

Bundled fragments of first-order modal logic: (un)decidability

Anantha Padmanabha R. Ramanujam

*Institute of Mathematical Sciences,
Homi Bhabha National Institute, Chennai*

Yanjing Wang

Department of Philosophy, Peking University, Beijing

Abstract

Quantified modal logic provides a natural logical language for reasoning about modal attitudes even while retaining the richness of quantification for referring to predicates over domains. But then most fragments of the logic are undecidable, over many model classes. Over the years, only a few fragments (such as the monodic) have been shown to be decidable. In this paper, we study fragments that bundle quantifiers and modalities together, inspired by earlier work on epistemic logics of know-how/why/what. As always with quantified modal logics, it makes a significant difference whether the domain stays the same across worlds, or not. In particular, we show that the bundle $\forall\Box$ is undecidable over constant domain interpretations, even with only monadic predicates, whereas $\exists\Box$ bundle is decidable. On the other hand, over increasing domain interpretations, we get decidability with both $\forall\Box$ and $\exists\Box$ bundles with unrestricted predicates. In these cases, we also obtain tableau based procedures that run in PSPACE. We further show that the $\exists\Box$ bundle cannot distinguish between constant domain and variable domain interpretations.

Keywords: First-order modal logic, decidability, bundled fragments.

1 Introduction

In *Meaning and Necessity* [1], Carnap remarked:

Any system of modal logic without quantification is of interest only as a basis for a wider system including quantification. If such a wider system were found to be impossible, logicians would probably abandon modal logic entirely.

However, it seems that history went exactly the other way around. Compared to the flourishing developments of propositional modal logic in the past decades with successful applications in various other fields, first-order modal logic (FOML) is much less studied. In addition to numerous philosophical controversies, FOML is also famously hard to handle technically: e.g., you often

loose good properties of first-order logic and modal propositional logic when putting them together.

Among those technical hurdles, finding useful decidable fragments of FOML has been a major one preventing the use of FOML in computational applications. On the one hand, the decidable fragments of first-order logic have been well mapped out during the last few decades. On the other hand, we have a thorough understanding of the robust decidability of propositional modal logics. However, when it comes to finding decidable fragments of FOML, the situation seems quite hopeless: even the *two-variable fragment with one single monadic predicate* is (robustly) undecidable over almost all useful model classes [7]. On the positive side, besides the severely restricted one-variable fragment, the only promising approach has so far come from the study of the so-called *monodic fragment*, which requires that there be at most one free variable in the scope of any modal subformula. Combining the monodic restriction with a decidable fragment of FO we often obtain decidable fragments of FOML, as Table 1 shows (results mostly hold for the usual frame classes e.g., T, S4, ...).

Language	Model	Decidability	Ref
P^1	cons-D,	undecidable	[6]
x, y, p, P^1	inc/cons-D	undecidable	[5,3]
$x, y, \Box_i, \text{single } P^1$	inc/cons-D	undecidable	[7]
single x	inc/cons-D	decidable	[8,2]
$x, y/P^1/GF, \Box_i(x)$	inc/cons-D	decidable	[12]

Table 1

x, y refers to the two-variable fragment, P^1 refers to unary predicates. Inc and cons-D refers to increasing domain and constant domain FOML structures. GF is the guarded fragment. \Box_i is multi-modal logic. $\Box_i(x)$ refers to having only 1 free variable inside the modality (monodic fragment).

The reason behind this sad tale is not far to seek: the addition of \Box gives implicitly an extra quantifier, over a fresh variable. Thus if we consider the two-variable fragment of FOML, with only unary predicates in the syntax, we can use \Box to code up binary relations and we ride out of the two-variable fragment as well as the monadic fragment of FOL. The monodic restriction confines the use of \Box significantly so that it cannot introduce a fresh variable implicitly.

It is then natural to ask: apart from variable restrictions, is there some other way to obtain syntactic fragments of FOML that are yet decidable?

One answer came, perhaps surprisingly, from epistemic logic. In recent years, interest has grown in studying epistemic logics of knowing-how, knowing-why, knowing-what, and so on (see [11] for a survey). As observed in [11], most of the new epistemic operators essentially share a unified *de re* semantic schema of $\exists x \Box$ where \Box is an epistemic modality.¹ For instance, knowing how to achieve ϕ means that there exists a mechanism which you

¹ Note that the quantifier is not necessarily first-order.

know such that executing it will make sure that you end in a ϕ state [9]. Here the distinction between $\exists\Box$ and $\Box\exists$ is crucial. It is also observed that such logics are often decidable. This leads to the proposal in [10] of a new fragment of FOML by packing \exists and \Box into a *bundle* modality, but without any restriction on predicates or the occurrences of variables.

$$\phi ::= P\bar{x} \mid \neg\phi \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid \exists x\Box\phi$$

Note that in this language, quantifiers have to always come with modalities. If x does not appear in ϕ then $\exists x\Box$ is simply equivalent to the usual \Box . Such a language suffices to say many interesting things besides knowing-how such as:

- I do not know who killed Mary: $\neg\exists x\Box\text{kill}(x, \text{Mary})$
- I know a theorem such that I do not know any proof: $\exists x\Box\neg\exists y\Box\text{prove}(x, y)$
- For each person I think it is possible that I know someone who is a friend of him or her: $\forall x\Diamond\exists y\Box\text{friend}(x, y)$ (note that $\forall x\Diamond$ is $\neg\exists x\Box\neg$)
- I know a public key whose corresponding private key is known to agent j but not to me: $\exists x\Box_i(\exists y\Box_j\text{key}(x, y) \wedge \neg\exists y\Box_i\text{key}(x, y))$.

It is shown that this fragment with arbitrary predicates is in fact PSPACE-complete over increasing domain models. Essentially, the idea is similar to the “secret of success” of modal logic: *guard the quantifiers*, now with a modality. On the other hand, the same fragment is undecidable over S5 models, and this can be shown by coding first-order sentences in this language using S5 properties.

There are curious features to observe in this tale of (partial) success. The fragment in [10] includes the $\exists\Box$ bundle but not its companion $\forall\Box$ bundle, and considers only increasing domain models. The latter observation is particularly interesting when we notice that S5 models, where the fragment becomes undecidable, force constant domain semantics.

The last distinction is familiar to first-order modal logicians, but might come across as a big fuss to others. Briefly, it is the distinction between a *possibilist* approach and an *actualist* approach. In the former, the model has one fixed domain for all possible worlds, and quantification extends over the domain (rather than only those objects that exist in the current world). This is the constant domain semantics. In the latter approach, each possible world has its own domain, and quantification extends only over objects that exist in the current world. In increasing domain semantics, once an object exists in a world w , it exists in worlds accessible from w .

Given such subtlety, it is instructive to consider more general bundled fragments of FOML, including both $\exists\Box$ and $\forall\Box$ as the natural first step, and study them over constant domain as well as increasing domain models. This is precisely the project undertaken in this paper, and the results are summarized in Table 2.

As we can see, the $\exists\Box$ bundle behaves better computationally than the $\forall\Box$ bundle. For $\forall\Box$, even the monadic fragment is undecidable over constant domain models: we can encode in this language, qua satisfiability, any first-order

Language	Domain	Decidability	Remark
$\forall\Box, P^1$	constant	undecidable	
$\exists\Box, P$	constant	decidable	PSPACE-complete
$\exists\Box, \forall\Box, P$	increasing	decidable	PSPACE-complete

Table 2
Satisfiability problem classification for Bundled FOML fragment

logic sentence with binary predicates by exploiting the power of $\forall\Box$. A straightforward consequence is that the $\Box\forall$ fragment is also undecidable over constant domain models.

On the other hand, we can actually give a tableau method for the $\exists\Box$ and $\forall\Box$ fragment together, similarly as the tableau in [10], for increasing domain models. The crucial observation is that such models allow us to manufacture new witnesses for $\forall x\Diamond$ and $\exists x\Diamond$ formulas, giving considerable freedom in model construction, which is not available in constant domain models.

Indeed, the well-behavedness of the $\exists\Box$ bundle is further attested to by the fact that it is decidable over constant domain models as well. So constant domain is not the culprit for undecidability of this fragment over S5 models. Actually, we can show the $\exists\Box$ bundle does not distinguish increasing domain models and constant domain models.

The paper is structured as follows. After formal definitions of bundled fragments, we present undecidability results and then move on to tableaux procedures for the decidable fragments. We then show that the validities of $\exists\Box$ over increasing domain are exactly the same as its validities over constant domain models, and end the paper with a re-look at mapping the terrain of these fragments.

2 The bundled fragment of FOML

Let Var be a countable set of variables, and \mathbf{P} be a fixed set of predicate symbols, with $\mathbf{P}^n \subseteq \mathbf{P}$ denoting the set of all predicate symbols of arity n . We use \bar{x} to denote a finite sequence of (distinct) variables in Var . We only consider the ‘pure’ first order unimodal logic: that is, the vocabulary is restricted to Var (no equality and no constants and no function symbols).

Definition 2.1 Given Var and \mathbf{P} , the bundled fragment of FOML denoted by BFOML is defined as follows:

$$\phi ::= P\bar{x} \mid \neg\phi \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid \exists x\Box\phi \mid \exists x\Diamond\phi$$

where $x \in \text{Var}$, $P \in \mathbf{P}$. We denote the fragment $\text{BFOML}^{\exists\Box}$ to be the formulas which contains only $\exists\Box$ formulas and $\text{BFOML}^{\exists\Diamond}$ which contains only $\exists\Diamond$ formulas.

$\top, \perp, \vee, \Rightarrow$ (True, False, Or and Implies) are defined in the standard way. $\forall x\Diamond\phi$ as $\neg\exists x\Box\neg\phi$ is the dual of $\exists x\Box\phi$, and $\forall x\Box\phi$ defined by $\neg\exists x\Diamond\neg\phi$ is the

dual of $\exists x \Box \phi$. With both bundles we can say, in an epistemic setting, that for each country I know its capital $\forall x \Box \exists y \Box \text{Capital}(x, y)$.

The *free* and *bound* occurrences of variables are defined as in first-order logic, by viewing $\exists x \Box$ and $\exists x \Diamond$ as quantifiers. We denote $\text{Fv}(\phi)$ as the set of free variables of ϕ . We write $\phi(\bar{x})$ if all the free variables in ϕ are included in \bar{x} . Given a BFOML formula ϕ and $x, y \in \text{Var}$, we write $\phi[y/x]$ for the formula obtained by replacing every free occurrence of x by y . A formula is said to be a *sentence* if it contains no free variables.

The semantics is the standard *increasing domain* semantics of FOML. The \models relation is specialized to the BFOML fragment.

Definition 2.2 An (increasing domain) model M for BFOML is a tuple (W, D, δ, R, ρ) where, W is a non-empty set of worlds, D is a non-empty domain, $R \subseteq (W \times W)$, $\delta : W \rightarrow 2^D$ assigns to each $w \in W$ a *non-empty* local domain s.t. wRv implies $\delta(w) \subseteq \delta(v)$ for any $w, v \in W$, and $\rho : W \times \mathbf{P} \rightarrow \bigcup_{n \in \omega} 2^{D^n}$ such that ρ assigns to each n -ary predicate on each world an n -ary relation on D .

We often write D_w for $\delta(w)$. A *constant domain* model is one where $D_w = D$ for any $w \in W$. A *finite model* is one with both W finite and D finite.

Consider a model $M = (W, D, \delta, R, \rho)$, $w \in W$. To interpret free variables, we also need a variable assignment $\sigma : \text{Var} \rightarrow D$. Call σ *relevant* at $w \in W$ if $\sigma(x) \in \delta^M(w)$ for all $x \in \text{Var}$. The increasing domain condition ensures that whenever σ is relevant at w and we have wRv , then σ is relevant at v as well. (In a constant domain model, every assignment σ is relevant at all the worlds.)

Given $M = (W, D, \delta, R, \rho)$, $w \in W$, and an assignment σ relevant at w , define $M, w, \sigma \models \phi$ inductively as follows:

$M, w, \sigma \models P(x_1 \cdots x_n)$	$\Leftrightarrow (\sigma(x_1), \dots, \sigma(x_n)) \in \rho(P, w)$
$M, w, \sigma \models \neg \phi$	$\Leftrightarrow M, w, \sigma \not\models \phi$
$M, w, \sigma \models (\phi \wedge \psi)$	$\Leftrightarrow M, w, \sigma \models \phi$ and $M, w, \sigma \models \psi$
$M, w, \sigma \models \exists x \Box \phi$	\Leftrightarrow there is some $d \in \delta(w)$ such that $M, v, \sigma[x \mapsto d] \models \phi$ for all v s.t. wRv
$M, w, \sigma \models \exists x \Diamond \phi$	\Leftrightarrow there is some $d \in \delta(w)$ and some $v \in W$ such that wRv and $M, v, \sigma[x \mapsto d] \models \phi$

where $\sigma[x \mapsto d]$ denotes another assignment that is the same as σ except for mapping x to d .

It is easily verified that $M, w, \sigma \models \phi$ is defined only when σ is relevant at w . In general, when considering the truth of ϕ in a model, it suffices to consider $\sigma : \text{Fv}(\phi) \rightarrow D$, assignment restricted to the free variables occurring free in ϕ . When $\text{Fv}(\phi) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and $\{d_1, \dots, d_n\} \subseteq D$, We write $M, w \models \phi[\bar{d}]$ to denote $M, w, \sigma \models \phi(\bar{x})$ for any σ such that and for all $i \leq n$ we have $\sigma(x_i) = d_i$. Hence when ϕ is a sentence, we can simply write $M, w \models \phi$.

We say ϕ is *valid*, if ϕ is true on any M, w w.r.t. any σ relevant at w . ϕ is *satisfiable* if $\neg \phi$ is not valid.

3 Undecidability results

In this section we prove that the satisfiability problem for the BFOML $^{\exists\Diamond}$ fragment with constant domain semantics is undecidable even when the atomic predicates are restricted to be unary. We prove this by reduction from the satisfiability problem for FO with one arbitrary binary predicate, which is known to be undecidable (from [4]).

That full FOML with constant domain semantics is undecidable even when the atomic predicates are only unary is well known; it was shown by Kripke [6]. That we need only 2 variables along with propositions to make Monadic FOML undecidable was shown by Gabbay and Shehtman [3]. That propositions can be eliminated was observed by Kontchakov, Kurucz and Zakharyashev [5].

Consider FO(R), the first order logic with only variables as terms and no equality, and the single binary predicate R . To translate FO(R) sentences to BFOML $^{\exists\Diamond}$ formulas, we use two unary predicate symbols p, q in the latter. The main idea is that the atomic formula $R(x, y)$ is coded up as the FOML formula $\exists z\Diamond(p(x) \wedge q(y))$, where z is a new variable, distinct from x and y .² In the model constructed, it will turn out that $R = P \times Q$. But in which world is this to be enforced? We will enforce that all worlds at a specific modal depth interpret R in the same way, thus ruling out any ambiguity, crucially using the $\forall\Box$ bundle and constant domain semantics.

For any *quantifier free* FO(R) formula α , we define the translation of α to BFOML $^{\exists\Diamond}$ formula ϕ_α inductively as follows.

- $\phi_{R(x,y)} ::= \exists z\Diamond(p(x) \wedge q(y))$, where z is distinct from x and y .
- $\phi_{\neg\alpha} ::= \neg\phi_\alpha$ and $\phi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2} ::= \phi_{\alpha_1} \wedge \phi_{\alpha_2}$.

Now consider an FO(R) sentence α (having no free variables) and presented in prenex form: $Q_1x_1 Q_2x_2 \cdots Q_nx_n(\beta)$ where β is quantifier free. We define ψ_α to be the conjunction of the following three sentences:

- $\psi_1 ::= Q_1x_1\Delta_1 Q_2x_2\Delta_2 \cdots Q_nx_n\Delta_n(\phi_\beta)$
where $Q_ix_i\Delta_i ::= \exists x_i\Diamond$ if $Q_i = \exists$ and $Q_ix_i\Delta_i ::= \forall x_i\Box$ if $Q_i = \forall$.
- $\psi_2 ::= \forall z_1\Box\forall z_2\Box((\exists z\Diamond)^n(\exists z\Diamond(p(z_1) \wedge q(z_2)))) \Rightarrow (\forall z\Box)^n(\exists z\Diamond(p(z_1) \wedge q(z_2))))$.
- $\psi_3 ::= \bigwedge_{j=1}^{n+2}(\forall\Box z)^j\exists z\Diamond\top$.

Of these, ψ_1 ensures that the formulas are interpreted over the same domain, and that the meaning of R is given as $P \times Q$ in a world at depth $n + 1$. ψ_2 ensures that all worlds at depth $n + 3$ agree on p and q and hence on R . ψ_3 asserts that every path can be extended until depth $n + 2$, one never gets stuck earlier.

The role of dummy variables z_1 and z_2 in ψ_2 and depth $n + 2$ in ψ_3 may need an explanation. First note that the interpretation for R is collected at depth $n + 1$, and the extra depth is because the extra quantification in the coding of R

² This is similar to the approach used by Kripke [6], specialized for the BFOML $^{\exists\Diamond}$ fragment.

added successor worlds. Now we need these two variables to refer to elements of p and q at depth $n + 1$, but in the bundled fragment, any variable comes packed with a modality. Thus we get depth $n + 3$. Further we could not use variables from α (which might be quantified existentially), so fresh variables are needed.

Theorem 3.1 *The FO(R) sentence α is satisfiable iff the BFOML $^{\exists\Diamond}$ sentence ψ_α is constant domain satisfiable.*

Proof We sketch the proof here, the details are given in Appendix A. Fix $\alpha ::= Q_1x_1 \cdots Q_nx_n\beta$, where β is quantifier free. To prove (\Rightarrow) , assume that α is satisfiable. Let D be some domain such that $(D, I) \models \alpha$ where $I \subseteq (D \times D)$ is the interpretation for R .

Define $M = (W, R, D, \delta, \rho)$ where:

$$W = \{v_1, v_2\} \cup \{w_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{u_d \mid d \in D\}.$$

$$R = \{(v_1, v_2), (v_2, w_1)\} \cup \{(w_i, w_{i+1}) \mid 1 \leq i < n\} \cup \{(w_n, u_d) \mid u_d \in W\}.$$

$$\delta(u) = D \text{ for all } u \in W.$$

For all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $v_i, w_j \in W$ define $\rho(v_i, p) = \rho(v_i, q) = \rho(w_j, p) = \rho(w_j, q) = \emptyset$ and for all $u_d \in W$, $\rho(u_d, p) = \{d\}$ and $\rho(u_d, q) = \{c \mid (d, c) \in I\}$.

By construction, M is a model that is a path of length $n + 2$ originating from v_1 until w_n at which point we have a tree of depth 1, with children u_d , one for each $d \in D$. Therefore, it is easy to see that $M, v_1 \models \psi_3$.

Note that M is a constant domain model. Further, it can be easily checked that $(a, b) \in R$ iff $M, u_a \models (p(a) \wedge q(b))$. Thus $(D, I) \models R(x, y)$ iff $M, w_n \models \exists z \Diamond (p(x) \wedge q(y))$. Hence a routine induction shows that for any quantifier free formula β' , $(D, I) \models \beta'$ iff $M, w_n \models \phi_{\beta'}$. Further, since M is a path model until w_n and there is a path of length $n + 3$ starting from v_1 , we see that $M, v_1 \models \psi_2 \wedge \psi_3$. We then show that $M, v_1 \models \psi_1$, which would complete the forward direction of the proof. This is proved by reverse induction on i . The base case, when $i = n$, follows from our assertion above on the interpretation of R at w_n . For the induction step, we crucially use the fact the model constructed is a path and hence \Box and \Diamond coincide along the path.

To prove (\Leftarrow) , suppose that ψ_α is satisfiable, and let $M = (W, D, R, \gamma, V)$ be a constant domain model such that $M, v \models \psi_\alpha$. Without loss of generality, we can assume (W, R) to be a tree rooted at v , and ψ_3 ensures that every path in it has length at least $n + 3$. Let u' be any world at height $n + 3$. Define $I_{u'} = \{(c, d) \mid c \in \rho(u', p), d \in \rho(u', q)\}$. For world u at height $n + 2$, define $I_u = \bigcup \{I_{u'} \mid (u, u') \in R\}$. Since $M, v \models \psi_2$, we see that $I_u = I_{u'}$, for all u, w at height $n + 2$. Hence we unambiguously define $I = I_u$, thus defining the first order model $M' = (D, I)$. We now claim that the formula α is satisfied in this model. The definition of I ensures that the atomic formulas are correctly satisfied. We proceed by subtree induction noting that all children of a node satisfy subformulas equivalently (which is needed for $\forall\Box$ formulas). \square

4 Decidability results

Having seen that the BFOML fragment is undecidable over constant domain models, and noted that the $\exists\Box$ bundle is decidable over increasing domain models ([10]), it is natural to wonder whether the problem is decidable with the $\forall\Box$ bundle or constant domain semantics, or both. In this section, we show that it is indeed the combination that is the culprit, by showing that relaxing either of the conditions leads to decidability. First, we show that the full fragment is decidable over increasing domain models, and then show that the $\exists\Box$ bundle is decidable over constant domain models.

4.1 Increasing domain models

We consider formulas given in negation normal form (NNF):

$$\phi ::= P\bar{x} \mid \neg P\bar{x} \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid (\phi \vee \phi) \mid \exists x\Box\phi \mid \exists x\Diamond\phi \mid \forall x\Box\phi \mid \forall x\Diamond\phi$$

Formulas of the form $P\bar{x}$ and $\neg P\bar{x}$ are *literals*. Clearly, every BFOML-formula ϕ can be rewritten into an equivalent formula in NNF.

We call a formula *clean* if no variable occurs both bound and free in it and every use of a quantifier quantifies a distinct variable. Note that every BFOML-formula can be rewritten into an equivalent clean formula. (For instance, $\exists x\Box P(x) \vee \exists x\Box Q(x)$ and $P(x) \wedge \exists x\Box Q(x)$ are unclean formulas, whereas $\exists x\Box P(x) \vee \exists y\Box Q(y)$ and $P(x) \wedge \exists y\Box Q(y)$ are their clean equivalents.)

We define the following tableau rules for all BFOML formulas in NNF. The tableau is a tree structure $T = (W, V, E, \lambda)$ where W is a finite set, (V, E) is a rooted tree and $\lambda : V \rightarrow L$ is a labelling map. Each element in L is of the form (w, Γ, F) , where $w \in W$, Γ is a finite set of formulas and $F \subseteq \text{Var}$ is a finite set. The intended meaning of the label is that the node constitutes a world w that satisfies the formulas in Γ with the ‘assignment’ F , with each variable in F denoting one that occurs free in Γ and as we will see, the interpretation will be the identity.

A rule specifies that if a node labelled by the premise of the rule exists, it can cause one or more new nodes to be created as children with the labels as given by the completion of the rule.

Definition 4.1 Tableau rules

$\frac{w : \phi_1 \vee \phi_2, \Gamma, F}{w : \phi_1, \Gamma, \sigma \mid w : \phi_2, \Gamma, F} (\vee) \quad \frac{w : \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2, \Gamma, F}{w : \phi_1, \phi_2, \Gamma, F} (\wedge)$
$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \text{Given } n_1, m_1 \geq 1, n_2, m_2, s \geq 0: \\ w : \exists x_1 \Diamond \alpha_1 \cdots, \exists x_{n_1} \Diamond \alpha_{n_1}, \exists y_1 \Box \beta_1, \cdots, \exists y_{n_2} \Box \beta_{n_2}, \\ \forall z_1 \Diamond \phi_1, \cdots, \forall z_{m_1} \Diamond \phi_{m_1}, \forall z'_1 \Box \psi_1, \cdots, \forall z'_{m_2} \Box \psi_{m_2}, \quad r_1 \dots r_s, F \end{array}}{\langle wv_{x_i} : \alpha_i, \{\beta_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n_2\}, \{\psi_l[z/z'_l] \mid z \in F', l \in [1, m_2]\}, F' \rangle \cup \langle wv_{z'_k}^y : \phi_k[y/z_k], \{\beta_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n_2\}, \{\psi_l[z/z'_l] \mid z \in F', l \in [1, m_2]\}, F' \rangle} \text{ (BR)}$ <p style="text-align: center; margin: 0;"><i>where</i> $i \in [1, n_1], k \in [1, m_1], y \in F'$</p>
$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \text{Given } n_2, m_2 \geq 1; s \geq 0: \\ w : \exists y_1 \Box \beta_1, \cdots, \exists y_{n_2} \Box \beta_{n_2}, \forall z'_1 \Box \psi_1, \cdots, \forall z'_{m_2} \Box \psi_{m_2}, r_1 \dots r_s, F \end{array}}{w : r_1 \dots r_s, F} \text{ (END)}$

where $F' = F \cup \{x_i \mid i \in [1, n_1]\} \cup \{y_j \mid j \in [1, n_2]\}$ and $r_1 \dots r_s \in \text{lit}$ (the literals).

The rules are standard. The rule (END) says that in the absence of any $Qx\Diamond$ formulas, with $Q \in \{\exists, \forall\}$, the branch does not need to be explored further, only the literals remain. Further, note that there is an implicit ordering on how rules are applied: (BR) insists on the label containing no top level conjuncts or disjuncts, and hence may be applied only after the \wedge and \vee rules have been applied as many times as necessary.

The rule (BR) looks complicated but asserts standard modal validities, but with multiplicity. To see how it works, consider a model M , a world u and assignment σ such that $(M, u, \sigma) \models \exists x\Diamond\alpha \wedge \exists y\Box\beta \wedge \forall z\Box\psi$. Then for some domain element $c \in \delta(u)$, we have a successor world v such that $(M, v, \sigma') \models \alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \psi$, where $\sigma'(x) = c$ and $\sigma'(z) = c$. Further if $(M, u, \sigma) \models \forall z\Diamond\phi \wedge \forall z'\Box\psi$ then for every domain element $d \in \delta(u)$, we have a successor world v_d such that $(M, v_d, \sigma') \models \phi \wedge \psi$, where $\sigma'(z) = d$ and $\sigma'(z') = d$. When the domain elements we use are themselves variables, they can be substituted into formulas so we could well write $(M, v_d, \sigma') \models \phi[z/d] \wedge \psi[z'/d]$. The rule (BR) achieves just this, but has to do all this simultaneously for all the quantified formulas at the node “in one shot”, and has to keep the formulas clean too.

We need to check that the rule (BR) is well-defined. Specifically, if the label in the premise contains only clean formulas, we need to check that the label in the conclusion does the same. To see this, observe the following, with Γ being the set of clean formulas in the premise. Let Δ, Δ' stand for any modality.

- Note that if $\exists x\Delta\phi$ and $Qy\Delta'\psi$ are both in Γ , with Q any quantifier, then $x \neq y$ and neither x occurs free in ψ nor y occurs free in ϕ , also ϕ or ψ do not contain any subformula that quantifies over x or y .
- Hence, in the conclusion of (BR), every substitution of the form $\phi[y/z]$ or $\psi[z/z']$ results in a clean formula, since y occurs free in ϕ and z does not occur at all in ϕ and similarly for ψ .

Thus, maintaining ‘cleanliness’ allows us to treat existential quantifiers as giving their own witnesses. The ‘increase’ in the domain is given by the added elements in F' in the conclusion. Note that with each node creation either the number of boolean connectives or the maximum quantifier rank of formulas in the label goes down, and hence repeated applications of the tableau rules must terminate, thus guaranteeing that the tableau generated is always finite.

A tableau is said to be *open* if it does not contain any node u such that its label contains a literal r as well as its negation. Given a tableau T , we say a node $(w : \Gamma, F)$ is a *branching node* if it is branching due to the application of BR. We call (w, Γ, F) the *last node of w* , if it is a leaf node or a branching node. Clearly, given any label w appearing in any node of a tableau T , the last node of w uniquely exists. If it is a non-leaf node, every child of w is labelled wu for some u .

Let t_w denote the last node of w in tableau T and let $\lambda(t_w) = (w, \Gamma, F)$. If it is a non-leaf node, then it is a branching node with rule (BR) applying to it with F' as its conclusion. We let $Dom(t_w)$ denote the set F' in this case and $Dom(t_w) = F$ otherwise.

Theorem 4.2 *For any clean BFOML-formula θ in NNF, there is an open tableau from $(r, \{\theta\}, F_r)$ where $F_r = \{x \mid x \text{ is free in } \theta\} \cup \{z\}$, where $z \in \text{Var}$, z does not appear in θ , iff θ is satisfiable in an increasing domain model.*

Proof

Let T be any tableau T starting from $(r, \{\theta\}, F_r)$ where θ is clean. We observe that for any node (v, Γ, F) in T , we have the following. If $x \in F$ and occurs in a formula in Γ then every occurrence is free. Further, every variable x occurring free in a formula in Γ is in F . These are proved by induction on the structure of T using the fact that the rule (BR), when applied to clean formulas, results in clean formulas.

To prove the theorem, given an open tableau $T = (W, V, E, \lambda)$ with root node labelled by $(r, \{\theta\}, F_r)$, we define $M = (W, D, \delta, R, \rho)$ where: $D = \text{Var}$; wRv iff $v = wv'$ for some v' ; $\delta(w) = \text{Dom}(t_w)$; $\bar{x} \in \rho(w, P)$ iff $P\bar{x} \in \Gamma$, where $\lambda(t_w) = (w, \Gamma, F)$. Clearly, if wRv then $\text{Dom}(t_w) \subseteq \text{Dom}(t_v)$, and hence M is indeed an increasing domain model.

Moreover ρ is well-defined due to openness of T . We now show that M, r is indeed a model of θ , and this is proved by the following claim.

Claim. For any tree node w in T if $\lambda(t_w) = (w, \Gamma, F)$ and if $\alpha \in \Gamma$ then $(M, w, id_F) \models \alpha$. (Below, we abuse notation and write $(M, w, F) \models \alpha$ for $(M, w, id_F) \models \alpha$ where $id_F = \{(x, x) \mid x \in F\}$.)

The proof proceeds by subtree induction on the structure of T . The base case is when the node considered is a leaf node and hence it is also the last node with that label. The definition of ρ ensures that the literals are evaluated correctly in the model.

For the induction step, the cases for the conjunction and disjunction rules are standard. Now consider the application of rule (BR) at a branching node t_w with label (w, Γ, F) . Let

$$\Gamma = \{\exists x_i \diamond \alpha_i \mid i \in [1, n_1]\} \cup \{\exists y_j \square \beta_j \mid j \in [1, n_2]\} \cup \{\forall z_k \diamond \phi_k \mid k \in [1, m_1]\} \\ \cup \{\forall z'_l \square \psi_l \mid l \in [1, m_2]\} \cup \{r_1 \dots r_s\}.$$

By induction hypothesis, we have that for every $i \leq n_1$, $M, wv_{x_i}, F' \models \alpha_i \wedge \bigwedge_{j \leq n_2} \beta_j \wedge \psi'$ and for every $y \in F'$ and $k \in [1, m_1]$, $M, wv_{z_k}^y, F' \models \phi_k[y/z_k] \wedge \psi'$, where $\psi' = \bigwedge_{l \leq m_2} \psi_l[z/z'_l]$.

Note that $D_w = \text{Dom}(t_w) = F'$. We need to show that $M, w, F \models \alpha$ for each $\alpha \in \Gamma$. Every such α is either a literal or a bundle formula. The assertion for literals follows from the definition of ρ . For $\exists x_i \diamond \alpha_i \in \Gamma$ we have the successor wv_{x_i} where α_i is true. Similarly for every $\forall z_k \diamond \phi_k \in \Gamma$ and $y \in D_w$ we have the successor $wv_{z_k}^y$ where $\phi_k[y/z_k]$ is true.

Now for the case $\exists y_j \square \beta_j$: by induction hypothesis, for all successors $wv_z^\#$ of w where $\#$ is either empty or $\# \in F'$ we have $M, wv_z^\#, F' \models \beta_j$. By cleanliness of β_j , for all $j' \neq j$ and for all i, k, l we have that $x_i, y_{j'}, z_k, z'_l$ are not free in β_j . Hence $M, wv_z^\#, id_F[y_j \mapsto y_j] \models \beta_j$ for each $wv_z^\#$. Since $y_j \in F' = D_w$ we have $M, w, id_F \models \exists y_j \square \beta_j$.

The case $\forall z'_l \square \psi_l$ is similar. By induction hypothesis, we have $M, wv_z^\#, F' \models$

$\psi_l[a/z'_l]$ for every $a \in F'$ and again by cleanliness of ψ_l , for all $l' \neq l$ and for all i, j, k we note that x_i, y_j, z_k, z'_l are not free in ψ_l . Thus $M, wv_z^\#, F'[z_l \mapsto a] \models \psi_l$ for all $a \in F' = D_w$. Hence $M, w, id_F \models \forall z'_l \Box \psi_l$.

Thus the claim is proved and hence it follows that $M, r, F_r \models \theta$.

Completeness of tableau construction:

We only need to show that all rule applications preserve the satisfiability of the formula sets in the labels. This would ensure that there is an open tableau since satisfiability of formula sets ensures lack of contradiction among literals. It is easy to see that the rules (\wedge) and (END) preserve satisfiability. If one of the conclusions of the (\vee) rule is satisfiable then so is the premise. It remains only to show that (BR) preserves satisfiability. Consider a label set Γ of clean formulas at a branching node. Let $\Gamma = \{\exists x_i \Diamond \alpha_i \mid i \in [1, n_1]\} \cup \{\exists y_j \Box \beta_j \mid j \in [1, n_2]\} \cup \{\forall z_k \Diamond \phi_k \mid k \in [1, m_1]\} \cup \{\forall z'_l \Box \psi_l \mid l \in [1, m_2]\} \cup \{r_1 \dots r_s\}$.

be satisfiable at a model $M = \{W, D, \delta, R, \rho\}$, $w \in W$ and an assignment η such that $\eta(x) \in D_w$ for all $x \in FV(\Gamma)$ and $M, w, \eta \models \bigwedge_{\chi \in \Gamma} \chi$.

By the semantics, we have the following: (A): There exist $a_1, \dots, a_{n_1} \in D_w$ and $v_1 \dots v_{n_1} \in W$ successors of w such that $M, v_i, \eta[x_i \mapsto a_i] \models \alpha_i$. (B): There exist $b_1, \dots, b_{n_2} \in D_w$ such that for all $v \in W$ if $w \rightarrow v$ then $M, v, \eta[y_j \mapsto b_j] \models \beta_j$. (C): For all $c \in D_w$ there exist $v_1^c \dots v_{m_1}^c \in W$, successors of w such that $M, v_k^c, \eta[z_k \mapsto c] \models \phi_k$. (D): For all $d \in D_w$ and for all $v \in W$ if $w \rightarrow v$ then $M, v, \eta[z'_l \mapsto d] \models \psi_l$.

By cleanliness of β_j , each y_j is free only in β_j and y_j is not free in any $\alpha_i, \beta_{j'}, \phi_k, \psi_l$ for $j' \neq j$ and for all i, k, l . Similarly z'_l is free only in ψ_l and z'_l is not free in any $\alpha_i, \beta_j, \phi_k, \psi_{l'}$ for $l' \neq l$ and for all i, j, k . Thus, due to (B) and (D), we can rewrite (A) and (C) as: (A'): There exists some $\bar{b} \in D_w$ and for all $\bar{d} \in D_w$ such that there exist $a_i \in D_w$ and $v_i \in W$, successor of w such that $M, v_i, \eta[x_i \mapsto a_i; \bar{y} \mapsto \bar{b}; \bar{z}' \mapsto \bar{d}] \models \alpha_i \wedge \bigwedge_j \beta_j \wedge \bigwedge_l \psi_l$.

(C'): there exists $\bar{b} \in D_w$ and for all $\bar{d} \in D_w$ such that for all $c \in D_w$ there exist $v_1^c \dots v_{m_1}^c \in W$, successors of w such that $M, v_k^c, \eta[z_k \mapsto c; \bar{y} \mapsto \bar{b}; \bar{z}' \mapsto \bar{d}] \models \phi_k \wedge \bigwedge_j \beta_j \wedge \bigwedge_l \psi_l$.

Now all the nodes in the conclusion of the BR rule have formulas as described in type A' or C' and are hence satisfiable. \square

This proves the theorem, offering us a tableau construction procedure for every formula: we have an open tableau iff the formula is satisfiable. Now note that the tableau is not only of depth linear in the size of the formula, but also that subformulas are never repeated across siblings. Hence an algorithm can explore the tableau depthwise and reuse the same space when exploring other branches. The techniques are standard as in tableau procedures for modal logics. The extra space overhead for keeping track of domain elements is again only linear in the size of the formula. This way, we can get a PSPACE-algorithm for checking satisfiability. On the other hand, the PSPACE lower bound for propositional modal logic applies as well, thus giving us the following corollary.

Corollary 4.3 *Satisfiability of BFOML-formulas is PSPACE-complete.*

4.2 Constant domain models

We now take up the second task, to show that over constant domain models, the culprit is the $\forall\Box$ bundle, by proving that the satisfiability problem for the BFOML $^{\exists\Box}$ is decidable over constant domain models. [10] already showed decidability of the BFOML $^{\exists\Box}$ over increasing domain models. Taken together, we see that the BFOML $^{\exists\Diamond}$ fragment is computationally robust.

The central idea behind the tableau procedure in the previous section was the use of existential quantifiers to offer their own witnesses, and cleanliness of formulas ensures that these are new every time they are encountered. This works well with increasing domain models, but in constant domain models, we need to fix the domain right at the start of the tableau construction and use only these elements as witnesses. Yet, a moment's reflection assures us that we can give a precise bound on how many new elements need to be added for each subformula of the form $\exists x\Box\phi$, and hence we can include as many elements as needed at the beginning of the tableau construction.

Let $\text{Sub}(\theta)$ stand for the finite set of subformulas of θ . Given a clean formula θ in NNF, for every $\exists x_j\Box\phi \in \text{Sub}(\theta)$ let $\text{Var}^{\exists}(\theta) = \{x \mid \exists x\Box\phi \in \text{Sub}(\theta)\}$. Now, cleanliness has its advantages: every subformula of a clean formula is clean as well. Hence, when θ_1 and θ_2 are both in $\text{Sub}(\theta)$, $\text{Var}^{\exists}(\theta_1) \cap \text{Var}^{\exists}(\theta_2) = \emptyset$. Similarly, when $\theta_1 \in \text{Sub}(\theta)$ and $\theta_2 \in \text{Sub}(\theta_1)$, again $\text{Var}^{\exists}(\theta_1) \cap \text{Var}^{\exists}(\theta_2) = \emptyset$.

Fix a clean formula θ in NNF with modal depth h . For every $x \in \text{Var}^{\exists}(\theta)$ define Var_x to be the set of h fresh variables $\{x^k \mid 1 \leq k \leq h\}$, and let $\text{Var}^+(\theta) = \bigcup\{\text{Var}_x \mid x \in \text{Var}^{\exists}(\theta)\}$, be the set of new variables to be added. Note that $\text{Var}_x \cap \text{Var}_y = \emptyset$ when $x \neq y$. Fix a variable z not occurring in θ . Define $D_\theta = \text{Fv}(\theta) \cup \text{Var}^+(\theta) \cup \{z \mid z \text{ does not occur in } \theta\}$. Note that D_θ is non-empty.

The tableau rules are given by:

$\frac{w : \phi_1 \vee \phi_2, \Gamma, C}{w : \phi_1, \Gamma, C \mid w : \phi_2, \Gamma, C} (\vee) \qquad \frac{w : \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2, \Gamma, C}{w : \phi_1, \phi_2, \Gamma, C} (\wedge)$
$\frac{\text{Given } n, s \geq 0; m \geq 1: \\ w : \exists x_1\Box\phi_1, \dots, \exists x_n\Box\phi_n, \forall y_1\Diamond\psi_1, \dots, \forall y_m\Diamond\psi_m, r_1 \dots r_s, C}{\langle (wv_{y_i}^y : \{\phi_j[x_j^{k_j}/x_j] \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}, \psi_i[y/y_i], C') \rangle \text{ where } y \in D_\theta, i \in [1, m]} \text{ (BR)}$
$\frac{\text{Given } n \geq 1, s \geq 0: \\ w : \exists x_1\Box\phi_1, \dots, \exists x_n\Box\phi_n, r_1, \dots, r_s, C}{w : r_1 \dots r_s, C} \text{ (END)}$

where $C \subseteq D_\theta$ and $C' = C \cup \{x_j^{k_j} \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\} \cup \{y\}$ where k_j is the smallest number such that $x_j^{k_j} \in \text{Var}_{x_j} \setminus C$ and $r_1 \dots r_s \in \text{lit}$.

Note that the rule starts off one branch for each $y \in D_\theta$, since the $\forall\Diamond$ connective requires this over the fixed constant domain D_θ . C keeps track of the variables used already along the path from the root till the current node. These are now fixed, so the witness for $\exists x\Box\phi$ is picked from the remaining variables in $\text{Var}_x(\theta)$. Note that the variables in Var_{x_j} are introduced only by applying BR. Since $|\text{Var}_{x_j}|$ is the modal depth, we always have a fresh x_j^k to choose.

The notion of open tableau is as before, and the following observation is very useful:

Proposition 4.4 *The rule (BR) preserves cleanliness of formulas: if a tableau node is labelled by (w, Γ, C) , Γ is clean, and a child node labelled (wv, Γ', C') is created by (BR) then Γ' is clean as well.*

An important corollary of this proposition is that for all $x \in D_\theta$, at any tableau node all occurrences of x in Γ are free. Therefore, for any formula of the form $\psi_i[y/y_i]$ in the conclusion of the rule, y is free and y_i does not occur at all in ψ_i .

Theorem 4.5 *For any clean BFOML $^{\exists\Box}$ -formula θ in NNF, there is an open constant tableau from $(r, \{\theta\}, FV(\theta))$ iff θ is satisfiable in a constant domain model.*

Proof

The structure of the proof is very similar to the earlier one, but we need to be careful to check that sufficient witnesses exist as needed, since the domain is fixed at the beginning of tableau construction. The proposition above, that the rule (BR) preserves cleanliness of formulas, does the bulk of the work. The details are presented in Appendix B. □

The complexity of the decision procedure does not change from before, since we add only polynomially many new variables.

Corollary 4.6 *The satisfiability problem for BFOML $^{\exists\Box}$ -formulas over constant domain models is PSPACE-complete.*

5 Between Constant Domain and Increasing Domain

We now show that the BFOML $^{\exists\Box}$ fragment cannot distinguish increasing domain models and constant domain models. Note that in FOML this distinction is captured by the Barcan formula $\forall x\Box\phi \rightarrow \Box\forall x\phi$; but this is not expressible in BFOML $^{\exists\Box}$.³

The tableau construction for the BFOML $^{\exists\Box}$ fragment over increasing domain models is a restriction of the one in the last section, and was presented in [10].

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{c} \text{Given } n, s \geq 0; m \geq 1: \\ w : \exists x_1\Box\phi_1, \dots, \exists x_n\Box\phi_n, \forall y_1\Diamond\psi_1, \dots, \forall y_m\Diamond\psi_m, r_1 \dots r_s, F \\ \frac{\langle (wv_{y_i}^y : \{\phi_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}, \psi_i[y/y_i], F') \rangle \text{ where } y \in F', i \in [1, m]}{\text{where } F' = F \cup \{x_j \mid j \in [1, n]\}} \quad (\text{BR}) \end{array}}$$

Theorem 5.1 *For any BFOML $^{\exists\Box}$ formula ϕ satisfiable on some increasing domain model, the constant domain tableau of ϕ is open.*

Proof (Sketch) We give a proof sketch. Consider a clean BFOML $^{\exists\Box}$ formula ϕ , and let $\phi' = \phi \wedge \bigwedge \{\exists x'\Box\top \mid x' \in \text{Var}^+(\phi)\}$ (recall that $\text{Var}^+(\phi) =$

³ However, with equality added in the language we can distinguish the two by a formula. We can also accomplish this in the $\forall\Box$ fragment: $\forall x\Box\forall y\Box\neg p(x) \wedge \forall z\Box\exists x\Diamond\neg p(x)$

$\bigcup_{x \in \text{Var}^{\exists}(\phi)} \text{Var}_x$). Clearly ϕ is satisfiable in an increasing domain model iff ϕ' is as well. Let T be an open tableau for ϕ' . We show that T can be transformed into a constant open tableau T' for ϕ .

Suppose if T has no applications of (BR), it is also a constant tableau and we are done, so suppose that T has at least one application of the rule (BR). By construction, all the $x' \in \text{Var}^+(\phi)$ are added to the domain of the root, thus they are also at all the local domains in T . Note that we may have more elements in the local domains, such as x that get added when we apply BR to $\exists x \Box \phi$, and therefore there are more branches than needed for a constant domain tableau of ϕ (such as those for x).

We can get rid of them by the following process:

- Fix $\psi = \exists x \Box \theta \in \text{Sub}(\phi)$:
 - Fix a node s where BR rule is applied and ψ is in s . Since ϕ is clean, there is no other node in any path of T from the root passing through s such that $\exists x \Box \theta' \in \text{Sub}(\phi)$ occurs for some θ' . Let m be the modal depth of ϕ . The path from the root to the predecessor of s can use at most $m - 1$ different variables in $\text{Var}_x(\phi)$ when generating successors by applying the BR rule to some $\forall y \Diamond \theta$ formula. Pick the first $x^h \in \text{Var}_x$ which is not used in the path up to this node.
 - Delete all the descendent nodes of s that are named using x^h when applying BR to some $\forall y \Diamond$ formula. It is not hard to see that the resulting sub-tableau rooted at s has no occurrence of x^h at all since x^h could only be introduced among the children of s using BR.
 - Rename all the occurrences of x by x^h (in formulas and node names) in all the descendent nodes of s . Then the branching structure from the sub-tableau rooted at s will comply with the BR rule for constant-domain tableau.
 - Repeat the above for all the application nodes of the BR rule w.r.t. ψ
- Repeat the above procedure for all ψ of the form $\exists x \Box \theta \in \text{Sub}(\phi)$.

The core idea is to simply use the newly introduced variable x as if it were x^h in a constant-domain tableau. Note that each branch-cutting operation and renaming operation (by new variables) above will preserve openness, since openness is merely about contradictions among literals. We then obtain a constant domain tableau by setting the domain as D_ϕ . □

Note that the constant domain tableau T of ϕ constructed is a sub-tree embedding inside the increasing domain tableau T' of ϕ' . However, showing that it is generated precisely by the tableau rules in Section 4.2 involves some tedious detail.

6 Discussion

We have considered a decidable fragment of FOML over increasing domain models, by bundling quantifiers together with modalities, and shown it to have

the same complexity as propositional modal logic, while admitting arbitrary k -ary predicates. Considering that most decidable fragments of FOML involve severe syntactic restrictions involving quantifiers and variables, we have an interesting fragment for study. The tableau procedure offers a method of reasoning in the logic as well.

We also have a cautionary tale. The $\exists\Box$ bundle, well motivated by considerations from epistemic logic ([10]) is shown to be robustly decidable, for both constant domain and increasing domain semantics, whereas the $\forall\Box$ bundle is undecidable over constant domain models.

It should be emphasized that this paper is envisaged as a study of ‘bundling’ quantifiers and modalities (in terms of decidability) rather than proposing the definitive bundled fragment. The bundle $\Box\forall$ appears to have properties similar to that of $\forall\Box$ (over constant domain models) but $\Box\exists$ seems to be interestingly different. All the four combinations play important roles in Barcan formula, Buridan formula and their converses. Further, it is not inconceivable that a bundle inspired by a particular shape of quantifier prefix such as $\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n \Box$ or $\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n \forall z_1 \dots \forall z_n \Box$ might be worthy of study, with their own motivation based on our knowledge about decidable prefix fragments of first-order logic.

An obvious extension is to consider the language with constants, function symbols and equality. This leads to not only familiar interesting conundrums regarding rigid identifiers but computational considerations as well. Another direction is to find decidable bundled fragments of FOML over specific frame classes (such as T, S4, S5 etc.). It would be interesting to see how other non-normal modalities behave in the bundled fragments.

References

- [1] Carnap, R., “Meaning and Necessity: A Study in Semantics and Modal Logic,” University of Chicago Press, 1947.
- [2] Fischer-Servi, G. et al., *The finite model property for MIPQ and some consequences.*, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic **19** (1978), pp. 687–692.
- [3] Gabbay, D. M. and V. B. Shehtman, *Undecidability of modal and intermediate first-order logics with two individual variables*, J. Symbolic Logic **58** (1993), pp. 800–823.
URL <https://projecteuclid.org:443/euclid.jsl/1183744299>
- [4] Gödel, K., *Zum entscheidungsproblem des logischen funktionenkalküls*, Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik **40** (1933), pp. 433–443.
- [5] Kontchakov, R., A. Kurucz and M. Zakharyashev, *Undecidability of first-order intuitionistic and modal logics with two variables*, Bull. Symbolic Logic **11** (2005), pp. 428–438.
URL <https://doi.org/10.2178/bsl/1122038996>
- [6] Kripke, S. A., *The undecidability of monadic modal quantification theory*, Mathematical Logic Quarterly **8** (1962), pp. 113–116.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/malq.19620080204>
- [7] Rybakov, M. N. and D. Shkatov, *Undecidability of first-order modal and intuitionistic logics with two variables and one monadic predicate letter*, CoRR **abs/1706.05060** (2017).
URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.05060>
- [8] Segerberg, K., *Two-dimensional modal logic*, Journal of Philosophical Logic **2** (1973), pp. 77–96.
URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30226970>
- [9] Wang, Y., *A logic of goal-directed knowing how*, Synthese (2017), forthcoming.

- [10] Wang, Y., *A new modal framework for epistemic logic*, in: *Proceedings Sixteenth Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge, TARK 2017, Liverpool, UK, 24-26 July 2017.*, 2017, pp. 515–534.
URL <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.251.38>
- [11] Wang, Y., *Beyond knowing that: a new generation of epistemic logics*, in: *Jaakko Hintikka on knowledge and game theoretical semantics*, 2018 pp. 499–533.
- [12] Wolter, F. and M. Zakharyashev, *Decidable fragments of first-order modal logics*, *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* **66** (2001), pp. 1415–1438.
URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2695115>

Appendix A: Details of undecidability proof

Here we present the proof details for undecidability of the BFOML $^{\exists\Diamond}$ over constant domain models.

For any *quantifier free* FO(R) formula α , we first recall the translation of α to BFOML $^{\exists\Diamond}$ formula ϕ_α inductively as follows.

- $\phi_{R(x,y)} ::= \exists z\Diamond(p(x) \wedge q(y))$, where z is distinct from x and y .
- $\phi_{\neg\alpha} ::= \neg\phi_\alpha$.
- $\phi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2} ::= \phi_{\alpha_1} \wedge \phi_{\alpha_2}$.

Now consider an FO(R) sentence α (having no free variables) and presented in prenex form: $Q_1x_1 Q_2x_2 \cdots Q_nx_n(\beta)$ where β is quantifier free. We define ψ_α to be the conjunction of the following three sentences:

- $\psi_1 ::= Q_1x_1\Delta_1 Q_2x_2\Delta_2 \cdots Q_nx_n\Delta_n(\phi_\beta)$
where $Q_ix_i\Delta_i ::= \exists x_i\Diamond$ if $Q_i = \exists$ and $Q_ix_i\Delta_i ::= \forall x_i\Box$ if $Q_i = \forall$.
- $\psi_2 ::= \forall z_1\Box\forall z_2\Box((\exists z\Diamond)^n(\exists z\Diamond(p(z_1) \wedge q(z_2)))) \Rightarrow (\forall z\Box)^n(\exists z\Diamond(p(z_1) \wedge q(z_2))))$.
- $\psi_3 ::= \bigwedge_{j=1}^{n+2}(\forall\Box z)^j\exists z\Diamond\top$.

Theorem 6.1 *An FO(R) sentence α is satisfiable iff the BFOML $^{\exists\Diamond}$ sentence ψ_α is constant domain satisfiable.*

Proof Fix $\alpha ::= Q_1x_1 \cdots Q_nx_n\beta$, where β is quantifier free. To prove (\Rightarrow) , assume that α is satisfiable. Let D be some domain such that $(D, I) \models \alpha$ where $I \subseteq (D \times D)$ is the interpretation for R .

Define $M = (W, R, D, \delta, \rho)$ where:

$$W = \{v_1, v_2\} \cup \{w_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{u_d \mid d \in D\}.$$

$$R = \{(v_1, v_2), (v_2, w_1)\} \cup \{(w_i, w_{i+1}) \mid 1 \leq i < n\} \cup \{(w_n, u_d) \mid u_d \in W\}.$$

$$\delta(u) = D \text{ for all } u \in W.$$

For all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $v_i, w_j \in W$ define $\rho(v_i, p) = \rho(v_i, q) = \rho(w_j, p) = \rho(w_j, q) = \emptyset$ and for all $u_d \in W$, $\rho(u_d, p) = \{d\}$ and $\rho(u_d, q) = \{c \mid (d, c) \in I\}$.

By construction, M is a model that is a path of length $n+2$ originating from v_1 until w_n at which point we have a tree of depth 1, with children u_d , one for each $d \in D$. Therefore, it is easy to see that $M, v_1 \models \psi_3$.

Note that M is a constant domain model. Further, it can be easily checked that $(a, b) \in R$ iff $M, u_a \models (p(a) \wedge q(b))$. Thus $(D, I) \models R(x, y)$ iff $M, w_n \models \exists z \diamond (p(x) \wedge q(y))$. Hence a routine induction shows that for any quantifier free formula β' , $(D, I) \models \beta'$ iff $M, w_n \models \phi_{\beta'}$. Further, since M is a path model until w_n and there is a path of length $n + 3$ starting from v_1 , we see that $M, v_1 \models \psi_2 \wedge \psi_3$. We now claim that $M, v_1 \models \psi_1$, which would complete the forward direction of the proof.

First, some notation. For all $1 \leq i \leq n$ let $x_1 \cdots x_i$ be denoted by \bar{x}^i and \bar{d}^i be a vector of length i with values in D . Let $[\bar{x}^i \rightarrow \bar{d}^i]$ denote the interpretation where $\sigma(x_j) = d_j$. Further, for $1 \leq i < n$, let $\alpha[i] = Q_{i+1}x_{i+1} \cdots Q_n x_n \beta$ and let $\psi_1[i] = Q_{i+1} \Delta_{i+1} \cdots Q_n x_n \Delta_n \phi_\beta$.

The following claim proves that $M, v_1 \models \psi_1$:

Claim. For all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $w_i \in W$, for all $d_1 \cdots d_i \in D$, we have $D, I, [\bar{x}^i \rightarrow \bar{d}^i] \models \alpha[i]$ iff $M, w_i, [\bar{x}^i \rightarrow \bar{d}^i] \models \psi_1[i]$.

The proof is by reverse induction on i . The base case, when $i = n$, follows from our assertion above on the interpretation of R at w_n .

Now for the induction step, we need to consider formulas $\alpha[i - 1]$ and $\psi_1[i - 1]$ at w_{i-1} . Now $\alpha[i - 1]$ is either $\exists x_i \alpha[i]$ or $\forall x_i \alpha[i]$.

For the case when $\alpha[i - 1]$ is $\exists x_i \alpha[i]$ the corresponding formula is $\exists x_i \diamond \psi_1[i]$.

We have

$D, I, [\bar{x}^{i-1} \rightarrow \bar{d}^{i-1}] \models \exists x_i \alpha[i]$ iff there is some $c \in D$ such that

$D, I, [\bar{x}^{i-1} \rightarrow \bar{d}^{i-1}, x_i \rightarrow c] \models \alpha[i]$ iff (by induction hypothesis)

$M, w_i, [\bar{x}^{i-1} \rightarrow \bar{d}^{i-1}, x_i \rightarrow c] \models \psi_1[i]$ iff

$M, w_{i-1}, [\bar{x}^{i-1} \rightarrow \bar{d}^{i-1}] \models \exists x_i \diamond \psi_1[i]$, as required.

Now consider the case when $\alpha[i - 1]$ is $\forall x_i \alpha[i]$, and let some $c \in D$. Then $D, I, [\bar{x}^{i-1} \rightarrow \bar{d}^{i-1}, x_i \rightarrow c] \models \alpha[i]$ and by induction hypothesis,

$M, w_i, [\bar{x}^{i-1} \rightarrow \bar{d}^{i-1}, x_i \rightarrow c] \models \psi_1[i]$. Note that this holds for all $c \in D$.

Additionally, w_i is the unique successor of w_{i-1} , and hence

$M, w_{i-1}, [\bar{x}^{i-1} \rightarrow \bar{d}^{i-1}] \models \forall x_i \square \psi_1[i]$, as required.

To prove (\Leftarrow) , suppose that ψ_α is satisfiable, and let $M = (W, D, R, \gamma, V)$ be a constant domain model such that $M, v \models \psi_\alpha$. Without loss of generality, we can assume (W, R) to be a tree rooted at v , and ψ_3 ensures that every path in it has length at least $n + 3$.

Let u' be any world at height $n + 3$. Define $I_{u'} = \{(c, d) \mid c \in \rho(u', p), d \in \rho(u', q)\}$. For world u at height $n + 2$, define $I_u = \bigcup \{I_{u'} \mid (u, u') \in R\}$. Since $M, v \models \psi_2$, we see that $I_u = I_w$, for all u, w at height $n + 2$. Hence we unambiguously define $I = I_u$, thus defining the first order model $M' = (D, I)$. We now claim that the formula α is satisfied in this model.

Recall that $\alpha = Q_1 x_1 Q_2 x_2 \cdots Q_n x_n (\beta)$, where β is quantifier-free. The definition of I and the remark above ensure that $(D, I) \models \beta$ iff for all worlds u at height $n + 2$, $M, u \models \phi_\beta$.

Let w_i denote any world at height i , $3 \leq i \leq n + 2$.

Claim. For all i , $3 \leq i \leq n + 2$, for all $d_1 \cdots d_i \in D$, we have:

$D, I, [\bar{x}^i \rightarrow \bar{d}^i] \models \alpha[i]$ iff for all $w_i \in W$ at height i , $M, w_i, [\bar{x}^i \rightarrow \bar{d}^i] \models \psi_1[i]$.

The proof of this claim is very similar to the proof in the forward direction of the theorem, by induction on $n - i$. The base case is settled above and when we consider the induction step, we strip one quantifier from $\alpha[i]$.

Consider the case when $\alpha[i - 1]$ is $\exists x_i \alpha[i]$; the corresponding formula is $\exists x_i \diamond \psi_1[i]$. We have

$D, I, [x^{i-1} \rightarrow d^{i-1}] \models \exists x_i \alpha[i]$ iff there is some $c \in D$ such that

$D, I, [x^{i-1} \rightarrow d^{i-1}, x_i \rightarrow c] \models \alpha[i]$ iff (by induction hypothesis)

$M, w_i, [x^{i-1} \rightarrow d^{i-1}, x_i \rightarrow c] \models \psi_1[i]$ for every w_i at height i iff

$M, w_{i-1}, [x^{i-1} \rightarrow d^{i-1}] \models \exists x_i \diamond \psi_1[i]$, for every w_{i-1} at height $i - 1$ as required.

Now suppose that $\alpha[i - 1]$ is $\forall x_i \alpha[i]$, and let $D, I, [x^{i-1} \rightarrow d^{i-1}] \models \forall x_i \alpha[i]$.

Now let some $c \in D$. Then

$D, I, [x^{i-1} \rightarrow d^{i-1}, x_i \rightarrow c] \models \alpha[i]$ and by induction hypothesis,

$M, w_i, [x^{i-1} \rightarrow d^{i-1}, x_i \rightarrow c] \models \psi_1[i]$ for every w_i at height i . But since the choice of c was arbitrary, this holds for all $c \in D$. Hence

$M, w_{i-1}, [x^{i-1} \rightarrow d^{i-1}] \models \forall x_i \square \psi_1[i]$, for every w_{i-1} at height $i - 1$ as required.

The other direction is similar. □

Appendix B: Details of constant tableau

We now show that existence of a constant open tableau is equivalent to satisfiability over constant domain models. We firstly recall a fact familiar from first order logic, that will be handy in the proof.

Proposition 6.2 *For any FOML formula ϕ and any model M, w :*

$$M, w, \sigma \models \phi[y/x] \iff M, w, \sigma'[x \mapsto \sigma(y)] \models \phi$$

if $\sigma(y) = \sigma'(y)$ for all $y \neq x$ with y not occurring free in ϕ .

Theorem 6.3 *For any clean BFOML ^{$\exists \square$} -formula θ in NNF, the following are equivalent:*

- *There is an open constant tableau from $(r, \{\theta\}, FV(\theta))$.*
- *θ is satisfiable in a constant domain model.*

Proof

Soundness of tableau construction:

Given an open constant tableau $T = (W, V, E, \lambda)$ from the root node labelled $(r, \{\theta\}, FV(\theta))$, we define $M = \{W, D_\theta, R, \rho\}$ where:

- wRv iff $v = ww'$ for some w' .
- $\bar{x} \in \rho(w, P)$ iff $P\bar{x} \in \Gamma$, where $\lambda(t_w) = (w, \Gamma)$.

By definition, D_θ is not empty. Further, ρ is well-defined due to the openness of T . As before, we prove that M, r is indeed a model of θ , and this is proved by the following claim.

Claim. For any tree node w in T if $\lambda(t_w) = (w, \Gamma, C)$ and if $\alpha \in \Gamma$ then $(M, w, id_C) \models \alpha$. (Again, we abuse notation and write $(M, w, C) \models \alpha$ for $(M, w, id_C) \models \alpha$.)

The proof proceeds by subtree induction on the structure of T . The base case is when the node considered is a leaf node and hence it is also the last node with that label. The definition of ρ ensures that the literals are evaluated correctly in the model.

For the inductive step, the cases for application of conjunction and disjunction rules are standard.

Consider the branching node $(w : \Gamma)$ where

$$\Gamma = \{\exists x_1 \Box \phi_1 \dots \exists x_n \Box \phi_n, \forall y_1 \Diamond \psi_1 \dots \forall y_m \Diamond \psi_m, r_1, \dots, r_s\}.$$

By induction hypothesis,

$$M, wv_{y_i}^y, C'(wv_{y_i}^y) \models \psi_i[y/y_i] \wedge \bigwedge_1^n \phi_j[x_j^{k_j}/x_j]$$

for every $y \in D_\theta$ and $i \in [1, m]$. We need to show that $M, w, C \models \phi$ for each $\phi \in \Gamma$.

The assertion for literals in Γ follows from the definition of ρ . For each $\exists x_j \Box \phi_j \in \Gamma$ and each $wv_{y_i}^y$, with $y \in D_\theta$, we have $M, wv_{y_i}^y, C'(wv_{y_i}^y) \models \phi_j[x_j^{k_j}/x_j]$ by induction hypothesis. It is clear that $\{x_j^{k_j} \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ are not free in ϕ_j since they are chosen to be new. Hence, by Proposition 6.2, $M, wv_{y_i}^y, id_C[x_j \mapsto x_j^{k_j}] \models \phi_j$ for all $wv_{y_i}^y$. Therefore $M, w, id_C \models \exists x_j \Box \phi_j$.

For $\forall y_i \Diamond \psi_i \in \Gamma$, and $y \in D_\theta$, by induction hypothesis, we have $M, wv_{y_i}^y, C'(wv_{y_i}^y) \models \psi_i[y/y_i]$. By Proposition 4.4 and its corollary, y_i is not free in $\psi_i[y/y_i]$ and hence by Proposition 6.2, $M, wv_{y_i}^y, id_C[y_i \mapsto y] \models \psi_i$. Since this holds for each $y \in D_\theta$, we get $M, w, id_C \models \forall y_i \Diamond \psi_i$ for each i .

Thus, it follows that $M, r, \sigma(r) \models \theta$.

Completeness of tableau construction:

We need to show that rule applications preserve the satisfiability of the formula set. The proof is as before, we only discuss the BR case.

Consider a label set Γ of clean formulas at a branching node. Let

$$\Gamma = \{\exists x_j \Box \phi_j \mid j \in [1, n]\} \cup \{\forall y_i \Diamond \psi_i \mid j \in [1, m]\} \cup \{r_1 \dots r_s\}$$

be satisfiable in a model $M = \{W, D, R, \rho\}$, $w \in W$ and an assignment η such that $M, w, \eta \models \phi$ for all $\phi \in \Gamma$.

By the semantics:

- (A) there exist $c_1, \dots, c_n \in D$ such that for all $v \in W$, if wRv then $M, v, \eta[x_j \mapsto c_j] \models \phi_j$.
- (B) for all $c \in D^M$ there exist $v_1^c \dots v_m^c \in W$, successors of w such that $M, v_i^c, \eta[y_i \mapsto c] \models \psi_i$ for each $i \in [1, m]$.

By cleanliness of formulas in Γ , each x_j is free only in ϕ_j , and each y_i is free only in ψ_i . Thus we can merge the assignments without changing the truth values of ϕ_j and ψ_i , and obtain:

(B') for all $c \in D$ there exist $v_1^c \dots v_m^c \in W$, successors of w , such that

$$M, v_i^c, \eta[\overline{x_j} \mapsto \overline{c_j}, y_i \mapsto c] \models \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n \wedge \psi_i, i \in [1, m].$$

Fixing a $y \in D_\theta$ and an $i \in [1, m]$, in the following we show that $\{\phi_j[x_j^{k_j}/x_j] \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}, \psi_i[y/y_i]\}$ is satisfiable. There are two cases to be considered:

- y is not one of $x_j^{k_j}$. First since η is an assignment for all the variables in Var , we can suppose $\eta(y) = b \in D$. By (B') above, there exists a successor v_i^b of w such that

$$M, v_i^b, \eta[\overline{x_j} \mapsto \overline{c_j}, y_i \mapsto b] \models \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n \wedge \psi_i$$

. Note that $\overline{x_j}$ and y_i are not in D_θ thus they are different from y . On the other hand, by cleanliness of Γ , y_i does not occur in ϕ_j and $\eta(y) = b$, hence:

$$M, v_i^b, \eta[\overline{x_j} \mapsto \overline{c_j}] \models \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n \wedge \psi_i[y/y_i].$$

Finally, since each x_j only occurs in ϕ_j and each $x_j^{k_j}$ does not occur in $\phi_1 \dots \phi_j$ and $\psi_i[y/y_i]$, we have:

$$M, v_i^b, \eta[\overline{x_j^{k_j}} \mapsto \overline{c_j}] \models \phi_1[x_1^{k_1}/x_1] \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n[x_n^{k_n}/x_n] \wedge \psi_i[y/y_i].$$

- y is $x_j^{k_j}$ for some j . Then we pick c_j , the witness for x_j , and by (B'),

$$M, v_i^{c_j}, \eta[\overline{x_j} \mapsto \overline{c_j}, y_i \mapsto c_j] \models \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n \wedge \psi_i.$$

Since y is $x_j^{k_j}$ then

$$M, v_i^{c_j}, \eta[\overline{x_j} \mapsto \overline{c_j}, x_j^{k_j} \mapsto c_j] \models \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n \wedge \psi_i[y/y_i].$$

Now proceeding similarly as in the case above we can show that:

$$M, v_i^{c_j}, \eta[\overline{x_j^{k_j}} \mapsto \overline{c_j}] \models \phi_1[x_1^{k_1}/x_1] \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n[x_n^{k_n}/x_j] \wedge \psi_i[y/y_i].$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. □