

# Conditional Esakia Duality

Brendan Dufty<sup>1</sup> and Jim de Groot<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
brendan.dufty@student.uva.nl

<sup>2</sup> The Australian National University, Canberra, Ngunnawal Country, Australia  
jim.degroot@anu.edu.au

Classical conditional logic strives to resolve issues that mathematicians and philosophers alike have had with traditional implication. We often have an intuition that  $A \rightarrow B$  should speak to a connection between  $A$  and  $B$  — they should not be irrelevant or coincidentally connected. Weiss developed **ICK** from Chellas classical conditional in [1] by adding conditional implication,  $\Box \rightarrow$ , to basic intuitionistic logic. The conditional intuitively represents a stricter interpretation of implication —  $\varphi \Box \rightarrow \psi$  is only the case if  $\varphi$  is relevant to  $\psi$ . This intuition is reflected in the frame semantics of **ICK**.

**Definition 1.** An *ICK-frame* is a tuple  $(X, \leq, f)$  where  $(X, \leq)$  is a preorder and

$$f : X \times Up(X, \leq) \rightarrow Up(X, \leq)$$

is a *selection function* such that  $x \leq y$  implies  $f(y, a) \subseteq f(x, a)$  for all  $a \in Up(X, \leq)$ . Proposition letters are interpreted via a valuation which assigns an upset of  $(X, \leq)$  to each proposition letter, and  $\wedge, \vee, \neg$  and  $\rightarrow$  are interpreted as usual. For  $x \in X$  we let

$$x \Vdash \varphi \Box \rightarrow \psi \quad \text{iff} \quad f(x, \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket) \subseteq \llbracket \psi \rrbracket,$$

where  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket = \{w \in X \mid w \Vdash \varphi\}$ .

We can think of  $f$  as picking out the worlds relevant to  $\varphi$  at  $w$ . While a selection function best approximates our conditional motivations, it is sometimes easier to view it as an upset-indexed family of relations  $\{R_\alpha\}$ , where  $(\leq \circ R_\alpha \circ \leq) \subseteq R_\alpha$  for each relation. This allows us to view each relation as a modal relation in the sense of intuitionistic normal modal logic [4].

The new connective  $\Box \rightarrow$  can be axiomatised by adding to intuitionistic logic the axioms

$$(\varphi \Box \rightarrow (\psi \wedge \theta)) \leftrightarrow ((\varphi \Box \rightarrow \psi) \wedge (\varphi \Box \rightarrow \theta)) \quad \text{and} \quad (\varphi \Box \rightarrow \top) \leftrightarrow \top$$

and congruence rules, resulting in the logic **ICK**. We find the following algebraic semantics:

**Definition 2.** A *conditional Heyting algebra* is a tuple  $(\mathcal{A}, \Box \rightarrow)$  consisting of a Heyting algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  and a binary operator  $\Box \rightarrow$  satisfying  $a \Box \rightarrow (b \wedge c) = (a \Box \rightarrow b) \wedge (a \Box \rightarrow c)$  and  $a \Box \rightarrow 1 = 1$ .

Inspired by the duality for intuitionistic normal modal logic [4, 2] and Weiss' work on **ICK** [3], we define topologised frame semantics as follows.

**Definition 3.** A *conditional Esakia space* is an Esakia space  $\mathbb{X} = (X, \leq, \tau)$  equipped with a family of point-closed relations  $\{R_A \mid A \in ClpUp(\mathbb{X})\}$  such that for each  $A, B \in ClpUp(\mathbb{X})$ :

$$\Box_{R_A}(B) := \{x \in X \mid R_A[x] \subseteq B\} \in ClpUp(\mathbb{X}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\leq \circ R_A \circ \leq) = R_A.$$

It is well known that collection of clopen upsets of an Esakia space  $\mathbb{X}$  forms a Heyting algebra, denoted by  $\mathbb{X}^+$ . We can obtain a conditional Heyting algebra  $(\mathbb{X}^+, \Box \rightarrow)$  by defining

$$A \Box \rightarrow B = \Box_{R_A}(B).$$

Conversely, every Heyting algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  corresponds to an Esakia space  $\mathcal{A}_+$  based on the prime filters of  $\mathcal{A}$ . In particular, we know that every clopen upset of  $\mathcal{A}_+$  is of the form  $\tilde{a} := \{x \in \mathcal{A}_+ \mid a \in x\}$  for some  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . Ergo, the following definition

$$xR_{\tilde{a}}y \quad \text{iff} \quad \{b \in \mathcal{A} \mid a \Box \rightarrow b \in x\} \subseteq y,$$

results in a conditional Esakia space  $(\mathcal{A}_+, \{R_{\tilde{a}}\})$ . In fact, the assignments above give rise to a dual equivalence between categories:

**Theorem 4.** *The category of conditional Esakia spaces (with suitable morphisms) is dually equivalent to the category of conditional Heyting algebras and homomorphisms.*

This duality allows us to prove several frame completeness results. Beginning with **ICK** we note that if **ICK**  $\not\models \varphi$  then there exists a conditional Heyting algebra such that  $\mathcal{A} \not\models \varphi$ . Hence there exists a conditional Esakia space  $\mathbb{X} = (X, \leq, \tau, \{R_\alpha\})$  and a valuation  $V$  such that  $(\mathbb{X}, V) \not\models \varphi$ . Forgetting the topology *almost* gives an ICK-frame, except it lacks relations  $R_\alpha$  when  $\alpha$  is a non-clopen upset. We can fill in these missing relations by setting:

$$S_\alpha = \begin{cases} R_\alpha & \text{if } \alpha \text{ is a clopen upset} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Since the clopen-indexed relations are unchanged we find that  $((X, \leq, \{S_\alpha\}), V) \not\models \varphi$ , so that:

**Theorem 5.** *The logic ICK is sound and complete with respect to ICK-frames.*

This example highlights the two prongs of a duality completeness proof. When we extend **ICK** with a collection of axioms we induce both a *frame correspondence condition* and a *counter-example space*. We then need to extend the space to a frame which satisfies this correspondence condition for all upsets while also leaving the clopen relations (which guarantee the counter-example) unchanged. We call these “nice extensions” *fill-ins*, since we are in a sense filling in the missing upset relations on the underlying frame of a conditional Esakia space. Below we list several extensions of **ICK** together with their frame correspondent and (one possible) fill-in that can be used to prove completeness.

Axiom	Frame Condition	Fill-in
$\varphi \Box \rightarrow \varphi$	$R_A[x] \subseteq A$	$R_p[x] \subseteq p$
$p \wedge (p \Box \rightarrow q) \rightarrow q$	$p \cap \Box_{R_p}(q) \subseteq q$	$R_p[x] \supseteq p$
$(p \Box \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \wedge r \Box \rightarrow q)$	$\Box_{R_p}(q) \subseteq \Box_{R_p \cap q}(q)$	$R_p[x] := \bigcup_{p \supseteq U} R_U[x]$
$(p \Box \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \Box \rightarrow r) \rightarrow p \Box \rightarrow r$	$\Box_{R_p}(q) \cap \Box_{R_q}(r) \subseteq \Box_{R_p}(r)$	$R_p[x] := \bigcup \{R_U[x] \mid R_U[x] \subseteq p\}$
$(p \Box \rightarrow q) \vee (p \Box \rightarrow \neg q)$	$\Box_{R_p}(q) \cup \Box_{R_p}(X \setminus \downarrow q) = X$	The empty relation

## References

- [1] B. F. Chellas. Basic conditional logic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 4(2):133–153, 1975.
- [2] A. Palmigiano. Dualities for intuitionistic modal logics. *Liber Amicorum for Dick de Jongh*, pages 151–167, 2004.
- [3] Y. Weiss. Basic intuitionistic conditional logic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 48(3):447–469, 2019.
- [4] F. Wolter and M. Zakharyashev. Intuitionistic modal logic. In A. Cantini, E. Casari, and P. Minari, editors, *Logic and Foundations of Mathematics: Selected Contributed Papers of the Tenth International Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, pages 227–238, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 1999. Springer.