

Semantic Incompleteness of Lieberman et al. (2020)’s Hilbert-style System for Term-modal Logic **K** with Equality and Non-rigid Terms

Takahiro Sawasaki

Institute of Liberal Arts and Science
Kanazawa University
Kanazawa, Japan

tsawasaki@staff.kanazawa-u.ac.jp

In this paper, we prove the semantic incompleteness of the Hilbert-style system for the minimal normal term-modal logic with equality and non-rigid terms that was proposed in Lieberman et al. (2020) “Dynamic Term-modal Logics for First-order Epistemic Planning.” Term-modal logic is a family of first-order modal logics having term-modal operators indexed with terms in the first-order language. While some first-order formula is valid over the class of all frames in the Kripke semantics for the term-modal logic proposed there, it is not derivable in Lieberman et al. (2020)’s Hilbert-style system. We show this fact by introducing a non-standard Kripke semantics which makes the meanings of constants and function symbols relative to the meanings of relation symbols combined with them.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we prove the semantic incompleteness of the Hilbert-style system **HK** for the minimal normal term-modal logic **K** with equality and non-rigid terms that was proposed in Lieberman et al. [11]. Term-modal logic, developed by Thalmann [22] and Fitting et al. [4], is a family of first-order modal logics having term-modal operators $[t]$ indexed with terms t in the first-order language. In the language of term-modal logic, for example, $[x]P(x)$, $[f(x)]P(x)$ and $\forall x[f(x)]P(x)$ are formulas. Term-modal logic is more expressive than multi-modal propositional logic and has been applied to epistemic logic [10, 17, 18, 21, 1, 23, 24, 16, 15, 13, 11, 14] and deontic logic [20, 19, 8, 9, 7, 5, 6]. Some other developments of term-modal logic have been overviewed e.g. in [11, pp. 22-4] and [5, pp. 48-50].

The logic developed in Lieberman et al. [11] is a first-order dynamic epistemic logic for epistemic planning, and term-modal logic is invoked as its underlying logic. Technically speaking, their term-modal logic is a two-sorted normal term-modal logic of the constant domain with equality and non-rigid terms. They make their logic two-sorted because, whereas letting the domain of a model include both agents and objects, they read an epistemically interpreted term-modal operator K_t as “agent t knows.” The language defined in [11] allows $K_t\phi$ to be a formula only if t is a term for an agent, and thereby excludes the possibility that terms denoting objects appear in the argument of the term-modal operator. The Hilbert-style system **HK** found in [11, p. 17] was originally presented in [1] which is probably based on [17, 18]. Later, two issues on action model and reduction axiom were fixed in the erratum [12] of [11].

Unfortunately, **HK** is semantically incomplete due to the unprovability of a first-order formula $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$. In Section 3, we show that it is valid over the class of all frames whereas it is unprovable in **HK**. To this end, we there introduce a non-standard Kripke semantics which makes the

meanings of constants and function symbols relative to the meanings of relation symbols combined with them.

It is worth noting here that, as the above first-order formula suggests, the semantic incompleteness of **HK** is irrelevant to its term-modal aspects. To make the point clear, let \mathcal{L} be a first-order modal language having equality, constants and only the ordinary non-indexed modal operator as its modal operators, and say the semantics for first-order modal logic (the FOML-semantics for short) to refer to the Kripke semantics of the constant domain given to \mathcal{L} in which the accessibility relation is just a binary relation on worlds and constants are interpreted relative to worlds. Using a semantics similar to the non-standard semantics introduced in Section 3, we can in fact prove that the Hilbert-style system naturally obtained from **HK** by changing from the two-sorted term-modal language to \mathcal{L} becomes semantically incomplete with respect to the FOML-semantics similarly due to the unprovability of $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$. The question to be asked here is what is the formulation of a sound and complete Hilbert-style system to the FOML-semantics. To the best of our knowledge, this is still an open question. Such a Hilbert-style system seems to have never been provided together with a detailed proof in the literature.¹

This paper will proceed as follows. In Section 2 we first introduce the syntax in [11]. Since there are some minor defects on the definitions for type, we do this with some modifications. Then we introduce the Kripke semantics and the Hilbert-style system **HK** given in [11]. In Section 3 we prove the semantic incompleteness of **HK** by introducing a non-standard Kripke semantics for which **HK** is sound but in which $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$ is not valid.

2 Syntax, Semantics and the Hilbert-style System **HK**

We will first introduce the syntax presented in [11, pp. 3-4] with some modifications. The idea there is to define the notions of term and formula while assigning (sequences of) types “agt”, “obj” or “agt_or_obj” to all symbols like variables or relation symbols. It is basically the same idea as in Enderton [2, Section 4.3], but there is an important difference. In the syntax of [11], not only agt or obj but also agt_or_obj may be assigned to the arguments of function symbols and relation symbols, so that $P(x)$ seems to be intended to become a formula even when x has type agt and P takes type agt_or_obj.

However, the original definitions 1–3 for the syntax seem to have two minor defects. First, the original definition 1 for type assignment and the original definition 2 for term are dependent upon one another, thus they are circular definitions. Second, whereas $P(x)$ seems to be intended to become a formula when x has type agt and P takes type agt_or_obj, it does not actually become a formula since the original definition 3 for formula requires that the type of x and the type of the argument of P must be the same. Accordingly, for example, $x = x$ cannot be a formula in any signature since the type of x is either agt or obj but the type of the arguments of $=$ is always agt_or_obj.

To amend the above two defects, we redefine the syntax in [11, pp. 3-4] as follows.

Definition 1 (Signature). Let Var be a countably infinite set of *variables*, Cn a countable set of *constants*, Fn a countable set of *function symbols*, and Rel a countable set of *relation symbols* containing the *equality symbol* $=$. Let $\langle \text{TYPE}, \preceq \rangle$ be also the ordered set of *types* where $\text{TYPE} = \{ \text{agt}, \text{obj}, \text{agt_or_obj} \}$ and \preceq is the reflexive ordering on TYPE with $\text{agt} \preceq \text{agt_or_obj}$ and $\text{obj} \preceq \text{agt_or_obj}$, i.e.,

$$\preceq := \{ \langle \tau, \tau \rangle \mid \tau \in \text{TYPE} \} \cup \{ \langle \text{agt}, \text{agt_or_obj} \rangle, \langle \text{obj}, \text{agt_or_obj} \rangle \}.$$

¹As a sound and complete proof system with respect to the multi-modal FOML-semantics with the epistemic accessibility relation for each agent, Fagin et al. [3, p. 90] offered a Hilbert-style system having two first-order principles $A(t/x) \rightarrow \exists xA$ and $t = s \rightarrow (A(t/z) \leftrightarrow A(s/z))$ as axioms with a restriction that t, s must be variables if A has any occurrence of an (not term-modal) epistemic operator K_a . However, the proof of this system’s completeness is omitted there.

A *type assignment* $\tau: \text{Var} \cup \text{Cn} \cup \text{Fn} \cup \text{Re1} \rightarrow \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{TYPE}^n$ is an assignment mapping

1. a variable x to a type $\tau(x) \in \{\text{agt}, \text{obj}\}$ such that both $\text{Var} \cap \tau^{-1}[\{\text{agt}\}]$ and $\text{Var} \cap \tau^{-1}[\{\text{obj}\}]$ are countably infinite, where $\tau^{-1}[X]$ is the inverse image of a set X ;
2. a constant c to a type $\tau(c) \in \{\text{agt}, \text{obj}\}$;
3. a function symbol f to a sequence of types $\tau(f) \in \text{TYPE}^n \times \{\text{agt}, \text{obj}\}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
4. the equality symbol $=$ to the sequence of types $\tau(=) = \langle \text{agt_or_obj}, \text{agt_or_obj} \rangle$;
5. a relation symbol P distinct from $=$ to a sequence of types $\tau(P) \in \text{TYPE}^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The tuple $\langle \text{Var}, \text{Cn}, \text{Fn}, \text{Re1}, \tau \rangle$ is called a *signature*.

Definition 2 (Term of Type). Let $\langle \text{Var}, \text{Cn}, \text{Fn}, \text{Re1}, \tau \rangle$ be a signature. The set of *terms of types* is defined as follows.

1. any variable $x \in \text{Var}$ is a term of type $\tau(x)$.
2. any constant $c \in \text{Cn}$ is a term of type $\tau(c)$.
3. If t_1, \dots, t_n are terms of types τ_1, \dots, τ_n and f is a function symbol in Fn such that $\tau(f) = \langle \tau'_1, \dots, \tau'_n, \tau'_{n+1} \rangle$ and $\tau_i \preceq \tau'_i$, then $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is a term of type τ'_{n+1} .

For convenience, henceforth we use a type assignment τ to mean its uniquely extended assignment by letting $\tau(f(t_1, \dots, t_n)) = \tau$ for each term of the form $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ of type τ .

Definition 3 (Language). Let $\langle \text{Var}, \text{Cn}, \text{Fn}, \text{Re1}, \tau \rangle$ be a signature. The *language* is the set of formulas φ defined in the following BNF.

$$\varphi ::= P(t_1, \dots, t_n) \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid K_s\varphi \mid \forall x\varphi,$$

where t_1, \dots, t_n, s are terms with $\tau(s) = \text{agt}$ and $P \in \text{Re1}$ such that $\tau(P) = \langle \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \rangle$ and $\tau(t_i) \preceq \tau_i$. Note here that P can be $=$.

As usual, we use the notations $t \neq s := \neg(t = s)$, $\varphi \rightarrow \psi := \neg(\varphi \wedge \neg\psi)$ and $\exists x\varphi := \neg\forall x\neg\varphi$.

We believe that our definitions successfully capture what was intended in the original definitions 1–3. On top of these definitions, we will follow [11, p. 4] to define the notions of *free variable* and *bound variable* in a formula as usual, where the set of free variables in $K_t\varphi$ is defined as the union of the set of variables in t and the set of free variables in φ . For a variable x , terms t, s and a formula φ such that $\tau(x) = \tau(s)$ and no variables in s are bound variables in φ , we also define *substitutions* $t(s/x)$ and $\varphi(s/x)$ of s for x in t and φ in a usual manner, except that $(K_t\varphi)(s/x) = K_{t(s/x)}\varphi(s/x)$. Whenever we write $t(s/x)$ or $\varphi(s/x)$, we tacitly assume that $\tau(x) = \tau(s)$ and no variables in s are bound variables in φ . We also define the lengths of term and formula as usual.

Let us now introduce the Kripke semantics presented in [11, pp. 5-6].

Definition 4 (Frame, [11, Def. 4]). A *frame* is a tuple $F = \langle D, W, R \rangle$ where

1. $D := D_{\text{agt_or_obj}} := D_{\text{agt}} \sqcup D_{\text{obj}}$ is the disjoint union of a non-empty set D_{agt} of *agents* and a non-empty set D_{obj} of *objects*;
2. W is a non-empty set of *worlds*;
3. R is a mapping that assigns to each agent $i \in D_{\text{agt}}$ a binary relation R_i on W , i.e., $R: D_{\text{agt}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(W \times W)$.

Definition 5 (Model, [11, Def. 5]). Let $\langle \text{Var}, \text{Cn}, \text{Fn}, \text{Re1}, \tau \rangle$ be a signature. A *model* is a tuple $M = \langle D, W, R, I \rangle$ where $\langle D, W, R \rangle$ is a frame and I is an *interpretation* that maps

1. a pair $\langle c, w \rangle$ of some $c \in \text{Cn}$ and some $w \in W$ to an element $I(c, w) \in D_{\tau(c)}$;
2. a pair $\langle f, w \rangle$ of some $f \in \text{Fn}$ and some $w \in W$ to a function $I(f, w): (D_{\tau_1} \times \cdots \times D_{\tau_n}) \rightarrow D_{\tau_{n+1}}$, where $\tau(f) = \langle \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n, \tau_{n+1} \rangle$;
3. a pair $\langle =, w \rangle$ of the equality symbol $=$ and some $w \in W$ to the set $I(=, w) = \{ \langle d, d \rangle \mid d \in D_{\text{agt_or_obj}} \}$;
4. a pair $\langle P, w \rangle$ of some $P \in \text{Re1} \setminus \{ = \}$ and some $w \in W$ to a subset $I(P, w)$ of $D_{\tau_1} \times \cdots \times D_{\tau_n}$, where $\tau(P) = \langle \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \rangle$.

Definition 6 (Valuation, [11, Def. 6, 7]). A *valuation* is a mapping $v: \text{Var} \rightarrow D$ such that $v(x) \in D_{\tau(x)}$ and the valuation $v[x \mapsto d]$ is the same valuation as v except for assigning to a variable x an element $d \in D_{\tau(x)}$. Given a valuation v , a world w and an interpretation I in a model, the extension $\llbracket t \rrbracket_w^{I,v}$ of a term t is defined by $\llbracket x \rrbracket_w^{I,v} = v(x)$, $\llbracket c \rrbracket_w^{I,v} = I(c, w)$, and $\llbracket f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \rrbracket_w^{I,v} = I(f, w)(\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_w^{I,v}, \dots, \llbracket t_n \rrbracket_w^{I,v})$.

Definition 7 (Satisfaction, [11, Def. 8]). The *satisfaction* $M, w \models_v \phi$ of a formula ϕ at a world w in a model M under a valuation v is defined as follows.

$$\begin{array}{lll}
M, w \models_v P(t_1, \dots, t_n) & \text{iff} & \langle \llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_w^{I,v}, \dots, \llbracket t_n \rrbracket_w^{I,v} \rangle \in I(P, w) \quad (P \text{ can be } =) \\
M, w \models_v \neg \phi & \text{iff} & M, w \not\models_v \phi \\
M, w \models_v \phi \wedge \psi & \text{iff} & M, w \models_v \phi \quad \text{and} \quad M, w \models_v \psi \\
M, w \models_v \forall x \phi & \text{iff} & M, w \models_v [x \mapsto d] \phi \quad \text{for all } d \in D_{\tau(x)} \\
M, w \models_v K_t \phi & \text{iff} & M, w' \models_v \phi \quad \text{for all } w' \in W \text{ such that } \langle w, w' \rangle \in R_{\llbracket t \rrbracket_w^{I,v}}
\end{array}$$

Definition 8 (Validity, [11, p. 25]). A formula ϕ is *valid* if for all models M , all worlds $w \in W$ and all valuations v , it holds that $M, w \models_v \phi$.

Remark 1. Instead of the x -variant of a valuation v used in [11], we adopted the valuation $v[x \mapsto d]$ to give the satisfaction for $\forall x \phi$. This change is just for the clarity of our proof and does not affect the satisfiability of formulas. As for validity, because unlike [11] we are only interested here in the validity of formula over the class of all frames, for the sake of brevity we defined the validity of formula independently of any class of frames.

For ease of reference, henceforth we call this semantics *TML-semantics*.

Finally, we will introduce by Table 1 the Hilbert-style system **HK** for the minimal normal term-modal logic **K** presented in Liberman et al. [11, p. 17]. The notion of provability is defined as usual.

What is involving the semantic incompleteness of **HK** here is UE and PS. As remarked in Fagin et al. [3, pp. 88-9], the ordinary first-order axioms $\forall x \phi \rightarrow \phi(t/x)$ and $t = s \rightarrow (\phi(t/z) \rightarrow \phi(s/z))$ are not valid in Kripke semantics for first-order modal logic where constants or function symbols are interpreted as non-rigid. In order to avoid making invalid formulas provable, Liberman et al. [11] adopted the variable-restricted versions UE and PS of these two axioms. The problem is that PS or its combinations with UE or $\exists!d$ are not sufficient to derive a valid formula $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$.

3 Semantic Incompleteness of the Hilbert-style System **HK**

In this section, we prove the semantic incompleteness of **HK** by showing that $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$ is valid in the TML-semantics but not provable in **HK**. As expected, there is no difficulty to show the former.

Axiom			
	all propositional tautologies		
UE	$\forall x \varphi \rightarrow \varphi(y/x)$	K	$K_t(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (K_t \varphi \rightarrow K_t \psi)$
Id	$t = t$	BF	$\forall x K_t \varphi \rightarrow K_t \forall x \varphi$ for x not occurring in t
PS	$x = y \rightarrow (\varphi(x/z) \rightarrow \varphi(y/z))$	KN1	$x \neq y \rightarrow K_t x \neq y$
\exists Id	$c = c \rightarrow \exists x(x = c)$		
DD	$x \neq y$ if $\tau(x) \neq \tau(y)$		
Inference rules			
MP	From φ and $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$, infer ψ		
KG	From φ , infer $K_t \varphi$		
UG	From $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$, infer $\varphi \rightarrow \forall x \psi$ for x not free in φ		

Table 1: The Hilbert-style system **HK** for the minimal normal term-modal logic **K**

Proposition 1. Let $\langle \text{Var}, \text{Cn}, \text{Fn}, \text{Re1}, \tau \rangle$ be a signature, $x \in \text{Var}$, $c \in \text{Cn}$ and $P \in \text{Re1}$ with $\tau(P) = \langle \text{agt_or_obj} \rangle$. A formula $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$ is valid in the TML-semantics.

Proof. Suppose $M, w \models_v x = c$ and $M, w \models_v P(x)$. Since $\llbracket x \rrbracket_w^{I,v} = \llbracket c \rrbracket_w^{I,v}$ and $\llbracket x \rrbracket_w^{I,v} \in I(P, w)$, we have $\llbracket c \rrbracket_w^{I,v} \in I(P, w)$. Thus $M, w \models_v P(c)$. \square

To establish the unprovability of $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$, it is sufficient to find a new semantics to which **HK** is sound but in which this formula is not valid. To this end, we will first introduce the notion of non-standard model as follows.

Definition 9 (Non-standard Model). Let $\langle \text{Var}, \text{Cn}, \text{Fn}, \text{Re1}, \tau \rangle$ be a signature. A *non-standard model* is a tuple $N = \langle D, W, R, J \rangle$ where $\langle D, W, R \rangle$ is a frame in the sense of Definition 4 and J is an interpretation that maps

1. a triple $\langle c, w, X \rangle$ of some $c \in \text{Cn}$, some $w \in W$ and some $X \subseteq D^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ to an element $J(c, w, X) \in D_{\tau(c)}$;
2. a triple $\langle f, w, X \rangle$ of some $f \in \text{Fn}$, some $w \in W$ and some $X \subseteq D^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ to a function $J(f, w, X): (D_{\tau_1} \times \dots \times D_{\tau_n}) \rightarrow D_{\tau_{n+1}}$, where $\tau(f) = \langle \tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n+1} \rangle$;
3. a pair $\langle =, w \rangle$ of the equality symbol $=$ and some $w \in W$ to the set $J(=, w) = \{ \langle d, d \rangle \mid d \in D_{\text{agt_or_obj}} \}$;
4. a pair $\langle P, w \rangle$ of some $P \in \text{Re1} \setminus \{ = \}$ and some $w \in W$ to a subset $J(P, w)$ of $D_{\tau_1} \times \dots \times D_{\tau_n}$, where $\tau(P) = \langle \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \rangle$.

Here is the intuition. A subset X of D^n is a set of sequences consisting of either/both of agents and objects. Thus, the set X mentioned in the meanings $J(c, w, X)$ and $J(f, w, X)$ of a constant c and a function symbol f can serve as the meaning of a relation symbol. This trick enables us to make the meanings of constants and function symbols relative to the meanings of relation symbols combined with them.

We then define the notion of satisfaction of formula in non-standard model. In what follows, we use the same notion of valuation as in the TML-semantics and define the extension $\llbracket t \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v}$ of a term t in a given non-standard model similarly by letting $\llbracket x \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v} = v(x)$, $\llbracket c \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v} = J(c, w, X)$ and $\llbracket f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v} = J(f, w, X)(\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v}, \dots, \llbracket t_n \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v})$.

Definition 10 (Satisfaction in Non-standard Model). The *satisfaction* $N, w \models_v \varphi$ of a formula φ at a world w in a non-standard model N under a valuation v is defined as follows.

$$\begin{array}{lll}
N, w \models_v P(t_1, \dots, t_n) & \text{iff} & \langle \llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_{w, J(P, w)}^{J, v}, \dots, \llbracket t_n \rrbracket_{w, J(P, w)}^{J, v} \rangle \in J(P, w) \quad (P \text{ can be } =) \\
N, w \models_v \neg \varphi & \text{iff} & N, w \not\models_v \varphi \\
N, w \models_v \varphi \wedge \psi & \text{iff} & N, w \models_v \varphi \quad \text{and} \quad N, w \models_v \psi \\
N, w \models_v \forall x \varphi & \text{iff} & N, w \models_v [x \rightarrow d] \varphi \quad \text{for all } d \in D_{\tau(x)} \\
N, w \models_v K_t \varphi & \text{iff} & N, w' \models_v \varphi \quad \text{for all } w' \in W \text{ such that } \langle w, w' \rangle \in R_{\llbracket t \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v}}
\end{array}$$

What we should pay attention here is the satisfactions of atomic formula $P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ and term-modal formula $K_t \varphi$. In the satisfaction of $P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ in non-standard model, the meaning $\llbracket t_i \rrbracket_{w, J(P, w)}^{J, v}$ of each t_i in $P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is determined by the interpretation J , the valuation v , the world w and *the meaning $J(P, w)$ of the relation symbol P combined with terms t_1, \dots, t_n* . Thus, as explained in the following Example 1, the meaning of a constant c occurring in $P(c)$ could be different from that of c occurring in $Q(c)$.

Example 1. Let $lewis \in \text{Cn}$ with $\tau(lewis) = \text{agt}$ and $SL, CF \in \text{Re1}$ with $\tau(SL) = \tau(CF) = \langle \text{agt} \rangle$, and consider a non-standard model such that

$$\begin{aligned}
J(SL, w) &= \{i \in D_{\text{agt}} \mid i \text{ is one of the authors of } \textit{Symbolic Logic}\}, \\
J(CF, w) &= \{i \in D_{\text{agt}} \mid i \text{ is the author of } \textit{Counterfactuals}\},
\end{aligned}$$

$J(lewis, w, J(SL, w))$ is C. I. Lewis and $J(lewis, w, J(CF, w))$ is D. Lewis. The meaning $J(lewis, w, J(SL, w))$ of *lewis* occurring in $SL(lewis)$ is then different from the meaning $J(lewis, w, J(CF, w))$ of *lewis* occurring in $CF(lewis)$. Note that, although $J(lewis, w, J(SL, w)) \in J(SL, w)$ holds in the above non-standard model, we can technically have a non-standard model such that $J(lewis, w, J(SL, w)) \notin J(SL, w)$ holds by assigning D. Lewis to $J(lewis, w, J(SL, w))$.

On the other hand, because the meaning $\llbracket t \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v}$ of t in K_t is determined independently of the meaning of any relation symbol, the satisfaction of $K_t \varphi$ in non-standard model is in effect the same as the satisfaction of $K_t \varphi$ in model of the TML-semantics. By this fact we can validate axioms K and BF in this semantics.

The notion of validity is defined as in the TML-semantics. For ease of reference, henceforth we call this semantics *non-standard semantics*.

Now it is easy to see the invalidity of $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$ in the non-standard semantics.

Proposition 2. Let $\langle \text{Var}, \text{Cn}, \text{Fn}, \text{Re1}, \tau \rangle$ be a signature, $x \in \text{Var}$, $c \in \text{Cn}$ with $\tau(x) = \tau(c)$ and $P \in \text{Re1}$ with $\tau(P) = \langle \text{agt_or_obj} \rangle$. A formula $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$ is not valid in the non-standard semantics.

Proof. We may assume $\tau(x) = \tau(c) = \text{agt}$ without loss of generality. Let $N = \langle D, W, R, J \rangle$ be a non-standard model such that $w \in W$, $D_{\text{agt}} = \{\alpha, \beta\}$, $J(c, w, \{\langle d, d \rangle \mid d \in D_{\text{agt_or_obj}}\}) = \alpha$, $J(x, w, \{\alpha\}) = \beta$ and $J(P, w) = \{\alpha\}$. Let v be also a valuation such that $v(x) = \alpha$. Since

$$\llbracket x \rrbracket_{w, J(=, w)}^{J, v} = v(x) = \alpha = J(c, w, \{\langle d, d \rangle \mid d \in D_{\text{agt_or_obj}}\}) = J(c, w, J(=, w)) = \llbracket c \rrbracket_{w, J(=, w)}^{J, v},$$

we have $N, w \models_v x = c$. It is also easy to see $N, w \models_v P(x)$. However, since

$$\llbracket c \rrbracket_{w, J(P, w)}^{J, v} = J(c, w, J(P, w)) = J(c, w, \{\alpha\}) = \beta,$$

it fails that $N, w \models_v P(c)$. Therefore $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$ is not valid in the non-standard semantics. \square

On top of this, we can prove as below that **HK** is sound with respect to the non-standard semantics.

Proposition 3. Let $\langle \text{Var}, \text{Cn}, \text{Fn}, \text{Rel}, \tau \rangle$ be a signature and $x, y \in \text{Var}$ with $\tau(x) = \tau(y)$. Let $N = \langle D, W, R, J \rangle$ be also a non-standard model, w a world, X a subset of D^n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and v a valuation. For all terms t ,

$$\llbracket t(y/x) \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v} = \llbracket t \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v[x \mapsto v(y)]}.$$

Proof. By induction on the length of terms.

- For t being the variable x , $\llbracket x(y/x) \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v} = v(y) = v[x \mapsto v(y)](x) = \llbracket x \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v[x \mapsto v(y)]}$.
- For t being a variable z distinct from x , $\llbracket z(y/x) \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v} = v(z) = v[x \mapsto v(y)](z) = \llbracket z \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v[x \mapsto v(y)]}$.
- For t being a constant c , $\llbracket c(y/x) \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v} = J(c, w, X) = \llbracket c \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v[x \mapsto v(y)]}$.
- For t being of the form $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket f(t_1, \dots, t_n)(y/x) \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v} &= \llbracket f(t_1(y/x), \dots, t_n(y/x)) \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v} \\ &= J(f, w, X)(\llbracket t_1(y/x) \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v}, \dots, \llbracket t_n(y/x) \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v}) \\ &= J(f, w, X)(\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v[x \mapsto v(y)]}, \dots, \llbracket t_n \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v[x \mapsto v(y)]}) \quad (\text{inductive hypothesis}) \\ &= \llbracket f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \rrbracket_{w,X}^{J,v[x \mapsto v(y)]}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 4. Let $\langle \text{Var}, \text{Cn}, \text{Fn}, \text{Rel}, \tau \rangle$ be a signature, $x, y \in \text{Var}$ with $\tau(x) = \tau(y)$ and $N = \langle D, W, R, J \rangle$ a non-standard model. For all worlds w , all valuations v and all formulas φ ,

$$N, w \models_v \varphi(y/x) \quad \text{iff} \quad N, w \models_{v[x \mapsto v(y)]} \varphi.$$

Proof. By induction on the length of formulas. Since the proof of the cases for $\neg\psi$ and $\psi \wedge \gamma$ are straightforward, we see only the cases for $P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, $\forall z\psi$ and $K_t\psi$.

- For φ being of the form $P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} N, w \models_v P(t_1, \dots, t_n)(y/x) &\quad \text{iff} \quad \langle \llbracket t_1(y/x) \rrbracket_{w,J(P,w)}^{J,v}, \dots, \llbracket t_n(y/x) \rrbracket_{w,J(P,w)}^{J,v} \rangle \in J(P, w) \\ &\quad \text{iff} \quad \langle \llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_{w,J(P,w)}^{J,v[x \mapsto v(y)]}, \dots, \llbracket t_n \rrbracket_{w,J(P,w)}^{J,v[x \mapsto v(y)]} \rangle \in J(P, w) \quad (\text{Proposition 3}) \\ &\quad \text{iff} \quad N, w \models_{v[x \mapsto v(y)]} P(t_1, \dots, t_n) \end{aligned}$$

- For φ being of the form $\forall z\psi$, if $z = x$, then $N, w \models_v (\forall x\psi)(y/x)$ iff $N, w \models_v \forall x\psi$ iff $N, w \models_{v[x \mapsto v(y)]} \forall x\psi$. So suppose $z \neq x$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} N, w \models_v (\forall z\psi)(y/x) &\quad \text{iff} \quad N, w \models_v \forall z\psi(y/x) \\ &\quad \text{iff} \quad N, w \models_{v[z \mapsto d]} \psi(y/x) \quad \text{for all } d \in D_{\tau(z)} \\ &\quad \text{iff} \quad N, w \models_{v[z \mapsto d][x \mapsto v[z \mapsto d](y)]} \psi \quad \text{for all } d \in D_{\tau(z)} \quad (\text{inductive hypothesis}) \\ &\quad \text{iff} \quad N, w \models_{v[x \mapsto v(y)][z \mapsto d]} \psi \quad \text{for all } d \in D_{\tau(z)} \quad (z \neq x \text{ and } z \neq y) \\ &\quad \text{iff} \quad N, w \models_{v[x \mapsto v(y)]} \forall z\psi \end{aligned}$$

- For φ being of the form $K_t \psi$,

$$\begin{aligned}
N, w \models_v (K_t \psi)(y/x) & \text{ iff } N, w \models_v K_{t(y/x)} \psi(y/x) \\
& \text{ iff } N, w' \models_v \psi(y/x) \quad \text{all } w' \in W \text{ such that } \langle w, w' \rangle \in R_{\llbracket t(y/x) \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v}} \\
& \text{ iff } N, w' \models_v \psi(y/x) \quad \text{all } w' \in W \text{ such that } \langle w, w' \rangle \in R_{\llbracket t \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v[x \rightarrow v(y)]}} \\
& \quad \text{(Proposition 3)} \\
& \text{ iff } N, w' \models_{v[x \rightarrow v(y)]} \psi \quad \text{all } w' \in W \text{ such that } \langle w, w' \rangle \in R_{\llbracket t \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v[x \rightarrow v(y)]}} \\
& \quad \text{(inductive hypothesis)} \\
& \text{ iff } N, w \models_{v[x \rightarrow v(y)]} K_t \psi.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 1 (Soundness). If φ is provable in **HK**, then φ is valid in the non-standard semantics.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that all axioms are valid and that all inference rules preserve validity. Since the proof of the latter is done as usual, we see only the former.

- For any propositional tautology, its validity is obvious since the non-standard semantics gives the ordinary satisfactions for \neg and \wedge .
- For UE, i.e., $\forall x \varphi \rightarrow \varphi(y/x)$, suppose $N, w \models_v \forall x \varphi$. Then $N, w \models_{v[x \rightarrow v(y)]} \varphi$. Thus by Proposition 4 $N, w \models_v \varphi(y/x)$ holds, as required.
- For Id, i.e., $t = t$, its validity is obvious.
- For PS, i.e., $x = y \rightarrow (\varphi(x/z) \rightarrow \varphi(y/z))$, its validity is shown by induction on φ .
 - For φ being of the form $P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, suppose $N, w \models_v x = y$ and $N, w \models_v P(t_1, \dots, t_n)(x/z)$.

Since

$$\langle \llbracket t_1(x/z) \rrbracket_{w, J(P, w)}^{J, v}, \dots, \llbracket t_n(x/z) \rrbracket_{w, J(P, w)}^{J, v} \rangle \in J(P, w),$$

we can use $v(x) = v(y)$ and Proposition 3 to obtain

$$\langle \llbracket t_1(y/z) \rrbracket_{w, J(P, w)}^{J, v}, \dots, \llbracket t_n(y/z) \rrbracket_{w, J(P, w)}^{J, v} \rangle \in J(P, w).$$

Thus $N, w \models_v P(t_1, \dots, t_n)(y/z)$.

- For φ being of the forms $\neg \psi$ or $\psi \wedge \gamma$, the proof is straightforward.
- For φ being of the form $\forall z' \psi$, suppose $N, w \models_v x = y$ and $N, w \models_v (\forall z' \psi)(x/z)$. If $z' = z$, obviously $N, w \models_v (\forall z' \psi)(y/z)$. If $z' \neq z$, then we have $N, w \models_v \forall z' \psi(x/z)$ thus $N, w \models_{v[z' \rightarrow d]} \psi(x/z)$ for all $d \in D_{\tau(z')}$. Since we have $N, w \models_{v[z' \rightarrow d]} x = y$ for all $d \in D_{\tau(z')}$, by inductive hypothesis we obtain $N, w \models_{v[z' \rightarrow d]} \psi(y/z)$ for all $d \in D_{\tau(z')}$. Therefore, $N, w \models_v (\forall z' \psi)(y/z)$.
- For φ being of the form $K_t \psi$, suppose $N, w \models_v x = y$ and $N, w \models_v (K_t \psi)(x/z)$. Then $N, w' \models_v \psi(x/z)$ for all $w' \in W$ such that $\langle w, w' \rangle \in R_{\llbracket t(x/z) \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v}}$. Now, we have $N, w' \models_v x = y$ for all $w' \in W$, as well as $\llbracket t(x/z) \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v} = \llbracket t(y/z) \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v}$ by $v(x) = v(y)$ and Proposition 3. So by inductive hypothesis we obtain $N, w' \models_v \psi(y/z)$ for all $w' \in W$ such that $\langle w, w' \rangle \in R_{\llbracket t(y/z) \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v}}$. Thus, $N, w \models_v (K_t \psi)(y/z)$.

- For \exists Id, i.e., $c = c \rightarrow \exists x(x = c)$, suppose $N, w \models_v c = c$. Since $N, w \models_{v[x \rightarrow J(c, w, J(=, w))]} x = c$, we have $N, w \models_v \exists x(x = c)$, as required.
- For DD, i.e., $x \neq y$ if $\tau(x) \neq \tau(y)$, suppose $\tau(x) \neq \tau(y)$ and let N, w and v be arbitrary. By the definition of valuation, each of $v(x)$ and $v(y)$ is in $D_{\tau(x)}$ and $D_{\tau(y)}$, respectively. Since $\tau(x) \neq \tau(y)$, $D_{\tau(x)}$ and $D_{\tau(y)}$ must be disjoint. Thus $N, w \models_v x \neq y$, as required.
- For K, i.e., $K_t(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (K_t\varphi \rightarrow K_t\psi)$, suppose $N, w \models_v K_t(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$ and $N, w \models_v K_t\varphi$. Let w' be any world such that $\langle w, w' \rangle \in R_{\llbracket t \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v}}$. Then we have $N, w' \models_v \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ and $N, w' \models_v \varphi$. Thus $N, w' \models_v \psi$, as required.
- For BF, i.e., $\forall x K_t\varphi \rightarrow K_t\forall x\varphi$ for x not occurring in t , suppose $N, w \models_v \forall x K_t\varphi$. To show $N, w \models_v K_t\forall x\varphi$, let w' be any world such that $\langle w, w' \rangle \in R_{\llbracket t \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v}}$ and take any $d \in D_{\tau(x)}$. By our supposition, we have $N, w \models_{v[x \rightarrow d]} K_t\varphi$. Now $\llbracket t \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v} = \llbracket t \rrbracket_{w, \emptyset}^{J, v[x \rightarrow d]}$ holds since x does not occur in t . Thus $N, w' \models_{v[x \rightarrow d]} \varphi$, as required.
- For KNI, i.e., $x \neq y \rightarrow K_t x \neq y$, suppose $N, w \models_v x \neq y$. By definition, obviously $N, w' \models_v x \neq y$ for all worlds w' . Thus $N, w \models K_t x \neq y$, as required.

By the above argument the proof has completed. \square

We can now prove the semantic incompleteness of **HK** as follows.

Theorem 2. Let $\Sigma = \langle \text{Var}, \text{Cn}, \text{Fn}, \text{Rel}, \tau \rangle$ be a signature, $x \in \text{Var}$, $c \in \text{Cn}$ with $\tau(x) = \tau(c)$ and $P \in \text{Rel}$ with $\tau(P) = \langle \text{agt_or_obj} \rangle$. A formula $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$ is not provable in **HK**.

Proof. If $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$ is provable in **HK**, then by the soundness (Theorem 1) it must be valid in the non-standard semantics, which contradicts Proposition 2. \square

Corollary 1 (Semantic Incompleteness of **HK**). The Hilbert-style system **HK** is semantically incomplete with respect to the TML-semantics, i.e., there exists some formula φ such that φ is valid in the TML-semantics but not provable in **HK**.

Proof. By Proposition 1 and Theorem 2. \square

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we proved that Liberman et al.[11]'s Hilbert-style system **HK** for the term-modal logic **K** with equality and non-rigid terms is semantically incomplete by introducing the non-standard semantics for which **HK** is sound but in which $x = c \rightarrow (P(x) \rightarrow P(c))$ is not valid.

A further direction to be pursued is to give sound and complete Hilbert-style systems for term-modal logics including **K** with equality and non-rigid terms. Such systems, for example, might be obtained as slight modifications of the system given in Fagin et al. [3, p. 90]. Another further direction that might be worth studying is to apply the non-standard semantics to the analysis of natural language. As Example 1 suggests, it is reasonable to see $J(P)$ in $J(c, w, J(P))$ as a kind of *context* uniquely determining the denotation of a constant c at a world w . Thus, the non-standard semantics might be seen as a semantics capturing the context-dependency of the denotations of nouns in natural language.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP23KJ2146.

References

- [1] A. Achen (2017): *Putting the Agents Back in the Domain: A Two-Sorted Term-Modal Logic*. Master's thesis, University of Copenhagen, doi:10.48550/arXiv.1811.01590. Bachelor thesis.
- [2] Herbert Enderton (2001): *A Mathematical Introduction to Logic*, second edition. Academic Press, doi:10.1016/C2009-0-22107-6.
- [3] Ronald Fagin, Yoram Moses, Joseph Y. Halpern & Moshe Y. Vardi (2003): *Reasoning about Knowledge*. MIT press.
- [4] Melvin Fitting, Lars Thalmann & Andrei Voronkov (2001): *Term-Modal Logics*. *Studia Logica* 69, pp. 133–169, doi:10.1023/A:1013842612702.
- [5] Stef Frijters (2021): *All Doctors Have an Obligation to Care for Their Patients: Term-modal Logics for Ethical Reasoning with Quantified Deontic Statements*. Ph.D. thesis, Ghent University.
- [6] Stef Frijters (2023): *An Andersonian-Kangerian Reduction of Term-Modal Deontic Logics*. In: *Deontic Logic and Normative Systems 16th International Conference, DEON 2023*, College Publications, pp. 159–176.
- [7] Stef Frijters & Thijs De Coninck (2021): *The Manchester Twins : Conflicts between Directed Obligations*. In Fenrong Liu, Alessandra Marra, Paul Portner & Frederik Van De Putte, editors: *Deontic Logic and Normative Systems: 15th International Conference, Proceedings*, College Publications.
- [8] Stef Frijters, Joke Meheus & Frederik Van De Putte (2019): *Quantifying over the Indexes of Obligation Operators*. In: *Formal Ethics 2019*, Ghent University, Gent.
- [9] Stef Frijters & Frederik Van De Putte (2020): *Classical Term-modal Logics*. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, doi:10.1093/logcom/exaa053.
- [10] B. Kooi (2008): *Dynamic Term-modal Logic*. In J. van Benthem, S. Ju & F. Veltman, editors: *A Meeting of the Minds. Proceedings of the Workshop on Logic, Rationality and Interaction, Beijing, 2007*, *Texts in Computing Computer Science* 8, College Publications, pp. 173–185.
- [11] Andrés Occhipinti Liberman, Andreas Achen & Rasmus Kræmmer Rendsvig (2020): *Dynamic Term-modal Logics for First-order Epistemic Planning*. *Artificial Intelligence* 286, p. 103305, doi:10.1016/j.artint.2020.103305.
- [12] Andrés Occhipinti Liberman, Andreas Achen & Rasmus Kræmmer Rendsvig (2023): *Erratum to “Dynamic Term-Modal Logics for First-Order Epistemic Planning” [artif. Intell. 286 (2020) 103305]*. *Artificial Intelligence* 323, p. 103969, doi:10.1016/j.artint.2023.103969.
- [13] Andrés Occhipinti Liberman & Rasmus K. Rendsvig (2019): *Dynamic Term-Modal Logic for Epistemic Social Network Dynamics*. In: *Logic, Rationality, and Interaction*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 168–182, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-60292-8_13.
- [14] Andrés Occhipinti Liberman & Rasmus Kræmmer Rendsvig (2020): *Decidability Results in First-Order Epistemic Planning*. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, pp. 4161–4167, doi:10.24963/ijcai.2020/575.
- [15] Pavel Naumov & Anna Ovchinnikova (2023): *De Re and De Dicto Knowledge in Egocentric Setting*, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2308.00001.
- [16] Pavel Naumov & Jia Tao (2019): *Everyone Knows that Someone Knows: Quantifiers over Epistemic Agents*. *The Review of Symbolic Logic* 12(2), pp. 255–270, doi:10.1017/s1755020318000497.
- [17] Rasmus K. Rendsvig (2010): *Epistemic Term-Modal Logic*. In Marija Slavkovic, editor: *Proceedings of the 15th Student Session of the European Summer School in Logic, Language and Information*, pp. 37–46.

- [18] Rasmus K. Rendsvig (2011): *Towards a Theory of Semantic Competence*. Master's thesis, Roskilde University.
- [19] Takahiro Sawasaki & Katsuhiko Sano (2021): *Term-Sequence-Dyadic Deontic Logic*. In Fenrong Liu, Alessandra Marra, Paul Portner & Frederik Van De Putte, editors: *Deontic Logic and Normative Systems: 15th International Conference, DEON 2020/2021*, College Publication, pp. 376–393.
- [20] Takahiro Sawasaki, Katsuhiko Sano & Tomoyuki Yamada (2019): *Term-Sequence-Modal Logics*. In Patrick Blackburn, Emiliano Lorini & Meiyun Guo, editors: *Logic, Rationality, and Interaction: 7th International Workshop, LORI 2019, Chongqing, China, October 18–21, 2019, Proceedings*, 11813, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 244–258, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-60292-8_18.
- [21] Igor Sedlár (2014): *Term-Modal Logics of Evidence. Epistemic Logic for Individual, Social, and Interactive Epistemology (ESSLLI 2014)*, Tübingen, Germany.
- [22] Lars Thalmann (2000): *Term-Modal Logic and Quantifier-free Dynamic Assignment Logic*. Ph.D. thesis, Uppsala University.
- [23] Yanjing Wang & Jeremy Seligman (2018): *When Names are not Commonly Known: Epistemic Logic with Assignments*. In Guram Bezhaniashvili, Giovanna D'Agostino, George Metcalfe & Thomas Studer, editors: *Advances in Modal Logic, Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Advances in Modal Logic, Held in Bern, Switzerland, August 27-31, 2018*, College Publications, pp. 611–628, doi:10.48550/arXiv.1805.03852.
- [24] Yanjing Wang, Yu Wei & Jeremy Seligman (2022): *Quantifier-free Epistemic Term-modal Logic with Assignment Operator*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 173(3), p. 103071, doi:10.1016/j.apal.2021.103071.