



BEYOND “KNOWING THAT” (III)

LOGIC OF KNOWING (WHAT THE) VALUE (IS)

Yanjing Wang

Department of Philosophy, Peking University

NASSLLI 2018, CMU

www.wangyanjing.com

Background

Knowing value

Conditionally knowing value

An alternative semantics

Further directions

BACKGROUND

A QUOTE AGAIN...

“Classic” - a book which people praise and don't read.

– Mark Twain

We usually read the “digested” versions of the classics.
However, they are not as “juicy” as the originals.

The classics (in logic) are usually rich in sincere considerations and questions behind the initiation of a new field, which should be appreciated beyond “archaeological” interests.

However, only the “most important” parts (sometimes “minor” things in the author's mind at the time of writing) survive after iterated filtering by influential authors and schools.

A CLASSIC PAPER IN DYNAMIC EPISTEMIC LOGIC

- Jan Plaza: Logics of public communications. In Proceedings of the 4th ISMIS Oak Ridge, TN: Oak Ridge National Laboratory, pp. 201-216. (1989) Unknown for a long time.
- Rediscovered in the late 90s after Gerbrandy and Groeneveld (1997) proposed a similar logic independently (in the Amsterdam tradition of update semantics).
- Reprinted in *Synthese* Volume 158, Issue 2, pp 165-179 (2007), with Hans van Ditmarsch's comments about the history of **DEL** before and after Plaza's paper, and content of the paper (pp 181-187).

WHAT PLAZA DID

- Define the syntax and semantics of *public announcement logic* (**PAL**):

$$\varphi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \psi) \mid \mathcal{K}_i\varphi \mid \mathcal{K}W_i\varphi \mid \varphi + \psi$$

$$\mathcal{M}, s \models \varphi + \psi \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}, s \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{M}|_{\varphi}, s \models \psi$$

- $\varphi + \psi$ is essentially $\langle \varphi \rangle \psi$
- Discover the reduction to epistemic logic
- Give a complete proof system via reduction e.g.,
$$\varphi + (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) \equiv (\varphi + \psi_1) \wedge (\varphi + \psi_2)$$
- But that is only *half* of the paper!

A VERSION OF PLAZA'S SYSTEM FOR PAL

Axiom Schemas	
TAUT	all the instances of tautologies
DISTK	$\mathcal{K}_i(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_i\varphi \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i\psi)$
!ATOM	$[\psi]p \leftrightarrow (\psi \rightarrow p)$
!NEG	$[\psi]\neg\varphi \leftrightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \neg[\psi]\varphi)$
!CON	$[\psi](\varphi \wedge \chi) \leftrightarrow ([\psi]\varphi \wedge [\psi]\chi)$
!K	$[\psi]\mathcal{K}_i\varphi \leftrightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i(\psi \rightarrow [\psi]\varphi))$
Rules	
NECK	$\frac{\varphi}{\mathcal{K}_i\varphi}$
RE	$\frac{\varphi \leftrightarrow \chi}{\psi \leftrightarrow \psi[\chi/\varphi]}$
MP	$\frac{\varphi, \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$

ONE OF THE TWO RUNNING EXAMPLES IN PLAZA'S PAPER

Mr. Sum & Mr. Product

Mr. Puzzle: I choose two natural numbers between 1 and 100. I will tell the sum of the numbers only to Mr. Sum, and their product only to Mr. Product.

He tells them.

Mr. Product: I do not know the numbers.

Mr. Sum: I knew you didn't.

Mr. Product: But now I know!

Mr. Sum: So do I!

What are the two numbers?

How to express *knowing the numbers*?

KNOWING VALUE

KNOW-VALUE OPERATOR BY PLAZA (ALSO MA & GUO IJCAI83)

ELKv is defined as (where $c \in C$ is a constant symbol):

$$\varphi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid \mathcal{K}_i\varphi \mid \mathcal{K}v_i c$$

$\mathcal{K}v_i$ says “agent i knows [what] the value of c [is]”

ELKv is interpreted on FO-epistemic models with a *constant* domain $\mathcal{M} = \langle S, D, \{\sim_i \mid i \in I\}, V, V_C \rangle$, where V_C assigns to each (non-rigid) $c \in C$ an $o \in D$ on each $s \in S$:

$$\mathcal{M}, s \models \mathcal{K}v_i c \iff \text{for any } t_1, t_2 : \text{if } s \sim_i t_1, s \sim_i t_2, \\ \text{then } V_C(c, t_1) = V_C(c, t_2).$$

Essentially the semantics says $\exists x \mathcal{K}(c \approx x)$. Knowing whether φ can be viewed as “knowing what the truth value of φ is”.

KNOW-VALUE OPERATOR BY PLAZA (ALSO MA, GUO IJCAI83)

ELK_v can express “*i* knows that *j* knows the password but *i* doesn’t know what exactly it is” by $\mathcal{K}_i\mathcal{K}_vj:c \wedge \neg\mathcal{K}_vj:c$.

The interaction between the two operators is crucial: it cannot be treated as $\mathcal{K}_i\mathcal{K}_j p \wedge \neg\mathcal{K}_i p$ which is inconsistent.

It is crucial in security protocol verification. Ways to capture “knowing what”: e.g., introducing $has_i(m)$ as a basic proposition with a database of messages in the semantics.

See [Dechesne & Wang Synthese 2010] for a survey on various knowledge in the security setting.

KNOW-VALUE OPERATOR BY PLAZA (ALSO MA, GUO IJCAI83)

To handle the *Sum and Product* puzzle, Plaza extended **ELKv** with announcement operator (call it **PALKv**):

$$\varphi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid \mathcal{K}_i\varphi \mid \mathcal{K}v_i c \mid \langle\varphi\rangle\varphi$$

Plaza mentioned some axioms on top of S5 and van Ditmarsch (2007) raised their completeness as an open problem.

$$\text{Kv4} \quad \mathcal{K}v_i c \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathcal{K}_j \mathcal{K}v_i c$$

$$\text{Kv5} \quad \neg \mathcal{K}v_i c \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathcal{K}_i \neg \mathcal{K}v_i c$$

$$\text{KKv} \quad \langle \mathcal{K}_i \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{K}_i \varphi \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i c$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}v_i c \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i d \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{K}v_i c \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i d$$

$$\langle \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathcal{K}_i (\varphi \rightarrow \langle \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c)$$

$$\langle \varphi \rangle \neg \mathcal{K}v_i c \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathcal{K}_i (\varphi \rightarrow \langle \varphi \rangle \neg \mathcal{K}v_i c)$$

THE LAST THREE CAN BE DERIVED FROM OTHERS.

$$\text{Kv4} \quad \mathcal{K}v_i c \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i c$$

$$\text{Kv5} \quad \neg \mathcal{K}v_i c \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathcal{K}_i \neg \mathcal{K}v_i c$$

$$\text{KKv} \quad \langle \mathcal{K}_i \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c \leftrightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \varphi \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i c$$

$$(i) \quad \mathcal{K}v_i c \leftrightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i c \quad \text{Kv4, T}$$

$$(ii) \quad \langle \mathcal{K}v_i c \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i d \leftrightarrow \langle \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i c \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i d \quad \text{RE}$$

$$(iii) \quad \langle \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i c \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i d \leftrightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i c \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i d \quad \text{KKv}$$

$$(iv) \quad \langle \mathcal{K}v_i c \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i d \leftrightarrow (\mathcal{K}v_i c \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i d) \quad \text{MP(ii) (iii)}$$

$$(i) \quad \mathcal{K}v_i c \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i c \quad \text{Kv4}$$

$$(ii) \quad \langle \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c \rightarrow \langle \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i c \quad \text{DISTA, NECA}$$

$$(iii) \quad \langle \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i c \leftrightarrow (\varphi \wedge \mathcal{K}_i (\varphi \rightarrow \langle \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c)) \quad \text{!K}$$

$$(iv) \quad \langle \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i (\varphi \rightarrow \langle \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c) \quad \text{MP(ii)(iii)}$$

Call S5 plus Plaza's three axioms PALKV_p .

Theorem (Wang & Fan IJCAI13)

$\theta = \langle p \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c \wedge \langle q \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c \rightarrow \langle p \vee q \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c$ is not provable in PALKV_p , thus PALKV_p is not complete.

Proof idea:


- define a class \mathbb{C} of two-dimensional models (with $\xrightarrow{\varphi}$ -labelled transitions) and a new semantics \Vdash for PALKV such that:
 - for all PALKV formulas φ : $\vdash \varphi \implies \mathbb{C} \Vdash \varphi$
 - show that $\mathbb{C} \not\Vdash \theta$.

Cf. [Wang & Cao Synthese 2013] for the general method of constructing such semantics for PAL and incompleteness.

THE IDEA OF THE COUNTER MODEL

Properties of \mathbb{C} includes:

- Invariance for basic propositions, functionality of transitions, perfect recall, no miracles, replacement (about substitution)
- D-Invariance: if $s \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}_i\varphi} t$, then $V_C(d, s) = V_C(d, t)$, in order to handle $\langle \mathcal{K}_i\varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c \leftrightarrow \mathcal{K}_i\varphi \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i c$.



A BISIMULATION NOTION

A d -bisimulation between \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 is a non-empty relation $Z \subseteq S_1 \times S_2$ such that if $s_1 Z s_2$ then the following requirements hold for all $i \in I$ (besides the standard bis conditions):

Kv-Zig: if $t_1 \sim_i^1 s_1 \sim_i^1 t'_1$, and $V_C^1(c, t_1) \neq V_C^1(c, t'_1)$
 for some c then there exist $t_2, t'_2 \in S_2$ such that
 $t_2 \sim_i^2 s_2 \sim_i^2 t'_2$, and $V_C^2(c, t_2) \neq V_C^2(c, t'_2)$;

Kv-Zag: symmetric

We write $\mathcal{M}_1, s_1 \leftrightarrow_d \mathcal{M}_2, s_2$ iff there is a d -bisimulation between \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 linking s_1 and s_2 .

Proposition

If $\mathcal{M}_1, s_1 \leftrightarrow_d \mathcal{M}_2, s_2$, then $\mathcal{M}_1, s_1 \equiv_{ELKV} \mathcal{M}_2, s_2$.

A REDUCTION-BASED AXIOMATIZATION IS IMPOSSIBLE

Now consider the following two epistemic models (using \circ and \bullet for the objects assigned to c):

$$s : p \circ \neg \neg p \bullet \quad s' : p \circ \neg \neg p \bullet$$

It is not hard to see that these two models are d -bisimilar linking s and s' . However, we can distinguish s and s' easily by a **PALK v** formula $[p]\mathcal{K}v_1c$.

Theorem (Wang & Fan IJCAI13)

PALK v is strictly more expressive than ELK v .

CONDITIONALLY KNOWING VALUE

CONDITIONALLY KNOWING WHAT

Axiomatizing **PALKv** is indeed hard (still open). We propose a generalization of $\mathcal{K}v_i$ operator inspired by the relativized common knowledge operator (call it **ELKv^r**):

$$\varphi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \mathcal{K}_i\varphi \mid \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, c)$$

where $\mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, c)$ says “agent i knows what c is given φ ”, e.g., I know my password for this website given it is 4-digit.

$$\mathcal{M}, s \models \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, c) \iff \text{for any } t_1, t_2 \in S \text{ such that } s \sim_i t_1 \text{ and } s \sim_i t_2 : \\ \mathcal{M}, t_1 \models \varphi \& \mathcal{M}, t_2 \models \varphi \text{ implies } V_C(c, t_1) = V_C(c, t_2)$$

Note that $\models \mathcal{K}v_i c \leftrightarrow \mathcal{K}v_i(\top, c)$.

Let **PALKv^r** be:

$$\varphi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid \mathcal{K}_i\varphi \mid \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, c) \mid \langle \varphi \rangle \varphi$$

PALKv^r looks more expressive than PALKv but in fact they are equally expressive.

Theorem (Wang & Fan IJCAI13)

The comparison of the expressive power of those logics are summarized in the following (transitive) diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{ELKv}^r & \longleftrightarrow & \text{PALKv}^r \\
 \uparrow & & \downarrow \\
 \text{ELKv} & \longrightarrow & \text{PALKv}
 \end{array}$$

Translation $t : \text{ELKv}^r \rightarrow \text{PALKv}$, $g : \text{PALKv}^r \rightarrow \text{ELKv}^r$

$$\begin{aligned}
 t(\mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, d)) &= \mathcal{K}_i \neg t(\varphi) \vee \hat{\mathcal{K}}_i \langle t(\varphi) \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i d \\
 g(\langle \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i(\psi, d)) &= g(\varphi) \wedge g(\mathcal{K}v_i(\langle \varphi \rangle \psi, d))
 \end{aligned}$$

System $\mathbb{E}LKVR$

Axiom Schemas

TAUT

all the instances of tautologies

Rules

DISTK

 $\mathcal{K}_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_i p \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i q)$

MP

 $\frac{p, p \rightarrow q}{q}$

T

 $\mathcal{K}_i p \rightarrow p$

NECK

 $\frac{q}{\mathcal{K}_i q}$

4

 $\mathcal{K}_i p \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}_i p$

5

 $\neg \mathcal{K}_i p \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \neg \mathcal{K}_i p$

SUB

 $\frac{\varphi[p/\psi]}{\psi \leftrightarrow \chi}$ DISTKv^r $\mathcal{K}_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}v_i(q, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}v_i(p, c))$

RE

 $\frac{\psi \leftrightarrow \chi}{\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi[\psi/\chi]}$ Kv^r4 $\mathcal{K}v_i(p, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i(p, c)$ Kv^r⊥ $\mathcal{K}v_i(\perp, c)$ Kv^r∨ $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_i(p \wedge q) \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i(p, c) \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i(q, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}v_i(p \vee q, c)$ Kv^r∨ was inspired by $\theta = \langle p \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c \wedge \langle q \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c \rightarrow \langle p \vee q \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i c$. $\mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, d) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, d)$ T, Kv^r4 $\neg \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, d) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \neg \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, d)$

5

 $\neg \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, d) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \neg \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, d)$

RE

CORE IDEAS FOR THE COMPLETENESS

$\mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, c)$ can be viewed as $\exists x \mathcal{K}_i(\varphi \rightarrow c = x)$ where x is a variable and c . Again, weak language vs. rich model.

Just using consistent sets as building blocks won't work:

$$p, d \mapsto \circ \text{ ——— } p, d \mapsto \bullet$$

We need to saturate each maximal consistent set with:

- counterparts of atomic formulas such as $c \approx x$
- counterparts of $\mathcal{K}_i(\varphi \rightarrow c \approx x)$

We need to make sure the extra information is “consistent” by some conditions on the MCSs.

Definition (Wang & Fan AiML14)

Let MCS be the set of maximal consistent sets w.r.t. $\mathbb{E}LKVR$, and let \mathbb{N} be the set of natural numbers. The canonical model \mathcal{M} of $\mathbb{E}LKVR$ is a tuple $\langle S, \mathbb{N}, \{\sim_i \mid i \in I\}, V, V_C \rangle$ where:

- S consists of all the triples $\langle \Gamma, f, g \rangle \in MCS \times \mathbb{N}^C \times (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\star\})^{I \times \mathbb{E}LKVR^f \times \mathbb{N}^C}$ that satisfy the following three conditions:
 - (i) $g(i, \psi, d) = \star$ iff $\mathcal{K}v_i(\psi, d) \wedge \hat{\mathcal{K}}_i\psi \notin \Gamma$,
 - (ii) If $g(i, \varphi, d) \neq \star$ and $g(i, \psi, d) \neq \star$ then:
 $g(i, \varphi, d) = g(i, \psi, d)$ iff $\mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi \vee \psi, d) \in \Gamma$
 - (iii) $\psi \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i(\psi, d) \in \Gamma$ implies $f(d) = g(i, \psi, d)$.
- $s \sim_i t$ iff $\{\varphi \mid \mathcal{K}_i\varphi \in s\} \subseteq t$ and $g_s(i) = g_t(i)$
- $V_C(d, s) = f_s(d)$

Lemma

Each maximal consistent set can be properly *saturated* with those counterparts.

Lemma

Each saturated MCS including $\diamond\varphi$ has a *saturated* φ -successor.

Lemma

Each saturated MCS including $\neg K v_i(\varphi, c)$ has **two** saturated φ -successors which disagree about the value of c .

A generalization of Axiom $\mathbf{Kv}^r \vee$ (U is a finite set of formulas)
 $\hat{K}_i(\bigwedge U) \wedge \bigwedge_{\varphi \in U} K v_i(\varphi, d) \rightarrow K v_i(\bigvee U, d)$ is crucial.

Theorem (Wang & Fan AiML14)

$ELKV^r$ is sound and strongly complete for $ELKv^r$.

We can axiomatize multi-agent $PALKv^r$ by adding the following reduction axiom schemas (call the resulting system $SPALKV^r$):

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 !\text{ATOM} & \langle \psi \rangle p \leftrightarrow (\psi \wedge p) \\
 !\text{NEG} & \langle \psi \rangle \neg \varphi \leftrightarrow (\psi \wedge \neg \langle \psi \rangle \varphi) \\
 !\text{CON} & \langle \psi \rangle (\varphi \wedge \chi) \leftrightarrow (\langle \psi \rangle \varphi \wedge \langle \psi \rangle \chi) \\
 !\text{K} & \langle \psi \rangle \mathcal{K}_i \varphi \leftrightarrow (\psi \wedge \mathcal{K}_i (\psi \rightarrow \langle \psi \rangle \varphi)) \\
 !\text{Kv}^r & \langle \varphi \rangle \mathcal{K}v_i (\psi, c) \leftrightarrow (\varphi \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i (\langle \varphi \rangle \psi, c))
 \end{array}$$

Theorem (Xiong 14, Ding 14)

$ELKv^r$ (on epistemic models) is decidable.

AN ALTERNATIVE SEMANTICS

AXIOMATIZING ELKV^r OVER S5 FRAMES [WANG AND FAN AIML2014]

System S5-ELKVR

Axiom Schemas

TAUT

all the instances of tautologies

Rules

DISTK

 $\mathcal{K}_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_i p \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i q)$

MP

 $\frac{\varphi, \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$

T

 $\mathcal{K}_i p \rightarrow p$

NECK

 $\frac{\psi}{\varphi}$

4

 $\mathcal{K}_i p \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}_i p$ $\frac{\varphi}{\mathcal{K}_i \varphi}$

5

 $\neg \mathcal{K}_i p \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \neg \mathcal{K}_i p$

SUB

DISTKv^r $\mathcal{K}_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}v_i(q, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}v_i(p, c))$

RE

Kv^r4 $\mathcal{K}v_i(p, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i \mathcal{K}v_i(p, c)$ Kv^r⊥ $\mathcal{K}v_i(\perp, c)$ Kv^r∨ $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_i(p \wedge q) \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i(p, c) \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i(q, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}v_i(p \vee q, c)$ $\frac{\varphi[p/\psi]}{\psi \leftrightarrow \chi}$
 $\frac{\psi \leftrightarrow \chi}{\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi[\psi/\chi]}$

AXIOMATIZING ELK^r OVER ARBITRARY FRAMES [DING 2015]

System $ELKVR$

Axiom Schemas

TAUT

all the instances of tautologies

DISTK

$$\mathcal{K}_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_i p \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i q)$$

DISTK v^r

$$\mathcal{K}_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}v_i(q, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}v_i(p, c))$$

K $v^r \perp$

$$\mathcal{K}v_i(\perp, c)$$


K $v^r \vee$

$$\hat{\mathcal{K}}_i(p \wedge q) \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i(p, c) \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i(q, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}v_i(p \vee q, c)$$

- The completeness proofs are highly non-trivial due to the imbalance between the rich model and limited language.
- Suitable bisimulation notion for this logic was unknown.

TWO QUESTIONS AND OUR KEY OBSERVATION


- How can it be connected to (normal) modal logic?
- How to rebalance the syntax and semantics?



SIMPLIFY THE SEMANTICS WHILE KEEPING THE LOGIC

Observation: $\neg \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, c)$ can be viewed as a special diamond:

$$\mathcal{M}, s \models \neg \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, c) \Leftrightarrow \text{there exist } t_1, t_2 \in S \text{ such that } s \sim_i t_1 \text{ and } s \sim_i t_2 : \\ \mathcal{M}, t_1 \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, t_2 \models \varphi \text{ but } V_C(c, t_1) \neq V_C(c, t_2)$$



A MODAL LANGUAGE

To facilitate the comparison, we write $\neg \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, c)$ as $\diamond_i^c \varphi$ and use the following language **MLKv^r**:

$$\varphi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid \Box_i \varphi \mid \diamond_i^c \varphi$$


interpreted on Kripke models with binary and **ternary** relations $\langle S, \{\rightarrow_i : i \in I\}, \{R_i^c : i \in I, c \in \mathbf{C}\}, V \rangle$, with extra conditions.

$$\mathcal{M}, s \Vdash \diamond_i^c \varphi \iff \exists u, v: \text{s.t. } sR_i^c uv \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, u \Vdash \varphi, \mathcal{M}, v \Vdash \varphi.$$

- (1) $sR_j^c tu \iff sR_j^c ut$; (2) $sR_j^c uv$ only if $s \rightarrow_i u$ and $s \rightarrow_i v$;
- (3) $sR_j^c tu$ and $s \rightarrow_i v$ implies that $sR_j^c tv$ or $sR_j^c uv$ holds;
- (4) $sR_j^c tu$ for some $j \in I$, $s \rightarrow_i t$ and $s \rightarrow_i u$ implies $sR_j^c tu$;
- (5) $sR_j^c tu$ implies $t \neq u$.

AN INTERESTING PROPERTY

$sR_i^c t_1 t_2$ and $s \rightarrow_i u$ implies that at least one of $sR_i^c t_1 u$ and $sR_i^c t_2 u$ holds



We show that (4)(5) do not matter: For any set $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi\}$ of **MLKv^r** formulas: $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_{1-5}} \varphi \iff \Gamma \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_{1-3}} \varphi \iff t(\Gamma) \models t(\varphi)$ where t translates **MLKv^r** formulas back to **ELKv^r**.

RECALL THE SYSTEM FOR $ELKv^r$.

System $ELKv^r$		Rules
Axiom Schemas		MP $\frac{\varphi, \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$
TAUT	all the instances of tautologies	$\frac{\psi}{\psi}$
DISTK	$\mathcal{K}_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}_i p \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i q)$	NECK $\frac{\mathcal{K}_i \varphi}{\mathcal{K}_i \varphi}$
DISTKv^r	$\mathcal{K}_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\mathcal{K}v_i(q, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}v_i(p, c))$	SUB $\frac{\varphi[p/\psi]}{\varphi \leftrightarrow \chi}$
Kv^r⊥	$\mathcal{K}v_i(\perp, c)$	$\frac{\psi \leftrightarrow \chi}{\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi[\psi/\chi]}$
Kv^r∨	$\hat{\mathcal{K}}_i(p \wedge q) \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i(p, c) \wedge \mathcal{K}v_i(q, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}v_i(p \vee q, c)$	RE

In the new language:

- **DISTKv^r**: $\Box_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box_i^c \neg q \rightarrow \Box_i^c \neg p)$ equivalent to $\Box_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box_i^c p \rightarrow \Box_i^c q)$ under **SUB** and **RE**.
- **Kv^r∨**: $\Diamond_i(p \wedge q) \wedge \Diamond_i^c(p \vee q) \rightarrow (\Diamond_i^c p \vee \Diamond_i^c q)$
- **Kv^r⊥**: $\Box_i^c \top$

A NEW LOOK AT THE AXIOMATIZATION

System SMLKVR

Axiom Schemas

TAUT all the instances of tautologies

DISTK $\Box_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box_i p \rightarrow \Box_i q)$

DISTKv^r $\Box_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box_i^c p \rightarrow \Box_i^c q)$

Kv^r∨ $\Diamond_i(p \wedge q) \wedge \Diamond_i^c(p \vee q) \rightarrow (\Diamond_i^c p \vee \Diamond_i^c q)$

Rules

MP $\frac{\varphi, \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$

NECK $\frac{\psi}{\Box_i \psi}$

NECK^r $\frac{\Box_i^c \psi}{\psi}$

RE $\frac{\psi \leftrightarrow \chi}{\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi[\psi/\chi]}$

SUB $\frac{\varphi}{\varphi[p/\psi]}$

We replace $\Box_i^c T$ by a necessitation rule **NECK^r**.

Theorem

SMLKVR is sound and complete w.r.t. \mathcal{C}_{1-3} (and \mathcal{C}_{1-5}).

A relatively easy canonical model construction suffices (3 page).

A NEW LOOK AT THE AXIOMATIZATION

System SMLKVR

Axiom Schemas

TAUT all the instances of tautologies

DISTK $\Box_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box_i p \rightarrow \Box_i q)$

DISTKv^r $\Box_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box_i^c p \rightarrow \Box_i^c q)$

Kv^r∨ $\Diamond_i(p \wedge q) \wedge \Diamond_i^c(p \vee q) \rightarrow (\Diamond_i^c p \vee \Diamond_i^c q)$

Rules

MP $\frac{\varphi, \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$

NECK $\frac{\psi}{\Box_i \psi}$

NECK^r $\frac{\psi}{\Box_i^c \psi}$

RE $\frac{\psi \leftrightarrow \chi}{\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi[\psi/\chi]}$

SUB $\frac{\varphi}{\varphi[p/\psi]}$

Note that $\Diamond_i^c(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow (\Diamond_i^c \varphi \vee \Diamond_i^c \psi)$ does not hold. Moreover, $\Box_i^c(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\Box_i^c \varphi \rightarrow \Box_i^c \psi)$ does not hold neither, thus the logic is **not normal**.

However, this is only the appearance.

DISGUISED NORMAL MODAL LOGIC

\diamond_i^c is essentially a **binary** diamond!

In **MLKvr** we only allow $\diamond_i^c(\varphi, \varphi)$. Let **MLKvb** be the language with $\diamond_i^c(\varphi, \psi)$.

$\diamond_i^c(\varphi, \psi)$ has the standard semantics for (polyadic) normal modal logic:

$$\mathcal{M}, s \Vdash \diamond_i^c(\varphi, \psi) \iff \exists u, v: \text{s.t. } sR_i^c uv \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, u \Vdash \varphi, \mathcal{M}, v \Vdash \psi.$$

THE GENERALIZATION DOES NOT INCREASE EXPRESSIVITY

Proposition

MLKvb is equally expressive as MLKvr over \mathbb{C}_{1-3} .

$\diamond_i^c(\varphi, \psi)$ is equivalent to the disjunction of the following:

- $\diamond_i^c\varphi \wedge \diamond_i\psi$
- $\diamond_i^c\psi \wedge \diamond_i\varphi$
- $\diamond_i\varphi \wedge \diamond_i\psi \wedge \neg\diamond_i^c\varphi \wedge \neg\diamond_i^c\psi \wedge \diamond_i^c(\varphi \vee \psi)$

A NORMAL POLYADIC MODAL LOGIC

System SMLKVB

Axiom Schemas

TAUT	all the instances of tautologies
DISTK	$\Box_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box_i p \rightarrow \Box_i q)$
DISTBK	$\Box_i^c(p \rightarrow q, r) \rightarrow (\Box_i^c(p, r) \rightarrow \Box_i^c(q, r))$
SYM	$\Box_i^c(p, q) \rightarrow \Box_i^c(q, p)$
INCL	$\Diamond_i^c(p, q) \rightarrow \Diamond_i p$
DISBK	$\Diamond_i^c(p, q) \wedge \Diamond_i r \rightarrow \Diamond_i^c(p, r) \vee \Diamond_i^c(q, r)$

Rules

MP

$$\frac{\varphi, \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$$

NECK

$$\frac{\psi}{\phi}$$

NECKvb

$$\frac{\Box_i^c \phi}{\Box_i^c(\varphi, \psi)}$$

SUB

$$\frac{\varphi}{\varphi[p/\psi]}$$

Theorem

SMLKVB is sound and complete w.r.t. \mathcal{C}_{1-3} and \mathcal{C}_{1-5} .

SMLKVB can drive all the axioms in SMLKVR.

THE COMPLETENESS PROOF IS NOW SIMPLY ROUTINE (ONE PAGE)

$$\mathcal{M}^c = \langle S, \{\rightarrow_i : i \in I\}, \{R_i^c : i \in I, c \in \mathbb{C}\}, V \rangle$$

- S is the set of all maximal **SMLKVB**-consistent sets of **MLKvb** formulas,
- $s \rightarrow_i t \iff \{\varphi : \Box_i \varphi \in s\} \subseteq t$,
- $sR_i^c t u \iff (1) \{\varphi : \Box_i \varphi \in s\} \subseteq t \cap u$ and (2) for any $\Box_i^c(\varphi, \psi) \in s$, $\varphi \in t$ or $\psi \in u$.
- $V(s) = \{p : p \in s\}$.

SYM, **INCL**, and **DISBK** are canonical for the corresponding properties 1-3.

ELKVR AS A NORMAL MODAL LOGIC

$ELKv^r$ can be viewed as a disguised normal modal logic!

Standard techniques apply:

- Canonical model for free.
- Bisimulation for free.
- ? Decision procedure

These will help us in solving problems about the original $ELKv^r$.

Definition (Bisimulation)

Let $\mathcal{M}_1 = \langle S_1, \{\rightarrow_i^1 : i \in I\}, \{R_i^c : i \in I, c \in \mathbb{C}\}, V_1 \rangle$, $\mathcal{M}_2 = \langle S_2, \{\rightarrow_i^2 : i \in I, c \in \mathbb{C}\}, \{Q_i^c : i \in I\}, V_2 \rangle$ be two models for **MLKvb** (also for **MLKv^r**). A \mathbb{C} -bisimulation between \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 is a non-empty binary relation $Z \subseteq S_1 \times S_2$ such that for all $s_1 Z s_2$, the following conditions are satisfied:

Inv : $V_1(s_1) = V_2(s_2)$;

Zig : $s_1 \rightarrow_i^1 t_1 \Rightarrow \exists t_2$ such that $s_2 \rightarrow_i^2 t_2$ and $t_1 Z t_2$;

Zag : $s_2 \rightarrow_i^2 t_2 \Rightarrow \exists t_1$ such that $s_1 \rightarrow_i^1 t_1$ and $t_1 Z t_2$;

Kvb-Zig : $s_1 R_i^c t_1 u_1 \Rightarrow \exists t_2, u_2 \in S_2$ such that $t_1 Z t_2$, $u_1 Z u_2$ and $s_2 Q_i^c t_2 u_2$;

Kvb-Zag : $s_2 Q_i^c t_2 u_2 \Rightarrow \exists t_1, u_1 \in S_1$ such that $t_1 Z t_2$, $u_1 Z u_2$ and $s_1 R_i^c t_1 u_1$.

A SIMPER LOGIC

Plaza's unconditional language:

$$\varphi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid \mathcal{K}_i\varphi \mid \mathcal{K}V_iC$$

is essentially:

$$\varphi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid \Box_i\varphi \mid \Box_i^c\perp$$

System SMLKV

Axiom Schemas

TAUT all the instances of tautologies

DISTK $\Box_i(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box_i p \rightarrow \Box_i q)$

INCLT $\Diamond_i^c\top \rightarrow \Diamond_i\top$

Rules

MP
$$\frac{\varphi, \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$$

NECK
$$\frac{\psi}{\Box_i\psi}$$

SUB
$$\frac{\varphi[p/\psi]}{\varphi}$$

RE
$$\frac{\psi \leftrightarrow \chi}{\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi[\psi/\chi]}$$

FURTHER DIRECTIONS

ADDING DYNAMICS

Enrich \mathbf{ELKv}^r with *public inspection* $[c]$:

$$\varphi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid \mathcal{K}_i\varphi \mid \mathcal{K}v_i(\varphi, c) \mid [c]\varphi$$

$$\boxed{\mathcal{M}, s \models [c]\varphi \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}|_c^s, s \models \varphi}$$

where $\mathcal{M}|_c^s$ is defined as the tuple $\langle S', D, \sim |_{S' \times S'}, V|_{c \times S'}, V_c|_{S'} \rangle$ where $S' = \{s' \mid V_c(c, s') = V_c(c, s)\}$. Note that the relativization here is *not global*.

\mathbf{PSELKv}^r is more expressive than \mathbf{ELKv}^r : $[c]$ cannot be reduced.

HOW TO AXIOMATIZE IT?

It is hard and still open, but you can:

- Restrict the language: to only allow $\mathcal{K}v;c$ and $[c]\varphi$ [van Eijck, Gattinger, Wang ICLA17]
- Enrich the language: with equalities, and conditional operator for all the combinations of values and propositions [Baltag AiML16]

CONNECTIONS TO DEPENDENCE LOGIC AND INQUISITIVE LOGIC

We can define the knowledge of dependency as following:

$$Kd_i(c, d) := \mathcal{K}_i[c]\mathcal{K}v_i d$$

$$\mathcal{M}, s \models Kd_i(c, d) \Leftrightarrow \text{for all } t_1 \sim_i s, t_2 \sim_i s : V_C(c, t_1) = V_C(c, t_2) \\ \implies V_C(d, t_1) = V_C(d, t_2)$$

I know the value of d depends on the value of c , it can be expressed by $=(c, d)$ in *dependence logic* by Väänänen, taking the epistemic possibilities as “teams” in their setting.

It is also the knowledge of the entailment of interrogatives in first-order inquisitive logic:

$$K_i(?value\ c \rightarrow ?value\ d) := Kd_i(c, d)$$

TAKE-HOME MESSAGES

- Do (re)read the classics
- To handle the weak language in the completeness proof, we need to provide extra information in building the canonical model. The maximal consistent sets do not suffice.
- Conditional knowing value logic is a disguised normal modal logic with binary and ternary modalities.