Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic Volume 30, Number 1, Winter 1989

Notes on Modal Definability

JOHAN van BENTHEM*

1 Introduction This paper contains a few observations on the definability of frame classes in modal logic, utilizing current algebraic methods in the area. For technical background, see [3], [4].

Possible worlds frames induce modal algebras of their subsets, and conversely, modal algebras can be represented as frame-induced set algebras by the Stone ultrafilter representation. This back-and-forth connection allows for a transfer of existing definability results in Universal Algebra to the model theory of possible worlds frames. One notable result is that, in translating the Birkhoff characterization of equational varieties, if a frame F validates the full modal theory of some frame class K, then the following structural connection exists: The 'ultrafilter extension' ue(F) is a generated subframe of a *p*-morphic image of an ultrafilter extension of some disjoint union of frames in K. Several wellknown theorems on the modal definability of frame classes have been deduced from this and similar observations. Here we shall take a closer look at the structure of the *ultrafilter extensions* involved (Section 2), deriving some additional definability results (Section 3). Then we particularize the theory to an important special case, viz. that of *finite frames*, which turns out to require additional techniques (Section 4). Finally, another specialization is considered, to the case of singleton classes K, i.e. to the study of *modal equivalence* between frames (Section 5).

The notion of an ultrafilter extension and its various uses forms a red thread through this report—which is otherwise a loose collection of results 'rounding out' the existing literature.

^{*}The contents of this paper form a response to the work of several people. A reading of Fine [13] led to Section 3.1, a review of Sambin & Vaccaro [24] to Section 3.2. Also, notably, involvement with Rodenburg [23] and Doets [9] produced Section 4. And finally, a correspondence with Kees Doets and Dick de Jongh inspired Section 5.2.

I would also wish to thank the referee of this Journal for several valuable suggestions.