

Constructive S4 modal logics with the finite birelational frame property

Philippe Balbiani. ^{*}1, Martín Diéguez [†]2, David Fernández-Duque [‡]3, and Brett McLean [§]4

¹IRIT, Toulouse University. Toulouse, France

²LERIA, University of Angers, Angers, France

³Department of Philosophy, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

⁴Department of Mathematics, Ghent University. Gent, Belgium

Abstract

The logics **CS4** and **IS4** are the two leading intuitionistic variants of the modal logic **S4**. Whether the finite model property holds for each of these logics have been long-standing open problems. It was recently shown that **IS4** has the finite frame property and thus the finite model property. In this paper, we prove that **CS4** also enjoys the finite frame property.

Additionally, we investigate the following three logics closely related to **IS4**. The logic **GS4** is obtained by adding the Gödel–Dummett axiom to **IS4**; it is both a superintuitionistic and a fuzzy logic and has previously been given a real-valued semantics. We provide an alternative birelational semantics and prove strong completeness with respect to this semantics. The extension **GS4^c** of **GS4** corresponds to requiring a crisp accessibility relation on the real-valued semantics. We give a birelational semantics corresponding to an extra confluence condition on the **GS4** birelational semantics and prove strong completeness. Neither of these two logics have the finite model property with respect to their real-valued semantics, but we prove that they have the finite frame property for their birelational semantics. Establishing the finite birelational frame property immediately establishes decidability, which was previously open for these two logics. Our proofs yield NEXPTIME upper bounds. The logic **S4I** is obtained from **IS4** by reversing the roles of the modal and intuitionistic relations in the birelational semantics. We also prove the finite frame property, and thereby decidability, for **S4I**.

^{*}philippe.balbani@irit.fr

[†]martin.dieguezlodeiro@univ-angers.fr

[‡]fernandez-duque@ub.edu

[§]brett.mclean@ugent.be

1 Introduction

Intuitionistic logic, with its roots in constructive reasoning, has found important and profound applications in computer science, most notably through the Curry–Howard correspondence. This correspondence, often termed the “propositions-as-types” principle, establishes a deep connection between logic and the type theory of programming languages.

In the context of intuitionistic *modal* logic, this correspondence has led to the development of expressive and powerful frameworks for reasoning about computation and program behavior. For example, modal types can represent computations that are guaranteed to terminate (necessity) or those that might diverge (possibility). Moreover, modal type theory allows modalities to capture program invariants, preconditions, and postconditions, allowing for a more fine-grained and expressive specification of program behavior.

Davis and Pfenning [1] extended the Curry–Howard correspondence and intuitionistic variant of **S4** in order to achieve a modal account of *staged computation*.¹ The resulting system Mini-ML \Box can be used to introduce the notion of partially evaluated functions in functional programming.

Similarly, Choudhury and Krishnaswami [2] proposed a typed system based on an intuitionistic variant of **S4** within the context of impure functional programming languages that can distinguish between expressions with and without side effects. To do so, the authors use modalities to capture important notions such as *safety* or *purity* in a comonadic type discipline.

Within the context of computer security, Miyamoto and Igarashi [3] extend intuitionistic logic with **S4** modalities to propose a typed λ -calculus to capture typed-based information flow analysis. In their approach, security levels are mapped to Kripke worlds and the intuitionistic accessibility relation simulates the heritage among the levels, i.e. any information available at a lower level is also available at higher levels.

Another important field of application related intuitionistic variants of **S4** is the so-called Fitch-style modal λ -calculus [4, 5], where Fitch-style calculi [6] are extended with two functions ‘later’ and ‘constant’, which can be captured in terms of the \Box modality in intuitionistic modal logic. In [7], Clouston studies a variation of the modal **S4** Fitch-style calculus where the \Box modality is idempotent (i.e. $\Box\varphi$ and $\Box\Box\varphi$ are not only logical equivalent but also identical).

Inspired by the previous work of Fitch [8] and Wijesekera [9], *constructive modal logics* provide specific semantics for the \Diamond operator. Although most of the applications we have mentioned only consider the \Diamond -free fragment of intuitionistic modal logic, it is worth mentioning that although both approaches share the same \Diamond -free axioms, they do not share the same \Diamond -free validities, i.e. there are \Diamond -free theorems of **IS4** that may only be proven using axioms involving \Diamond .

It is also important to mention that intuitionistic modal logic has played

¹A staged computation is a computation that proceeds as a sequence of multiple stages, where each stage produces the input for the next. These stages can be carried out on different machines by different users—think, for example, of the (various) compilation and execution stages that are necessary to arrive at the final output of a program.

a significant role in the development of formal proof assistants, providing a foundation for expressing and reasoning about modalities, which are crucial for capturing various aforementioned aspects of formalised computational and mathematical reasoning.

Regarding **S4** specifically, there are (at least) three prominent constructive/intuitionistic variants in the literature. This paper investigates two of them, known as **IS4** [10] and **CS4** [11]. Each of these logics has a natural axiomatisation and is sound and strongly complete for a class of Kripke structures based on two preorders: one preorder \preceq for the intuitionistic implication, and another preorder \sqsubseteq for the modalities \diamond and \square . However, the questions of whether these logics enjoy the *finite model property* remained open for twenty years or more: in the case of **CS4** since at least 2001 [11], and of **IS4** at least since 1994 [10]. The question for **IS4** was recently resolved in the positive in [12]. In this paper we do the same for **CS4**, solving the other principle open problem concerning nonclassical variants of **S4**.

The third preexisting constructive/intuitionistic variant of **S4**, which we do not investigate in this paper, is the logic **IntS4** studied (along with related variants of other modal logics) by Wolter and Zakharyashev [13, 14]. In contrast to **CS4** and **IS4**, the logic **IntS4** was already known to have the finite model property, although the semantics are quite different, for example employing a different binary relation for each of \diamond and \square .

In this paper as well as proving that **CS4** has the finite frame property, we also present three slight variants of **IS4** and show that they too all enjoy the finite frame property.

The first two **IS4** variants are tightly related both to **IS4** and also to **S4** modal extensions of *Gödel(-Dummett) logic*. According to Caicedo and Ramírez [15], such fuzzy versions of modal logic may be used to model situations where modal notions may be applied to vague predicates. One may consider propositions such as “*The weather is always warm in Tulum*” or “*Alice knows that Bob is trustworthy*”, where to be ‘warm’ or ‘trustworthy’ are treated as vague (they can be true to varying degrees), and ‘always’ and ‘knows’ are treated as modalities.

Among many approaches for dealing with vagueness, Gödel logics [16] are particularly appealing versions of fuzzy logic, because they can alternatively be viewed as superintuitionistic logics [17]. Indeed, propositional Gödel logic lies strictly between intuitionistic propositional logic and classical propositional logic, and is characterised by a semantics that assigns to each proposition a truth value in the interval $[0, 1]$. If we further assume that modalities are interpreted using a *crisp* accessibility relation (that is, expressions of the form $x R y$ take values in $\{0, 1\}$), then Gödel modal logic may be seen as a specialisation of intuitionistic modal logic [18, 10] where semantically the intuitionistic partial order validates an *upward linearity* condition.

Some modal extensions of Gödel logic have already been studied in the literature, including combinations with the logics **K** [19, 20, 21], **S4** [15], **S5** [15, 22, Chapter 8], and with linear temporal logic [23, 24]. In the specific case of Gödel **K**, it has been proved that the complexity of the validity problem is **PSPACE**-complete for the box fragment [20] (where the logics of the accessibility-crisp

and accessibility-fuzzy frames coincide) and also the diamond fragment [19] (for both accessibility-crisp frames and accessibility-fuzzy frames). Modal logics over accessibility-fuzzy frames have been axiomatised by Caicedo and Rodríguez [15, 25], and over accessibility-crisp frames by Rodríguez and Vidal [26].

Our first IS4 variant, GS4, which we prove to be equivalent to Gödel S4, has semantics defined over a subclass of the IS4 frames: those where the intuitionistic relation is *upward linear*, so that the logic validates the Gödel–Dummett axiom $(p \rightarrow q) \vee (q \rightarrow p)$. Its accessibility-crisp variant, GS4^c, is defined by imposing a forth–down confluence condition on the GS4 frames.

Our third IS4 variant, S4I, is defined over the same class of frames as IS4, except that the roles of the intuitionistic and the modal preorders are interchanged. These frame conditions for S4I are natural from a technical point of view, as they are the minimal conditions required so that both modalities \diamond and \square can be evaluated ‘classically’.

The key insights involved in our proofs for the finite frame properties is that for each logic, one of two situations occurs, depending on the strength of the logic. Either, as is the case for the two Gödel logics GS4 and GS4^c, the associated birelational semantics is strict enough that we can obtain finite models directly by taking an appropriate bisimulation quotient. Or, in the case of S4I and CS4, we can first show that it is sufficient that the logic enjoys the *shallow frame property*, meaning that any non-valid formula may be falsified on a frame where the length of any \prec -chain is bounded (as usual, $w \prec v$ means that $w \preceq v$ but $v \not\preceq w$).² While shallow models may in principle be infinite, their quotients modulo bisimulation with respect to \preceq are always finite, thus reducing the problem of proving the finite frame property to that of proving the shallow frame property, which we then proceed to do.

Structure of paper

In Section 2 we present the five logics CS4, IS4, GS4, GS4^c, and S4I studied in this paper. We first give syntactic definitions using Hilbert-style deductive calculi, and then give semantics in terms of classes of birelational structures. We also present the alternative real-valued semantics for GS4 and GS4^c.

In Section 3 we prove the soundness of the deductive systems with respect to the associated birelational semantics. We also verify the relationships between the five logics, in particular confirming that they are all distinct.

In Section 4 we present the corresponding strong completeness results (Theorems 2 and 3) by constructing canonical models in the following order: IS4, GS4, GS4^c, S4I, CS4.

Section 5 is devoted to proofs of the finite frame property for the four logics GS4, GS4^c, CS4, and S4I, that is, for all of the logics except IS4. In Section 5.1 we introduce notions used in all four finite frame property proofs: two notions of bisimulation and quotients with respect to such bisimulations. In Section 5.2 we prove the finite frame property for GS4 (Theorem 4) by taking bisimulation

²The descriptor *shallow* has been used in a similar way in the context of classical modal logic [27].

quotients of falsifying birelational models from the corresponding class, relying on the soundness and completeness results of the previous two sections. In Section 5.3 we prove the finite frame property for GS4^c (Theorem 6) in a similar way. In Section 5.4 we show that in order to prove the finite frame properties for CS4 and S4I , it is sufficient to prove certain *shallow* frame properties. Then in Section 5.5 and Section 5.6 we prove the finite frame properties for CS4 (Theorem 7) and S4I (Theorem 8), respectively, by showing how to construct shallow falsifying models by modifying the canonical models.

We finish the paper with Section 6, drawing conclusions and discussing potential future lines of research.

This paper is an extended version of the two conference papers [28] and [29]. In this version, we present new, more direct proofs of the finite frame properties for GS4 and GS4^c . These new proofs demonstrate that GS4 and GS4^c are in NEXPTIME (Corollaries 2 and 3), which did not follow previously.

2 Syntax and semantics

In this section we first introduce the propositional modal language shared by all the logics we are interested in. Then we define the logics themselves. Finally, we present the various birelational or real-valued semantics for the logics.

Fix a *countably infinite* set \mathbb{P} of propositional variables.³ Then the **intuitionistic modal language** \mathcal{L} is defined by the grammar (in Backus–Naur form)

$$\varphi, \psi := p \mid \perp \mid (\varphi \wedge \psi) \mid (\varphi \vee \psi) \mid (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \mid \diamond\varphi \mid \Box\varphi$$

where $p \in \mathbb{P}$. We also use $\neg\varphi$ as shorthand for $\varphi \rightarrow \perp$ and $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ as shorthand for $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge (\psi \rightarrow \varphi)$. As usual, the unary modalities bind tighter than the binary connectives; we also assume that \wedge and \vee bind tighter than \rightarrow .

In this paper a **logic** means a set of formulas closed under substitution (by formulas of the underlying language, which will always be \mathcal{L}).

2.1 Deductive calculi

We define the logics we are interested in syntactically, via Hilbert-style deductive calculi.

Definition 1. *The logic CS4 is the smallest logic containing all intuitionistic tautologies and closed under the following axioms and rules.*

$$\mathbf{K}_{\Box} \quad \Box(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box p \rightarrow \Box q)$$

$$\mathbf{K}_{\diamond} \quad \Box(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\diamond p \rightarrow \diamond q)$$

³The restriction to countable \mathbb{P} can be a genuine restriction for questions about entailment (see, for example, [25, Proposition 3.1]), but not for validity, since formulas are finite.

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\mathbf{MP} \frac{\varphi \rightarrow \psi \quad \varphi}{\psi} & \mathbf{T}_{\square} \square p \rightarrow p & \mathbf{4}_{\diamond} \diamond \diamond p \rightarrow \diamond p \\
\mathbf{Nec} \frac{\varphi}{\square \varphi} & \mathbf{T}_{\diamond} p \rightarrow \diamond p & \mathbf{4}_{\square} \square p \rightarrow \square \square p
\end{array}$$

We now define the additional axioms

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{DP} \ \diamond(p \vee q) \rightarrow \diamond p \vee \diamond q; & \mathbf{FS2} \ (\diamond p \rightarrow \square q) \rightarrow \square(p \rightarrow q); \\
\mathbf{CD} \ \square(p \vee q) \rightarrow \square p \vee \square q; & \mathbf{N} \ \neg \diamond \perp; \\
\mathbf{GD} \ (p \rightarrow q) \vee (q \rightarrow p). &
\end{array}$$

Here **DP** stands for ‘disjunctive possibility’, **FS2** for ‘Fischer Servi 2’ [30], **CD** for ‘constant domain’, **N** for ‘nullary’, and **GD** for ‘Gödel–Dummett’.

Definition 2. *The logics IS4, S4I, GS4, and GS4^c are defined similarly to CS4, with additional axioms as indicated in Figure 1.*

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{IS4} = \text{CS4} + \mathbf{DP} + \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{FS2} \\
\text{S4I} = \text{CS4} + \mathbf{DP} + \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{CD} \\
\text{GS4} = \text{IS4} + \mathbf{GD} \\
\text{GS4}^c = \text{GS4} + \mathbf{CD} = \text{S4I} + \mathbf{FS2} + \mathbf{GD}
\end{array}$$




Figure 1: Definition of logics considered and Hasse diagram for these logics

Thus **CS4** will serve as the ‘minimal’ logic for the purpose of this paper, and the remaining logics we consider are extensions. We will see in Section 3 that only the inclusions obtained directly from the definitions (and displayed in Figure 1) hold.

We use the standard Gentzen-style notation that defines $\Gamma \vdash_{\Lambda} \Delta$ to mean $\bigwedge \Gamma' \rightarrow \bigvee \Delta' \in \Lambda$ for some finite $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ and $\Delta' \subseteq \Delta$. We call \vdash_{Λ} the **syntactic consequence** relation. The logic Λ will usually be clear from context, in which case we will not reflect it in the notation. When working with a turnstile, we will follow the usual proof-theoretic conventions of writing Γ, Δ instead of $\Gamma \cup \Delta$ and φ instead of $\{\varphi\}$.

2.2 Semantics

We will consider several semantics for our intuitionistic variants of **S4**, some of which are intuitionistic semantics (that is, featuring intuitionistic frames) and some of which are real-valued semantics. For the various intuitionistic semantics, it will be convenient to introduce a general class of structures that includes each of these semantics as special cases.

Definition 3. An *intuitionistic frame* is a triple $\mathcal{F} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq)$, where W is a set, \preceq is a preorder (that is, a reflexive and transitive binary relation) on W , and $W^\perp \subseteq W$ is closed under \preceq , that is, whenever $w \in W^\perp$ and $w \preceq v$, we also have that $v \in W^\perp$ [31]. We say that \mathcal{F} is **upward linear** if $w \preceq u$ and $w \preceq v$ implies that $u \preceq v$ or $v \preceq u$.⁴

An **birelational frame** is a quadruple $\mathcal{F} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, R)$, where (W, W^\perp, \preceq) is an intuitionistic frame and (W, W^\perp, R) is a Kripke frame in which W^\perp is closed under R . It is a **bi-intuitionistic frame** if both (W, W^\perp, \preceq) and (W, W^\perp, R) are intuitionistic frames. The frame \mathcal{F} is **upward linear** if (W, W^\perp, \preceq) is upward linear.

The set W^\perp is called the set of **fallible worlds**, as in [11, 31]. Note that in a birelational frame, W^\perp is closed under both \preceq and R . When $W^\perp = \emptyset$ we omit it, and view \mathcal{F} as a triple (W, \preceq, R) . In this case, we say that \mathcal{F} is **infallible**.

Given an birelational frame $\mathcal{F} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, R)$, a **valuation** on \mathcal{F} is a function $V: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow 2^W$ that is *monotone* in the sense that each $V(p)$ is upward closed with respect to \preceq and includes W^\perp (to ensure the validity of $\perp \rightarrow \varphi$).

We define the satisfaction relation \models recursively by

- $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models p \in \mathbb{P}$ if $w \in V(p)$;
- $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \perp$ if $w \in W^\perp$;
- $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi \wedge \psi$ if $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi$ and $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \psi$;
- $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi \vee \psi$ if $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi$ or $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \psi$;
- $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ if for all $v \succ w$, $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \varphi$ implies $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \psi$;
- $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \Diamond \varphi$ if for all $u \succ w$ there exists $u R v$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \varphi$;
- $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \Box \varphi$ if for all u, v such that $w \preceq u R v$, $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \varphi$.

It can be easily proved by induction on φ that for all $w, v \in W$, if $w \preceq v$ and $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi$ then $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \varphi$.

An **birelational model** is an birelational frame equipped with a valuation; if the frame is a bi-intuitionistic frame, then we speak of a **bi-intuitionistic model**. If $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, R, V)$ is any model and φ any formula, we write $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$ if $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi$ for every $w \in W$.

Validity is defined as one would expect, but is worth being precise about the surrounding terminology and notation.

Definition 4. Let \mathcal{S} be any class of models or class of frames. Let Γ be a set of formulas and φ a formula. We write $\Gamma \models_{\mathcal{S}} \varphi$ and say that φ is a **local semantic**

⁴With respect to the topology whose opens are the up-closed sets, upward linear is equivalent to *locally linear* (each point has a linear neighbourhood), but this paper is not about topological semantics, making *upward linear* the more transparent term.

consequence of Γ if, for each model \mathcal{M} from \mathbf{S} and each $w \in \mathcal{M} \setminus W^\perp$, we have

$$\forall \psi \in \Gamma, (\mathcal{M}, w) \models \psi \implies (\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi.$$

We say that φ is **valid** on \mathbf{S} if $\models_{\mathbf{S}} \varphi$ (that is, if $\emptyset \models_{\mathbf{S}} \varphi$; we may also write $\mathbf{S} \models \varphi$), and **falsifiable** otherwise. We say that φ is **satisfiable** on \mathbf{S} if $\varphi \not\models_{\mathbf{S}} \perp$. This terminology extends also to single models or frames.

Definition 5 (strongly complete). Let \mathbf{S} be a class of frames or class of models. A logic Λ is said to be strongly complete with respect to \mathbf{S} if for any set of formulas Γ and for any formula φ , if $\Gamma \models_{\mathbf{S}} \varphi$ then $\Gamma \vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi$.

Since this paper is only concerned with constructive analogues of **S4**, we will only be working with birelational frames that are bi-intuitionistic frames. Note, however, that even the class of bi-intuitionistic frames does not validate some of the **S4** axioms, as the following example shows.

Example 1. Consider the bi-intuitionistic model $\mathcal{M} = (W, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$, whose corresponding frame is displayed in Figure 2, with $V(p) = \{x, y, z, t\}$. Note that we omit W^\perp : by convention, this means that $W^\perp = \emptyset$.




Figure 2: A bi-intuitionistic frame. Plain lines for \preceq ; arrows for \sqsubseteq . (Reflexive lines and arrows not displayed)

Since p is satisfied at x , y , and z , we have $(\mathcal{M}, x) \models \Box p$. But since p is not satisfied at w , we have $(\mathcal{M}, z) \not\models \Box p$, and thus $(\mathcal{M}, x) \not\models \Box \Box p$. Hence $(\mathcal{M}, x) \not\models \Box p \rightarrow \Box \Box p$, and therefore $\mathbf{4}_{\Box}$ is not valid on the class of all bi-intuitionistic frames.

In order to make $\mathbf{4}_{\Box}$ valid, it is necessary to enforce additional constraints governing the interaction between \preceq and \sqsubseteq . There are various properties that have been used to this end.

Definition 6. Let $\mathcal{F} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq)$ be an intuitionistic frame and $R \subseteq W \times W$. We say that R is:

- (i) **forth-up confluent** (for \mathcal{F}) if, whenever $w \preceq w'$ and $w R v$, there is v' such that $v \preceq v'$ and $w' R v'$;
- (ii) **back-up confluent** (for \mathcal{F}) if, whenever $w R v \preceq v'$, there is w' such that $w \preceq w' R v'$;




Figure 3: Confluence conditions

(iii) **forth-down confluent** (for \mathcal{F}) if, whenever $w \preceq v R v'$, there is w' such that $w R w' \preceq v'$.

Figure 3 depicts the confluence conditions. A bi-intuitionistic frame $\mathcal{F} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq)$ is **forth-up confluent** (respectively, **back-up confluent**, **forth-down confluent**) if \sqsubseteq is forth-up confluent (respectively, back-up confluent, forth-down confluent) for (W, W^\perp, \preceq) .

The notions of forth-up and forth-down confluence allow us to simplify the semantic clauses for \diamond and \square , respectively.

Lemma 1. Let $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ be any bi-intuitionistic model, $w \in W$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$.

1. If \mathcal{M} is forth-up confluent, then $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \diamond\varphi$ if and only if $\exists v \sqsubseteq w$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \varphi$.
2. If \mathcal{M} is forth-down confluent, then $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \square\varphi$ if and only if $\forall v \sqsubseteq w$ we have $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \varphi$.

Proof. We prove the second claim; the first is proven similarly by dualising. It follows immediately from the semantics of \square (and reflexivity of \preceq) that if $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \square\varphi$ and $v \sqsubseteq w$, then $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \varphi$. Conversely, suppose that $\forall v \sqsubseteq w$, we have $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \varphi$. Let $u \succ w$ and $u' \sqsubseteq u$. By forth-down confluence, there is $w' \sqsubseteq w$ with $w' \preceq u'$. By our assumption, $(\mathcal{M}, w') \models \varphi$. By monotonicity of the satisfaction relation, $(\mathcal{M}, u') \models \varphi$. Since u and u' were arbitrary subject to $u \succ w$ and $u' \sqsubseteq u$, we conclude that $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \square\varphi$. \square

Definition 7. We define the following classes of birelational frames.

1. The class of CS4 frames is the class of back-up confluent bi-intuitionistic frames.
2. The class of IS4 frames is the class of forth-up confluent, infallible CS4 frames.
3. The class of S4I frames is the class of forth-up and forth-down confluent, infallible bi-intuitionistic frames.

4. The class of **GS4** frames is the class of upward-linear **IS4** frames.
5. The class of **GS4^c** frames is the class of forth-down confluent **GS4** frames.

In the following sections, we will see that these names are appropriate, in the sense that the valid formulas of each class are precisely the logics they are named after.

For Gödel logics, alternative semantics are possible, which view the logics as fuzzy logics.

Definition 8. A *real-valued (Kripke) frame* is a pair $\mathcal{F} = (W, R)$, where W is a set and $R: W \times W \mapsto [0, 1]$ is a function. It is **reflexive** if for all $w \in W$ we have $R(w, w) = 1$. It is **transitive** if for all $u, v, w \in W$ we have $R(u, w) \geq \min\{R(u, v), R(v, w)\}$. If $R: W \times W \mapsto \{0, 1\}$ we will say the frame is **accessibility crisp**.

A (**Gödel**) **valuation** on \mathcal{F} is a function $V(\cdot): W \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all $w \in W$,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_w(\perp) &= 0, \\
V_w(\varphi \wedge \psi) &= \min\{V_w(\varphi), V_w(\psi)\}, \\
V_w(\varphi \vee \psi) &= \max\{V_w(\varphi), V_w(\psi)\}, \\
V_w(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } V_w(\varphi) \leq V_w(\psi) \\ V_w(\psi) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
V_w(\diamond\varphi) &= \sup_{v \in W} \{\min\{R(w, v), V_v(\varphi)\}\}, \\
V_w(\square\varphi) &= \inf_{v \in W} \{1 \text{ if } R(w, v) \leq V_v(\varphi); V_v(\varphi) \text{ otherwise}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

A real-valued Kripke frame equipped with a Gödel valuation is a **Gödel–Kripke model**, and an accessibility-crisp frame equipped with a valuation is a **accessibility-crisp model**.

Definition 9. Let \mathcal{S} be any class of Gödel–Kripke models or class of real-valued frames. Let Γ be a set of formulas and φ a formula. We write $\Gamma \models_{\mathcal{S}} \varphi$ and say that φ is a **local semantic consequence** of Γ if, for each model \mathcal{M} from \mathcal{S} and each $w \in \mathcal{M}$, we have

$$\forall \psi \in \Gamma, V_w(\psi) = 1 \implies V_w(\varphi) = 1. \quad (1)$$

We say that φ is **valid** on \mathcal{S} if $\models_{\mathcal{S}} \varphi$ (that is, $\emptyset \models_{\mathcal{S}} \varphi$), and **falsifiable** otherwise. This terminology extends also to single models or frames.

The definition (1) of local semantic consequence is taken from [25]. By a simple ‘truncate the truth values’ argument, over classes of frames this definition is equivalent to the *a priori* stronger condition $V_w(\varphi) \geq \inf\{V_w(\psi) \mid \psi \in \Gamma\}$.

The logics **GS4** and **GS4^c** are known to be strongly complete with respect to local semantic consequence on classes of real-valued frames.

Theorem 1.

(Caicedo and Rodríguez). Let \models_{FS4} denote local semantic consequence on the class of reflexive transitive real-valued frames, and \vdash_{GS4} denote the syntactic consequence relation for the logic **GS4**. Then

$$\Gamma \models_{\text{FS4}} \varphi \iff \Gamma \vdash_{\text{GS4}} \varphi. \quad ([25, \text{Theorem 5.1(ii)}])$$

(Rodríguez and Vidal). Let \models_{cFS4} denote local semantic consequence on the class of reflexive transitive accessibility-crisp frames, and \vdash_{GS4^c} denote the syntactic consequence relation for the logic **GS4^c**. Then

$$\Gamma \models_{\text{cFS4}} \varphi \iff \Gamma \vdash_{\text{GS4}^c} \varphi. \quad ([26, \text{Theorem 5.4}])$$

Note that Theorem 1 would not be true if the set of propositional variables were uncountable, even for the modality-free fragment [25, Proposition 3.1].

The logic **CS4** was introduced in [11] motivated by syntactic considerations. In the same paper, the class of **CS4** frames was defined in order to provide a semantics. A proof of the strong completeness of **CS4** with respect to the **CS4** frames is sketched in [11]. We provide a full proof of this fact in Section 4. The logic **IS4** was introduced by Fischer Servi in [30], where the logic was proven complete with respect to **IS4** frames. The logics **GS4** and **GS4^c** were introduced in [25] and [26], respectively, in order to obtain the completeness results of Theorem 1.⁵

Regarding **S4I**, it is easy to check that $(W, \preceq, \sqsubseteq)$ is an **S4I** frame if and only if $(W, \sqsubseteq, \preceq)$ is an **IS4** frame, so this could be viewed as ‘commuting’ the roles of **S4** and intuitionistic logic (which we may denote **I**). In fact, in the context of expanding products of modal logics, **IS4** frames are similar to $\mathbb{I} \times^e \mathbf{S4}$ frames, where \times^e is the ‘expanding product’ as defined in [32], and similarly, **S4I** frames can be regarded as $\mathbf{S4} \times^e \mathbb{I}$ frames. Additionally, in view of Lemma 1, the **S4I** conditions give us the advantage of being able to evaluate \diamond and \square classically.

3 Soundness

In this section we establish the soundness of the logics **CS4**, **IS4**, **S4I**, **GS4**, and **GS4^c**, with respect to the corresponding classes of bi-intuitionistic frames. Using the soundness results, we also note that these five logics are all distinct and related exactly as shown in Figure 1.

It will be useful to distinguish the following type of frame. We call a frame \diamond -**regular** if it is forth-up confluent and infallible. Accordingly, a logic is \diamond -regular if it extends **CS4** and contains Axioms **DP** and **N**. Essentially, on \diamond -regular frames, \diamond works as one would expect from classical modal logic. The only logic we consider that is not \diamond -regular is **CS4**.

We first list some formulas that are valid over frame classes that need not be \diamond -regular. Of course the validities of any class of birelational frames are closed under substitution.

⁵The axioms and rules in [25, Theorem 5.1(ii)] are slightly different to those we use to define **GS4**, but are proven equivalent in [25, Lemma 2.1].

Proposition 1.

- (1) Axioms \mathbf{K}_\square and \mathbf{K}_\diamond are valid, and the inference rules \mathbf{MP} and \mathbf{Nec} preserve validity, over any class of birelational frames.
- (2) Axioms \mathbf{T}_\square , \mathbf{T}_\diamond , and $\mathbf{4}_\diamond$ are valid over the class of bi-intuitionistic frames.
- (3) Axiom $\mathbf{4}_\square$ is valid over any bi-intuitionistic frame that is either back-up confluent or forth-down confluent.
- (4) Axiom \mathbf{GD} is valid over the class of upward-linear frames.

Proof. Items (1) and (2) are standard (and see for example [10]). We check only $\mathbf{4}_\diamond$. Let $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ be any bi-intuitionistic model. Suppose that $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \diamond\diamond p$ and let $v \succ w$. Then there exists $u \sqsupseteq v$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, u) \models \diamond p$. Then since $u \succ u$, there exists $u' \sqsupseteq u$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, u') \models p$. By transitivity, $u' \sqsupseteq v$, and as v was arbitrary subject to $v \succ w$, we conclude that $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \diamond p$.

For item (3), the case for back-up confluence is known, as such a frame is a CS4 frame [11]. If instead $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ is forth-down confluent, we have by Lemma 1 that for any $w \in W$, $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \square p$ if and only if $\forall v \sqsupseteq w$, $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models p$. Using this characterisation, we may reason as in the classical case to deduce $\mathcal{M} \models \square p \rightarrow \square\square p$ from the transitivity of \sqsubseteq .

Item (4) is also well known, but we provide a proof. Assume for a contradiction that \mathbf{GD} is not valid on the class of GS4 frames. This means that $(\mathcal{M}, w) \not\models p \rightarrow q$ and $(\mathcal{M}, w) \not\models p \rightarrow q$ for some model \mathcal{M} based on a GS4 frame and $w \in W$. From the former assumption it follows that there is $v \succ w$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models p$ and $(\mathcal{M}, v) \not\models q$. From the latter assumption it follows that there is $v' \succ w$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, v') \models q$ and $(\mathcal{M}, v') \not\models p$. Since \mathcal{M} is upward linear, we need to consider two cases: if $v \preceq v'$ we get that $(\mathcal{M}, v') \models p$; if $v' \preceq v$ we conclude that $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models q$. In either case we reach a contradiction. \square

Note that with (1), (2), and (3), we have confirmed the soundness of the logic CS4 with respect to the class of CS4 frames.

Next we consider \diamond -regular classes.

Proposition 2. *Let \mathfrak{C} be any class of \diamond -regular bi-intuitionistic frames.*

- (a) Axiom \mathbf{N} is valid on \mathfrak{C} .
- (b) Axiom \mathbf{DP} is valid on \mathfrak{C} .
- (c) If the frames of \mathfrak{C} are back-up confluent, then Axiom $\mathbf{FS2}$ is valid on \mathfrak{C} .
- (d) If the frames of \mathfrak{C} are forth-down confluent, then Axiom \mathbf{CD} is valid on \mathfrak{C} .

Proof. Item (a) is a straightforward consequence of infallibility. Item (b) is easily derived from Lemma 1.1, since satisfaction of $\diamond(p \vee q)$ requires a single witness, which is then sufficient to witness either $\diamond p$ or $\diamond q$. Item (c) is proven in [10].

For (d), assume that \mathcal{M} is forth-up and forth-down confluent, and that $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \Box(\varphi \vee \psi)$. If $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \Box\varphi$, there is nothing to prove, so assume that $(\mathcal{M}, w) \not\models \Box\varphi$. From Lemma 1.2 it follows that there is $v \sqsupseteq w$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, v) \not\models \varphi$. But $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \varphi \vee \psi$, so $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \psi$, and from Lemma 1.1 we obtain $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \Diamond\psi$. \square

Given the soundness of CS4 (with respect to any of our frame classes), to verify the soundness of the remaining logics with respect to their corresponding frame classes, it suffices to check the remaining axioms in the definition of the logics. Examining Definition 2, we see that we have soundness of:

IS4 by (a), (b), and (c),

S4I by (a), (b), and (d),

then building on the soundness of IS4:

GS4 by Proposition 1(4),

then

GS4^c by (d).

Thus we obtain the following.

Corollary 1. *Each of CS4, IS4, S4I, GS4, and GS4^c is sound for its respective class of frames.*

To end this section, we now verify that the inclusions among our logics are exactly as depicted by the Hasse diagram in Figure 1. With the exception of comparisons involving S4I, these relationships are all well known. First we show that the marked inclusions are proper. In each case, we exhibit a formula contained in the larger logic but falsified on the frame class corresponding to smaller logic. By soundness of the smaller logic, it does not contain the formula.

IS4 $\not\subseteq$ CS4 and S4I $\not\subseteq$ CS4 By definition, $\mathbf{N} \in \text{IS4}$ and $\mathbf{N} \in \text{S4I}$. Consider the bi-intuitionistic frame $(\{i, f\}, \{f\}, \{(i, i), (f, f)\}, \{(i, i), (f, f), (i, f)\})$ depicted on the top left of Figure 4. This frame is back-up confluent and thus a CS4 frame. The infallible world i satisfies $\Diamond\perp$ (under any valuation), and so falsifies $\neg\Diamond\perp$.

GS4 $\not\subseteq$ IS4 and GS4^c $\not\subseteq$ S4I By definition, $\mathbf{GD} \in \text{GS4}$ and $\mathbf{GD} \in \text{GS4}^c$. Consider the infallible bi-intuitionistic model depicted on the top right of Figure 4, where p and q are propositional variables. As \sqsubseteq is trivial, the frame validates all confluence conditions and in particular is both an IS4 frame and an S4I frame. The world at the bottom falsifies $(p \rightarrow q) \vee (q \rightarrow p)$.




Figure 4: Frames and models separating the logics. (Reflexive arrows not displayed)

$\text{GS4}^c \not\subseteq \text{GS4}$ By definition, $\mathbf{CD} \in \text{GS4}^c$. Consider the infallible bi-intuitionistic model depicted on the bottom left of Figure 4. It is easy to check that the frame is back-up confluent, forth-up confluent, and upward linear, and thus is a GS4 frame. The world at the bottom satisfies $\Box(p \wedge q)$ but neither $\Box p$ nor $\Diamond q$, and thus falsifies \mathbf{CD} .

Finally we verify the incomparability of S4I with either IS4 or GS4 .

$\text{S4I} \not\subseteq \text{GS4}$ By definition, $\mathbf{CD} \in \text{S4I}$. As we have just seen, $\mathbf{CD} \notin \text{GS4}$.

$\text{IS4} \not\subseteq \text{S4I}$ By definition, $\mathbf{FS2} \in \text{IS4}$. Consider the infallible bi-intuitionistic model depicted on the bottom right of Figure 4. It is easy to check that the frame is back-up confluent and forth-up confluent, and thus is a S4I frame. The bottom left world falsifies $\Diamond p$ and thus satisfies $\Diamond p \rightarrow \Box q$. But the same world does not satisfy $\Box(p \rightarrow q)$ and thus falsifies $\mathbf{FS2}$.

4 Strong completeness

In this section, we prove the strong completeness of each of the logics CS4 , IS4 , S4I , GS4 , and GS4^c with respect to its corresponding birelational semantics.

It will be convenient to observe that the following formulas are contained in CS4 , and thus also its extensions IS4 , S4I , GS4 , and GS4^c . We leave the proofs to the reader.

Proposition 3. *The following formulas belong to CS4 .*

$$(1) \Diamond(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box p \rightarrow \Diamond q),^6$$

⁶This is the first of Fischer Servi's two *connecting axioms* [30].

- (2) $\diamond(p \wedge q) \rightarrow \diamond p \wedge \diamond q$,
- (3) $\Box p \wedge \Box q \rightarrow \Box(p \wedge q)$,
- (4) $\Box p \vee \Box q \rightarrow \Box(p \vee q)$.

4.1 Prime theories

We first introduce the notions common to all our completeness proofs. Fix a logic Λ . At the moment we only need to assume that Λ is a logic and that it includes intuitionistic logic and the axiom \mathbf{T}_\Box .

A set Γ of \mathcal{L} -formulas is called a **theory** if it is closed under syntactic consequence ($\Gamma \vdash \varphi$ implies $\varphi \in \Gamma$). Further, we say that Γ is **prime** if $\varphi \vee \psi \in \Gamma$ implies that either $\varphi \in \Gamma$ or $\psi \in \Gamma$.

Definition 10. *Given sets Φ and Ξ of formulas, we say that Φ is Ξ -consistent if $\Phi \not\vdash \Xi$. We say that Φ is **consistent** if it is \emptyset -consistent (with the understanding that $\bigvee \emptyset \equiv \perp$). If Ξ is a singleton $\{\xi\}$, we write ξ -consistent instead of $\{\xi\}$ -consistent.*

Note that if Φ is Ξ -consistent, then necessarily $\perp \notin \Phi$. We say that Ψ **extends** Φ if $\Phi \subseteq \Psi$.

Lemma 2. *Any Ξ -consistent set Φ of formulas can be extended to a Ξ -consistent prime theory Φ_* .*

Proof. By a standard application of Zorn's lemma, there exists a maximal (with respect to set inclusion) set of formulas $\Phi_* \supseteq \Phi$ such that Φ_* is Ξ -consistent. Using some intuitionistic reasoning, it is easy to see that Φ_* is closed under \vdash and is thus a theory. To see that Φ_* is prime, suppose that $\varphi \vee \psi \in \Phi_*$. We cannot have that $\Phi_* \cup \{\varphi\}$ and $\Phi_* \cup \{\psi\}$ are both Ξ -inconsistent, since by left disjunction introduction (formalisable as a theorem of intuitionistic logic) we would obtain that $\Phi_*, \varphi \vee \psi$ is Ξ -inconsistent. However, $\Phi_*, \varphi \vee \psi$ is just Φ_* , contrary to assumption. Thus either Φ_*, φ or Φ_*, ψ is Ξ -consistent; say, Φ_*, φ . But then by maximality of Φ_* , we must already have $\varphi \in \Phi_*$, as required. \square

If Φ is a theory then we define

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^\Box &:= \{\varphi \in \mathcal{L} \mid \Box\varphi \in \Phi\}, \\ \Phi^\diamond &:= \{\varphi \in \mathcal{L} \mid \diamond\varphi \notin \Phi\}.\end{aligned}$$

4.2 Completeness of \diamond -regular logics

In this subsection we show that the \diamond -regular logics we consider are strongly complete, using standard canonical model arguments. In this setting, we may uniformly define the canonical model for any \diamond -regular logic Λ .

Definition 11. *Let Λ be a \diamond -regular logic. We define the canonical model for Λ as $\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda = (W_c, \preceq_c, \sqsubseteq_c, V_c)$, where*

- a) W_c is the set of consistent prime Λ -theories,
- b) $\preceq_c \subseteq W_c \times W_c$ is defined by $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi$ if and only if $\Phi \subseteq \Psi$,
- c) $\sqsubseteq_c \subseteq W_c \times W_c$ is defined by $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi$ if and only if $\Phi^\square \subseteq \Psi$ and $\Phi^\diamond \cap \Psi = \emptyset$,
- d) $V_c: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow 2^{W_c}$ is defined by $V_c(p) := \{\Phi \in W_c \mid p \in \Phi\}$.

As we will see, this construction always yields \diamond -regular models, given the assumption that Λ is \diamond -regular.

Lemma 3. *If Λ is any \diamond -regular logic, then \mathcal{M}_c^Λ is a \diamond -regular bi-intuitionistic model.*

Proof. It is immediate from the definition that \preceq_c is a preorder. It is also straightforward to show, using Axioms $\mathbf{4}_\square$ and $\mathbf{4}_\diamond$, that \sqsubseteq_c is a preorder, so we focus on showing that \mathcal{M}_c^Λ is forth-up confluent.

Let Φ , Ψ , and Θ in W_c be such that $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi$ and $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Theta$. We claim that $\Psi^\square \cup \Theta$ is $\diamond\Psi^\diamond$ -consistent. If not, there exist $\varphi \in \Psi^\square$, $\theta \in \Theta$, and $\psi \in \Psi^\diamond$ such that $\varphi \wedge \theta \rightarrow \diamond\psi \in \mathbf{GS4}$. (Note that we can take single formulas since Θ is closed under conjunction; by Proposition 3(3), Ψ^\square is too; and in view of **DP** and precision of Ψ , we know Ψ^\diamond is closed under disjunction.) Since $\theta \in \Theta$, we then obtain $\varphi \rightarrow \diamond\psi \in \Theta$. Then by Axiom **T** $_\diamond$, we get $\diamond(\varphi \rightarrow \diamond\psi) \in \Theta$. Therefore $\varphi \rightarrow \diamond\psi \notin \Theta^\diamond$, so $\varphi \rightarrow \diamond\psi \notin \Phi^\diamond$, and hence $\diamond(\varphi \rightarrow \diamond\psi) \in \Phi$. Using Proposition 3(1) we get $\square\varphi \rightarrow \diamond\diamond\psi \in \Phi$. Since $\Phi^+ \subseteq \Psi^+$ this gives $\square\varphi \rightarrow \diamond\diamond\psi \in \Psi$. As $\varphi \in \Psi^\square$, we deduce $\diamond\diamond\psi \in \Psi$. By Axiom $\mathbf{4}_\diamond$, this contradicts the consistency of Φ .

In view of Lemma 2, $\Psi^\square \cup \Theta$ can be extended to a $\diamond\Psi^\diamond$ -consistent prime theory Υ . It is easy to check by our choice of Υ that $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Upsilon$ and $\Theta \preceq_c \Upsilon$. \square

Lemma 4. *Let Λ be any \diamond -regular logic.*

- 1. If **FS2** $\in \Lambda$, then \mathcal{M}_c^Λ is back-up confluent.
- 2. If **CD** $\in \Lambda$, then \mathcal{M}_c^Λ is forth-down confluent.

Proof. For the first item, suppose that $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi \preceq_c \Theta$, and let $\Xi := \{\square\xi \in \mathcal{L} \mid \xi \notin \Theta\}$ and $\Delta = \{\diamond\delta \in \mathcal{L} \mid \diamond\delta \in \Theta\}$. We claim that $\Phi \cup \Delta$ is Ξ -consistent. If not, there are $\varphi \in \Phi$, $\diamond\delta_1, \dots, \diamond\delta_n \in \Delta$, and $\square\xi \in \Xi$ such that $\varphi, \{\diamond\delta_i\}_{i=1}^n \vdash \square\xi$, which using $\mathbf{4}_\diamond$ yields $\varphi \vdash \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \diamond\delta_i \rightarrow \square\xi$. Then using Proposition 3(2) we can obtain $\varphi \vdash \diamond\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \delta_i \rightarrow \square\xi$. By an application of **FS2**, we obtain $\varphi \vdash \square(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \delta_i \rightarrow \xi)$. Then since $\varphi \in \Phi$, we obtain $\square(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \delta_i \rightarrow \xi) \in \Phi$. Since $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi$, we get $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \delta_i \rightarrow \xi \in \Psi$, and since $\Psi \preceq_c \Theta$ and each $\delta_i \in \Theta$, we get $\xi \in \Theta$, contradicted by the definition of Ξ . Hence $\Phi \cup \Delta$ is Ξ -consistent.

Let Υ be any Ξ -consistent prime extension of $\Phi \cup \Delta$. Then $\Phi \preceq_c \Upsilon \sqsubseteq_c \Theta$: that $\Phi \preceq_c \Upsilon$ follows from $\Phi \subseteq \Upsilon$, and we check that $\Upsilon \sqsubseteq_c \Theta$. We have $\Upsilon^\square \subseteq \Theta$, since if $\xi \notin \Theta$ it follows by the definition of Ξ and the fact that Υ is Ξ -consistent that $\xi \notin \Upsilon^\square$, while if $\delta \notin \Theta^\diamond$ it follows that $\diamond\delta \in \Theta$; hence $\diamond\delta \in \Delta \subseteq \Upsilon$ and $\delta \notin \Upsilon^\diamond$. It follows that $\Upsilon^\diamond \subseteq \Theta^\diamond$, so $\Upsilon \sqsubseteq_c \Theta$.

For the second item, suppose that $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Theta$. Let $\Xi = \mathcal{L} \setminus \Theta$. We claim that Φ^\square is $\diamond\Phi^\diamond \cup \Xi$ -consistent. If not, there exist $\square\varphi \in \Phi$, $\diamond\psi \notin \Phi$, and $\chi \notin \Theta$ such that $\varphi \rightarrow \chi \vee \diamond\psi \in \Lambda$. By **Nec**, Axiom **K** $_\square$ and **MP** we get that $\square\varphi \rightarrow \square(\chi \vee \diamond\psi) \in \Lambda$, and thus $\square(\chi \vee \diamond\psi) \in \Lambda$. By **CD** it follows that $\square\chi \vee \diamond\diamond\psi \in \Phi$, and then by **4** $_\diamond$, it follows that $\square\chi \vee \diamond\psi \in \Phi$. Since $\chi \notin \Theta$, we know $\square\chi \notin \Phi$. Then by primality, $\diamond\psi \in \Phi$ —a contradiction. Thanks to Lemma 2, Φ^\square can be extended to a $\diamond\Phi^\diamond \cup \Xi$ -consistent prime theory Υ . It then readily follows that $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Upsilon \preceq_c \Theta$, as required. \square

The last frame condition we need to check is that Gödel logics are indeed upward linear.

Lemma 5. *If Λ is any \diamond -regular logic such that **GD** $\in \Lambda$, then the model \mathcal{M}_c^Λ is upward linear.*

Proof. Assume toward a contradiction that \preceq_c is not upward linear. Let the theories Φ , Ψ , and Ω be such that $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi$ and $\Phi \preceq_c \Omega$, but $\Psi \not\preceq_c \Omega$ and $\Omega \not\preceq_c \Psi$. From the definition of \preceq_c we get that $\Psi \not\subseteq \Omega$ and $\Omega \not\subseteq \Psi$. So there exist two formulas φ and ψ such that $\varphi \in \Psi \setminus \Omega$ and $\psi \in \Omega \setminus \Psi$. Therefore $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \notin \Psi \supseteq \Phi$ and $\psi \rightarrow \varphi \notin \Omega \supseteq \Phi$. Consequently, $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \vee (\psi \rightarrow \varphi) \notin \Phi$, contradicting Axiom **GD**. \square

It already follows from the above that, for any of the \diamond -regular logics Λ we consider, \mathcal{M}_c^Λ is a Λ -model. Thus to conclude our completeness proof, it remains to establish a standard truth lemma. Since the case for a formula of the form $\square\varphi$ is subtle, we establish it separately.

Lemma 6. *Let Λ be a \diamond -regular logic containing either **FS2** or **CD**. Then for any $\Phi \in W_c$ and any formula φ , we have $\square\varphi \in \Phi$ if and only if whenever $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Theta$, it follows that $\varphi \in \Theta$.*

Proof. For the left-to-right direction, suppose that $\square\varphi \in \Phi$ and $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Theta$. By the definition of \preceq_c , we have $\square\varphi \in \Psi$, and thus $\varphi \in \Psi^\square$. Then by the definition of \sqsubseteq_c , we have $\varphi \in \Theta$, as needed.

For the other direction, we consider two cases. First assume that **FS2** $\in \Lambda$. If $\square\varphi \notin \Phi$, using Zorn's lemma, let $\Psi \succ_c \Phi$ be a \preceq_c -maximal $\square\varphi$ -consistent theory. We claim that

$$\chi \in \Psi^\diamond \implies \square(\chi \rightarrow \varphi) \in \Psi. \quad (2)$$

Suppose $\chi \in \Psi^\diamond$. By maximality of Ψ , we have $\Psi, \diamond\chi \vdash \square\varphi$, so $\Psi \vdash \diamond\chi \rightarrow \square\varphi$. By **FS2**, we obtain $\Psi \vdash \square(\chi \rightarrow \varphi)$ and thus $\square(\chi \rightarrow \varphi) \in \Psi$, as needed.

Note by **DP** that Ψ^\diamond is closed under disjunction. (This uses the fact that Ψ is prime, which as we saw in the proof of Lemma 2, follows from maximality.) We claim that Ψ^\square is $\diamond\Psi^\diamond \cup \{\varphi\}$ -consistent. If not, we would have $\chi \in \Psi^\square$ and $\theta \in \Psi^\diamond$ such that $\chi \vdash \varphi \vee \diamond\theta$, and reasoning as before, $\square\chi \vdash \square(\varphi \vee \diamond\theta)$. It follows that $\square\chi, \square(\diamond\theta \rightarrow \varphi) \vdash \square(\varphi \vee \varphi)$, that is $\square\chi, \square(\diamond\theta \rightarrow \varphi) \vdash \square\varphi$. From **4** $_\diamond$ we see that $\diamond\diamond\theta \in \Psi$ implies that $\diamond\theta \in \Psi$, which by contraposition becomes

$\theta \in \Psi^\diamond$ implies $\diamond\theta \in \Psi^\diamond$. Thus we may use (2) to conclude that $\Box(\diamond\theta \rightarrow \varphi) \in \Psi$, so $\Psi \vdash \Box\varphi$, a contradiction.

Hence there exists a $\diamond\Psi^\diamond \cup \{\varphi\}$ -consistent prime theory Υ extending Ψ^\square . It follows that $\varphi \notin \Upsilon$ and it is readily verified that $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Upsilon$, as needed.

Next we consider the case where **CD** $\in \Lambda$. Suppose that $\Box\varphi \notin \Phi$; we claim that Φ^\square is $\diamond\Phi^\diamond \cup \{\varphi\}$ -consistent. If not, there exist $\Box\chi \in \Phi$ and $\diamond\theta \notin \Phi$ such that $\chi \rightarrow \varphi \vee \diamond\theta \in \Lambda$. By **Nec**, **K \Box** and **MP** we get $\Box(\varphi \vee \diamond\theta) \in \Phi$. By Axiom **CD**, this gives $\Box\varphi \vee \diamond\theta \in \Phi$ —a contradiction since Φ is prime, and neither $\Box\varphi \in \Phi$ nor, by **4 \diamond** , $\diamond\theta \in \Phi$. Therefore, Φ^\square can be extended to a $\diamond\Phi^\diamond \cup \varphi$ -consistent prime theory Υ . Clearly, $\varphi \notin \Upsilon$ and $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Upsilon$. \square

With this, we may establish the truth lemma for \diamond -regular logics.

Lemma 7 (truth lemma). *Let Λ be any \diamond -regular logic such that Λ contains either **FS2** or **CD**. For any $\Phi \in W_c$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$,*

$$\varphi \in \Phi \iff (\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Phi) \models \varphi.$$

Proof. By structural induction on φ . The case of propositional variables holds by the definition of V_c . The cases of \wedge and \vee are straightforward, and the case for $\varphi = \Box\psi$ follows from Lemma 6.

We consider the \rightarrow connective next. First suppose $\psi \rightarrow \chi \in \Phi$. Let $\Psi \succ_c \Phi$ be such that $(\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Psi) \models \psi$. By the induction hypothesis, $\psi \in \Psi$. Since $\Psi \succ_c \Phi$ and $\psi \rightarrow \chi \in \Phi$, we have $\psi \rightarrow \chi \in \Psi$. By closure under syntactic consequence, $\chi \in \Psi$, and then by the induction hypothesis, $(\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Psi) \models \chi$. Since Ψ was arbitrary subject to $\Psi \succ_c \Phi$, we conclude $(\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Phi) \models \psi \rightarrow \chi$.

Conversely, suppose $\psi \rightarrow \chi \notin \Phi$. We claim that $\Phi \cup \{\psi\}$ is χ -consistent. If not, by the definition of \vdash , there exists $\xi \in \Phi$ such that $\xi \wedge \psi \rightarrow \chi \in \Lambda$. It follows that $\xi \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \chi) \in \Lambda$. Since $\xi \in \Phi$, we obtain $\psi \rightarrow \chi \in \Phi$ —a contradiction. Hence $\Phi \cup \{\psi\}$ is χ -consistent and so by Lemma 2 can be extended to a χ -consistent prime theory Ψ , and hence $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi$. By the induction hypotheses for ψ and χ , we deduce $(\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Psi) \models \psi$ and $(\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Psi) \not\models \chi$. Therefore $(\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Phi) \not\models \psi \rightarrow \chi$.

For the case that φ is of the form $\diamond\psi$, if $\diamond\psi \in \Phi$, then let us define $\Theta = \Phi^\square \cup \{\psi\}$, and let us assume toward a contradiction that $\Theta \vdash \{\chi \in \mathcal{L} \mid \diamond\chi \notin \Phi^+\}$. This means that there exist $\Box\theta \in \Phi$ and $\diamond\chi \notin \Phi$ such that $\theta \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \chi) \in \text{GS4}$. From **Nec** and **K \Box** , we obtain $\Box\theta \rightarrow \Box(\psi \rightarrow \chi)$, and thus $\Box(\psi \rightarrow \chi) \in \Phi$. Then by **K \diamond** , we obtain $\diamond\psi \rightarrow \diamond\chi$, and thus $\diamond\chi \in \Phi$ —a contradiction. Therefore Θ can be extended to a prime theory Υ such that $\Upsilon \not\vdash \{\chi \mid \diamond\chi \notin \Phi\}$. It follows that $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Upsilon$. Moreover, $\psi \in \Upsilon$. By the induction hypothesis, $(\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Upsilon) \models \psi$, so $(\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Phi) \models \diamond\psi$.

Conversely, assume that $(\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Phi) \models \diamond\psi$, so $(\mathcal{M}_c^\Lambda, \Upsilon) \models \psi$ for some $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Upsilon$. By the inductive hypothesis, $\psi \in \Upsilon$; hence by **T \diamond** , we have $\diamond\psi \in \Upsilon$, and thus $\psi \notin \Upsilon^\diamond$. It follows that $\psi \notin \Phi^\diamond$, hence $\diamond\psi \in \Phi$, as required. \square

It follows from the above considerations that all of the \diamond -regular logics we consider are strongly complete with respect to their corresponding class of frames, and in particular any formula that is not derivable is falsifiable. (Completeness of **IS4** is well known and was first proven in [30].)

Theorem 2. Let $\Lambda \in \{\text{IS4}, \text{S4I}, \text{GS4}, \text{GS4}^c\}$. Let \models_{Λ} denote semantic consequence on the class of Λ frames as given by Definition 7, and \vdash_{Λ} denote the syntactic consequence relation for Λ . Then for any set of formulas $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi\}$,

$$\Gamma \models_{\Lambda} \varphi \iff \Gamma \vdash_{\Lambda} \varphi.$$

Remark 1. Theorem 2 also applies to the logics $\text{S4I} + \mathbf{GD}$ and $\text{IS4} + \mathbf{CD}$, but the first logic does not seem to be the logic of any natural class of Gödel–Kripke frames, and our techniques in Section 5 do not settle whether the second has the finite model property, essentially for the same reason that they do not work for IS4.

4.3 Completeness of CS4

In this subsection we prove that CS4 is strongly complete for the class of CS4 frames. This claim is already made in [11], where the main elements of the proof are sketched, but there does not seem to be a detailed proof in the literature. Moreover, our proof of the finite model property relies on specific properties of the canonical model, and establishing these properties will amount to the bulk of the proof of completeness. For these two reasons, we provide a full completeness proof here.

The proof mostly follows the same pattern as for \diamond -regular logics, but some important modifications are needed to deal with the ‘irregular’ semantics for \diamond . Rather than working with plain theories, we must work with **augmented theories**, which are ordered pairs of sets of formulas $\Phi = (\Phi^+; \Phi^{\diamond})$. We say that Φ is **prime** if Φ^+ is prime. The intuition behind this definition is the following: formulas in Φ^+ are the ones satisfied by the theory, and the formulas in Φ^{\diamond} are those φ such that $\diamond\varphi$ is falsified directly by \sqsubseteq not having any witnesses for φ (as opposed to being falsified via a \preceq -accessible world). Any standard theory may be regarded as an augmented theory if we identify Φ with $(\Phi; \Phi^{\diamond})$, where $\Phi^{\diamond} = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{L} \mid \diamond\varphi \notin \Phi\}$, as we have defined previously. However, not all augmented theories are of this form, and in fact we often work with augmented theories of the form $(\Phi^+; \emptyset)$.

Definition 12. Given a set of formulas Ξ , we say that an augmented theory Φ is Ξ -**consistent** if for any finite set $\Delta \subseteq \Phi^{\diamond}$,

$$\Phi^+ \not\vdash \Xi, \diamond \bigvee \Delta.$$

We adopt the convention that $\diamond \bigvee \emptyset := \perp$ (note that this convention overrides $\bigvee \emptyset = \perp$). We say that Φ is **consistent** if it is \emptyset -consistent. If Ξ is a singleton $\{\xi\}$, we write ξ -consistent instead of $\{\xi\}$ -consistent.

Note that if Φ is a Ξ -consistent prime augmented theory, then necessarily $\perp \notin \Phi^+$. We say that an augmented theory Ψ **extends** Φ if $\Phi^+ \subseteq \Psi^+$ and $\Phi^{\diamond} \subseteq \Psi^{\diamond}$.

Lemma 8 (adapted from [11]). Any Ξ -consistent augmented theory $(\Phi^+; \Phi^{\diamond})$ can be extended to a Ξ -consistent prime augmented theory $(\Phi_*^+; \Phi^{\diamond})$.

Proof. Apply Lemma 2 with $\Xi' = \Xi \cup \{\diamond \vee \Delta \mid \Delta \sqsubseteq_{\text{fin}} \Phi^\diamond\}$, where \sqsubseteq_{fin} is the finite subset relation. \square

If Φ is an augmented theory then we define $\Phi^\square := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{L} \mid \square\varphi \in \Phi^+\}$.

Definition 13 (adapted from [11]). *We define the canonical model for CS4 as $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}} = (W_c, W_c^\perp, \preceq_c, \sqsubseteq_c, V_c)$, where*

- W_c is the set of all prime augmented CS4-theories,
- $W_c^\perp = \{(\mathcal{L}; \emptyset)\}$,
- $\preceq_c \subseteq W_c \times W_c$ is defined by $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi$ if and only if $\Phi^+ \subseteq \Psi^+$,
- $\sqsubseteq_c \subseteq W_c \times W_c$ is defined by $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi$ if and only if $\Phi^\square \subseteq \Psi^+$ and $\Phi^\diamond \subseteq \Psi^\diamond$,
- V_c is defined by $V_c(p) = \{\Phi \in W_c \mid p \in \Phi^+\}$.

We now show that $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}}$ is a CS4 model.

Lemma 9. $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}}$ is a bi-intuitionistic model.

Proof. It is easy to see that \preceq_c is a preorder given that \subseteq is itself a preorder, and the two monotonicity conditions for W_c^\perp and the one for V_c are easily verified.

It remains to check that \sqsubseteq_c is a preorder. Let us take $\Phi \in W_c$ and $\square\varphi \in \Phi^+$. Due to Axiom **T** $_\square$ and closure of Φ^+ under \vdash , we know $\varphi \in \Phi^+$; therefore, $\Phi^\square \subseteq \Phi^+$. Trivially, $\Phi^\diamond \subseteq \Phi^\diamond$, so in conclusion \sqsubseteq_c is reflexive.

To see that \sqsubseteq_c is transitive, let us consider $\Phi, \Psi, \Omega \in W_c$ such that $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi$ and $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Omega$. Let us first take $\square\varphi \in \Phi^+$. From Axiom **4** $_\square$ and closure of Φ^+ under \vdash , we obtain $\square\square\varphi \in \Phi^+$. From $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi$ and $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Omega$ we get $\square\varphi \in \Psi^+$ and $\varphi \in \Omega^+$; therefore $\Phi^\square \subseteq \Omega^+$. By the hypotheses $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi$ and $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Omega$, we also have $\Phi^\diamond \subseteq \Psi^\diamond \subseteq \Omega^\diamond$. We conclude that $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Omega$, so \sqsubseteq_c is transitive. \square

Lemma 10. $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}}$ is back-up confluent. In particular, if $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi \preceq_c \Omega$, then $\Upsilon := (\Phi^+; \emptyset)$ satisfies $\Phi \preceq_c \Upsilon \sqsubseteq_c \Omega$.

Proof. Take Φ, Ψ , and Ω in W_c such that $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi \preceq_c \Omega$, and let us define $\Upsilon = (\Phi^+; \emptyset)$. Now Φ^+ is already prime, so $\Upsilon \in W_c$. By definition $\Phi^+ \subseteq \Upsilon^+$; thus $\Phi \preceq_c \Upsilon$. Take $\square\varphi \in \Upsilon^+$. By definition $\square\varphi \in \Phi^+$. Since $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi \preceq_c \Omega$ it follows that $\varphi \in \Omega^+$. Since $\square\varphi$ was chosen arbitrarily, we have $\Upsilon^\square \subseteq \Omega^+$. Clearly also $\Upsilon^\diamond = \emptyset \subseteq \Omega^\diamond$, so $\Upsilon \sqsubseteq_c \Omega$. \square

We have established that $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}}$ is a CS4 model. We now proceed towards a truth lemma for $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}}$. Here is where we really put the axioms and inference rules to work.

Lemma 11. For all $\Gamma \in W_c$ and for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, the following hold.

- (a) $\diamond\varphi \in \Gamma^+$ if and only if for all $\Psi \succ_c \Gamma$ there is $\Delta \in W_c$ such that $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$ and $\varphi \in \Delta^+$.

(b) $\Box\varphi \in \Gamma^+$ if and only if for all Ψ and Δ such that $\Gamma \preceq_c \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$, we have $\varphi \in \Delta^+$.

Proof. (a). From left to right, assume that $\Diamond\varphi \in \Gamma^+$, and let $\Psi \succ_c \Gamma$. Let us define the augmented theory $\Upsilon = (\Psi^\Box, \varphi; \Psi^\Diamond)$. We show that Υ is consistent. If not, let $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_n \in \Psi^\Box$ and $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_m \in \Psi^\Diamond$ be such that, for $\chi := \bigwedge_i \chi_i$ and $\psi := \bigvee_i \psi_i$, we have $\chi \wedge \varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\psi \in \mathbf{CS4}$, so that $\chi \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\psi) \in \mathbf{CS4}$. By **Nec**, **K \Box** , and **MP**, it follows that $\Box\chi \rightarrow \Box(\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\psi) \in \mathbf{CS4}$. By Proposition 3(3) (and induction up to n), we also know that $\bigwedge_i \Box\chi_i \rightarrow \Box\chi \in \mathbf{CS4}$, and hence $\bigwedge_i \Box\chi_i \rightarrow \Box(\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\psi) \in \mathbf{CS4}$, or otherwise stated $\Box\chi_1, \dots, \Box\chi_n \vdash \Box(\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\psi)$. By closure of Ψ^+ under syntactic consequence, we obtain $\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\psi) \in \Psi^+$, and then by **K \Diamond** we obtain $\Diamond\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\Diamond\psi \in \Psi^+$. Since $\Gamma \preceq_c \Psi$ and $\Diamond\varphi \in \Gamma^+$, we also have $\Diamond\varphi \in \Psi^+$. We know that $\Diamond\varphi \wedge (\Diamond\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\Diamond\psi) \rightarrow \Diamond\Diamond\psi \in \mathbf{CS4}$ by substitution on an intuitionistic theorem. Thus by closure of Ψ^+ under \vdash , we have $\Diamond\Diamond\psi \in \Psi^+$. By **4 \Diamond** and syntactic closure, we reach $\Diamond\psi \in \Psi^+$, which contradicts the consistency of Ψ . We conclude that Υ is consistent. By Lemma 2, Υ can be extended to a consistent prime augmented theory $\Delta = (\Delta^+; \Delta^\Diamond)$ such that $\Psi^\Box \subseteq \Delta^+$ and $\Psi^\Diamond = \Delta^\Diamond$ (therefore $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$), and moreover $\varphi \in \Delta^+$, as needed.

Conversely, let us assume that $\Diamond\varphi \notin \Gamma^+$ and let us define $\Psi = (\Gamma^+; \{\varphi\})$. It is easy to see that Ψ is consistent, and since Γ^+ is prime, $\Psi \in W_c$. Moreover, $\Gamma \preceq_c \Psi$. We claim that for all $\Delta \in W_c$, if $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$ then $\varphi \notin \Delta^+$. To prove this, let us take any $\Delta \in W_c$ satisfying $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$. By definition, $\Psi^\Diamond \subseteq \Delta^\Diamond$, so $\varphi \in \Delta^\Diamond$. As Δ is a prime augmented theory, $\Diamond\varphi \notin \Delta^+$, so $\varphi \notin \Delta^+$ because of Axiom **T \Diamond** , as needed.

(b) From left to right, let $\Box\varphi \in \Gamma^+$, and let Ψ and Δ be such that $\Gamma \preceq_c \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$. From $\Gamma \preceq_c \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$, we obtain $\Gamma^+ \subseteq \Psi^+$ and $\Psi^\Box \subseteq \Delta^+$. Since $\Box\varphi \in \Gamma^+$ we have $\varphi \in \Delta^+$, as needed.

Conversely, let us assume that $\Box\varphi \notin \Gamma^+$ and let us define $\Psi = (\Gamma^+; \emptyset)$. Clearly Ψ is a prime theory and it satisfies $\Gamma \preceq_c \Psi$. Let us take $\Upsilon = (\Psi^\Box, \emptyset)$. Υ is φ -consistent, since otherwise **Nec** and **K \Box** would yield $\Box\bigwedge_i \psi_i \rightarrow \Box\varphi \in \mathbf{CS4}$ for some $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \in \Psi^\Box$, from which we can obtain $\Box\psi_1, \dots, \Box\psi_n \vdash \Box\varphi$ and thus $\Box\varphi \in \Gamma^+$ —a contradiction. By Lemma 2, Υ can be extended to a φ -consistent prime augmented theory $\Delta = (\Delta^+; \emptyset)$ such that $\Upsilon^+ \subseteq \Delta^+$. By the definition of Υ , we then have $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$ and $\varphi \notin \Delta^+$, as needed. \square

Lemma 12 (truth lemma). *For any prime augmented theory $\Phi \in W_c$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$,*

$$\varphi \in \Phi^+ \iff (\mathcal{M}_c^{\mathbf{CS4}}, \Phi) \models \varphi.$$

Proof. The cases for variables and $\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$ are similar to the proof of Lemma 7. The case where φ is of the form $\Diamond\psi$ is simple. By Lemma 11(a), $\Diamond\psi \in \Phi^+$ if and only if whenever $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi$, there exists $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Omega$ such that $\psi \in \Omega^+$. By the inductive hypothesis, this happens if and only if whenever $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi$ there exists $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Omega$ such that $(\mathcal{M}_c^{\mathbf{CS4}}, \Omega) \models \psi$, which is precisely the definition of $(\mathcal{M}_c^{\mathbf{CS4}}, \Phi) \models \Diamond\psi$.

The case where φ is of the form $\Box\psi$ is similar. By Lemma 11(b), $\Box\psi \in \Phi^+$ if and only if whenever $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Omega$, we have $\psi \in \Omega^+$. By the inductive hypothesis, this happens if and only if whenever $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Omega$, we have $(\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}}, \Omega) \models \psi$, which is precisely the definition of $(\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}}, \Phi) \models \Box\psi$. \square

From this, we obtain strong completeness of CS4 with respect to its class of models.

Theorem 3 (Alechina, Mendler, De Paiva, and Ritter [11]). *Let \models_{CS4} denote local semantic consequence on the class of CS4 frames, and \vdash_{CS4} denote the syntactic consequence relation for the logic CS4. Then*

$$\Gamma \models_{\text{CS4}} \varphi \iff \Gamma \vdash_{\text{CS4}} \varphi.$$

5 Finite frame properties

In this section we prove that the finite birelational frame property holds for each of the logics GS4, GS4^c, CS4, and S4I, in that order.

5.1 Σ -bisimulations

In this subsection we develop the theory of Σ -bisimulations, a key component common to all four of our finite frame property proofs.

Definition 14. *Given a set of formulas Σ and a bi-intuitionistic model $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$, we define the Σ -label of $w \in W$ to be the pair $\ell(w) = (\ell^+(w), \ell^\diamond(w))$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} \ell^+(w) &:= \{\varphi \in \Sigma \mid (\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi\}, \\ \ell^\diamond(w) &:= \{\varphi \in \Sigma \mid \forall v \sqsupseteq w \ (\mathcal{M}, v) \not\models \varphi\}. \end{aligned}$$

A Σ -bisimulation on \mathcal{M} is a forth-up and back-up confluent relation $Z \subseteq W \times W$ such that if $w Z v$ then $\ell(w) = \ell(v)$.

Notice that an arbitrary union of Σ -bisimulations is a Σ -bisimulation (and the empty relation is a Σ -bisimulation); thus a greatest Σ -bisimulation exists, which we denote by \sim_Σ . Since the set of Σ -bisimulations clearly contains the identity relation and is closed under compositions and under the converse operation, \sim_Σ must be an equivalence relation.

For each canonical model \mathcal{M}_c^Λ , we note that $\ell(\Phi) = (\Phi^+ \cap \Sigma, \Phi^\diamond \cap \Sigma)$.

Definition 15. *Given a bi-intuitionistic model $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ and an equivalence relation $\sim \subseteq W \times W$, we denote the equivalence class of $w \in W$ under \sim by $[w]$. We then define the quotient $\mathcal{M}/\sim = (W/\sim, W^\perp/\sim, \preceq/\sim, \sqsubseteq/\sim, V/\sim)$ by*

- $W/\sim := \{[w] \mid w \in W\}$,

- $W^\perp/\sim := \{[w] \mid w \in W^\perp\}$,
- $[w] \preceq/\sim [v]$ if there exist $w' \sim w$ and $v' \sim v$ such that $w' \preceq v'$,
- \sqsubseteq/\sim is the transitive closure of \sqsubseteq^0/\sim defined by $[w] \sqsubseteq^0/\sim [v]$ whenever there are w', v' such that $w \sim w' \sqsubseteq v' \sim v$,
- $V/\sim(p) := \{[w] \mid w \in V(p)\}$

Of particular importance is the case where the relation \sim is given by Σ -bisimulation.

Lemma 13. *Let $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ be a bi-intuitionistic model, and suppose that \sim is an equivalence relation that is also a Σ -bisimulation. Then*

- for all $w, v \in W$, we have $[w] \preceq/\sim [v]$ if and only if there is $v' \sim v$ such that $w \preceq v'$;
- the relation \preceq/\sim is a preorder.

Proof. For the first item, clearly if there is $v' \sim v$ such that $w \preceq v'$, then $[w] \preceq/\sim [v]$. Conversely, if $[w] \preceq/\sim [v]$, then there are $w' \sim w$ and $v' \sim v$ such that $w' \preceq v'$. Since \sim is a bisimulation, there is $v'' \sim v'$ such that $w \preceq v''$. But then by transitivity of \sim , we have $v'' \sim v$, as needed.

For the second item, clearly \preceq/\sim is reflexive. For transitivity, suppose $[w] \preceq/\sim [v] \preceq/\sim [u]$. Then by the first item, there exists $v' \sim v$ with $w \preceq v'$. Then $[v'] \preceq/\sim [u]$, and so, using the first item again, there exists $u' \sim u$ with $v' \preceq u'$. By transitivity of \preceq , we have $w \preceq u'$, and hence $[w] \preceq/\sim [u'] = [u]$. \square

By the second item of Lemma 13, if \mathcal{M} is a bi-intuitionistic model and \sim is an equivalence relation that is also a Σ -bisimulation, then \mathcal{M}/\sim is also a bi-intuitionistic model.

We now need an auxiliary lemma confirming that confluence notions for relations have nice closure properties. If R, S are binary relations then let $R; S$ denote their composition: $x R; S y$ if there is z such that $x R z$ and $z S y$.

Lemma 14. *Let $\mathcal{F} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq)$ be an intuitionistic frame.*

1. If $R, S \subseteq W \times W$ are forth-up (respectively back-up, forth-down) confluent, then so is $R; S$.
2. If $(R_i)_{i \in I} \subseteq W \times W$ are forth-up (respectively back-up, forth-down) confluent, then so is $\bigcup_{i \in I} R_i$.
3. If R is forth-up (respectively back-up, forth-down) confluent, then so is its transitive closure R^+ .

Proof. We prove only that forth-up confluence is closed under composition and leave other items to the reader. Suppose that $R, S \subseteq W \times W$ are forth-up confluent and $v \succ w R; S w'$. Then there is w'' such that $w R w'' S w'$. By forth-up confluence of R , there is v'' such that $v R v'' \succ w$. By forth-up confluence of S , there is v' such that $v'' S v' \succ w'$. But then $v R; S v' \succ w'$, as needed. \square

Lemma 15. *Let $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ be a bi-intuitionistic model and Σ be a set of formulas. Let \sim be a Σ -bisimulation that is also an equivalence relation. Then*

1. *If \mathcal{M} is forth-up confluent, then so is \mathcal{M}/\sim .*
2. *If \mathcal{M} is back-up confluent, then so is \mathcal{M}/\sim .*
3. *If \mathcal{M} is upward linear, then so is \mathcal{M}/\sim .*

Proof. For forth-up confluence, in view of Lemma 14, it suffices to show that \sqsubseteq^0/\sim is forth-up confluent. Assume that $[v] \succsim/\sim [w] \sqsubseteq^0/\sim [w']$. By Lemma 13, there is $v'' \sim v$ such that $v'' \succ w$. Since \mathcal{M} is forth-up confluent, there is v' such that $v'' \sqsupseteq v' \succ w'$. Therefore $[v] \sqsupseteq^0/\sim [v'] \succsim/\sim [w']$, as needed. Back-up confluence is treated similarly, and we omit it.

For upward linearity, assume that $[w] \preceq/\sim [u]$ and $[w] \preceq/\sim [v]$. Using Lemma 13, let u', v' in W be such that $u \sim u' \succ w \preceq v \sim v'$. Hence $u' \preceq v'$ or $v' \preceq u'$. Consequently $[u] \preceq/\sim [v]$ or $[v] \preceq/\sim [u]$. \square

Lemma 16 (truth lemma for quotients). *If $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ is any bi-intuitionistic model, Σ is closed under subformulas, and $\sim \subseteq W \times W$ is a Σ -bisimulation that is also an equivalence relation, then for all $w \in W$ and $\varphi \in \Sigma$, we have*

$$(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi \iff (\mathcal{M}/\sim, [w]) \models \varphi.$$

Proof. Proceed by a standard structural induction on φ . We consider only the interesting cases.

CASE $\varphi = \psi \rightarrow \theta$. If $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \psi \rightarrow \theta$ and $[v] \succsim/\sim [w]$, then in view of Lemma 13 (which we henceforth use without mention), there is $v' \sim v$ such that $w \preceq v'$. Since $v' \succ w$, either $(\mathcal{M}, v') \not\models \psi$ or $(\mathcal{M}, v') \models \theta$, which by the induction hypothesis and the fact that $[v] = [v']$ yields $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [v]) \not\models \psi$ or $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [v]) \models \theta$. Since $[v] \succsim/\sim [w]$ was arbitrary, we conclude that $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [w]) \models \varphi$.

Conversely, if $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [w]) \models \psi \rightarrow \theta$ and $v \succ w$, then $[w] \preceq/\sim [v]$, which implies that $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [v]) \not\models \psi$ or $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [v]) \models \theta$, and then by the induction hypothesis, that $(\mathcal{M}, v) \not\models \psi$ or $(\mathcal{M}, v) \models \theta$, as needed.

CASE $\varphi = \diamond\psi$. Suppose that $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \diamond\psi$ and let $[v] \succsim/\sim [w]$. We may assume that v is chosen so that $v \succ w$. Then there is v' such that $v \sqsubseteq v'$ and $(\mathcal{M}, v') \models \psi$. But then $[v] \sqsubseteq^0/\sim [v']$ and the induction hypothesis yields $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [v']) \models \psi$. We conclude that $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [w]) \models \diamond\psi$.

Conversely, suppose that $(\mathcal{M}, w) \not\models \diamond\psi$. Then there is $v \succ w$ such that $\psi \in \ell^\diamond(v)$. Let v' be such that $[v] \sqsubseteq^0/\sim [v']$. Then there exist sequences $(v_i)_{i \leq n}$ and $(v'_i)_{i \leq n}$ such that

$$v = v_0 \sim v'_0 \sqsubseteq v_1 \sim v'_1 \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq v_n \sim v'_n = v'.$$

By induction on $i \leq n$, one readily verifies that $\psi \in \ell^\diamond(v_i) \cap \ell^\diamond(v'_i)$, from which it follows that $\psi \in \ell^\diamond(v')$, and hence $\psi \notin \ell^+(v')$. By the induction hypothesis,

$(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [v']) \not\models \psi$. Since $v \succ w$, we have $[v] \succ/\sim [w]$, so as $[v']$ was arbitrary subject to $[v] \sqsubseteq/\sim [v']$, we obtain $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [w]) \not\models \Diamond\psi$ —a contradiction.

CASE $\varphi = \Box\psi$. This case is treated very similarly to the \Diamond case, but working ‘dually’. We show only that $(\mathcal{M}, w) \not\models \Box\psi$ implies that $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [w]) \not\models \Box\psi$ to illustrate. If $(\mathcal{M}, w) \not\models \Box\psi$, there are $v' \sqsupseteq v \succ w$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, v') \not\models \Box\psi$. But then $[v'] \sqsupseteq/\sim [v] \succ/\sim [w]$, and the induction hypothesis yields $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [v']) \not\models \psi$; hence $(\mathcal{M}/\sim, [w]) \not\models \Box\psi$. \square

Recall that \sim_Σ denotes the greatest Σ -bisimulation on a model.

Lemma 17. *Every \sim_Σ -equivalence class of \mathcal{M}/\sim_Σ is a singleton.*

Proof. Suppose that $[w] \sim_\Sigma [v]$; we must show that $w \sim_\Sigma v$ as well, to conclude $[w] = [v]$ (note that \sim_Σ is defined both on \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}/\sim). Define a relation $Z \subseteq W \times W$ given by $x Z y$ if $[x] \sim_\Sigma [y]$. Clearly $w Z v$, so it remains to check that Z is a Σ -bisimulation to conclude that $w \sim_\Sigma v$. Clearly Z preserves labels in Σ . We check only the ‘forth’ clause, as the ‘back’ clause is symmetric.

Suppose that $x' \succ x Z y$. Since $[x] \sim_\Sigma [y]$, there is y' such that $[x'] \sim_\Sigma [y'] \succ/\sim_\Sigma [y]$. In view of Lemma 13, we may assume that y' is chosen so that $y \preceq y'$. From $[x'] \sim_\Sigma [y']$ we obtain $x' Z y'$, as needed. \square

Quotients modulo Σ -bisimulation will be instrumental in proving the finite frame property for **CS4**. However, Σ -bisimulation does not preserve forth–down confluence, so to treat **S4I** and **GS4^c** we will need a stronger notion of bisimulation. In fact, we will also use this stronger notion to treat **GS4**.

Definition 16. *A **strong** Σ -bisimulation is a Σ -bisimulation Z such that both Z and Z^{-1} are forth–down confluent for \preceq . We denote the greatest strong Σ -bisimulation by \approx_Σ .*

Notice that an arbitrary union of strong Σ -bisimulations is a strong Σ -bisimulation (and the empty relation is a strong Σ -bisimulation); hence, \approx_Σ is well defined. Clearly \approx_Σ is an equivalence relation. The following is proven in essentially the same way as the forth–up confluence preservation clause of Lemma 15.

Lemma 18. *Let \mathcal{M} be a bi-intuitionistic model and Σ be a set of formulas. Let \approx be a strong Σ -bisimulation on \mathcal{M} that is also an equivalence relation. Then if \mathcal{M} is forth–down confluent, so is \mathcal{M}/\approx .*

We remark that the quotient \mathcal{M}/\sim may be infinite, even taking $\sim \in \{\sim_\Sigma, \approx_\Sigma\}$. However, in the following subsections we identify classes of models that do have finite quotients.

5.2 The finite frame property for **GS4**

In this subsection we prove our first finite frame property result, showing that the Gödel modal logic **GS4** indeed has the finite frame property. The upward-linear nature of **GS4** frames enables a particularly direct proof (not via a shallow frame property).

There are two steps to the proof. First we note that we may assume frames are not only upward but also *downward* linear. Then, given a subformula-closed subset Σ of \mathcal{L} , we describe a bisimulation quotient construction that yields finite models whenever Σ is finite. We describe the quotient explicitly, noting afterwards that it is in fact the quotient by the greatest strong Σ -bisimulation \approx_Σ defined in Section 5.1.

Downward-linear GS4 frames. First we argue that without loss of generality, models based on GS4 frames are downward linear. Let $\mathcal{M} = (W, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ be an arbitrary model based on a GS4 frame. We construct a model $\mathcal{M}' = (W', \preceq', \sqsubseteq', V')$ based on a downward-linear GS4 frame and falsifying exactly the same \mathcal{L} -formulas as \mathcal{M} .

The idea is to include copies of each of the (necessarily linear) principal upsets v^\uparrow , indexed by the generating world v . We define

$$\begin{aligned} W' &= \{(v, w) \in W \times W \mid v \preceq w\}, \\ (v_1, w_1) \preceq' (v_2, w_2) &\iff v_1 = v_2 \text{ and } w_1 \preceq w_2, \\ (v_1, w_1) \sqsubseteq' (v_2, w_2) &\iff w_1 \sqsubseteq w_2, \\ V'(v, w) &= V(w). \end{aligned}$$

As \preceq is an upward-linear partial order, clearly \preceq' is a partial order that is both upward and downward linear. As \sqsubseteq is a preorder, clearly \sqsubseteq' is a preorder. For forth-up confluence, suppose $(u_1, v_1) \sqsubseteq' (u_2, v_2)$ and that $(u_1, v_1) \preceq' (u_1, w_1)$. Then $v_1 \sqsubseteq v_2$ and $v_1 \preceq w_1$, so by forth-up confluence of \sqsubseteq there exists w_2 with $w_1 \sqsubseteq w_2$ and $v_2 \preceq w_2$. By transitivity of \preceq , we have $u_2 \preceq w_2$, so that $(u_2, w_2) \in W'$. Then $(u_1, w_1) \sqsubseteq' (u_2, w_2)$ and $(u_2, v_2) \preceq' (u_2, w_2)$, as required. Back-up confluence is entirely analogous. Thus $(W', \preceq', \sqsubseteq')$ is a GS4 frame.

It is straightforward to check by structural induction on formulas that for any \mathcal{L} -formula φ and any $v, w \in W$, we have

$$(\mathcal{M}', (v, w)) \models \varphi \iff (\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi.$$

We verify the left-to-right implication for the case that φ is of the form $\Box\psi$, since this will be instructive when we switch our focus to GS4^c . So suppose $(\mathcal{M}', (v, w)) \models \Box\psi$ and, let $w \preceq u$ and $u \sqsubseteq z$. Then $(v, w) \preceq' (v, u)$ and $(v, u) \sqsubseteq' (z, z)$, so $(\mathcal{M}', (z, z)) \models \psi$. Thus by the inductive hypothesis $(\mathcal{M}, z) \models \psi$. Since u and z were arbitrary, subject to $w \preceq u$ and $u \sqsubseteq z$, we have $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \Box\psi$, as required.

Thus \mathcal{M}' falsifies precisely the \mathcal{L} -formulas falsified by \mathcal{M} . In other words, in proving the finite frame property for GS4 we may work exclusively with models based on downward-linear GS4 frames.

Finite quotients. Now let Σ be a subformula-closed subset of \mathcal{L} . We will describe a quotient of any model based on a downward-linear GS4 frame that falsifies the same formulas from Σ as the original model and is finite whenever Σ is finite.

Let $\mathcal{M} = (W, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ be a model based on a downward-linear GS4 frame. For $w \in W$, define $\ell_{\mathcal{M}}(w)$ by

$$\ell_{\mathcal{M}}(w) = \{\varphi \in \Sigma \mid (\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi\},$$

and define

$$L_{\mathcal{M}}(w) = \{\ell(v) \mid w \preceq v \text{ or } v \preceq w\}.$$

We define the equivalence relation \approx on W by

$$w \approx v \iff (\ell(w), L(w)) = (\ell(v), L(v)).$$

If Σ is finite, then clearly W/\approx is finite.

It is straightforward to show that \approx is a strong Σ -bisimulation. Conversely, it is clear that if w and v are strongly Σ -bisimilar, then $\ell(w) = \ell(v)$ and $L(w) = L(v)$, and hence $w \approx v$. Thus \approx is the greatest strong Σ -bisimulation \approx_{Σ} .

By Lemma 15, the quotient \mathcal{M}/\approx has all the properties necessary to be a GS4 frame. It is clear that if Σ is finite then \mathcal{M}/\approx is finite.

Theorem 4. *GS4 has the finite birelational frame property. That is, if a formula φ is falsifiable (respectively satisfiable) on a birelational GS4 frame, then φ is falsifiable (respectively satisfiable) on a finite birelational GS4 frame.*

In order to use Theorem 4 to prove decidability, we need to compute a bound on the size of a model \mathcal{M}/\approx in terms of the size of Σ , when Σ is finite. Note that \preceq/\approx is given by the partial order

$$[w] \preceq/\approx [v] \iff L(w) = L(v) \text{ and } \ell(w) \supseteq \ell(v).$$

Lemma 19. *Suppose Σ is finite. Then the depth of \mathcal{M}/\approx is bounded by $|\Sigma| + 1$, and the cardinality of the domain of \mathcal{M}/\approx is bounded by $(|\Sigma| + 1) \cdot 2^{|\Sigma|(|\Sigma|+1)+1}$.*

Proof. Each element of the domain of \mathcal{M}/\approx is a pair (ℓ, L) where L is a (nonempty) subset of $\wp\Sigma$ and $\ell \in L$. Since L is linearly ordered by inclusion, it has depth at most $|\Sigma| + 1$. Hence \mathcal{M}/\approx has depth at most $|\Sigma| + 1$. There are $(2^{|\Sigma|})^i$ subsets of $\wp\Sigma$ of size i , so there are at most $\sum_{i=1}^{|\Sigma|+1} (2^{|\Sigma|})^i$ distinct L . The sum is bounded by $2^{|\Sigma|(|\Sigma|+1)+1}$. The factor of $|\Sigma| + 1$ corresponds to the choice of an $\ell \in L$, for each L . \square

Thus we have an exponential bound on the size of \mathcal{M}/\approx . Hence any falsifiable formula is falsifiable on an effectively bounded quasimodel, and it follows that GS4 is decidable.

Theorem 5. *The logic GS4 is decidable.*

Proof. Since falsifiability is the complement of validity, it suffices to show that it is decidable whether a formula φ is falsifiable over the class of all GS4 frames. Let Σ be the set of subformulas of φ . The cardinality of Σ is no greater than the length of φ . If φ is falsifiable in a GS4 frame of size at most $(|\Sigma| + 1) \cdot 2^{|\Sigma|(|\Sigma|+1)+1}$, then in particular φ is falsifiable in a GS4 frame. Conversely, if φ is falsified in a GS4 frame, then by Lemma 19, φ is falsified in a GS4 frame of size at most $(|\Sigma| + 1) \cdot 2^{|\Sigma|(|\Sigma|+1)+1}$. Hence, it suffices to check falsifiability of φ on the set of all GS4 frames (with valuations only for the variables appearing in φ) of size at most $(|\Sigma| + 1) \cdot 2^{|\Sigma|(|\Sigma|+1)+1}$. It is clear that this check can be carried out within a computable time bound; hence the problem is decidable. \square

This argument yields a NEXPTIME upper bound.

Corollary 2. *The logic GS4 is in NEXPTIME.*

Proof. Let n be the length of a formula φ ; thus n bounds the number of subformulas of φ . A nondeterministic algorithm runs as follows on input φ .

- Nondeterministically choose a structure $\mathcal{M} = (W, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V(p_1), \dots, V(p_m))$ of cardinality at most $(n+1) \cdot 2^{n(n+1)+1}$, where p_1, \dots, p_m are the variables appearing in φ . The structure \mathcal{M} can be stored with an exponential (in n) number of bits, and hence choosing \mathcal{M} can be done in exponential time.
- Check that \mathcal{M} is a GS4 frame and reject if not. This (deterministic) check takes exponential time.
- Calculate the interpretations in \mathcal{M} of each subformula of φ . There are at most n interpretations to calculate and each calculation can be done deterministically in exponential time provided the interpretations of subformulas of lower structural complexity are calculated first.
- Check whether there is any world not in the calculated interpretation of φ . □

5.3 The finite frame property for GS4^c

We now proceed to proving the finite birelational frame property for GS4^c. The strategy is the same as for GS4. However, the result does not follow immediately from our GS4 constructions, because our construction of downward-linear GS4 frames does not preserve forth–down confluence and hence does not specialise to GS4^c frames. We thus use a variant of our previous construction. Before we define this, we need to show that without loss of generality, GS4^c frames have an additional property.

Definition 17. *Let (W, \preceq) be a preordered set. We say a binary relation R on W is **pointwise convex**, if it validates the implication*

$$R(u, v_1), R(u, v_2), v_1 \preceq w \preceq v_2 \implies R(u, w).$$

Lemma 20. *Let (W, \preceq) be a preordered set and R a binary relation on W . Then the relation \overline{R} defined by*

$$\overline{R}(u, w) \iff \exists v_1 \preceq u \preceq v_2 : R(u, v_1), R(u, v_2)$$

*is pointwise convex. We call this the **convex closure** of R . Forming transitive closures preserves any confluence conditions. If R is forth–up and forth–down confluent and transitive, then \overline{R} is transitive.*

Proof. The claims are straightforward to prove; we give the details for the last claim. So suppose R is forth–up and forth–down confluent and transitive and that $\overline{R}(u, v)$ and $\overline{R}(v, w)$. Then there is $v' \preceq v$ with $R(u, v')$ and $w' \preceq w$ with

$R(v, w')$. By forth-down confluence of R there is $w'' \preceq w'$ with $R(v', w'')$. Then by transitivity of \preceq and R respectively, we have $w'' \preceq w$ and $R(u, w'')$. By a symmetric argument using forth-up confluence, there also exists $z \succ w$ with $R(u, z)$. So by definition $\overline{R}(u, w)$. \square

By Lemma 20, if $(W, \preceq, \sqsubseteq)$ is a GS4^c frame, then so is $(W, \preceq, \overline{\sqsubseteq})$. Given a valuation V , it is straightforward to show, by structural induction on formulas and using monotonicity of V , that the satisfaction relation \models on $(W, \preceq, \overline{\sqsubseteq}, V)$ is identical to that on $(W, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$. Hence

we may assume, without loss of generality, that GS4^c frames are pointwise convex.

Downward-linear GS4^c frames. Let $\mathcal{M} = (W, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ be an arbitrary model based on a pointwise convex GS4^c frame. We define a model $\mathcal{M}'' = (W'', \preceq'', \sqsubseteq'', V'')$ based on a downward-linear GS4^c frame and falsifying exactly the same \mathcal{L} -formulas as \mathcal{M} as follows. (The only difference with \mathcal{M}' from the previous subsection is in the definition of \sqsubseteq'' .)

$$\begin{aligned} W'' &= \{(v, w) \in W \times W \mid v \preceq w\}, \\ (v_1, w_1) \preceq'' (v_2, w_2) &\iff v_1 = v_2 \text{ and } w_1 \preceq w_2, \\ (v_1, w_1) \sqsubseteq'' (v_2, w_2) &\iff v_1 \sqsubseteq v_2 \text{ and } w_1 \sqsubseteq w_2, \\ V''(v, w) &= V(w). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that \mathcal{M}'' is an upward- and downward-linear bi-intuitionistic frame. We now check the confluence conditions. For forth-up confluence, suppose $(u_1, v_1) \sqsubseteq'' (u_2, v_2)$ and that $(u_1, v_1) \preceq'' (u_1, w_1)$. Then $v_1 \sqsubseteq v_2$ and $v_1 \preceq w_1$, so by forth-up confluence of \sqsubseteq there exists w_2 with $w_1 \sqsubseteq w_2$ and $v_2 \preceq w_2$. By transitivity of \preceq , we have $u_2 \preceq w_2$, so that $(u_2, w_2) \in W''$. Then $(u_1, w_1) \sqsubseteq'' (u_2, w_2)$ and $(u_2, v_2) \preceq'' (u_2, w_2)$, as required. Back-up confluence is entirely analogous. For forth-down confluence, suppose $(u_1, w_1) \sqsubseteq'' (u_2, w_2)$ and that $(u_1, v_1) \preceq'' (u_1, w_1)$. We have $v_1 \succ u_1 \sqsubseteq u_2$, so by forth-up confluence, there exists v_2 with $v_1 \sqsubseteq v_2 \succ u_2$. By upward linearity, either $v_2 \preceq w_2$ or $w_2 \preceq v_2$. In the first case $(u_2, v_2) \preceq'' (u_2, w_2)$ and we are done. In the second case, apply forth-down confluence to $v_1 \preceq w_1 \sqsubseteq w_2$ to obtain z with $v_1 \sqsubseteq z \preceq w_2$. Then since $v_1 \sqsubseteq z$ and $v_1 \sqsubseteq v_2$, and also $z \preceq w_2 \preceq v_2$, we have, by pointwise convexity, that $v_1 \sqsubseteq w_2$. Then we have $(u_1, v_1) \sqsubseteq'' (u_2, w_2) \preceq'' (u_2, w_2)$, witnessing the forth-down confluence of \sqsubseteq'' . We conclude that $(W'', \preceq'', \sqsubseteq'')$ is a downward-linear GS4^c frame.

It is straightforward to check by structural induction on formulas that for any \mathcal{L} -formula φ and any $v, w \in W$, we have

$$(\mathcal{M}'', (v, w)) \models \varphi \iff (\mathcal{M}, w) \models \varphi.$$

We verify the left-to-right implication for the case that φ is of the form $\Box\psi$. So suppose $(\mathcal{M}'', (v, w)) \models \Box\psi$ and let $w \preceq u$ and $u \sqsubseteq z$. Then $(v, w) \preceq'' (v, u)$ and $(v, u) \sqsubseteq'' (z, z)$, so $(\mathcal{M}', (z, z)) \models \psi$. Then $v \preceq u \sqsubseteq z$, so by forth-down

confluence there exists y with $v \sqsubseteq y \preceq z$. Then $(v, w) \preceq'' (v, u)$ and $(v, u) \sqsubseteq'' (y, z)$, so $(\mathcal{M}'', (y, z)) \models \psi$. Thus by the inductive hypothesis $(\mathcal{M}, z) \models \psi$. Since u and z were arbitrary, subject to $w \preceq u$ and $u \sqsubseteq z$, we have $(\mathcal{M}, w) \models \Box\psi$, as required.

Thus \mathcal{M}'' falsifies precisely the \mathcal{L} -formulas falsified by \mathcal{M} . So in proving the finite frame property for GS4^c we may work exclusively with models based on downward-linear GS4^c frames.

Now let Σ be a subformula-closed subset of \mathcal{L} . Given a downward-linear GS4^c frame \mathcal{M} , we know from Section 5.2 that the quotient \mathcal{M}/\approx is a GS4 frame of size at most $(|\Sigma| + 1) \cdot 2^{|\Sigma|(|\Sigma|+1)+1}$ falsifying precisely the same formulas as \mathcal{M} . By Lemma 18, \mathcal{M}/\approx is also forth-down confluent and hence a GS4^c frame. This yields the following results.

Theorem 6. *The logic GS4^c has the finite birelational frame property, and hence is decidable.*

Corollary 3. *The logic GS4^c is in NEXPTIME.*

5.4 Shallow frames

A key ingredient in our finite frame property proofs for CS4 and S4I is to work with *shallow frames*, which are frames where the *depths* of worlds are bounded. Given a frame $\mathcal{F} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq)$ and $w \in W$, the **depth** of w is the supremum, in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, of all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that there is a sequence

$$w = w_0 \prec w_1 \prec \dots \prec w_n.$$

The depth of the frame \mathcal{F} is the supremum of all depths of elements of W . The depth of a model is the depth of its underlying frame. Note that the depth of worlds or frames/models could be ∞ . If a frame or model has finite depth, we say that it is **shallow**. Shallow models will provide an important intermediate step towards establishing the finite frame property, as the bisimulation quotient of a shallow model is finite. Nevertheless, it can be quite large, as it is only superexponentially bounded.

Let 2_k^m be the superexponential function defined recursively by $2_0^m = m$ and $2_{k+1}^m = 2^{2_k^m}$.

Lemma 21. *For all $m, n, k \geq 1$:*

$$2^m \cdot 2_k^{(n-1)m} \leq 2_k^{nm}.$$

Proof. Proceed by induction on k . If $k = 1$, then

$$2^m \cdot 2_1^{(n-1)m} = 2^m \cdot 2^{(n-1)m} = 2_k^{nm}.$$

If $k > 1$, then note that $1 \leq 2_{k-1}^{(n-1)m}$, so that

$$m + 2_{k-1}^{(n-1)m} \leq (m + 1)2_{k-1}^{(n-1)m} \leq 2^m \cdot 2_{k-1}^{(n-1)m} \stackrel{\text{IH}}{\leq} 2_{k-1}^{nm}.$$

Then

$$2^m \cdot 2_k^{(n-1)m} = 2^m \cdot 2^{2^{k-1}(n-1)m} = 2^{m+2^{k-1}(n-1)m} \leq 2^{2^{n-1}m} = 2_k^{nm},$$

as needed. \square

Lemma 22. *Given a bi-intuitionistic model $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ of finite depth n and finite $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ with $|\Sigma| = s$:*

$$|W/\sim_\Sigma| \leq 2_{n+2}^{2(n+1)s}.$$

Proof sketch. This is proven in some detail in for example [33], but we outline the main elements of the proof. Proceed by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ to show that there are at most $2_{n+2}^{2(n+1)s}$ Σ -bisimulation classes of points of depth n . Let $w \in W$. If w has depth 0, its bisimulation class is uniquely determined by the labels $\ell(v) \in 2^\Sigma \times 2^\Sigma$ of those v in the cluster of w (that is, the set of $v \in W$ such that $v \preceq w \preceq v$), and there are at most $2^{2s} = 2_1^{2s}$ choices for each label, so there are at most $2^{2^{2s}} = 2_2^{2s}$ choices for the entire cluster.

For the inductive step, let $\{[v_i] \mid i \in I\}$ enumerate the equivalence classes of the immediate successors of w . Note that each v_i has depth less than that of w , so that by the induction hypothesis, there are at most $2_{n+1}^{2n_s}$ choices for $[v_i]$, and the bisimulation class of w is determined by the labels of its cluster, for which there are $2^{2^{2s}}$ choices, and a possible choice of $\{[v_i] : i \in I\}$, of which there are at most $2^{2^{2n_s}}$ choices. Hence there are at most

$$2^{2^{2s}} \cdot 2_{n+1}^{2^{2n_s}} = 2^{2^{2s} + 2^{2n_s}} \leq 2^{2^{2(n+1)s}} = 2_{n+2}^{2(n+1)s}$$

choices for the bisimulation class of w . \square

The following lemma is proven analogously to Lemma 22. A bi-intuitionistic model $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ is **forest-like** if for every $w \in W$, the set $\{v \in W \mid v \preceq w\}$ is totally ordered by \preceq .

Lemma 23. *Given a forest-like bi-intuitionistic model $\mathcal{M} = (W, W^\perp, \preceq, \sqsubseteq, V)$ of finite depth n and finite $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ with $|\Sigma| = s$, we have $|W/\approx_\Sigma| \leq 2_{n+2}^{2(n+1)s}$.*

Remark 2. *Note that the forest-like assumption in Lemma 23 is needed, as in general there may be infinitely many \approx_Σ equivalence classes of points if this assumption fails. In a model consisting of an infinite sequence*

$$w_0 \succ v_0 \prec w_1 \succ v_1 \prec w_2 \succ \dots$$

where p is true only on w_0 , no two points are strongly $\sim_{\{p\}}$ -bisimilar.

We conclude this section by showing that the shallow frame property implies the finite model property for the two logics we are interested in.

Proposition 4. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$.*

1. *If φ is falsifiable (respectively satisfiable) on a shallow CS4 frame, then φ is falsifiable (respectively satisfiable) on a finite CS4 frame.*

2. If φ is falsifiable (respectively satisfiable) on a shallow, forest-like S4I frame, then φ is falsifiable (respectively satisfiable) on a finite S4I frame.

Proof.

1 Let \mathcal{M} be a model based on a shallow CS4 frame that falsifies (respectively satisfies) φ . Define Σ to be the set of subformulas of φ . Then \mathcal{M}/\sim_Σ is finite by Lemma 22, is based on a CS4 frame by Lemma 15, and falsifies (respectively satisfies) φ by Lemma 16.

2 Let \mathcal{M} be a model based on a shallow forest-like S4I frame that falsifies (respectively satisfies) φ . Define Σ to be the set of subformulas of φ . By Lemma 18 we see that $\mathcal{M}/\approx_\Sigma$ is forth-down confluent. Reasoning as before, with Lemma 23 in place of Lemma 22, the structure $\mathcal{M}/\approx_\Sigma$ is a finite model based on an S4I frame and falsifies (respectively satisfies) φ . \square

Thus in order to prove the finite frame property for these logics, it suffices to show that they have the shallow frame property (with respect to the intended class of frames): that any non-valid formula is falsifiable on a shallow frame (of the appropriate type). This is the strategy that we will employ in the sequel.

Note that we can, in an identical manner, prove versions of Proposition 4(1) for IS4 and GS4 and a version of Proposition 4(2) for GS4^c, but we do not need these results here.

5.5 The finite frame property for CS4

In view of Proposition 4(1), in order to prove the finite frame property for CS4, it suffices to prove the shallow frame property. To this end we define a shallow model, $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}}$. In this subsection, the notation W_c, \preceq_c , etc. will refer to the canonical model $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}}$ for CS4 (see Section 4.3).

Definition 18. Given $\Gamma, \Delta \in W_c$, define $\Gamma \preceq_\Sigma \Delta$ if $\Gamma \preceq_c \Delta$ and either $\Gamma^+ = \Delta^+$ or there exists $\chi \in \Sigma$ such that $\chi \in \Delta^+ \setminus \Gamma^+$. We then define $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}} = (W_c, \preceq_\Sigma, \sqsubseteq_c, V_c)$.

Thus $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}}$ is almost identical to $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}}$, but we have modified the intuitionistic accessibility relation. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}}$ is a bi-intuitionistic model.

Lemma 24. For all $\Gamma \in W_c$ and $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \Sigma$ we have that $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \Gamma^+$ if and only if for all $\Delta \succ_\Sigma \Gamma$, $\varphi \in \Delta^+$ implies $\psi \in \Delta^+$.

Proof. From left to right, let us take $\Gamma \in W_c$ such that $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \Gamma^+$. Take any $\Delta \in W_c$ such that $\Gamma \preceq_\Sigma \Delta$. By definition, $\Gamma^+ \subseteq \Delta^+$ so $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \Delta^+$. If $\varphi \in \Delta^+$, it follows that $\psi \in \Delta^+$.

Conversely, assume towards a contradiction that $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \notin \Gamma^+$. Therefore, there exists $\Delta \succ_c \Gamma$ such that $\varphi \in \Delta^+$ and $\psi \notin \Delta^+$: 1. If $\Delta^+ \cap \Sigma = \Gamma^+ \cap \Sigma$

then we already have $\varphi \in \Gamma^+$ and $\psi \notin \Gamma^+$, and $\Gamma \preceq_\Sigma \Gamma$, as needed. 2. If $\Delta^+ \cap \Sigma \neq \Gamma^+ \cap \Sigma$, since $\Delta \succ_c \Gamma$, we conclude that $\Delta \succ_\Sigma \Gamma$. \square

Lemma 25. *Any \prec_Σ -chain has length at most $|\Sigma| + 1$.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma_0 \prec_\Sigma \Gamma_1 \prec_\Sigma \dots \prec_\Sigma \Gamma_n$ be any chain. For each $i < n$ there is $\varphi_i \in \Sigma$ such that $\varphi_i \in \Gamma_{i+1}^+ \setminus \Gamma_i^+$. Note that if $i < j < n$ then $\varphi_i \neq \varphi_j$, since by monotonicity $\varphi_i \in \Gamma_{i+1}^+$ implies that $\varphi_i \in \Gamma_j^+$. Hence $n \leq |\Sigma|$, so the length of the chain is at most $|\Sigma| + 1$. \square

Lemma 26. *The model $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}}$ is back-up confluent.*

Proof. If $\Phi \sqsubseteq_c \Psi \preceq_\Sigma \Theta$ then also $\Psi \preceq_c \Theta$, so that setting $\Upsilon := (\Phi^+; \emptyset)$, Proposition 10 yields $\Phi \preceq_c \Upsilon \sqsubseteq_c \Theta$, and clearly we also have $\Phi \preceq_\Sigma \Upsilon$, providing the required witness. \square

Lemma 27. *The following items hold.*

- If $\diamond\varphi \in \Sigma$ and $\Gamma \in W_c$ then $\diamond\varphi \in \Gamma^+$ if and only if for all $\Psi \succ_\Sigma \Gamma$ there is Δ such that $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$ and $\varphi \in \Delta^+$.
- If $\Box\varphi \in \Sigma$ and $\Gamma \in W_c$ then $\Box\varphi \in \Gamma^+$ if and only if for all Ψ and Δ such that $\Gamma \preceq_\Sigma \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$, $\varphi \in \Delta^+$.

Proof. For the first item, suppose that $\diamond\varphi \in \Sigma$ and $\Gamma \in W_c$ is such that $\diamond\varphi \in \Gamma^+$. Let $\Psi \succ_\Sigma \Gamma$. It follows that $\Psi \succ_c \Gamma$, so there is Δ such that $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$ and $\varphi \in \Delta^+$, as needed. Conversely, assume that $\diamond\varphi \notin \Gamma^+$. Consider $\Psi := (\Gamma^+; \{\varphi\})$. Then $\Psi \succ_\Sigma \Gamma$, and if $\Delta \sqsubseteq_c \Psi$, it follows that $\varphi \notin \Delta^+$.

For the second item, from left to right assume that $\Box\varphi \in \Gamma^+$ and suppose that $\Gamma \preceq_\Sigma \Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$. It follows that $\Gamma \preceq_c \Psi$, so $\Gamma^+ \subseteq \Psi^+$, and hence $\Box\varphi \in \Psi^+$. Since $\Psi \sqsubseteq_c \Delta$, then $\varphi \in \Delta^+$. Conversely, assume that $\Box\varphi \notin \Gamma^+$. As in the proof of Lemma 11, if we define $\Psi := (\Gamma^+; \emptyset)$, there exists $\Delta \sqsubseteq_c \Psi$ such that $\varphi \notin \Delta^+$. From $\Gamma^+ = \Psi^+$, it is easy to conclude that $\Gamma \preceq_\Sigma \Psi$. \square

From Lemmas 24 and 27 we immediately obtain the following.

Lemma 28. *For all $\Gamma \in W_c$ and $\varphi \in \Sigma$, we have $(\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}}, \Gamma) \models \varphi$ if and only if $\varphi \in \Gamma^+$.*

Lemma 29. *For $\varphi \in \Sigma$, we have $\varphi \in \text{CS4}$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}} \models \varphi$.*

Proof. We know that $\varphi \in \text{CS4}$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{CS4}} \models \varphi$. So given $\Gamma \in W_c$, we know $\varphi \in \text{CS4}$ implies $\varphi \in \Gamma^+$, which then by Lemma 28 gives $(\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}}, \Gamma) \models \varphi$. Conversely, if $\varphi \notin \text{CS4}$ then there is $\Gamma \in W_c$ such that $\varphi \notin \Gamma^+$, which implies that $\varphi (\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}}, \Gamma) \not\models \varphi$. \square

Theorem 7. *CS4 has the finite frame property. That is, if a formula φ is falsifiable (respectively satisfiable) on a CS4 frame, then φ is falsifiable (respectively satisfiable) on a finite CS4 frame.*

Proof. In view of Theorem 4(1), it suffices to show that CS4 has the shallow frame property. Fix a formula φ and let Σ be the set of subformulas of φ . By Lemma 25 and Lemma 26, $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}}$ is a model based on a shallow CS4 frame, and by Lemma 29, $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{CS4}} \models \varphi$ if and only if $\varphi \in \text{CS4}$, as needed. \square

5.6 The finite frame property for S4I

Our aim is to prove that S4I has the shallow frame property, from where the finite frame property will follow. The construction we will use has certain elements in common with that for CS4, with the caveat that we need to ensure that our models are forest-like in order to apply Theorem 4(2). The following construction will ensure this. In this subsection, W_c, \preceq_c , etc. refer to the components of $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{S4I}}$ (see Section 4.2), and W_Σ, \preceq_Σ , etc. will refer to the respective components of the model $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{S4I}}$ to be constructed below.

Definition 19. For a set of formulas Σ closed under subformulas, define W_Σ to be the set of all tuples $\Gamma = (\Gamma_0, \dots, \Gamma_n)$, where

1. each $\Gamma_i \in W_c$,
2. $\Gamma_i \preceq_c \Gamma_{i+1}$ if $i < n$,
3. for each $i < n$ there is a formula $\varphi \in \Sigma$ such that $\varphi \in \Gamma_{i+1} \setminus \Gamma_i$.

We define V_Σ by $\Gamma \in V_\Sigma(p)$ if and only if $p \in \Gamma_n^+ \cap \Sigma$. Define $\Gamma \preceq_\Sigma \Delta$ if Γ is an initial sequence of Δ .

Lemma 30. The relation \preceq_Σ is a forest-like partial order on W_Σ and any strict \preceq_Σ -chain has length at most $|\Sigma| + 1$. Moreover, V_Σ is monotone.

Proof. That \preceq_Σ is a forest-like partial order is easily checked from the definitions, and the bound on chains follows from the same reasoning as for Lemma 25, using the observation that $\Gamma \preceq_\Sigma \Delta$ implies that $\ell^+(\Gamma) \subsetneq \ell^+(\Delta)$. The monotonicity of V_Σ follows from the elements of Γ being ordered by \preceq_c . \square

Lemma 31. For all $\Gamma \in W_\Sigma$ and $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \Sigma$ we have that $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \ell^+(\Gamma)$ if and only if for all $\Delta \succ_\Sigma \Gamma$ with $\varphi \in \ell^+(\Delta)$ we have $\psi \in \ell^+(\Delta)$.

Proof. First assume that $\Gamma = (\Gamma_0, \dots, \Gamma_n)$ is such that $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \ell^+(\Gamma)$ and let $\Delta = (\Delta_0, \dots, \Delta_m)$ be such that $\Gamma \preceq_\Sigma \Delta$. Then $m \geq n$ and $\Delta_n = \Gamma_n$, which by transitivity of \preceq_c implies that $\Gamma_n \preceq_c \Delta_m$. It follows that if $\varphi \in \ell^+(\Delta)$ then $\psi \in \ell^+(\Delta)$.

Conversely, suppose that $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \in \Sigma \setminus \ell^+(\Gamma)$. We may further assume, without loss of generality, that if $\varphi \in \ell^+(\Gamma)$ then $\psi \in \ell^+(\Gamma)$, for otherwise we may take $\Delta = \Gamma$. Then there is $\Delta_{n+1} \succ_c \Gamma_n$ such that $\varphi \in \Delta_{n+1}$ but $\psi \notin \Delta_{n+1}$. For $i \leq n$ set $\Delta_i = \Gamma_i$, and define $\Delta = (\Delta_i)_{i \leq n+1}$. It should then be clear that Δ has the desired properties. \square

The accessibility relation for S4I is a bit more involved than that for CS4.

Definition 20. For theories Φ, Ψ in W_c we define $\Phi \preceq_{\Sigma}^0 \Psi$ if $\Phi \preceq_c \Psi$ and $\Phi^+ \cap \Sigma = \Psi^+ \cap \Sigma$. We define $\Gamma \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^0 \Delta$ if there is Θ so that $\Gamma \sqsubseteq_c \Theta \succ_{\Sigma}^0 \Delta$.

We define, for $\Gamma = (\Gamma_0, \dots, \Gamma_n)$ and $\Delta = (\Delta_0, \dots, \Delta_m) \in W_{\Sigma}$, $\Gamma \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^1 \Delta$ if there is a non-decreasing sequence j_1, \dots, j_n with $j_n = m$ such that $\Gamma_i \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^0 \Delta_{j_i}$ for $i \leq n$. We define \sqsubseteq_{Σ} to be the transitive closure of \sqsubseteq_{Σ}^1 .

With this, we define $\mathcal{M}_{\Sigma}^{\text{S4I}} = (W_{\Sigma}, \preceq_{\Sigma}, \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}, V_{\Sigma})$. It is easy to check using the above lemmas that $\mathcal{M}_{\Sigma}^{\text{S4I}}$ is a bi-intuitionistic model. Next we show that it is indeed a model based on an S4I frame.

Lemma 32. *The relation \sqsubseteq_{Σ} is forth-up and forth-down confluent on S .*

Proof. As before, it suffices to show that \sqsubseteq_{Σ}^1 is forth-up and forth-down confluent. Suppose that $\Phi \preceq_{\Sigma} \Phi'$ and $\Phi \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^1 \Delta$ and write $\Phi' = (\Phi_i)_{i \leq m'}$, so that $\Phi = (\Phi_i)_{i \leq m}$ for some $m \leq m'$, and $\Delta = (\Delta_i)_{i \leq n}$. We construct $\Delta' = (\Delta_i)_{i \leq n'}$ for some $n' \geq n$ such that $\Phi' \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma} \Delta'$ and $\Delta \preceq_{\Sigma} \Delta'$. Given $k \in [m, m']$, we assume inductively that $(\Delta_i)_{i \leq r}$ have been built so that $(\Phi_i)_{i \leq k} \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma} (\Delta_i)_{i \leq r}$. The base case with $r = m$ is already given by the assumption that $\Phi \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma} \Delta$. For the inductive step, assume that $(\Phi_i)_{i \leq k} \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma} (\Delta_i)_{i \leq r}$. Then in particular, $\Phi_k \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^0 \Delta_r$. By the definition of \sqsubseteq_{Σ}^0 , there is $\Theta \in W_c$ so that $\Phi_k \sqsubseteq_c \Theta \succ_{\Sigma}^0 \Delta_r$. By forth-up confluence of $\mathcal{M}_c^{\text{S4I}}$, there is Υ such that $\Phi_{k+1} \sqsubseteq_c \Upsilon \succ_c \Theta$. If $\Delta_r^+ \cap \Sigma = \Upsilon^+ \cap \Sigma$, we observe that $\Delta_r \preceq_{\Sigma}^0 \Upsilon$. Hence $\Phi_{k+1} \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^0 \Delta_r$, so that $(\Phi_i)_{i \leq k+1} \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^1 (\Delta_i)_{i \leq r}$. In this case, we may simply set $r' = r$. Otherwise, we set $r' = r + 1$ and $\Delta_{r+1} = \Upsilon$. In this case, we also have that $(\Phi_i)_{i \leq k} \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^1 (\Delta_i)_{i \leq r}$. \square

Lemma 33. *Let $\Gamma \in W_{\Sigma}$.*

1. *If $\diamond\varphi \in \Sigma$ then $\diamond\varphi \in \ell^+(\Gamma)$ if and only if there is $\Delta \sqsupseteq_{\Sigma} \Gamma$ such that $\varphi \in \ell^+(\Delta)$.*
2. *If $\square\varphi \in \Sigma$ then $\square\varphi \in \ell^+(\Gamma)$ if and only if for every $\Delta \sqsupseteq_{\Sigma} \Gamma$, $\varphi \in \ell^+(\Delta)$.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma = (\Gamma_i)_{i \leq n}$. For the first claim, we first prove the easier right-to-left direction. Suppose that $\Delta = (\Delta_i)_{i \leq m} \sqsupseteq_{\Sigma}^1 \Gamma$ is such that $\varphi \in \ell^+(\Delta)$, meaning that $\varphi \in \Delta_m^+$. Then $\Gamma_n \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^0 \Delta_m$, which means that for some $\Theta, \Gamma_n \sqsubseteq_c \Theta \succ_{\Sigma}^0 \Delta_m$. Then $\varphi \in \Theta^+$; hence $\diamond\varphi \in \Gamma_n^+ = \ell^+(\Gamma)$ by the truth lemma. If instead $\Delta \sqsupseteq_{\Sigma} \Gamma$, then there is a sequence

$$\Gamma = \Upsilon_0 \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^1 \Upsilon_1 \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^1 \dots \sqsubseteq_{\Sigma}^1 \Upsilon_n = \Delta,$$

and back-up induction on i shows that $\diamond\varphi \in \ell^+(\Upsilon_i)$, so that in particular $\diamond\varphi \in \ell^+(\Gamma)$.

For the left-to-right direction, suppose that $\diamond\varphi \in \ell^+(\Gamma)$. By back-up induction on $k \leq n$ we prove that there exists some sequence $(\Theta_i)_{i=k}^n$ such that $\Gamma_i \sqsubseteq_c \Theta_i$ for each $i \in [k, n]$ and $\Theta_i \preceq_c \Theta_{i+1}$ if $i \in [k, n)$ (interval notation should be interpreted over the natural numbers). In the base case $k = n$ and, by the truth lemma, there is $\Theta_n \sqsupseteq_c \Gamma_n$ such that $\varphi \in \Theta_n$. So, suppose that $(\Theta_i)_{i=k+1}^n$ has been constructed with the desired properties. Since the canonical model is

forth-down confluent, there is some Θ_k such that $\Gamma_k \sqsubseteq_c \Theta_k \preceq_c \Theta_{k+1}$, yielding the desired Θ_k .

The problem is that the sequence $\Theta = (\Theta_i)_{i \leq n}$ may not be an element of W_Σ . We instead choose a suitable subsequence $\Delta = (\Theta_{j_i})_{i \leq m}$, where j_k is defined by (forward) induction on k . For the base case, we set $j_0 = 0$, and $m_0 = 0$ (meaning that Δ currently has $m_0 + 1$ elements). Now, suppose that m_k has been defined as has been j_i for $i \leq m_k$, in such a way that $(\Theta_{j_i})_{i \leq m_k} \in W_\Sigma$ and $(\Gamma_i)_{i \leq k} \sqsubseteq_\Sigma (\Theta_{j_i})_{i \leq m_k}$. To define $m_{k+1} \geq m_k$ and $(\Theta_{j_i})_{i \leq m_{k+1}}$, we consider two cases. First assume that there is $\psi \in \Sigma$ such that $\psi \in \Theta_{k+1} \setminus \Theta_{j_k}$. In this case, setting $m_{k+1} = m_k + 1$ and $j_{m_{k+1}} = k + 1$ we see that $(\Theta_{j_i})_{i \leq m_{k+1}}$ has all desired properties. In particular, the existence of the formula ψ guarantees that $(\Theta_{j_i})_{i \leq m_{k+1}} \in W_\Sigma$. Otherwise, set $m_{k+1} = m_k$. In this case we see that $\Gamma_{k+1} \sqsubseteq_c \Theta_{k+1} \not\preceq_\Sigma^0 \Theta_{j_{m_k}}$, so that $\Gamma_{k+1} \sqsubseteq_\Sigma^0 \Theta_{j_{m_k}}$ and thus $(\Gamma_i)_{i \leq k+1} \sqsubseteq_\Sigma (\Theta_{j_i})_{i \leq m_{k+1}}$. That $(\Theta_{j_i})_{i \leq m_{k+1}} \in W_\Sigma$ follows from the fact that $m_{k+1} = m_k$ and the induction hypothesis. The claim then follows by setting $m = m_n$ and $\Delta = (\Theta_{j_i})_{i \leq m}$.

The second claim is proven similarly, but by contraposition. We leave the details to the reader. \square

From Lemmas 31 and 33 we immediately obtain the following.

Lemma 34. *For $\Gamma \in W_\Sigma$ and $\varphi \in \Sigma$, we have $(\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{S4I}}, \Gamma) \models \varphi$ if and only if $\varphi \in \ell^+(\Gamma)$.*

Lemma 35. *For $\varphi \in \Sigma$, we have $\varphi \in \text{S4I}$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{S4I}} \models \varphi$.*

Proof. We know that $\varphi \in \text{S4I}$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}^{\text{S4I}} \models \varphi$. Now, given $\Gamma \in W_\Sigma$, we have $\ell^+(\Gamma) = \Theta \cap \Sigma$, for some prime set Θ containing all derivable formulas, so $\varphi \in \ell^+(\Gamma)$. Lemma 34 yields that $\varphi \in \text{S4I}$ implies $(\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{S4I}}, \Gamma) \models \varphi$. Conversely, if $\varphi \notin \text{S4I}$ then there is $\Gamma \in W_c$ such that $\varphi \notin \Gamma$, which setting $\Gamma' = (\Gamma)$ to be a singleton sequence yields $(\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{S4I}}, \Gamma') \not\models \varphi$. \square

Theorem 8. *S4I has the finite frame property. That is, if a formula φ is falsifiable (respectively satisfiable) on a S4I frame, then φ is falsifiable (respectively satisfiable) on a finite S4I frame. Hence S4I is decidable.*

Proof. In view of Theorem 4(2), it suffices to show that S4I has the shallow, forest-like model property. Fix a formula φ and let Σ be the set of subformulas of φ . By Lemmas 30 and 32, $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{S4I}}$ is a model based on a shallow, forest-like S4I frame, and by Lemma 35, $\mathcal{M}_\Sigma^{\text{S4I}} \models \varphi$ if and only if $\varphi \in \text{S4I}$, as needed. \square

6 Concluding remarks

We have settled the long-standing problems of the finite frame property for CS4 and the decidability of GS4 and GS4^c. We also introduced a logic closely related to IS4 that also enjoys the finite frame property. The logics we considered correspond to classes of models with combinations of the forth-up, back-up

and forth–down confluence properties. There are a handful of other logics that may be defined in this fashion.

The forth–up confluence property alone is the basis of what we call \diamond -regular logics. We have not provided an axiomatisation for the logic of reflexive transitive \diamond -regular frames, as our completeness proofs rely on either Axiom **FS2** or Axiom **CD** being available. Note that this class does not validate $\Box p \rightarrow \Box \Box p$. First results on logics of frames satisfying only forth–up confluence were recently presented in [34], where the **K** version was axiomatised and shown to be decidable.

Similarly, we may consider the class of forth–down confluent frames. While Axiom **CD** holds on frames that are forth–up *and* forth–down confluent, it is unclear how the class of forth–down confluence frames may be axiomatised. On the other hand, it seems that the shallow model construction we have provided for **S4I** should readily adapt to frames satisfying only the forth–up or the forth–down confluence property, so all that is needed for finite frame property results in these settings is to find the respective axiomatisations.

In total, there are eight logics that could be obtained from combinations of the three confluence frame conditions, and eight more for their upward-linear variants. The study of logics of frames satisfying both forth–up and forth–down confluence [35] has recently been initiated (in the enriched *bi*-intuitionistic modal language), although the decidability results in this paper are not obtained via shallow model properties.

Finally, we mention that Gödel modal logics are of independent interest (see for example [15, 20]), with the Gödel variants of the modal logics **K** and **S5** enjoying the finite model property [21]. However, the decidability of **GS4** and **GS4^c** remained challenging problems, since these logics do not enjoy a finite model property for real-valued semantics. We have shown how birelational semantics do not have this issue, and indeed the logics enjoy the finite frame property for this semantics, and hence are decidable. We believe that this work could lead to a systematic treatment of other prominent Gödel modal logics whose decidability was previously unknown, by first providing them with a birelational interpretation and then establishing the finite frame property under this semantics.

An interesting question left open is that of the complexity of the two logics **GS4** and **GS4^c**. The exponential bound on the size of models yields a **NEXPTIME** upper bound on complexity, but it is possible that validity is in fact **PSPACE**-complete since this is the case of Gödel linear temporal logic, which is defined by similar frame conditions [23].

Acknowledgments

David Fernández-Duque and Brett McLean were partially funded by the SNSF-FWO Lead Agency Grant 200021L_196176 (SNSF)/G0E2121N (FWO).

Martin Diéguez was partially funded by the research project Amorceage /EL4HC of the program RFI Atlanstic 2020.

References

- [1] Rowan Davies and Frank Pfenning. A modal analysis of staged computation. *J. ACM*, 48(3):555–604, may 2001.
- [2] Vikraman Choudhury and Neel Krishnaswami. Recovering purity with comonads and capabilities. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 4(ICFP):1–28, 2020.
- [3] Kenji Miyamoto and Atsushi Igarashi. A modal foundation for secure information flow. In *Workshop on Foundations of Computer Security*, pages 187–203, 2004.
- [4] Valentijn Anton Johan Borghuis. *Coming to terms with modal logic: on the interpretation of modalities in typed lambda-calculus*. PhD thesis, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, 1994.
- [5] Simone Martini and Andrea Masini. *A Computational Interpretation of Modal Proofs*, pages 213–241. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1996.
- [6] Fitch R.B. *Symbolic logic: an introduction*. Ronald Press, 1952.
- [7] Ranald Clouston. Fitch-style modal lambda calculi. In Christel Baier and Ugo Dal Lago, editors, *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*, pages 258–275, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing.
- [8] Frederic B Fitch. Intuitionistic modal logic with quantifiers. *Portugaliae mathematica*, 7(2):113–118, 1948.
- [9] Duminda Wijesekera. Constructive modal logics I. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 50(3):271–301, 1990.
- [10] A. Simpson. *The proof theory and semantics of intuitionistic modal logic*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK, 1994.
- [11] Natasha Alechina, Michael Mendler, Valeria de Paiva, and Eike Ritter. Categorical and Kripke semantics for constructive S4 modal logic. In *Proceedings of 15th International Workshop on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2001), 10th Annual Conference of the EACSL, Paris, France*, volume 2142 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 292–307. Springer, 2001.
- [12] Marianna Girlando, Roman Kuznets, Sonia Marin, Marianela Morales, and Lutz Straßburger. Intuitionistic S4 is decidable. In *LICS*, pages 1–13, 2023.
- [13] F. Wolter and M. Zakharyashev. The relation between intuitionistic and classical modal logics. *Algebra and Logic*, 36(2):73–92, Mar 1997.
- [14] Frank Wolter and Michael Zakharyashev. Intuitionistic modal logic. In *Logic and Foundations of Mathematics: Selected Contributed Papers of the 10th International Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science, Florence, Italy*, pages 227–238. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 1999.

- [15] X. Caicedo and R. Rodríguez. Standard Gödel modal logics. *Studia Logica*, 94:189–214, 2010.
- [16] K. Gödel. Zum intuitionistischen aussagenkalkül. *Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, 69:65–66, 1932.
- [17] A. Heyting. Die formalen Regeln der intuitionistischen Logik. In *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, page 42–56. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1930. Reprint in *Logik-Texte: Kommentierte Auswahl zur Geschichte der Modernen Logik*, Akademie-Verlag, 1986.
- [18] Gisèle Fischer Servi. On modal logic with an intuitionistic base. *Studia Logica*, 36(3):141–149, 1977.
- [19] George Metcalfe and Nicola Olivetti. Towards a proof theory of Gödel modal logics. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 7(2), 2011.
- [20] George Metcalfe and Nicola Olivetti. Proof systems for a Gödel modal logic. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods (TABLEAUX 2009), Oslo, Norway*, volume 5607 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 265–279. Springer, 2009.
- [21] Xavier Caicedo, George Metcalfe, Ricardo Oscar Rodríguez, and Jonas Rogger. A finite model property for Gödel modal logics. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Workshop on Logic, Language, Information, and Computation (WoLLIC 2013), Darmstadt, Germany*, volume 8071 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 226–237. Springer, 2013.
- [22] Petr Hájek. *Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 1998.
- [23] Juan P. Aguilera, Martín Diéguez, David Fernández-Duque, and Brett McLean. Time and Gödel: Fuzzy temporal reasoning in PSPACE. In *Proceedings of the 28th Workshop on Logic, Language, Information and Computation - 28th International Conference (WoLLIC 2022), Icsí, Romania*, pages 18–35, 2022.
- [24] Juan P. Aguilera, Martín Diéguez, David Fernández-Duque, and Brett McLean. A Gödel calculus for linear temporal logic. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning - 19th International Conference (KR 2022), Haifa, Israel*, pages 2–11. IJCAI, 2022.
- [25] Xavier Caicedo and Ricardo Oscar Rodríguez. Bi-modal Gödel logic over $[0, 1]$ -valued Kripke frames. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 25(1):37–55, 2015.

- [26] Ricardo Oscar Rodríguez and Amanda Vidal. Axiomatization of crisp Gödel modal logic. *Studia Logica*, 109(2):367–395, 2021.
- [27] Lutz Schröder and Dirk Pattinson. Shallow models for non-iterative modal logics. In *KI 2008: Advances in Artificial Intelligence, 31st Annual German Conference on AI, Kaiserslautern, Germany*, pages 324–331, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer.
- [28] Philippe Balbiani, Martín Diéguez, and David Fernández-Duque. Some constructive variants of S4 with the finite model property. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, (LICS 2021)*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2021.
- [29] Martín Diéguez and David Fernández-Duque. Decidability for S4 Gödel modal logics. In María Eugenia Cornejo, István Á. Harmati, László T. Kóczy, and Jesús Medina-Moreno, editors, *Computational Intelligence and Mathematics for Tackling Complex Problems 4*, pages 1–7. Springer International Publishing, 2023.
- [30] Gisèle Fischer Servi. Axiomatizations for some intuitionistic modal logics. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico Università e Politecnico di Torino*, 42(3):179–194, 1984.
- [31] Ryuta Arisaka, Anupam Das, and Lutz Straßburger. On nested sequents for constructive modal logics. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 11(3), 2015.
- [32] D. Gabelaia, A. Kurucz, F. Wolter, and M. Zakharyashev. Non-primitive recursive decidability of products of modal logics with expanding domains. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 142(1-3):245–268, 2006.
- [33] P. Balbiani, J. Boudou, M. Diéguez, and D. Fernández-Duque. Intuitionistic linear temporal logics. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 21(2):14:1–14:32, 2020.
- [34] Philippe Balbiani, Han Gao, Çigdem Gencer, and Nicola Olivetti. A natural intuitionistic modal logic: Axiomatization and bi-nested calculus. *CoRR*, abs/2309.06309, 2023.
- [35] David Fernández-Duque, Brett McLean, and Lukas Zenger. A Family of Decidable Bi-intuitionistic Modal Logics. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, pages 262–271, 8 2023.