strongest modal companion to intuitionistic propositional logic.

The variety of modal algebras validating the \( n \)-th logic is shown to be generated by the powerset algebras of the finite frames with cycle length bounded by \( n \). Moreover each algebra in the variety is a model of the universal theory of the finite ones, and so is embeddable into an ultraproduct of them.

1 Algebraic Logic and Logical Algebra

The field of algebraic logic has been described as having two main aspects (see the introductions to [Daigneault 1974] and [Andréka, Németi, and Sain 2001]). One is the study of algebras arising from logical ideas. The other is the study of logical questions by algebraic methods.

Both aspects are well exemplified in the profound research of Hajnal Andréka and István Németi. Together, and in collaboration with many colleagues, they have created a prodigious body of literature about Boolean algebras, cylindric algebras, polyadic algebras, relation algebras, fork algebras, modal algebras, dynamic algebras, Kleene algebras and others; with applications to questions of definability, axiomatizability, interpolation, omitting types, decidability etc. for a range of logics.

Concerning the first aspect, there is no restriction on the methods that may be used to study abstract algebras. Often the work is algebraic, but it may also involve, say, topology or set theory. Or logic itself. The study of algebraic questions by logical methods, a kind of converse to the first second aspect, might be called logical algebra.

One of the aims of the present paper is to provide an illustration of logical algebra at work. In the final section we show that some varieties of modal algebras, built from certain finite graphs with bounded circumference, have the property that each member of the variety is embeddable into an ultraproduct of finite members. The logical proof of this structural result involves an adaptation of a construction developed to show that certain modal logics have the finite model property under their Kripke semantics, as well as an analysis of the behaviour of the universal sentences satisfied by the algebras involved.

The initial impetus for this study came from reflection on a property of the well known modal logic of Grzegorczyk, which is characterised by the class of finite partially ordered Kripke frames.
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A partial order can be described as a quasi-order (reflexive transitive relation) that has circumference equal to 1, where the circumference is the longest length of any cycle. This suggests a natural question: what modal logics are characterised by frames with circumference at most \(n\) for an arbitrary natural number \(n\)? Dropping reflexivity and considering transitive frames, the answer is already known for two cases. For \(n = 0\) it is the Gödel-Löb modal logic of provability, and for \(n = 1\) it is a version of Grzegorczyk’s logic without reflexivity. Here we will provide a systematic answer for all \(n\), giving in each case an axiomatisation of the logic concerned and showing it has the finite model property. We then turn to the algebraic version of these results, and take up the matters mentioned in the previous paragraph.

The next section provides more background on these ideas, as preparation for the technical work to follow.

2 Grzegorczyk and Lòb

Grzegorczyk [1967] defined a modal logic, which he called G, by adding to S4 the axiom

\[
((p \rightarrow \Box q) \rightarrow \Box q) \land ((\neg p \rightarrow \Box q) \rightarrow \Box q)) \rightarrow \Box q, \tag{2.1}
\]

where \(\rightarrow\) denotes strict implication, i.e. \(\varphi \rightarrow \psi\) is \(\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)\). He showed that G is a modal companion to intuitionistic propositional logic, meaning that the latter is embedded conservatively into G by the Gödel-McKinsey-Tarski translation.

A few years earlier, Sobociński [1964] had defined a logic K1.1 by adding to S4 the axiom

\[
((p \rightarrow \Box p) \rightarrow \Box p),
\]

which he called J1. This was an adaptation of

\[
((p \rightarrow \Box p) \rightarrow \Box p) \rightarrow (\Diamond \Box p \rightarrow p),
\]

which was in turn a simplification by Geach of

\[
((p \rightarrow \Box p) \rightarrow \Box p) \rightarrow (\Box \Box p \rightarrow \Box p),
\]

which had been discovered in 1958 by Dummett as an example of a formula that is not a theorem of S4.3 but is valid under Prior’s Diodorean temporal interpretation of necessity in discrete linear time (see Prior [1962], p.139 and Prior [1967], p.29).

Sobociński [1970] showed that K1.1 is weaker than G, by deriving J1 from Grzegorczyk’s G-axiom (2.1). He raised the issue of whether K1.1 was strictly weaker, suggesting that this was ‘very probable’. However Segerberg [1971, Section II.3] proved that K1.1 and G are the same logic, by showing that K1.1 is determined by the class of finite partially ordered Kripke frames and observing that (2.1) is valid in all such frames, hence derivable in K1.1. Segerberg axiomatised K1.1 as S4 plus

\[
\Box(\Box(p \rightarrow \Box p) \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p, \tag{2.2}
\]

which is equivalent to J1 over S4. He gave the name ‘Grz’ to axiom (2.2) in honour of Grzegorczyk, and K1.1/G has been known ever since as S4Grz.

The difference between S4 and S4Grz can be understood in terms of the distinction between quasi-ordered and partially ordered frames. A quasi-order \((W, R)\) is a reflexive transitive relation \(R\) on a set \(W\). It is a partial order if in addition it is antisymmetric: \(xRyRx\) implies \(x = y\). The condition ‘\(xRyRx’ defines an equivalence relation on \(W\) whose equivalence classes are known as clusters. \(R\) is universal on a given cluster and maximally so. It lifts to a partial order of the set of clusters by specifying that \(CRC’\) iff \(xRy\) where \(x\) is any member of cluster \(C\) and \(y\) is any member of cluster \(C’\). The original relation \(R\) is a partial order iff each cluster contains just a single element.
In these terms, S4 has a number of characterisations. It is the logic of all quasi-orders, of all partial orders, and of all finite quasi-orders. But it is not the logic of all finite partial orders since, as mentioned above, that logic is S4Grz. The Grz-axiom (2.2) is valid in any finite partial order, but invalid in some infinite partial orders. The precise situation is that Grz is valid in a frame \((W, R)\) iff it is a partial order that has no strictly ascending chains, i.e. no sequences \(x_0 R \cdots R x_n R x_{n+1} R \cdots\) such that \(x_{n+1} R x_n\) fails for all \(n\). A finite quasi-order has no such chains, so validates Grz iff it is antisymmetric.

For \(n \geq 1\), an \(n\)-cycle is given by a sequence \(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}\) of \(n\) distinct points that have \(x_0 R \cdots R x_{n-1} R x_0\). The points of a cycle all belong to the same cluster, and in a finite frame the length of a longest cycle is equal to the size of a largest cluster. This maximum length/size is the circumference of the frame.

Our interest in this paper is in relaxing the antisymmetry property of partial orders that constrains clusters to be singletons and cycles to be of length 1. What logic results if we allow cycles of length up to two, or three etc.? Also we wish to broaden the context to consider transitive frames that may have irreflexive elements, and clusters that may consist of a single such element. So instead of S4, we work over the weaker K4, which is the logic of all transitive frames. That allows us to admit a circumference of 0, since in a finite transitive irreflexive frame there are no cycles at all. The logic characterised by such frames has been well studied: it is the smallest normal logic to contain the L"ob axiom

\[ \Box(\Box p \rightarrow p) \rightarrow \Box p. \tag{2.3} \]

The proof of this fact is also due to Segerberg (1971), who called the axiom W and the logic KW. Later Solovay (1976) showed that it is precisely the modal logic that results when \(\Box\) is interpreted as expressing provability in first-order Peano arithmetic. It was L"ob (1955) who showed that (2.3) is valid under this interpretation. The logic is now often called the G"odel-L"ob logic, or GL.

For each natural number \(n\) we will define an axiom \(C_n\) which is valid in precisely those transitive frames that have no strictly ascending chains and no cycles (or clusters) with more than \(n\) elements. We prove that the logic of this class of frames is axiomatisable as the system K4\(C_n\).

The proof uses the familiar technology of filtration of canonical models and then modification of the filtration to obtain a finite model with the desired properties. Here the modification involves ‘breaking up’ clusters that contain too many elements, hence destroying cycles that are too long. It establishes that K4\(C_n\) has the finite model property, being the logic of the class of finite transitive frames that have circumference at most \(n\), and is a decidable logic. From this we conclude that the logics \(\{\text{K4}C_n : n \geq 0\}\) form a strictly decreasing sequence of extensions of K4 whose intersection is K4 itself. The analysis is then adapted to some extensions of K4\(C_n\) obtained by adding the axioms corresponding to seriality, reflexivity and connectedness of the relation \(R\).

To indicate the nature of the axioms \(C_n\), we indicate first that \(C_0\) is equivalent over all frames to the formula

\[ \lozenge p \rightarrow \lozenge (p \land \neg \lozenge p), \]

which is itself equivalent to the L"ob axiom (2.3).

To explain \(C_1\), observe that Grz is equivalent over S4 to

\[ \Box(\Box (p \rightarrow \Box p) \rightarrow p) \rightarrow \Box p, \tag{2.4} \]

which can be equivalently expressed in terms of \(\Diamond\) as

\[ \Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond (p \land \neg \Diamond (\neg p \land \Diamond p)). \tag{2.5} \]

Replacing \(\neg p\) here by a variable which is hypothesised to be incompatible with \(p\), we are led to define \(C_1\) to be the two-variable formula

\[ \Box \neg (p \land q) \rightarrow (\Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond (p \land \neg \Diamond (q \land \Diamond p))). \]
This will be shown in Theorem 5.1 to be equivalent to (2.5), hence to (2.4), over K4. Frames validating the logic K4 + C1 have only singleton clusters, some of which may contain irreflexive elements. The finite frames of this kind determine the logic K4 + (2.4), as was shown by Amerbauer (1994) using tableaux techniques, and then by Gabelaia (2004) using a filtration method. This logic is equal to K4 + C1. Grzegorczyk’s logic disallows irreflexivity and is equal to S4C1.

Lifting the pattern of C1 to three variables p0, p1, p2, we define C2 to be

\[ \Box (\bigwedge_{i<j<k} \neg(p_i \land p_j)) \rightarrow (\Diamond p_0 \rightarrow \Diamond(p_0 \land \neg\Diamond(p_1 \land \Diamond(p_2 \land \Diamond(p_0))))). \]

Cn extends the pattern to n + 1 variables, and will be formally defined in Section 4.

After completing our model-theoretic analysis we turn to algebra in the final section and study the variety Vn of all modal algebras validating the logic K4Cn. This is generated by its finite members, and indeed by the class Cn+1 of all powerset algebras of the class Cn of all finite transitive frames of circumference at most n. Thus Vn is the class of all models of the set of universal sentences satisfied by Cn+1. It follows that every member of Vn can be embedd into an ultraproduct of members of Cn+1.

3 Clusters and Cycles

A frame \( F = (W, R) \) is a directed graph, consisting of a binary relation R on a set W. A point \( x \in W \) is reflexive if \( xRx \), and irreflexive otherwise. If every member of W is (ir)reflexive, we say that R and F are (ir)reflexive. F is transitive when R is a transitive relation.

For the most part we work with transitive frames and informally give R a temporal interpretation, so that if \( xRy \) we may say that y is an R-successor of x, that y comes R-after x, or is R-later than x, etc.

In a transitive frame, a cluster is a subset C of W that is an equivalence class under the equivalence relation \( \{ (x, y) : x = y \ or \ xRyRx \} \). A singleton \( \{ x \} \) with x irreflexive is a degenerate cluster. All other clusters are non-degenerate: if C is non-degenerate then it contains no irreflexive points and the relation R is universal on C and maximally so. Graph-theoretically, a non-degenerate cluster is a maximally complete subgraph of the directed graph \( (W, R) \).

Let \( C_x \) be the R-cluster containing x. Thus \( C_x = \{ x \} \cup \{ y : xRyRx \} \). The relation R lifts to a well-defined relation on the set of clusters by putting \( C_x R C_y \) if \( xRy \). This relation is transitive and antisymmetric, for if \( C_x R C_y R C_z \), then \( xRyRx \) and so \( C_x = C_y \).

We distinguish between finite and infinite sequences of R-related points. An R-path in a frame is a finite sequence \( x_0, \ldots, x_n \) of (not necessarily distinct) points from W with \( x_mRx_{m+1} \) for all \( m < n \). An ascending R-chain in a frame is an infinite sequence \( \{ x_m : m < \omega \} \) of (not necessarily distinct) points from W with \( x_mRx_{m+1} \) for all \( m < \omega \). If R is transitive, this implies \( x_{m}Rax_{k} \) whenever \( m < k \). The chain is strictly ascending if not \( x_{m+1}Rx_{m} \) for all m, hence for transitive R, not \( x_{m}Rx_{m} \) whenever \( m < k \). Observe that if x is a reflexive point then the constant infinite sequence \( x, x, \ldots \) is an ascending R-chain that is not strict. In a transitive frame, a strictly ascending chain has all its terms \( x_{m} \) being pairwise distinct, so there are infinitely many of them.

Lemma 3.1. The following are equivalent for any transitive frame \( F = (W, R) \):

1. There are no strictly ascending chains of points in F.
2. Any ascending chain \( C_0 R C_1 R \cdots \) of R-clusters is ultimately constant in the sense that there exists an m such that \( C_m = C_k \) for all \( k > m \).

Proof. Suppose (1) fails, and there is a strictly ascending R-chain \( \{ x_m : m < \omega \} \). Then \( \{ x_mRx_{m+1}\} \) and not \( \{ x_{m+1}Rx_{m}\} \) for all m, so the cluster chain \( \{ x_m : m < \omega \} \) is strictly ascending and hence not ultimately constant, showing that (2) fails.
the formation of $\phi$

Conversely if (2) fails, there is an ascending cluster chain $\{C_m : m < \omega\}$ that is not ultimately constant. So for all $m$ there exists a $k > m$ such that $C_m \neq C_k$, and hence not $C_kRC_m$ as $C_mRC_k$ and $R$ is antisymmetric on clusters. Using this we can pick out a subsequence $\{C_{fm} : m < \omega\}$ that is strictly ascending. Then choosing $x_m \in C_{fm}$ for all $m$ gives a chain of points $\{x_m : m < \omega\}$ that is strictly ascending, showing that (1) fails.

A cycle of length $n \geq 1$, or $n$-cycle, is a sequence $x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}$ of $n$ distinct points such that $x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x_0$ is an $R$-path. There are no 0-cycles. A 1-cycle is given by a single point $x_0$ having $x_0Rx_0$.

Adopting terminology from graph theory, we define the circumference of frame $F$ to be the supremum of the set of all lengths of cycles in $F$. In particular $F$ has circumference 0 iff it has no cycles, a property implying that $F$ has no reflexive points. In a finite frame with non-zero circumference, since there are finitely many cycles the circumference is the length of a longest one.

In a transitive frame, the points of any cycle are $R$-related to each other and are reflexive, and all belong to the same non-degenerate cluster. It follows that the circumference is 0 iff the frame is irreflexive. Moreover, any finite non-empty subset of a non-degenerate cluster can be arranged (arbitrarily) into a cycle. Thus for $n \geq 1$, a frame has a cycle of length $n$ iff it has a non-degenerate cluster of size at least $n$. So a non-zero circumference of a finite transitive frame is equal to the size of a largest non-degenerate cluster.

### 4 Models and Valid Schemes

We now introduce the standard language of propositional modal logic in which formulas are constructed from some denumerable set $\text{Var}$ of propositional variables by the standard Boolean connectives $\top, \neg, \land$ and the unary modality $\Box$. The other Boolean connectives $\bot, \lor, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow$ are introduced as the usual abbreviations, and the dual modality $\lozenge$ is defined to be $\neg \Box \neg$.

A model $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, V)$ on a frame $(W, R)$ is given by a valuation function $V$ assigning to each variable $p \in \text{Var}$ a subset $V(p) \subseteq W$, thought of as the set of points of $W$ at which $p$ is true. The truth-relation $\mathcal{M}, x \models \varphi$ of a formula $\varphi$ being true at $x$ in $\mathcal{M}$ is defined by an induction on the formation of $\varphi$ as follows:

- $\mathcal{M}, x \models p$ iff $x \in V(p)$, for $p \in \text{Var}$.
- $\mathcal{M}, x \models \top$.
- $\mathcal{M}, x \models \neg \varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M}, x \not\models \varphi$ (i.e. not $\mathcal{M}, x \models \varphi$).
- $\mathcal{M}, x \models \varphi \land \psi$ iff $\mathcal{M}, x \models \varphi$ and $\mathcal{M}, x \models \psi$.
- $\mathcal{M}, x \models \Box \psi$ iff $\mathcal{M}, y \models \varphi$ for every $y \in W$ such that $xRy$.

Consequently, $\mathcal{M}, x \models \lozenge \varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M}, y \models \varphi$ for some $y \in W$ such that $xRy$.

This definition assigns to each formula $\varphi$ the truth set $\varphi^\mathcal{M} = \{x \in W : \mathcal{M}, x \models \varphi\}$. (The semantics could have given by defining truth sets inductively, starting with $p^\mathcal{M} = V(p)$.) We say that $\varphi$ is true in model $\mathcal{M}$, written $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$, if it is true at all points in $\mathcal{M}$, i.e. $\varphi^\mathcal{M} = W$. We call $\varphi$ valid in frame $F$ if it is true in all models on $F$.

Given formulas $\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n$, define the formula $P_n(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n)$ to be

$$\lozenge(\varphi_1 \land \lozenge(\varphi_2 \land \cdots \land \lozenge(\varphi_n \land \lozenge\varphi_0)) \cdots)$$

provided that $n \geq 1$. For the case $n = 0$, put $P_0(\varphi_0) = \lozenge \varphi_0$. This definition can made more formal by inductively defining a sequence $\{P_n : n < \omega\}$ of operations on formulas, with $P_n$ being $n + 1$-ary. $P_0$ is as just given, and for $n > 0$ we inductively put

$$P_n(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n) = \lozenge(\varphi_1 \land P_{n-1}(\varphi_0, \varphi_2, \ldots, \varphi_n)).$$
Then the next result follows readily from the properties of the truth-relation.

**Lemma 4.1.** In any model $M$ on a transitive frame, $M, x_0 \models P_n(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n)$ iff there is an $R$-path $x_0 R \cdots R x_{n+1}$ such that $M, x_i \models \varphi_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $M, x_{n+1} \models \varphi_0$.

Let $D_n(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n) = \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \neg(\varphi_i \land \varphi_j)$. For $n = 0$ this is the empty conjunction, which we take to be the constant tautology $T$. Define $C_n$ to be the scheme

$$\Box D_n(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n) \rightarrow (\Diamond \varphi_0 \rightarrow \Diamond (\varphi_0 \land \neg P_n(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n))).$$

In other words, $C_n$ is the set of all uniform substitution instances of

$$\Box D_n(p_0, \ldots, p_n) \rightarrow (\Diamond p_0 \rightarrow \Diamond (p_0 \land \neg P_n(p_0, \ldots, p_n))),$$

where $p_0, \ldots, p_n$ are variables.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let $F$ be any transitive frame, and $n \geq 0$.

1. $C_n$ is valid in $F$ iff $F$ has circumference at most $n$ and has no strictly ascending chains.

2. If $F$ is finite, then $C_n$ is valid in $F$ iff $F$ has circumference at most $n$.

**Proof.** Fix a list $p_0, \ldots, p_n$ of variables and abbreviate $D_n(p_0, \ldots, p_n)$ to $D_n$ and $P_n(p_0, \ldots, p_n)$ to $P_n$. Then the scheme $C_n$ is valid in $F$ iff its instance

$$\Box D_n \rightarrow (\Diamond p_0 \rightarrow \Diamond (p_0 \land \neg P_n))$$

(4.1)

is valid, since validity in a frame preserves uniform substitution of formulas for variables.

1. We show the implication from left to right by showing its contrapositive. Suppose the right side of 1 fails. Then there are two possible cases, the first being that $F$ has circumference greater than $n$, so has a cycle with at least $n + 1$ elements, say $x_0, \ldots, x_n$. If $n = 0$ then $D_n = T$. If $n \geq 1$, take a model on $F$ having $V(p_i) = \{x_i\}$ for all $i \leq n$. The $x_i$’s are distinct and each formula $\neg (p_i \land p_j)$ with $i < j < n$ is true at every point in the model, hence so is $D_n$. So whatever the value of $n$, $D_n$ is true everywhere, and therefore so is $\Box D_n$. By transitivity all points of the cycle are $R$-related to each other, hence to $x_0$, including $x_0$ itself. Therefore $\Diamond p_0$ is true at $x_0$. By Lemma 4.1, the $R$-path $x_0 R x_1 R \cdots R x_n R x_0$ ensures that $P_n$ is true at $x_0$. Hence as $p_0$ is true only at $x_0$, $\Diamond (p_0 \land \neg P_n)$ is false everywhere. Altogether these facts imply that the instance (4.1) of $C_n$ is false at $x_0$ (in fact at every point of the cycle), so is not valid in $F$.

The second case is that $F$ has a strictly ascending $R$-chain $\{x_m : m < \omega\}$. Then take a model on $F$ having $V(p_i) = \{x_m : m \equiv i \mod (n+1)\}$ for all $i \leq n$. Since the points $x_m$ of the chain are all distinct, the sets $V(p_i)$ are all pairwise disjoint, so each formula $\neg (p_i \land p_j)$ is true everywhere, hence so is $\Box D_n$. Since each congruence class $\mod (n + 1)$ is cofinal in $\omega$, each set $V(p_i)$ is cofinal in the chain, i.e. for all $k < \omega$ there is an $m > k$ with $x_k Rx_m \in V(p_i)$. In particular this implies that $\Diamond p_0$ is true at every point of the chain. Now if $p_0$ is true at point $x_m$, then the $R$-path $x_m R x_{m+1} R \cdots x_{m+n} R x_{m+(n+1)}$ has $p_i$ true at $x_{m+i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $p_0$ true at $x_{m+(n+1)}$, so $P_n$ is true at $x_m$ by Lemma 4.1. Since $p_0$ is true only at points of the chain, it follows that $\Diamond (p_0 \land \neg P_n)$ is false everywhere. Altogether then, (4.1) is false at all points of the chain, hence not valid in $F$.

Put contrapositively, we have now shown that if $C_n$ is valid in $F$ then $F$ must have circumference at most $n$ and have no strictly ascending chains. For the converse, assume that $F$ has circumference at most $n$ and no strictly ascending chains. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $C_n$ is not valid in $F$. Hence (4.1) is not valid and so is false at some $x$ in some model on $F$. Working in that model, $\Diamond p_0$ and $\Box D_n$ are true at $x$, so $p_0$ is true at some $x_0$ with $x_0 Rx_0$, and the formulas $\neg (p_i \land p_j)$ are all true throughout $\{y \in W : x Ry\}$; while $\Diamond (p_0 \land \neg P_n)$ is false at $x$. As $x Rx_0$, $p_0 \land \neg P_n$ is false at $x_0$. Since $p_0$ is true at $x_0$, this implies that $P_n$ is true at $x_0$. Hence by Lemma 4.1, there is an $R$-path $x_0 R x_1 R \cdots R x_{n+1}$ such that $p_i$ is true at $x_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $p_0$ is true at $x_{n+1}$. The argument then repeats: by transitivity $x Rx_{n+1}$, so since $\Diamond (p_0 \land \neg P_n)$ is
false at \( x \), \( p_0 \land \neg \Box p_n \) is false at \( x_{n+1} \), and hence \( \Box p_n \) is true at \( x_{n+1} \). So by Lemma 4.1 again, there is an \( R \)-path \( x_{n+1}Rx_{n+2}R \cdots Rx_{2(n+1)} \) such that \( p_i \) is true at \( x_{n+1+i} \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and \( p_0 \) is true at \( x_2(n+1) \).

Iterating this construction ad infinitum, we generate an ascending \( R \)-chain \( \{ x_m : m < \omega \} \) of points of \( W \) such that for each \( i \leq n \), \( p_i \) is true at \( x_m \) iff \( m \equiv i \mod (n+1) \). Hence \( p_i \) is true cofinally along the chain. By assumption there are no strictly ascending chains, so by Lemma 3.1 the ascending cluster chain \( \{ [x_m] : m < \omega \} \) is ultimately constant. It follows that the point chain cannot continue moving forward into a 'later' cluster forever, so some cluster \( C \) in the cluster chain must contain some tail \( \{ x_m : m \geq k \} \) of the point chain. Then \( x_k, x_{k+1} \in C \) and \( x_kRx_{k+1} \), so \( C \) is a non-degenerate cluster. The tail \( \{ x_m : m \geq k \} \) contains points at which each of \( p_0, \ldots, p_n \) are true, by the cofinality of the truth of these \( p_i \)’s. But by the truth of \( \Box \square \mathbb{D}_n \) at \( x \), no two of these variables are ever true at the same point of the point chain. Hence the points in \( C \) at which \( p_0, \ldots, p_n \) are true are all distinct members of a non-degenerate cluster, so they form an \( n+1 \)-cycle. This contradicts the assumption that \( F \) has circumference at most \( n \). The contradiction forces us to conclude that \( C_n \) is valid in \( F \).

(2). This follows immediately from (1), as a finite transitive frame cannot have any strictly ascending chains.

The cases \( n = 0, 1 \) of this theorem are essential known. \( C_0 \) is

\[
\Box \top \rightarrow (\Diamond \varphi_0 \land \neg \Diamond \Diamond \varphi_0).
\]

That is valid in the same frames as \( (\Diamond \varphi_0 \rightarrow \Diamond (\varphi_0 \land \neg \Diamond \varphi_0)) \), an equivalent form of the Löb axiom

\[
\Box (\Box \varphi_0 \rightarrow \varphi_0) \rightarrow \Box \varphi_0.
\]

But it is well known that the Löb axiom is valid in a frame \( F \) iff \( F \) is transitive and has no ascending chains (see Boles, 1979, Section 5 or Blackburn et al., 2001, Example 3.9). Now a transitive frame has circumference 0 if it is irreflexive, and in a transitive irreflexive frame every ascending chain is strictly ascending. From these facts it can be seen that a transitive frame has no ascending chains iff it has circumference 0 and no strictly ascending chains.

For \( n = 1 \), \( C_1 \) is valid in the same transitive frames as the Grz-variant \( G \) (see Theorem 5.1 below). But a transitive frame validates \( G \) iff it has no ascending chains \( x_0Rx_1R \cdots \) with \( x_n \neq x_{n+1} \) for all \( n \) \( \) (Amerbauer, 1996, Lemma 1.1). The latter condition prevents there being any clusters with more than one element, ensuring that the circumference is at most 1. Thus it can be seen that a transitive frame validates \( G \) iff it has circumference at most 1 and no strictly ascending chains.

5 Finite Model Property for \( K4C_n \)

A normal logic is any set \( L \) of formulas that includes all tautologies and all instances of the scheme

\[
K: \Box (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\Box \varphi \rightarrow \Box \psi),
\]

and whose rules include modus ponens and \( \Box \)-generalisation (from \( \varphi \) infer \( \Box \varphi \)). The set of all formulas valid in some given class of frames is a normal logic. The smallest normal logic, known as \( K \), consists of the formulas that are valid in all frames.

The members of a logic \( L \) may be referred to as the \( L \)-theorems. A formula \( \varphi \) is \( L \)-consistent if \( \neg \varphi \) is not an \( L \)-theorem, and a set of formulas is \( L \)-consistent iff the conjunction of any of its finite subsets is \( L \)-consistent. A formula is an \( L \)-theorem iff it belongs to every maximally \( L \)-consistent set of formulas.

A logic \( L \) is transitive if it includes all instances of the scheme

\[
4: \Box \varphi \rightarrow \Box \Box \varphi.
\]
The set of formulas valid in some class of transitive frames is a transitive normal logic. The smallest transitive normal logic is known as $K4$. Its theorems are precisely the formulas that are valid in all transitive frames.

Since $\Box \top$ is a theorem of any normal logic, the scheme $C_0$ is deductively equivalent to the dual form of Löb’s axiom. For $n = 1$ we have:

**Theorem 5.1.** The scheme $C_1$ is deductively equivalent over $K4$ to the scheme

$$\Diamond \varphi_0 \rightarrow \Diamond (\varphi_0 \land \neg \Diamond (\neg \varphi_0 \land \Diamond \varphi_0))$$

(5.1)

that is itself deductively equivalent over $K$ to the Grz-variant (2.3).

**Proof.** For any $\varphi_0$, the formula $C_1(\varphi_0, \neg \varphi_0)$ is

$$\Box \neg(\varphi_0 \land \neg \varphi_0) \rightarrow (\Diamond \varphi_0 \rightarrow \Diamond (\varphi_0 \land \neg \Diamond(\neg \varphi_0 \land \Diamond \varphi_0))).$$

But $\neg(\varphi_0 \land \neg \varphi_0)$ is a tautology, so $\Box \neg(\varphi_0 \land \neg \varphi_0)$ is derivable in $K$, hence can be detached from $C_1(\varphi_0, \neg \varphi_0)$ to derive (5.1).

In the converse direction, for any $\varphi_0$ and $\varphi_1$ the formula

$$\Box \neg(\varphi_0 \land \varphi_1) \rightarrow (\Diamond \varphi_0 \rightarrow \Diamond (\varphi_0 \land \neg \Diamond(\neg \varphi_0 \land \Diamond \varphi_0))),$$

(5.3)

and all $y$. If $L$ extends $K4$, then the relation $R_L$ is transitive.

A normal logic $L$ has the canonical frame $F_L = (W_L, R_L)$, where $W_L$ is the set of maximally $L$-consistent sets of formulas, and $x R_L y$ iff $\{ \varphi : \Box \varphi \in x \} \subseteq y$ iff $\{ \Diamond \varphi : \varphi \in y \} \subseteq x$. If $L$ extends $K4$, then the relation $R_L$ is transitive.

By standard canonical frame theory (e.g. Blackburn et al. 2001, Chapter 4 or Goldblatt 1992, Chapter 3), we have that for all formulas $\varphi$ and all $x \in W_L$:

$$\Box \varphi \in x \iff \text{ for all } y \in W_L, x R_L y \text{ implies } \varphi \in y.$$

(5.2)

The canonical model $M_L$ on $F_L$ has $V(p) = \{ x \in W_L : p \in x \}$ for all $p \in \text{Var}$. With the help of (5.2) it can be shown that it satisfies

$$M_L, x \models \varphi \iff \varphi \in x,$$

(5.3)

a result known as the *Truth Lemma* for $M_L$. It implies that the formulas that are true in $M_L$ are precisely the $L$-theorems, since these are precisely the formulas that belong to every member of $W_L$.

$K4C_n$ is defined to be the smallest normal logic including the schemes 4 and $C_n$. It is straightforward to give a proof-theoretic derivation of $C_{n+1}$ in $K4C_n$, showing that $K4C_{n+1} \subseteq K4C_n$. We will prove that $K4C_n$ is characterised by validity in all finite transitive frames of circumference at most $n$. This is already known for $n = 0, 1$, as mentioned earlier. $K4C_0$ is the Gödel-Löb logic, first shown by Segerberg (1971) to be characterised by the class of finite transitive irreflexive frames, which are the finite transitive frames of circumference 0. Also $K4C_1$ is the logic $K4 + (2.4)$, shown by Amerbach (1996) to be characterised by the class of finite transitive anti-symmetric frames, i.e. those having only singleton clusters, hence circumference at most 1. We will however include the cases $n = 0, 1$ in our completeness proof to follow.

Let $M = (W, R, V)$ be any model that has transitive $R$ and $M \models C_n$, i.e. every instance of $C_n$ is true in $M$. For example, the canonical model of any normal logic extending $K4C_n$ has
these properties. When working within $\mathcal{M}$ we may sometimes leave out its name and just write $x \models \varphi$ when $\mathcal{M}, x \models \varphi$. We now set up a filtration of $\mathcal{M}$.

Let $\Phi$ be a finite set of formulas that is closed under subformulas. For each $x \in W$ let $x^\Phi$ be the set $\{ \varphi \in \Phi : x \models \varphi \}$ of all members of $\Phi$ that are true at $x$ in $\mathcal{M}$. An equivalence relation $\sim$ on $W$ is given by putting $x \sim y$ if $x^\Phi = y^\Phi$. We write $[x]$ for the equivalence class $\{ y \in W : x \sim y \}$, and put $W_\Phi = \{ [x] : x \in W \}$. The set $W_\Phi$ is finite, because the map $[x] \mapsto x^\Phi$ is a well-defined injection of $W_\Phi$ into the finite powerset of $\Phi$. Thus $W_\Phi$ has size at most $2^{\text{size} \Phi}$.

Let $\mathcal{M}_\Phi = (W_\Phi, R_\Phi, V_\Phi)$ be the standard transitive filtration of $\mathcal{M}$ through $\Phi$. Thus $[x] R_\Phi [y]$ if $\{(\varphi, \varphi) : \varphi \in x^\Phi \} \subseteq y^\Phi$, and $V_\Phi(p) = \{ [x] : x \models p \}$ for $p \in \Phi$, while $V_\Phi(p) = \emptyset$ otherwise. The relation $R_\Phi$ is transitive and has the important property that

$$x R_\Phi y \text{ implies } [x] R_\Phi [y],$$

for all $x, y \in W$. The Filtration Lemma gives that for all $\varphi \in \Phi$ and all $x \in W$,

$$\mathcal{M}_\Phi, [x] \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{M}, x \models \varphi.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.4)

We will use the fact that for any $R_\Phi$-cluster $C$, and any formula $\bigwedge \varphi \in \Phi$,

$$\text{if } [x], [y] \in C, \text{ then } \mathcal{M}, x \models \bigwedge \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{M}, y \models \bigwedge \varphi.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.5)

This follows from the Filtration Lemma, since if $[x]$ and $[y]$ are in the same $R_\Phi$-cluster, then exactly the same formulas of the form $\bigwedge \varphi$ are true at both of them in $\mathcal{M}_\Phi$.

We will replace $R_\Phi$ by a relation $R' \subseteq R_\Phi$ in such a way that each $R_\Phi$-cluster $C$ in $\mathcal{M}_\Phi$ is decomposed into an $R'$-cluster with at most $n$ elements and (possibly) some singleton (i.e. one-element) $R'$-clusters.

We use letters $\alpha, \beta$ for members of $W_\Phi$. Each such member is a subset of $W$. For each $x \in W$ we write $x' \alpha$ to mean that there is some $y \in \alpha$ such that $x R_\Phi y$. This could be read 'there is an $\alpha$-member of $W$ with $x$'. We write $x \not\sim \alpha$ if there is no such $y$.

The next result uses the axiom $\text{C}_n$ to establish a property of $R_\Phi$ that will allow us to refine it into a transitive relation whose clusters have at most $n$ elements.

**Lemma 5.2.** For any $R_\Phi$-cluster $C$, there is an element $x^* \in W$ such that $[x^*] \in C$ and a subset $C^* \subseteq C$ such that for all $y \in W$,

$$\text{if } x^* R_\Phi y \text{ and } [y] \in C, \text{ then } [y] \in C^* \text{ and } y \not\sim \alpha \text{ for all } \alpha \in C^*.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.7)

Moreover $C^*$ has at most $n$ elements, and if $C$ is degenerate then $C^*$ is empty.

**Proof.** Take any $R_\Phi$-cluster $C$. Say that $x \in W$ is an exit point for $C$ if firstly $[x] \in C$ and secondly $x R_\Phi y$ implies $[y] \notin C$. If there exists some exit point for $C$, then we choose one to be $x^*$ and put $C^* = \emptyset$. This already ensures that $C^*$ is empty whenever $C$ is degenerate, for if $C = \{ \alpha \}$ is $R_\Phi$-degenerate, then every $x \in \alpha$ is an exit point for $C$, since by (5.4) $x R_\Phi y$ implies $\alpha R_\Phi [y]$ and so $[y] \notin \{ \alpha \}$ as $\alpha$ is $R_\Phi$-irreflexive. It also ensures that the condition (5.7) holds (vacuously), and $C^*$ has 0 elements. Thus the Lemma holds if $C$ has an exit point.

We now consider the alternative case that there is no exit point for $C$. We define a nested finite sequence $C_0 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq C_m$ of subsets of $C$ and an associated sequence of elements $x_i \in W$, with $[x_i] \in C_i$ for all $i \leq m$, and $x_i R_{x_i+1}$ for $i < m$. The construction proceeds in stages. At stage 0, put $C_0 = C$ and pick any $x_0 \in W$ such that $[x_0] \in C$. The idea then is to successively remove elements $\alpha$ from the $C_i$'s that potentially violate (5.7) in the sense that there is a $[y] \in C$ with $x_0 R_\Phi y$ and $y \not\sim \alpha$.

Assume inductively that at a stage $i \geq 0$ we have defined $C_j \subseteq C$ and $x_j \in W$ with $[x_j] \in C$ for all $j \leq i$, and $C_j \supseteq C_{j+1}$ and $x_j R_{x_{j+1}}$ for $j < i$. If there exists a $y \in W$ with $x_i R_\Phi y$ and $[y] \in C$, and some $\alpha \in C_i$ with $y \not\sim \alpha$, then choose such $y$ and $\alpha$ and define $C_{i+1} = C_i - \{ \alpha \}$ and $x_{i+1} = y$. Then $x_{i+1} \not\sim \alpha$ and $x_i R_{x_{i+1}}$, and we proceed to stage $i + 1$. If there is no such $y$ and $\alpha$, then the construction stops.
Since $C$ is finite, we cannot go on removing elements from the $C_i$’s forever. Hence there exists some stage $m \geq 0$ (no bigger than the size of $C$) such that the construction stops at stage $m$. Define $C^* = C_m$ and $x^* = x_m$. To show that this fulfills (5.7), take any $y$ with $x^* R y$ and $|y| \in C$. If we did not have $|y| \in C^* = C_m$, then as $|y| \in C_0$ there would be an $i < m$ such that $|y| \in C_i$, and $|y| \notin C_{i+1}$, with $|y|$ being the element removed from $C_i$ to form $C_{i+1}$. By the construction this means that $x_{i+1} \not\leadsto |y|$. But $i + 1 \leq m$ and $x_m R y$, implying that $x_{i+1} \leadsto |y|$. This contradiction forces us to conclude that $|y| \in C^*$. Also, for any $\alpha \in C^* = C_m$ we must have $y \leadsto \alpha$, or else as $x_m R y$, $\alpha$ would qualify for removal from $C_m$ to form $C_{m+1}$ with $y = x_{m+1}$, allowing the construction to proceed to stage $m + 1$, contrary to fact. That completes the proof of (5.7).

It remains to show that $C^*$ has at most $n$ elements. This is where the core role of axiom $C_n$ is played. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $C^*$ has $n + 1$ distinct members $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n$. By standard filtration theory, these members are definable as subsets of $M$, i.e. for each $i \leq n$ there is a formula $\varphi_i$ such that for all $y \in W$,

$$M, y \models \varphi_i \text{ iff } y \in \alpha_i \quad (\text{iff } |y| = \alpha_i).$$

(5.8)

If $n \geq 1$, since the $\alpha_i$’s are distinct equivalence classes under $\sim$ they are pairwise disjoint, and hence for all $i < j \leq n$, the formula $\neg(\varphi_i \land \varphi_j)$ is true in $M$ at every $y \in W$, therefore so is

$$\mathbb{D}_n(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n).$$

(5.9)

But also as $\mathbb{D}_0(\varphi_0) = \mathbb{T}$, (5.9) holds as well when $n = 0$.

Now $x^*$ is not an exit point of $C$, since there are none in the present case, so $x^* R y$ for some $y$ with $|y| \in C$. Then $y \leadsto \alpha_0$ by (5.7). Hence by $R$-transitivity, $x^* R x_0$ for some $x_0 \in \alpha_0$, and so $M, x^* \models \varphi_0$. Combining this with (5.9) and the fact that every instance of $C_n$ is true in $M$, we get that

$$M, x^* \models \varphi_0 \land \neg\mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n).$$

Hence there is some $x_0$ with $x^* R x_0$ and

$$M, x_0 \models \varphi_0 \land \neg\mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n).$$

(5.10)

Therefore $x_0 \models \varphi_0$, so by (5.8) $|x_0| = \alpha_0 \in C^*$. We will now construct an $R$-path $x_0, \ldots, x_n$ with $x_i \in \alpha_i$, hence by (5.8) $x_i \models \varphi_i$, for all $i \leq n$. If $n = 0$ we already have $x_0 \in \alpha_0$ and there is nothing further to do. If $n > 0$, then assume inductively that for some $k < n$ we have defined an $R$-path $x_0, \ldots, x_k$ with $x_i \in \alpha_i$ for all $i \leq k$. Then by transitivity $x^* R x_k$ and $|x_k| = \alpha_k \in C$, so $x_k \leadsto \alpha_{k+1} \in C^*$ by (5.7), giving some $x_{k+1} \in \alpha_{k+1}$ such that $x_k \leadsto x_{k+1}$. That completes the inductive construction of the $R$-path $x_0, \ldots, x_n$ with $x_i \in \alpha_i$ for all $i \leq n$. With one more repetition we observe that $x^* R x_n$, so $x_n \leadsto \alpha_0$ by (5.7), hence $x_n R x_{n+1}$ for some $x_{n+1} \in \alpha_0$, thus $x_{n+1} \models \varphi_0$.

But now applying Lemma 4.1 to the $R$-path $x_0, \ldots, x_n, x_{n+1}$ we conclude that $x_0 \models \mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n)$. Since $x_0 \models \neg\mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n)$ by (5.10), this is a contradiction, forcing us to conclude that $C^*$ cannot have more than $n$ elements, and completing the proof of Lemma 5.2.

We now proceed to use this lemma to modify the model $M_\Phi$. For each $R_\Phi$-cluster $C$, choose and fix a point $x^*$ and associated set $C^* \subseteq C$ as given by the lemma. We will call $x^*$ the critical point for $C$. Then we define a subrelation $R'$ of $R_\Phi$ to refine the structure of each $R_\Phi$-cluster $C$ by decomposing it into the subset $C^*$ as an $R'$-cluster together with a degenerate $R'$-cluster $\{\alpha\}$ for each $\alpha \in C - C^*$. These singleton clusters all have $C^*$ as an $R'$-successor but are
$R'$-incomparable with each other. So the structure replacing $C$ looks like

![Diagram of a structure replacing $C$]

with the bullets being the degenerate $R'$-clusters determined by the points of $C - C^*$, and the large circle representing $C^*$. All elements of $W_\varphi$ that $R_\varphi$-precede $C$ continue to $R'$-precede all members of $C$, while elements of $W_\varphi$ that come $R_\varphi$-after $C$ continue to come $R'$-after all members of $C$. Doing this to each cluster of $(W_\varphi, R_\varphi)$ produces a new transitive frame $(W_\varphi, R')$ with $R' \subseteq R_\varphi$.

$R'$ can be more formally defined on $W_\varphi$ by specifying, for all $\alpha, \beta \in W_\varphi$, that $\alpha R' \beta$ iff either

- $\alpha$ and $\beta$ belong to different $R_\varphi$-clusters and $\alpha R_\varphi \beta$; or
- $\alpha$ and $\beta$ belong to the same $R_\varphi$-cluster $C$ and $\beta \in C^*$.

Thus every element of $C$ is $R'$-related to every element of $C^*$, and the restriction of $R'$ to $C$ is equal to the relation $C \times C^*$. So we could also define $R'$ as the union of these relations $C \times C^*$ for all $R_\varphi$-clusters $C$, plus all inter-cluster instances of $R_\varphi$. If $C$ is $R_\varphi$-degenerate, then $C^* = \emptyset$ by Lemma 5.2, and so $C \times C^* = \emptyset$. If $C$ is non-$R_\varphi$-degenerate, then the restriction of $R_\varphi$ to $C$ is $C \times C^*$, extending $C \times C^*$. This implies that $R'$ is a subrelation of $R_\varphi$ on $W_\varphi$.

Note that if $C^*$ is empty, then $C - C^* = C \neq \emptyset$, and all members of $C$ are $R'$-irreflexive. In that case $C$ is replaced in the new frame $(W_\varphi, R')$ by a non-empty set of degenerate $R'$-clusters. In the case $n = 0$, by Lemma 5.2 every $R_\varphi$-cluster $C$ has empty $C^*$, and so $(W_\varphi, R')$ consists entirely of $R'$-irreflexive points and therefore has circumference 0. In the alternative case $n \geq 1$, any non-degenerate $R'$-cluster will have the form $C^*$ for some $R_\varphi$-cluster $C$, and so have at most $n$-elements. Since any $R'$-cycle is included in a non-degenerate $R'$-cluster, it follows that all $R'$-cycles have length at most $n$ and $(W_\varphi, R')$ has circumference at most $n$. So in any case the finite transitive frame $(W_\varphi, R')$ validates $C_n$ by Theorem 4.2.

Now put $\mathcal{M}' = (W_\varphi, R', V_\varphi)$, a model differing from $\mathcal{M}_\varphi$ only in that $R'$ replaces $R_\varphi$. We show that replacing $\mathcal{M}_\varphi$ by $\mathcal{M}'$ leaves the truth relation unchanged for any formula $\varphi \in \Phi$: for all $x \in W$,

$$\mathcal{M}', |x| \models \varphi \iff \mathcal{M}_\varphi, |x| \models \varphi.$$ (5.11)

The proof of this proceeds by induction on the formation of $\varphi$. If $\varphi$ is a variable, then (5.11) holds because $\mathcal{M}'$ and $\mathcal{M}_\varphi$ have the same valuation $V_\varphi$. The induction cases of the Boolean connectives are standard. Now make the induction hypothesis on $\varphi$ that (5.11) holds for all $x \in W$, and suppose $\Diamond \varphi \in \Phi$. If $\mathcal{M}', |x| \models \Diamond \varphi$, then $|x| R' |y|$ and $\mathcal{M}', |y| \models \varphi$ for some $y$. Then $|x| R_\varphi |y|$ as $R' \subseteq R_\varphi$, and $\mathcal{M}_\varphi, |y| \models \varphi$ by induction hypothesis. Hence $\mathcal{M}_\varphi, |x| \models \Diamond \varphi$.

Conversely, assume $\mathcal{M}_\varphi, |x| \models \Diamond \varphi$. Then $\mathcal{M}, x, |x| \models \Diamond \varphi$ by the Filtration Lemma 5.5. Let $C$ be the $R_\varphi$-cluster of $|x|$, and $x^*$ be the chosen critical point for $C$ fulfilling Lemma 5.2. Then $|x|$ and $|x^*|$ both belong to $C$, so $\mathcal{M}, x^* \models \Diamond \varphi$ by (5.6). Hence there is some $y \in W$ with $x^* R_\varphi y$ and $\mathcal{M}, y \models \varphi$. Then $|x^*| R_\varphi |y|$ by (5.3) and $\mathcal{M}_\varphi, |y| \models \varphi$ by the Filtration Lemma 5.5, so $\mathcal{M}', |y| \models \varphi$ by induction hypothesis. If $|y| \in C$, then $|y| \in C^*$ by Lemma 5.2, so then $|x^*| R' |y|$ by definition of $R'$ since $|x^*| \in C$. But if $|y| \notin C$, then the $R_\varphi$-cluster of $|y|$ is strictly $R_\varphi$-later than $C$, and again $|x^*| R' |y|$ by definition of $R'$. So in any case we have $|x^*| R' |y|$ and $\mathcal{M}', |y| \models \varphi$, which gives $\mathcal{M}', |x^*| \models \Diamond \varphi$. That completes the inductive case for $\Diamond \varphi$, and hence proves that (5.11) holds for all $\varphi \in \Phi$.

**Theorem 5.3.** For all $n \geq 0$ and any formula $\varphi$ the following are equivalent.

1. $\varphi$ is a theorem of $K4C_n$. 
2. \( \varphi \) is valid in all transitive frames that have circumference at most \( n \) and no strictly ascending chains.
3. \( \varphi \) is valid in all finite transitive frames that have circumference at most \( n \).

**Proof.** 1 implies 2: Let \( L \) be the set of formulas that are valid in all transitive frames that have circumference at most \( n \) and no strictly ascending chains. Then \( L \) is a transitive normal logic that contains \( \mathbb{C}_n \) by Theorem 4.2. Hence \( L \) includes \( \mathbb{K}_4 \).

2 implies 3: This follows immediately from the fact that a finite frame has no strictly ascending chains.

3 implies 1: Put \( L = \mathbb{K}_4 \). Suppose 1 fails for \( \varphi \), i.e. \( \varphi \) is not a theorem of \( L \). Then there exists an \( x \in \mathcal{W}_L \) with \( \varphi \notin x \), hence \( M_L, x \not\models \varphi \) by the Truth Lemma (5.3). In the above construction of a finite model \( M' \), let \( M \) be \( M_L \), and \( \Phi \) be the set of all subformulas of \( \varphi \). Then by (5.3) and (5.11), \( M', |x| \not\models \varphi \). But the frame of \( M' \) is finite, transitive and has circumference at most \( n \). This shows that \( \varphi \) fails to be valid on such a frame, so 3 does not hold for \( \varphi \). ■

This theorem yields an alternative proof that \( \mathbb{K}_4 \subseteq \mathbb{K}_4 \), since any formula valid in all finite transitive frames that have circumference at most \( n + 1 \) is valid in all finite transitive frames that have circumference at most \( n \). A transitive frame consisting of a single cycle of length \( n + 1 \) will validate \( \mathbb{K}_4 \), but not \( \mathbb{C}_n \), showing that the logics \( \{ \mathbb{K}_4 : n \geq 0 \} \) form a strictly decreasing sequence of extensions of \( \mathbb{K}_4 \).

**Corollary 5.4.** \( \mathbb{K}_4 = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{K}_4 \).

**Proof.** \( \mathbb{K}_4 \) is a sublogic of \( \mathbb{K}_4 \) for all \( n \). For the converse inclusion, if \( \varphi \) is not a \( \mathbb{K}_4 \)-theorem, then it is invalid in some finite transitive frame \( \mathcal{F} \). If \( n \) is the size of the largest cycle in \( \mathcal{F} \), or if there are no cycles, then \( \mathcal{F} \) has circumference at most \( n \), so by Theorem 5.3 \( \varphi \) is not a \( \mathbb{K}_4 \)-theorem.

The proof of Theorem 5.3 establishes something more. It gives a computable upper bound on the size of the falsifying model \( M' \), showing that \( \varphi \) is a \( \mathbb{K}_4 \)-theorem iff it is valid in all finite transitive frames that have circumference at most \( n \) and have size at most \( 2^k \), where \( k \) is the number of subformulas of \( \varphi \). But it is decidable whether a given finite frame is transitive and has circumference at most \( n \), so by well-known arguments (Blackburn et al., 2001, Section 6.2), it follows that it is decidable whether or not a given formula is a \( \mathbb{K}_4 \)-theorem.

## 6 Extensions of \( \mathbb{K}_4 \)

We will now show how to apply and adapt the construction of \( M' \) to obtain finite-frame characterisations of various logics that extend \( \mathbb{K}_4 \).

**Seriality**

Let \( L \) be any extension of \( \mathbb{K}_4 \) that contains the D-axiom \( \Diamond \top \). A frame validates this axiom iff its relation is serial, meaning that every point has an \( R \)-successor: \( \forall w \exists y (xRy) \). We assume now that the transitive model \( M \) having \( M \models \mathbb{C}_n \) also has serial \( R \) (which holds if \( M = M_L \) because each point of \( M_L \) satisfies \( \Diamond \top \)). We use this to show that the subrelation \( R' \) of \( M' \) is also serial.

Suppose that a point \( \alpha \in \mathcal{W}_L \) has an \( R'_L \)-cluster \( C \) that is not \( R'_L \)-maximal, i.e. there is some cluster \( C' \) with \( R'_L \subseteq C' \) but not \( C'R'_L \subseteq C \). Then any \( \beta \in C' \) has \( \alpha R' \beta \), so is an \( R' \)-successor of \( \alpha \). Alternatively, if \( C \) is maximal, let \( x^* \) be the critical point for \( C \). There is a \( y \) with \( x^* R_L \), as \( R \) is serial. But then \( |x^*| R_L |y| \) by (5.4), and so \( |y| \in C \) as \( |x^*| \in C \) and \( C \) is maximal. But then \( |y| \in C^* \) by (5.7). Since every member of \( C \) is \( R' \)-related to every member of \( C^* \), we get that \( \alpha R' |y| \), completing the proof that \( R' \) is serial and hence the frame of \( M' \) validates \( \Diamond \top \).
Formally this is done by adding to the definition of $\mathcal{M}$ make it reflexive as well, so that the frame of $(\alpha \neg \beta \alpha)$ is reflexive. The canonical frame of any normal extension of K4.3 is weakly connected.

The minimal requirement to make the construction work is that each member of $\mathcal{R}$ follows from (5.4) that $\mathcal{M} \not\models \Phi$. Thus no $\mathcal{R}_\mathfrak{b}$-cluster is degenerate. We modify the definition of $\mathcal{R}$ to make them all into non-$\mathcal{R}'$-degenerate singleton clusters by requiring that $\alpha \mathcal{R}' \alpha$. Formally this is done by adding to the definition of $\alpha \mathcal{R}' \beta$ the third possibility that

- $\alpha$ and $\beta$ belong to the same $\mathcal{R}_\mathfrak{b}$-cluster $\mathcal{C}$, and $\alpha = \beta \in C - C^*$.

Equivalently, the restriction of $\mathcal{R}'$ to $C$ is equal to $(C \times C^*) \cup \{ (\alpha, \alpha) : \alpha \in C - C^* \}$. Since $\mathcal{R}_\mathfrak{b}$ is reflexive, this modified definition of $\mathcal{R}'$ still has $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}_\mathfrak{b}$, and that is enough to preserve the proof of the truth invariance result (5.11) for the modified model $\mathcal{M}'$.

From this it follows that S4C$n$, the smallest normal extension of K4C$n$ to contain the scheme T, is sound and complete for validity in all finite reflexive transitive frames that have circumference at most $n$.

We left out the case $n = 0$ here because the addition of $\mathcal{C}_0$ to S4 results in the inconsistent logic that has all formulas as theorems.

**Linearly**

K4.3 is the smallest normal extension of K4 that includes the scheme

$$\mathcal{L}((\varphi \land \mathcal{L} \varphi \to \psi) \lor \mathcal{L}(\psi \land \mathcal{L} \psi \to \varphi)). \quad (6.1)$$

A frame validates this scheme iff it is weakly connected, i.e. satisfies

$$\forall x \forall y \forall z (x \mathcal{R} y \land x \mathcal{R} z \to y \mathcal{R} z \lor y = z \lor z \mathcal{R} y).$$

The canonical frame of any normal extension of K4.3 is weakly connected.

If a transitive weakly connected frame is point-generated, i.e. $W = \{ x \} \cup \{ y \in W : x \mathcal{R} y \}$ for some point $x \in W$, then the frame is connected: it satisfies

$$\forall y \forall z (y \mathcal{R} z \lor y = z \lor z \mathcal{R} y).$$

Such a connected frame can be viewed as a linearly ordered set of clusters.

Now let $L$ be a normal extension of K4.3C$n$ and $\varphi$ a formula that is not a theorem of $L$. Then there is some $x \in W_L$ with $\varphi \not\in x$. Put $W = \{ x \} \cup \{ y \in W_L : x \mathcal{R}_L y \}$ and let $\mathcal{M} = (W, \mathcal{R}, V)$ be the submodel of $\mathcal{M}_L$ based on $W$. Then $\mathcal{R}$ is transitive, and is connected since $\mathcal{R}_L$ is weakly connected and $(W, \mathcal{R})$ is point-generated. Also the fact that $W$ is $\mathcal{R}_L$-closed and $\mathcal{M}_L \models \mathcal{C}_n$ ensures that $\mathcal{M} \models \mathcal{C}_n$. Take $\Phi$ to be the set of subformulas of $\varphi$, and $\mathcal{M}_\Phi$ to be the standard transitive filtration of $\mathcal{M}$ through $\Phi$. Then $\mathcal{M}_\Phi, |x| \not\models \varphi$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{R}$ is connected, it follows from (5.4) that $\mathcal{R}_\mathfrak{b}$ is connected.

We now modify each $\mathcal{R}_\mathfrak{b}$-cluster $\mathcal{C}$ to obtain a suitable model $\mathcal{M}'$ with circumference at most $n$. The way we did this for K4C$n$ allows some leeway in how we define the relation $\mathcal{R}'$ on $C - C^*$. The minimal requirement to make the construction work is that each member of $C - C^*$ forms a
singleton cluster that \( R' \) precedes \( C^* \). Instead of making these members of \( C - C^* \) incomparable with each other, we could form them arbitrarily into a linear sequence under \( R' \) that precedes \( C^* \), getting a structure that looks like

\[
\bullet \quad \bullet \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad C^*
\]

The model \( \mathcal{M}' \) will still satisfy (5.11), so will falsify \( \varphi \) at \( |x| \). Since the original \( R_B \)-clusters are linearly ordered by \( R_B \), this construction will make the \( R' \)-clusters be linearly ordered by \( R' \), with the non-degenerate ones being of size at most \( n \). Hence the frame underlying \( \mathcal{M}' \) will be connected and validate \( K4.3C_n \). This leads to the conclusion that

the logic \( K4.3C_n \) is sound and complete for validity in all finite transitive and connected frames that have circumference at most \( n \).

The analysis of the scheme \( T \) can also be applied here to show further that

for \( n \geq 1 \), the logic \( S4.3C_n \) is sound and complete for validity in all finite reflexive transitive and connected frames that have circumference at most \( n \).

### 7 Generating Varieties of Algebras

Modal formulas have algebraic models, and the algebraic models of a logic form a variety, i.e. an equationally definable class. Our Theorem 5.3 can be converted into a demonstration that the variety \( V_n \) of algebraic models of \( K4C_n \) is generated by its finite members, and indeed generated by certain finite algebras constructed out of finite transitive frames of circumference at most \( n \).

This implies that every member of \( V_n \) is a homomorphic image of a subalgebra of a direct product of such finite algebras. But something stronger can be shown: every member of \( V_n \) is isomorphic to a subalgebra of an ultraproduct of such finite algebras. A proof of this algebraic fact will now be given that makes explicit use of the filtration construction underlying Theorem 5.3 along with further logical analysis involving the universal sentences that are satisfied by members of \( V_n \).

We briefly review the modal algebraic semantics (a convenient reference for more information is Blackburn et al. 2001, Chapter 5). A normal modal algebra has the form \( A = (B, f^A) \) with \( B \) a Boolean algebra and \( f^A \) a unary operation on \( B \) that preserves all finite meets (including the empty meet as the greatest element 1). A modal formula can be viewed as a term of the language of \( A \), treating its variables as ranging over the individuals of \( B \), with \( \land \) and \( \lor \) denoting the complement and meet operation of \( B \), \( \top \) denoting 1 and \( \Box \) denoting \( f^A \). If \( \varphi \) has its variables among \( p_0, \ldots, p_{k-1} \), then it induces a \( k \)-ary term function \( \varphi^A \) on \( A \). We say that \( \varphi \) is valid in \( A \) when \( A \models \varphi \approx \top \), meaning that the equation \( \varphi \approx \top \) is satisfied in \( A \) in the usual sense from equational logic that \( A \models (\varphi \approx \top)(\vec{a}) \), i.e. \( \varphi^A(\vec{a}) = 1 \), for all \( k \)-tuples \( \vec{a} \) of elements of \( A \).

The satisfaction of any equation \( \varphi \approx \psi \) in \( A \) is expressible as the validity of a modal formula, since \( A \models \varphi \approx \psi \) if and only if the formula \( \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi \) is valid in \( A \), i.e. if \( A \models (\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi) \approx \top \).

Identifying \( \varphi \) with the equation \( \varphi \approx \top \), we can now legitimately write \( A \models \varphi(\vec{a}) \) to mean that \( \varphi^A(\vec{a}) = 1 \).

An algebra \( A \) will be called transitive if it validates the scheme 4, i.e. the formula \( \Box \varphi \rightarrow \Box \Box \varphi \) is valid in \( A \) for all \( \varphi \). Now the set \( L_A \) of all modal formulas that are valid in \( A \) is a normal logic that is closed under uniform substitution of formulas for variables, so for \( A \) to validate scheme 4 it is enough that it validates \( \Box p \rightarrow \Box \Box p \) for a variable \( p \), which amounts to requiring that \( f^A_a < f^A f^A_a \) for every element \( a \) of \( A \).

Each frame \( F = (W, R) \) has an associated algebra \( F^+ = (\mathcal{P}W, [R]) \), where \( \mathcal{P}W \) is the Boolean set algebra of all subsets of \( W \) and the unary operation \([R]\) on \( \mathcal{P}W \) is defined by \([R]X = \{ x : \forall y (xRy \iff y \in X) \}\). \( F^+ \) is called the complex algebra of \( F \). A complex algebra more generally is defined as one that is a subalgebra of some algebra of the form \( F^+ \).
Given such a subalgebra \( A \) of \( \mathcal{F}^+ \), consider a model \( M = (\mathcal{F}, V) \) on \( \mathcal{F} \) and a formula \( \varphi(p_0, \ldots, p_{k-1}) \) such that \( V(p_i) \in A \) for all \( i < k \). Then it can be shown that
\[
M \models \varphi^{A}(p_0^M, \ldots, p_{k-1}^M),
\]
where \( \psi^M \) is the truth set \( \{ x : A, x \models \psi \} \). From this it follows that
\[
A \models \varphi[p_0^M, \ldots, p_{k-1}^M] \iff M \models \varphi. \tag{7.1}
\]

Using this in the case that \( A = \mathcal{F}^+ \) leads to a proof that a formula \( \varphi \) is valid in \( \mathcal{F} \), i.e. \( M \models \varphi \) for all models \( M \) on \( \mathcal{F} \), if \( M \) is valid in the normal modal algebra \( \mathcal{F}^+ \) in the sense defined here.

The famous representation theorem of \( \text{J} \text{onsson and T} \text{arski (1951)} \) showed that any normal modal algebra \( A \) is isomorphic to a complex algebra, i.e. there is a monomorphism \( A \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^+ \) for some frame \( \mathcal{F} \). Moreover they showed that certain equational properties are preserved in passing from \( A \) to \( \mathcal{F}^+ \). In particular they proved that if \( A \) is a transitive algebra then so is \( \mathcal{F}^+ \), and furthermore that this implies that the binary relation \( R \) of \( \mathcal{F} \) is transitive.

We use the standard symbols \( H, S, P, P_U \) for the class operations of closure under homomorphic images, isomorphic copies of subalgebras, direct products and ultraproducts respectively. A class of algebras is a variety iff it is closed under \( H, S \) and \( P \). The smallest variety containing a given class of algebras \( \mathcal{K} \) is \( \text{HSP}(\mathcal{K}) \), which is called the variety generated by \( \mathcal{K} \). It is the class of all models of the equational theory of \( \mathcal{K} \), which is the set of all equations satisfied by \( \mathcal{K} \).

Let \( \mathcal{V}_n \) be the variety of all algebras that validate all theorems of the logic \( K4\mathcal{C}_n \). A sufficient condition for membership of an algebra \( A \) in \( \mathcal{V}_n \) is that \( A \) is a normal modal algebra that validates the schemes 4 and \( \mathcal{C}_n \). This is because if the logic \( L_A \) comprising all modal formulas that are valid in \( A \) includes 4 and \( \mathcal{C}_n \), then it includes \( K4\mathcal{C}_n \), since the latter is the smallest logic to include these schemes. As explained above, for \( L_A \) to include a scheme it suffices for it to contain a variable instance of it. Thus \( \mathcal{V}_n \) is defined by finitely many equations.

Let \( \mathcal{C}_n^+ \) be the class of all finite transitive frames of circumference at most \( n \), and \( \mathcal{C}_n^+ = \{ \mathcal{F}^+ : \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}_n \} \) the class of all complex algebras of members of \( \mathcal{C}_n \). Each \( \mathcal{F}^+ \in \mathcal{C}_n^+ \) validates 4 and \( \mathcal{C}_n \), since \( \mathcal{F} \) does, so \( \mathcal{C}_n^+ \subseteq \mathcal{V}_n \). We then have
\[
\text{SP}\mathcal{C}_n^+ \subseteq \text{HSP}\mathcal{C}_n^+ \subseteq \mathcal{V}_n. \tag{7.2}
\]
The first of these inclusions holds because the variety \( \text{HSP}\mathcal{C}_n^+ \) includes \( \mathcal{C}_n^+ \) and is closed under subalgebras and ultraproducts. The second holds because \( \mathcal{V}_n \) is closed under \( H, S, P, P_U \). We will show that both inclusions are equalities, so the three classes displayed in (7.2) are identical. To prove this we need some background theory about the universal sentences that are satisfied in \( \mathcal{V}_n \).

A universal sentence in the language of modal algebras has the form \( \forall \overline{p} \sigma \), where the formula \( \sigma \) is quantifier-free, so is a Boolean combination of equations, and \( \forall \overline{p} \) is a sequence of universal quantifiers including those for all the variables of \( \sigma \). The following result is a standard fact in the model theory of universal sentences.

**Lemma 7.1.** If every universal sentence satisfied by a class \( \mathcal{K} \) of algebras is satisfied by algebra \( A \), then \( A \) is embeddable into an ultraproduct of members of \( \mathcal{K} \), i.e. \( A \in \text{SP}\mathcal{K} \).

**Proof.** See [Burris and Sankappanavar, 1981], Section V.2, especially the proof of Theorem 2.20.

This result implies that \( \text{SP}\mathcal{K} \) is the class of all models of the universal theory of \( \mathcal{K} \), which is the set of all universal sentences satisfied by \( \mathcal{K} \).

**Theorem 7.2.** For any \( n \geq 0 \), \( \mathcal{V}_n = \text{HSP}\mathcal{C}_n^+ = \text{SP}\mathcal{C}_n^+ \).
Proof. By (7.2) it suffices to show that any member of $V_n$ belongs to $\text{SP}_{U/C_n^+}$. So take any $A \in V_n$. To show that $A \in \text{SP}_{U/C_n^+}$, it is enough by Lemma 7.1 to show that every universal sentence satisfied by $C_n^+$ is satisfied by $A$. We prove the contrapositive of this.

Let $\forall \overline{p} \sigma$ be a universal sentence that is not satisfied by $A$. We will show it is not satisfied by (some member of) $C_n^+$. We can suppose that $\sigma$ is in conjunctive normal form, so that the sentence has the shape $\forall \overline{p}(\bigwedge_{i<m} \sigma_i)$, where each conjunct $\sigma_i$ is a disjunction of equations and negations of equations. The sentence is then equivalent to $\bigwedge_{i<m} \forall \overline{p} \sigma_i$, so there must be some $i < m$ such that $A \not\models \forall \overline{p} \sigma_i$. This $\sigma_i$ has the form

$$\left( \bigvee_{h<k} \varphi_h \right) \lor \left( \bigvee_{j<l} \neg \psi_j \right),$$

where the $\varphi_h$'s and $\psi_j$'s are equations. Then for some interpretation $\overline{a}$ in $A$ of the list of variables $\overline{p}$, we have

$$A \not\models \varphi_h[\overline{a}] \quad \text{and} \quad A \models \psi_j[\overline{a}] \quad \text{(7.3)}$$

for all $h < k$ and $j < l$. We identify the equations $\varphi_h, \psi_j$ with modal formulas and switch to dealing with modal models.

By the Jónsson-Tarski representation theory we can take $A$ to be a subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}^+$ for some frame $\mathcal{F} = (W, R)$ with transitive $R$. So each member of $A$ is a subset of $W$. Let $M$ be any model on $\mathcal{F}$ such that for any variable $q$ the truth set $q^M$ is in $A$, and if $q$ occurs in the list $\overline{p}$, then $q^M$ is the corresponding entry from $\overline{a}$. Then every truth set of $M$ is in $A$, and by (7.3) and (7.1), for all $h < k$ and $j < l$ we get

$$M \not\models \varphi_h \quad \text{and} \quad M \models \psi_j. \quad \text{(7.4)}$$

Now we apply the filtration construction of Section 5 to the transitive model $M$, taking $\Phi$ to be the closure under subformulas of the set $\{ \varphi_h, \psi_j : h < k \land j < l \}$, so $\Phi$ is finite. The algebra $A$ belongs to $V_n$ and so validates $K4C_n$. Hence by (7.1) we get $M \models K4C_n$ as required.

The filtration construction produces a finite transitive model $M' = (W', R', V_{\Phi})$ of circumference at most $n$, such that for all $\varphi \in \Phi$ and $x \in W$,

$$M, x \models \varphi \iff M', [x] \models \varphi.$$

by (5.5) and (5.11). Since the map $x \mapsto [x]$ is surjective from $W$ to $W'$, this implies that

$$M \models \varphi \iff M' \models \varphi$$

for all $\varphi \in \Phi$. Applying this to (7.4) gives that for all $h < k$ and $j < l$ we have

$$M' \not\models \varphi_h \quad \text{and} \quad M' \models \psi_j. \quad \text{(7.5)}$$

Now let $A'$ be the complex algebra $(W', R')^+$. Since the frame $(W', R')$ belongs to $C_n$ we have $A' \in C_n^+$. Interpret each variable $q$ from $\overline{p}$ as the element $q^{M'}$ of $A'$ to get an interpretation $\overline{b}$ of $\overline{p}$ in $A'$. Combining (7.4) for $A'$ and $M'$ with (7.5) then gives

$$A' \not\models \varphi_h[\overline{b}] \quad \text{and} \quad A' \models \psi_j[\overline{b}]$$

for all $h < k$ and $j < l$. Hence $A' \not\models \forall \overline{p} \sigma_i$, and so $A' \not\models \forall \overline{p}(\bigwedge_{i<m} \sigma_i)$.

 Altogether we have shown that if any universal sentence is falsifiable in $A$ then it is falsifiable in some member $A'$ of $C_n^+$, hence if it is satisfied by $C_n^+$ then it is satisfied by $A$. As explained at the beginning, this is enough to prove the theorem.

It follows from this theorem that any member of $V_n$, i.e. any model of the equational theory of $C_n^+$, must be a model of the universal theory of $C_n^+$. This phenomenon is not special to the $V_n$'s. It will occur for many varieties that can be shown to be generated by their finite members by the kind of methods we have used here.
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