

MODELS FOR COMMON KNOWLEDGE LOGIC

YOSHIHITO TANAKA

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we discuss models of the common knowledge logic. The common knowledge logic is a multi-modal logic that includes the modal operators K_i ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), E , and C . The intended meanings of $K_i\phi$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), $E\phi$, and $C\phi$ are “the agent i knows ϕ ” ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), “everyone in \mathcal{I} knows ϕ ”, and “ ϕ is common knowledge among \mathcal{I} ”, respectively. Then, the models of these formulas satisfy the following conditions: $E\phi$ is true if and only if $K_i\phi$ is true for every $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and $C\phi$ is true if and only if all of ϕ , $E\phi$, $E^2\phi$, $E^3\phi, \dots$ are true. A suitable Kripke frame for this is $\langle W, R_{K_i} (i \in \mathcal{I}), R_C \rangle$, where R_C is the reflexive and transitive closure of R_E . We refer to such Kripke frames as CKL-frames. Additionally, an algebra suitable for this is a modal algebra with modal operators K_i ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), E , and C , which satisfies $E x = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} K_i x$, $C x \leq E C x$, and $C x$ is the greatest lower bound of the set $\{E^n x \mid n \in \omega\}$. We refer to such algebras as CKL-algebras. In this paper, we show that the class of CKL-frames is modally definable, but the class of CKL-algebras is not, which means that the class of CKL-algebras is not a variety.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we discuss models of the common knowledge logic. The common knowledge logic is a multi-modal logic that includes the modal operators K_i ($i \in \mathcal{I}$, where \mathcal{I} is a finite set of agents), E , and C . The intended meanings of $K_i\phi$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), $E\phi$, and $C\phi$ are “the agent i knows ϕ ” ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), “everyone in \mathcal{I} knows ϕ ”, and “ ϕ is common knowledge among \mathcal{I} ”, respectively. Then, the models of these formulas satisfy the following conditions: $E\phi$ is true if and only if $K_i\phi$ is true for every $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and $C\phi$ is true if and only if all of ϕ , $E\phi$, $E^2\phi$, $E^3\phi, \dots$ are true (see, e.g., [9, 8, 7])¹. A suitable Kripke frame for this is $\langle W, R_{K_i} (i \in \mathcal{I}), R_C \rangle$, where R_C is the reflexive and transitive closure of R_E . We refer to such Kripke frames as CKL-frames. Additionally, an algebra suitable for this is a modal algebra with modal operators K_i ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), E , and C , which satisfies $E x = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} K_i x$, $C x \leq E C x$, and $C x$ is the greatest lower bound of the set $\{E^n x \mid n \in \omega\}$. We refer to such algebras as CKL-algebras. In this paper, we show that the class of CKL-frames is modally definable, but the class of CKL-algebras is not, which means that the class of CKL-algebras is not a variety.

We use the proof systems \mathbf{PS}_{MH} , originally introduced by Meyer and van der Hoek [8], and \mathbf{PS}_ω , originally introduced by Kaneko-Nagashima-Suzuki-Tanaka [7], to discuss proof theoretic properties of common knowledge logic. The system \mathbf{PS}_{MH} includes the following three axiom schemas for the common knowledge operator:

$$(1.1) \quad C\phi \supset \phi, \quad C\phi \supset EC\phi, \quad C(\phi \supset E\phi) \supset (\phi \supset C\phi).$$

The system \mathbf{PS}_ω includes the first two axiom schemas of (1.1) and the following ω -rule:

$$\frac{\gamma \supset \Box_1(\phi_1 \supset \Box_2(\phi_2 \supset \dots \supset \Box_k(\phi_k \supset E^n\phi) \dots)) \quad (n \in \omega)}{\gamma \supset \Box_1(\phi_1 \supset \Box_2(\phi_2 \supset \dots \supset \Box_k(\phi_k \supset C\phi) \dots))}.$$

¹Some studies define that $C\phi$ is true if and only if all of $E\phi$, $E^2\phi$, $E^3\phi, \dots$ are true (see, e.g., [4, 2]). However, our research can be easily modified to apply in such cases, as well.

It is shown in [8] and [7] that \mathbf{PS}_{MH} and \mathbf{PS}_ω are sound and complete with respect to the class of CKL-frames, respectively. Then, it follows immediately that the both systems are sound and complete with respect to the class of CKL-algebras. We write \mathbf{CKL} for the set of formulas which are derivable in \mathbf{PS}_{MH} and \mathbf{PS}_ω . For the knowledge operators K_i ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), we only assume the conditions for the normal modal logic \mathbf{K} . However, the results of the paper hold for models for \mathbf{K} , \mathbf{D} , \mathbf{T} , $\mathbf{4}$ and their combinations.

Then, we prove that the class of CKL-frames is modally definable, that is, there exists a set S of formulas of common knowledge logic such that the class of CKL-frames is the class of Kripke frames in which S is valid. We show that the class of CKL-frames is the class of Kripke frames in which \mathbf{CKL} is valid. On the other hand, we show that the class of CKL-algebras is not modally definable. Therefore, the class of modal algebras in which \mathbf{CKL} is valid is not the class of CKL-algebras. We introduce the notion of MH-algebras, an algebraic counterpart of the system \mathbf{PS}_{MH} . Then, it is shown that the class of modal algebras defined by \mathbf{CKL} is the class of MH-algebras and that the class of CKL-algebras is a proper subclass of the class of MH-algebras. As a corollary it follows that the class of CKL-algebras is not a variety. We also show that the free MH-algebras are CKL-algebras.

In the last part of the paper, we discuss infinitary common knowledge logic. Infinitary common knowledge logic is introduced by Kaneko-Nagashima in [5, 6] to provide a mathematical logic framework for investigations of game theoretical problems. Then, it is shown by Kaneko-Nagashima-Suzuki-Tanaka [7] that the infinitary extension of \mathbf{PS}_ω is sound and complete with respect to the class of CKL-frames. We show that the infinitary extension of \mathbf{PS}_{MH} is also sound and complete with respect to the class of CKL-frames.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall basic definitions and fix notation. In Section 3, we give definitions of the systems \mathbf{PS}_{MH} and \mathbf{PS}_ω , introduced by Meyer and van der Hoek [8] and Kaneko-Nagashima-Suzuki-Tanaka [7], respectively. In Section 4, we show that the class of CKL-frames is modally defined, while the class CKL-algebras is not. In Section 5, we discuss infinitary common knowledge logic.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we recall basic definitions and fix notation. Throughout the paper, we write \mathcal{I} for a non-empty finite set of agents.

The language for common knowledge logic consists of the following symbols:

- (1) a countable set Prop of propositional variables;
- (2) \top and \perp ;
- (3) logical connectives: \wedge , \neg ;
- (4) modal operators K_i ($i \in \mathcal{I}$) and C .

The set Φ_{CKL} of formulas are defined in the usual way. We write $\phi \vee \psi$, $\phi \supset \psi$, $\phi \equiv \psi$ and $E\phi$ to abbreviate $\neg(\phi \wedge \psi)$, $\neg\phi \vee \psi$, $(\phi \supset \psi) \wedge (\psi \supset \phi)$ and $\bigwedge_{i \in \mathcal{I}} K_i \phi$, respectively. For each $n \in \omega$ we define $E^n \phi$ by $E^0 \phi = \phi$ and $E^{n+1} \phi = E(E^n \phi)$.

Throughout this paper, we consider multi-modal algebras with modal operators K_i ($i \in \mathcal{I}$) and C as algebraic models for common knowledge logic, and we refer to such multi-modal algebras simply as modal algebras.

Definition 2.1. *An algebra $\langle A, \sqcup, \sqcap, -, K_i$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), $C, 0, 1, \rangle$ is called a modal algebra if $\langle A, \sqcup, \sqcap, -, 0, 1, \rangle$ is a Boolean algebra and $\sqcap 1 = 1$ and $\sqcap(x \sqcap y) = \sqcap x \sqcap \sqcap y$ hold for each modal operator \sqcap and each x and y in A . For each x in A , we write $E x$ to abbreviate $\bigwedge_{i \in \mathcal{I}} K_i x$, and for each x and y in A , we write $x \rightarrow y$ for $\neg x \sqcup y$. A modal algebra A is said to be complete, if for any subset $S \subseteq A$, the*

least upper bound $\bigsqcup S$ and the greatest lower bound $\bigsqcap S$ exist in A , and said to be multiplicative, if for any subset $S \subseteq A$,

$$(2.1) \quad \square \bigsqcap S = \bigsqcap_{s \in S} \square s$$

holds for any modal operator \square . A modal algebra A is said to be ω -complete, if $\bigsqcup S$ and $\bigsqcap S$ exist in A for any countable subset $S \subseteq A$ and said to be ω -multiplicative, if (2.1) holds for any countable subset $S \subseteq A$. A modal algebra is called a CKL-algebra, if the following hold for each $x \in A$:

- (1) $Cx \leq ECx$;
- (2) Cx is the greatest lower bound of the set $\{E^n x \mid n \in \omega\}$.

We write \mathbf{A}_{CKL} for the class of all CKL-algebras.

Definition 2.2. An algebraic model is a pair $\langle A, v \rangle$, where A is a modal algebra and v is a mapping, which is called a valuation in A , from the set \mathbf{Prop} of propositional variables to A . For each valuation v in A , the domain \mathbf{Prop} is extended to Φ_{CKL} in the following way:

- (1) $v(\top) = 1, v(\perp) = 0$;
- (2) $v(\phi \wedge \psi) = v(\phi) \sqcap v(\psi)$;
- (3) $v(\neg\phi) = -v(\phi)$;
- (4) $v(K_i\phi) = K_i v(\phi)$ ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), $v(C\phi) = C v(\phi)$.

In this paper, we assume a Kripke frame is equipped with relations R_{K_i} ($i \in \mathcal{I}$), R_C , unless otherwise noted.

Definition 2.3. A Kripke frame is a structure $\langle W, R_{K_i} (i \in \mathcal{I}), R_C \rangle$, where W is a non-empty set and R_{K_i} ($i \in \mathcal{I}$) and R_C are binary relations on W . A Kripke frame is called a CKL-frame, if R_C is the reflexive and transitive closure of R_E , where $R_E = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_{K_i}$. We write $\mathbf{Frm}_{\text{CKL}}$ for the class of all CKL-frames.

Definition 2.4. A Kripke model is a pair $\langle F, v \rangle$, where $F = \langle W, \{R_{K_i}\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}, R_C \rangle$ is a CKL-frame and v is a mapping, which is called a valuation in F , from the set \mathbf{Prop} of propositional variables to $\mathcal{P}(W)$. For each valuation v in F , the domain \mathbf{Prop} is extended to Φ_{CKL} in the following way:

- (1) $v(\top) = W, v(\perp) = \emptyset$;
- (2) $v(\phi \wedge \psi) = v(\phi) \cap v(\psi)$;
- (3) $v(\neg\phi) = W \setminus v(\phi)$;
- (4) $v(\square\phi) = \{w \in W \mid \forall v \in W ((w, v) \in R_{\square} \Rightarrow v \in v(\phi))\}$. for each modal operator \square .

Definition 2.5. Let A be a modal algebra. A formula ϕ is said to be valid in A ($A \models \phi$, in symbol), if $v(\phi) = 1$ for any valuation v in A . Let C be a class of modal algebras. A formula ϕ is said to be valid in C if $A \models \phi$ for every $A \in C$. A set Γ of formulas is said to be valid in C ($C \models \Gamma$, in symbol), if $C \models \gamma$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$. The corresponding relations between Kripke frames and formulas are defined in the same way.

Definition 2.6. Let Γ be a set of formulas. We write $\mathbf{Alg}(\Gamma)$ (resp. $\mathbf{Frm}(\Gamma)$) for the class of modal algebras (resp. Kripke frames) in which Γ is valid. Let C be a class of modal algebras or a class of Kripke frames. We write $\mathbf{For}(C)$ for set of formulas which are valid in C .

Let $F = \langle W, R_{K_i} (i \in \mathcal{I}), R_C, \rangle$ be a Kripke frame. It is well-known that

$$F^+ = \langle \mathcal{P}(W), \cup, \cap, W \setminus, \square_{R_{K_i}} (i \in \mathcal{I}), \square_{R_C}, \emptyset, W \rangle$$

is a complete and completely multiplicative modal algebra, where

$$\Box_R S = \{w \in W \mid \forall v \in W((w, v) \in R) \Rightarrow v \in S\}$$

for each binary relation R in F , and $F \models \phi$ if and only if $F^+ \models \phi$, for any formula ϕ ([13], see also [1]). It is easy to see that the following theorem holds:

Theorem 2.7. *Let F be a Kripke frame. Then, F is a CKL-frame, if and only if F^+ is a CKL-algebra.*

3. PROOF SYSTEMS FOR COMMON KNOWLEDGE LOGIC

In this section, we define two equivalent proof systems \mathbf{PS}_{MH} and \mathbf{PS}_ω for common knowledge logic, initially introduced by Meyer and van der Hoek [8] and Kaneko-Nagashima-Suzuki-Tanaka [7], respectively.

We first define the system \mathbf{PS}_{MH} which is originally given by Meyer and van der Hoek (the system $\mathbf{KEC}_{(m)}$ of [8], where m is the number of the knowledge operators K_1, \dots, K_m).

Definition 3.1. *The proof system \mathbf{PS}_{MH} for common knowledge logic consists of the following axiom schemas (1)-(5) and inference rules (6)-(8):*

- (1) *all tautologies;*
- (2) $\Box(\phi \supset \psi) \supset (\Box\phi \supset \Box\psi)$, *for each modal operator \Box ;*
- (3) $\mathbf{C}\phi \supset \phi$;
- (4) $\mathbf{C}\phi \supset \mathbf{E}\mathbf{C}\phi$;
- (5) $\mathbf{C}(\phi \supset \mathbf{E}\phi) \supset (\phi \supset \mathbf{C}\phi)$;
- (6) *modus ponens;*
- (7) *uniform substitution rule;*
- (8) *necessitation rule for each modal operator.*

Next, we define the system \mathbf{PS}_ω , which includes an ω -rule. It is originally introduced by Kaneko-Nagashima-Suzuki-Tanaka (the system CY in [7]), and is a Hilbert-style translation of the sequent system CK given in [11].

Definition 3.2. *The proof system \mathbf{PS}_ω consists of axiom schemas (1)-(2) and inference rules (6)-(8) in Definition 3.1 and the following ω -rule: for any $k \in \omega$ and any modal operators \Box_1, \dots, \Box_k ,*

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{\gamma \supset \Box_1(\phi_1 \supset \Box_2(\phi_2 \supset \dots \supset \Box_k(\phi_k \supset \mathbf{E}^n \phi) \dots)) \quad (n \in \omega)}{\gamma \supset \Box_1(\phi_1 \supset \Box_2(\phi_2 \supset \dots \supset \Box_k(\phi_k \supset \mathbf{C}\phi) \dots))}.$$

The set of premises of inference rule (3.1) is countable. When $k = 0$, (3.1) means that

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{\gamma \supset \mathbf{E}^n \phi \quad (n \in \omega)}{\gamma \supset \mathbf{C}\phi}.$$

It is shown in [8] that a formula $\phi \in \Phi_{\text{CKL}}$ is derivable in \mathbf{PS}_{MH} if and only if ϕ is valid in the class $\mathbf{Frm}_{\text{CKL}}$ of CKL-frames. Soundness and completeness of \mathbf{PS}_ω with respect to $\mathbf{Frm}_{\text{CKL}}$ is shown in [11, 7]. So, \mathbf{PS}_{MH} and \mathbf{PS}_ω are equivalent. We write \mathbf{CKL} for the set of formulas that are derivable in these proof systems. It is obvious that the proof systems \mathbf{PS}_{MH} and \mathbf{PS}_ω are sound and complete with respect to the class \mathbf{A}_{CKL} of CKL-algebras. Hence, we have

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbf{CKL} = \text{For}(\mathbf{A}_{\text{CKL}}).$$

4. MODELS FOR CKL

In this section, we show that the class $\mathbf{Frm}_{\mathbf{CKL}}$ of CKL-frames is modally definable, while the class $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{CKL}}$ of CKL-algebras is not, which means that $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{CKL}}$ is not a variety. In fact, we prove that the class $\mathbf{Frm}_{\mathbf{CKL}}$ of all CKL-frames is equal to the class $\mathbf{Frm}(\mathbf{CKL})$ of Kripke frames in which all formulas of \mathbf{CKL} is valid. Next, we introduce a class $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{MH}}$ of MH-algebras, and show that \mathbf{CKL} is sound and complete with respect to $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{MH}}$, and that $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{CKL}}$ is a proper subclass of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{MH}}$. Then, we prove that $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{CKL}}$ is not modally definable. Finally, we show that free MH-algebras are CKL-algebras.

Definition 4.1. *A modal algebra is called a MH-algebra, if the following hold for each $x \in A$:*

- (1) $Cx \leq x$;
- (2) $Cx \leq ECx$;
- (3) $C(x \rightarrow Ex) \leq x \rightarrow Cx$.

We write $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{MH}}$ for the class of all MH-algebras.

It is clear that a formula of common knowledge logic is derivable in $\mathbf{PS}_{\mathbf{MH}}$ if and only if it is valid in $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{MH}}$. Hence,

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbf{CKL} = \mathbf{For}(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{MH}}).$$

We show that $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{CKL}} \subseteq \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{MH}}$.

Theorem 4.2. *If A is a CKL-algebra, then it is a MH-algebra.*

Proof. Suppose A is a CKL-algebra and take any $x \in A$. We show that for any $n \in \omega$

$$(4.2) \quad x \wedge C(x \rightarrow Ex) \leq E^n x$$

by induction on $n \in \omega$. The case $n = 0$ is trivial. Suppose that

$$(4.3) \quad x \wedge C(x \rightarrow Ex) \leq E^k x.$$

Since A is a CKL-algebra,

$$(4.4) \quad x \wedge C(x \rightarrow Ex) = x \wedge \prod_{n \in \omega} E^n(x \rightarrow Ex) \leq E^k(x \rightarrow Ex) \leq E^k x \rightarrow E^{k+1} x.$$

By (4.3) and (4.4),

$$x \wedge C(x \rightarrow Ex) \leq E^{k+1} x.$$

Hence, (4.2) holds for any $n \in \omega$. \square

Theorem 4.3. *An ω -complete and ω -multiplicative MH-algebra is a CKL-algebra.*

Proof. Suppose that A is an ω -complete and ω -multiplicative MH-algebra. Take any $x \in A$. Since A is ω -complete, $\prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x \in A$. We show that $Cx = \prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x$. Let $z = \prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x$. By ω -multiplicativity,

$$Ez = E \prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x = \prod_{n \in \omega} E^{n+1} x \geq \prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x = z.$$

Hence, $z \rightarrow Ez = 1$. By (3) of Definition 4.1, $1 \leq z \rightarrow Cz$, which means $z \leq Cz$. Therefore,

$$\prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x = z \leq Cz = C \prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x \leq Cx.$$

By (1) and (2) of Definition 4.1, for any $n \in \omega$,

$$Cx \leq E^n x.$$

Hence, $Cx \leq \prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x$. \square

i	0	2	\dots	$k(x) - 2$	$k(x)$	$k(x) + 2$	$k(x) + 4$	\dots
x	*	*	\dots	*	0	1	1	$1 \dots$
$\mathbf{K}_n x (n - k(k) \not\equiv 0)$	0	0	$0 \dots 0$	0	1	1	1	$1 \dots$
$\mathbf{K}_n x (n - k(x) \equiv 0)$	0	0	$0 \dots 0$	0	0	1	1	$1 \dots$
$\mathbf{E} x$	0	0	$0 \dots 0$	0	0	1	1	$1 \dots$

FIGURE 1. $\mathbf{K}_n x(i)$ and $\mathbf{E} x(i)$ for even i

Corollary 4.4. *A Kripke frame F is a CKL-frame, if and only if $F \models \mathbf{CKL}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.7, 4.2 and 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned} F \in \mathbf{Frm}_{\mathbf{CKL}} &\Leftrightarrow F^+ \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{CKL}} \Leftrightarrow F^+ \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{MH}} \\ &\Leftrightarrow F^+ \in \mathbf{Alg}(\mathbf{CKL}) \Leftrightarrow F^+ \models \mathbf{CKL} \Leftrightarrow F \models \mathbf{CKL}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we show that $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{CKL}} \subsetneq \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{MH}}$. Let $x \in 2^\omega$. We say that x is *finite*, if the cardinality of the set $\{n \mid x(n) = 1\}$ is finite, and *cofinite*, if the cardinality of the set $\{n \mid x(n) = 0\}$ is finite. The constant function in 2^ω that takes the values 0 (resp. 1) is simply denoted as 0 (resp. 1), if there is no confusion. By treating 2 as a two valued Boolean algebra, we consider 2^ω as a complete Boolean algebra.

Theorem 4.5. *There exists an MH-algebra that is not a CKL-algebra.*

Proof. Define $S \subseteq 2^\omega$ by

$$S = \{x \mid x \text{ is finite or cofinite}\}.$$

Then, S is a sub-Boolean algebra of 2^ω . For each cofinite $x \in S$, define $k(x) \in \omega$ as follows:

$$k(x) = \min\{i \mid i \text{ is an even number and for each even number } j \geq i, x(j) = 1\}$$

Since x is cofinite, $k(x)$ is well-defined. Suppose that $|\mathcal{I}| = N$ and define modal operators \mathbf{K}_n ($n \in \mathcal{I}$) on S as follows (see Figure 1):

- (1) if x is finite, then $\mathbf{K}_n(x) = 0$;
- (2) if $x = 1$, then $\mathbf{K}_n(x) = 1$;
- (3) if x is cofinite and $x \neq 1$ and $n \not\equiv k(x) \pmod{N}$, then

$$\mathbf{K}_n(x)(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \text{ is even and } i < k(x) \\ x(i) & \text{if } i \text{ is odd or } i \geq k(x); \end{cases}$$

- (4) if x is cofinite and $x \neq 1$ and $n \equiv k(x) \pmod{N}$, then

$$\mathbf{K}_n(x)(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \text{ is even and } i \leq k(x) \\ x(i) & \text{if } i \text{ is odd or } i > k(x). \end{cases}$$

Define modal operator \mathbf{C} on S by

$$\mathbf{C} x = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{E}(x)(i) = \prod_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbf{K}_n(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \text{ is even and } i \leq k(x) \\ x(i) & \text{if } i \text{ is odd or } i > k(x). \end{cases}$$

for any cofinite $x \in S$ which is not 1.

We first check that S is a modal algebra. By definition, $K_n 1 = 1$ ($n \in \mathcal{I}$) and $C 1 = 1$. It is straightforward to show that $C(x \sqcap y) = Cx \sqcap Cy$. We check that $K_n(x \sqcap y) = K_n x \sqcap K_n y$ holds. The cases that $x = 1$ or $y = 1$, and x or y is finite are straightforward. Suppose that x and y are cofinite and x and y are not 1. It is easy to see that $K_n(x \sqcap y)(i) = (K_n x \sqcap K_n y)(i)$, for each odd number $i \in \omega$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $k(x) \leq k(y)$. Then, $k(x \sqcap y) = k(y)$. Suppose that $n \equiv k(y) \pmod{N}$. Then, for each even number $i \in \omega$,

$$K_n(x \sqcap y)(i) = 0 \Leftrightarrow i \leq k(x \sqcap y) \Leftrightarrow i \leq k(y) \Leftrightarrow (K_n x \sqcap K_n y)(i) = 0.$$

The case $n \not\equiv k(y) \pmod{N}$ is shown in the same way. Hence, S is a modal algebra. Next, we show that S is a MH-algebra. It is easy to see that $Cx \leq x$ and $Cx \leq ECx$ hold. We show that $C(x \rightarrow Ex) \leq x \rightarrow Cx$ holds. The cases that $x = 0$ and $x = 1$ are straightforward. Suppose not. Then, $x \not\leq Ex$. Therefore, $x \rightarrow Ex \neq 1$. Hence,

$$C(x \rightarrow Ex) = 0 \leq x \rightarrow Cx.$$

Finally, we show that S is not a CKL-algebra. Let $a \in S$ be

$$a(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & (i = 0) \\ 1 & (i \neq 0) \end{cases}.$$

Then, in 2^ω ,

$$\prod_{n \in \omega} E^n a(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & (i \text{ is even}) \\ 1 & (i \text{ is odd}) \end{cases},$$

but the greatest upper bound of the set $\{E^n a \mid n \in \omega\}$ does not exist in S . \square

In S , $K_n 0 = 0$ and $K_n x \leq x$ hold for each $n \in \mathcal{I}$, and $K_n x \leq K_n K_n x$ holds for each $n \in \mathcal{I}$, if $|\mathcal{I}| \geq 2$. Hence, Theorem 4.5 holds for algebraic models for **K**, **D**, **T**, **4** and their combinations.

Corollary 4.6. *The class \mathbf{A}_{CKL} of CKL-algebras is not modally definable. Hence, it is not a variety.*

Proof. It is trivial from the definition that \mathbf{A}_{MH} is a variety. Hence, \mathbf{A}_{MH} is equationally definable. Since we can identify a formula $\phi \equiv \psi$ of the common knowledge logic with the equation $\phi = \psi$ of modal algebras, \mathbf{A}_{MH} is modally definable. Hence, by (4.1),

$$\mathbf{A}_{\text{MH}} = \text{Alg}(\text{For}(\mathbf{A}_{\text{MH}})) = \text{Alg}(\mathbf{CKL}).$$

On the other hand, by (3.3) and Theorem 4.5 and

$$\mathbf{A}_{\text{CKL}} \subsetneq \mathbf{A}_{\text{MH}} = \text{Alg}(\mathbf{CKL}) = \text{Alg}(\text{For}(\mathbf{A}_{\text{CKL}})).$$

Therefore, \mathbf{A}_{CKL} is not modally definable. Hence, it is not equationally definable. Therefore, it is not a variety. \square

In the last part of the section, we show that free MH-algebras are CKL-algebras. Let \mathbf{PS} be a proof system and \sim be a binary relation on Φ_{CKL} such that $\phi \sim \psi$ if and only if $\phi \equiv \psi$ is derivable in \mathbf{PS} , for each formulas ϕ and ψ . We write $\text{LT}_{\mathbf{PS}}$ for the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra Φ_{CKL}/\sim . For each formula ϕ , we write $|\phi|_{\mathbf{PS}}$ for the equivalence class of ϕ in Φ_{CKL}/\sim .

Definition 4.7. *Let X be a set of variables. The set of terms of modal algebras over X is the smallest set $T(X)$ which satisfies the following conditions:*

- (1) 0 and 1 are in $T(X)$;
- (2) if a is in $T(X)$, then $(\neg a) \in T(X)$;
- (3) if a and b are in $T(X)$, then $(a \sqcup b)$ and $(a \sqcap b)$ are in $T(X)$;
- (4) if a is in $T(X)$, then $(\Box a) \in T(X)$ for each modal operator \Box .

We write \sim_{MH} for the binary relation on $T(X)$ such that for each a and b in $T(X)$, $a \sim_{\text{MH}} b$ if and only if $a = b$ holds in every MH-algebras. It is known that \sim_{MH} is a congruence relation, and we write $|p|_{\text{MH}}$ for the equivalence class of p in $T(X)/\sim_{\text{MH}}$. We write the free MH-algebra over X

$$\langle T(X)/\sim_{\text{MH}}, \sqcup, \sqcap, -, K_i (i \in \mathcal{I}), C, 0, 1, \rangle$$

by $F_{\text{MH}}(X)$. We define notations \sim_{CKL} , $|p|_{\text{CKL}}$, and $F_{\text{CKL}}(X)$ in the same manner.

Theorem 4.8. *For each set X , the free MH-algebra $F_{\text{MH}}(X)$ over X is a CKL-algebra.*

Proof. It is easily proved that in the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra $LT_{\mathbf{PS}_\omega}$ of \mathbf{PS}_ω ,

$$|C\phi|_{\mathbf{PS}_\omega} = \prod_{n \in \omega} |E^n \phi|_{\mathbf{PS}_\omega}$$

holds, by (3) and (4) of Definition 3.1 and (3.2). Similarly, for each modal operator \square ,

$$(4.5) \quad |\square C\phi|_{\mathbf{PS}_\omega} = \prod_{n \in \omega} |\square E^n \phi|_{\mathbf{PS}_\omega},$$

holds by letting $k = 1$ and $\phi_1 = \perp$ in (3.1). Hence, the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra $LT_{\mathbf{PS}_\omega}$ is a CKL-algebra. Since \mathbf{PS}_{MH} and \mathbf{PS}_ω are complete with respect to the class $\mathbf{Frm}_{\text{CKL}}$ of all CKL-frames, $LT_{\mathbf{PS}_{\text{MH}}} = LT_{\mathbf{PS}_\omega}$. Suppose that X is countable. Then, there exists a bijection from the set \mathbf{Prop} of propositional variables to X , and we can identify a formula of the common knowledge logic with a term of modal algebras. Then, it is easy to see that $\phi \equiv \psi$ is derivable in \mathbf{PS}_ω if and only if $\phi = \psi$ holds in $F_{\text{CKL}}(X)$, and the same relation holds between \mathbf{PS}_{MH} and $F_{\text{MH}}(X)$. Hence,

$$F_{\text{CKL}}(X) \cong LT_{\mathbf{PS}_\omega} = LT_{\mathbf{PS}_{\text{MH}}} \cong F_{\text{MH}}(X).$$

Therefore, $F_{\text{MH}}(X)$ is a CKL-algebra. Take any set Y and any $|p|_{\text{MH}}$ and $|q|_{\text{MH}}$ in $F_{\text{MH}}(Y)$. Let y_1, \dots, y_n be the list of elements of Y which occur in p or q , and let X be a countable set which includes all y_1, \dots, y_n . Then, it is known that

$$|p|_{\text{MH}} = |q|_{\text{MH}} \text{ in } F_{\text{MH}}(Y) \Leftrightarrow |p|_{\text{MH}} = |q|_{\text{MH}} \text{ in } F_{\text{MH}}(X)$$

holds (see, e.g., Theorem 11.4 of [3]). Since $F_{\text{MH}}(X)$ is a CKL-algebra,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{for any } n \in \omega, |q|_{\text{MH}} \leq E^n |p|_{\text{MH}} \text{ in } F_{\text{MH}}(Y) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{for any } n \in \omega, |q|_{\text{MH}} \leq E^n |p|_{\text{MH}} \text{ in } F_{\text{MH}}(X) \\ \Rightarrow & |q|_{\text{MH}} \leq C |p|_{\text{MH}} \text{ in } F_{\text{MH}}(X) \\ \Leftrightarrow & |q|_{\text{MH}} \leq C |p|_{\text{MH}} \text{ in } F_{\text{MH}}(Y). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that for any $n \in \omega$, $C |p|_{\text{MH}} \leq E^n |p|_{\text{MH}}$ holds in $F_{\text{MH}}(Y)$. Hence,

$$C |p|_{\text{MH}} = \prod_{n \in \omega} E^n |p|_{\text{MH}}$$

holds in $F_{\text{MH}}(Y)$. □

It is known that an equation holds in a class of algebras if and only if it holds in the free algebra over a countable set of variables (see, e.g., corollary 11.5 of [3]). However, there exists an MH-algebra which does not satisfy the equation $Cx = \prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x$, while the free MH-algebra over a countable set X satisfies it. Of course, this is not a paradox, as $\prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x$ is not a term of MH-algebras.

5. INFINITARY COMMON KNOWLEDGE LOGIC

In this section, we discuss infinitary common knowledge logic. We define infinitary extensions \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} and \mathbf{IPS}_ω of \mathbf{PS}_{MH} and \mathbf{PS}_ω , respectively. Then, we show that \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} is Kripke complete. The system \mathbf{IPS}_ω is originally introduced by Kaneko-Nagashima-Suzuki-Tanaka [7], and its Kripke completeness is given also in [7]. We show that \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} and \mathbf{IPS}_ω are equivalent, which implies the Kripke completeness of \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} .

Now, we define syntax and semantics for infinitary common knowledge logic. First, we define syntax. We extend the language by adding two logical connectives \bigvee and \bigwedge , which denote countable disjunction and conjunction, respectively. Then, we define the set $\mathbf{I}\Phi_{\text{CKL}}$ of formulas of infinitary common knowledge logic as the least extension of Φ_{CKL} which satisfies the following: if Γ is a countable set of $\mathbf{I}\Phi_{\text{CKL}}$, then $\bigvee \Gamma$ and $\bigwedge \Gamma$ are in $\mathbf{I}\Phi_{\text{CKL}}$. Next, we define semantics. An algebraic model for infinitary common knowledge logic is a pair $\langle A, v \rangle$, where A is an ω -complete and ω -multiplicative modal algebra and v is a mapping from the set \mathbf{Prop} of propositional variables to A . For each valuation v in A and each countable set Γ of formulas, we define

$$v\left(\bigvee \Gamma\right) = \bigsqcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} v(\gamma), \quad v\left(\bigwedge \Gamma\right) = \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} v(\gamma).$$

A Kripke model for infinitary common knowledge logic is a pair $\langle F, v \rangle$, where $F = \langle W, \{R_{K_i}\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}, R_C \rangle$ is a CKL-frame and v is a mapping from the set \mathbf{Prop} of propositional variables to $\mathcal{P}(W)$. For each valuation v in F and each countable set Γ of formulas, we define

$$v\left(\bigvee \Gamma\right) = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} v(\gamma), \quad v\left(\bigwedge \Gamma\right) = \bigcap_{\gamma \in \Gamma} v(\gamma).$$

Now, we define \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} and \mathbf{IPS}_ω . First, we define \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} .

Definition 5.1. *The proof system \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} for infinitary common knowledge logic consists of all axiom schemas and inference rules of \mathbf{PS}_{MH} and the following axiom schemas*

$$(5.1) \quad \bigwedge_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \Box \gamma \supset \Box \bigwedge \Gamma \quad \text{for each modal operator } \Box,$$

$$(5.2) \quad \gamma \supset \bigvee \Gamma, \quad \bigwedge \Gamma \supset \gamma \quad (|\Gamma| \leq \omega, \gamma \in \Gamma),$$

and the following rules

$$(5.3) \quad \frac{\gamma \supset \phi \quad (\forall \gamma \in \Gamma)}{\bigvee \gamma \supset \phi}, \quad \frac{\phi \supset \gamma \quad (\forall \gamma \in \Gamma)}{\phi \supset \bigwedge \gamma} \quad (|\Gamma| \leq \omega).$$

Next, we define \mathbf{IPS}_ω , which is originally introduced by Kaneko-Nagashima (the system GL_ω in [5, 6]).

Definition 5.2. *The proof system \mathbf{IPS}_ω consists of all axioms and inference rules of \mathbf{PS}_ω and axioms (5.1) and (5.2) and inference rules (5.3).*

It is proved in [7] that \mathbf{IPS}_ω is Kripke complete:

Theorem 5.3. ([7]). *For each formula $\phi \in \mathbf{I}\Phi_{\text{CKL}}$, ϕ is provable in \mathbf{IPS}_ω if and only if it is valid in the class $\mathbf{Frm}_{\text{CKL}}$ of CKL-frames.*

Now, we show algebraic completeness of \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} and \mathbf{IPS}_ω .

Theorem 5.4. *For each formula $\phi \in \mathbf{I}\Phi_{\text{CKL}}$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) ϕ is provable in \mathbf{IPS}_ω ;
- (2) ϕ is provable in \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} ;
- (3) ϕ is valid in the class of ω -complete and ω -multiplicative CKL-algebras.

Proof. It is straightforward to show the soundness of \mathbf{IPS}_ω and \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} with respect to the class of ω -complete and ω -multiplicative CKL-algebras. It is obvious that the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of \mathbf{IPS}_ω is an ω -complete and ω -multiplicative CKL-algebra. Then, by Theorem 4.3, it follows that the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} is also an ω -complete and ω -multiplicative CKL-algebra. Hence, \mathbf{IPS}_ω and \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} are complete with respect to the class of ω -complete and ω -multiplicative CKL-algebras. \square

Corollary 5.5. *For each formula $\phi \in \mathbf{I}\Phi_{\text{CKL}}$, ϕ is provable in \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} if and only if it is valid in the class $\mathbf{Frm}_{\text{CKL}}$ of CKL-frames.*

Interestingly, the Kripke completeness of \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} can also be shown directly, by using a kind of universal technique, whereas proving the Kripke completeness of \mathbf{PS}_{MH} is not straightforward (see [8]). It is well-known that the Jónsson-Tarski representation theorem provides Kripke completeness of many types of modal logics. Moreover, it is known that an extension of the Jónsson-Tarski representation theorem, which preserves countably many infinite joins and meets, holds, and the Kripke completeness of various non-compact modal logics follows from this extension in the same way ([12, 10]). When proving the Kripke completeness of the common knowledge logic using this extension, it is necessary to show that $\prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x = Cx$ holds in the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra. As we have seen in Theorem 4.8, it is true that the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of \mathbf{PS}_{MH} satisfies $\prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x = Cx$, but, in Theorem 4.8, this was shown by using the Kripke completeness of \mathbf{PS}_{MH} . Since the order of the propositions to be proved is reversed, we must show that $\prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x = Cx$ holds in the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of \mathbf{PS}_{MH} without using Kripke completeness. However, this does not seem to be straightforward. On the other hand, it follows immediately from Theorem 4.3 that the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} satisfies $\prod_{n \in \omega} E^n x = Cx$. Therefore, Kripke completeness of \mathbf{IPS}_{MH} can be obtained directly from the extension of Jónsson-Tarski representation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Patrick Blackburn, Maarten de Rijke, and Yde Venema. *Modal Logic*. Cambridge, third edition, 2001.
- [2] Samuel Bucheli, Roman Kuznets, and Thomas Studer. Two ways to common knowledge. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 262:83–94, 2010.
- [3] S. Burris and H. P. Sankappanavar. *A Course in Universal Algebra*. Springer-Verlag, 1980.
- [4] Joseph Y. Halpern and Yoram Moses. A guide to completeness and complexity for modal logics of knowledge and beliefs. *Artificial Intelligence*, 54:319–379, 1992.
- [5] M. Kaneko and T. Nagashima. Game logic and its applications I. *Studia Logica*, 57:325–354, 1996.
- [6] M. Kaneko and T. Nagashima. Game logic and its applications II. *Studia Logica*, 58:273–303, 1997.
- [7] Mamoru Kaneko, Takashi Nagashima, Nobu-Yuki Suzuki, and Yoshihito Tanaka. Map of common knowledge logics. *Studia Logica*, 71:57–86, 2002.
- [8] John-Jules Ch. Meyer and Wiebe van der Hoek. *Epistemic Logic for AI and Computer Science*. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge, 1995.
- [9] Krister Segerberg. A model existence theorem in infinitary propositional modal logic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 23:337–367, 1994.
- [10] Yoshihito Tanaka. Model existence in non-compact modal logic. *Studia Logica*, 67:61–73, 2001.
- [11] Yoshihito Tanaka. Some proof systems for predicate common knowledge logic. *Reports on Mathematical Logic*, 37:79–100, 2003.
- [12] Yoshihito Tanaka and Hiroakira Ono. The Rasiowa-Sikorski lemma and Kripke completeness of predicate and infinitary modal logics. In Michael Zakharyashev, Krister Segerberg,

- Maarten de Rijke, and Heinrich Wansing, editors, *Advances in Modal Logic*, volume 2, pages 419–437. CSLI Publication, 2000.
- [13] Steven K. Thomason. Categories of frames for modal logic. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 40(3):439–442, 1975.