

Labelling procedures for Dialectical Classical Logic Argumentation

Federico Castagna

Department of Informatics, King's College London, UK

Abstract

The 3-value (IN, OUT, UNDEC) labellings method is a well-known approach for evaluating the arguments of an argumentation framework (AF). Similarly to the extension-based approach, the labelling method assigns a status to each argument in the AF according to its acceptability.

Dialectical Classical logic Argumentation (Dialectical Cl-Arg) is a novel approach that provides real-world dialectical characterisations of Cl-Arg arguments by resource-bounded agents while preserving the rational criteria established by the rationality postulates.

This research combines both subjects and introduces labellings and labelling procedures for Dialectical Cl-Arg, highlighting the properties enjoyed by these labellings (called ‘*dialectical labellings*’) in comparison with the standard ones. Algorithms designed for dialectical labellings will benefit from such properties and the entailed efficiency improvements.

Another valid method for computing justified arguments is through the argument labelling approach based on the 3-value labellings: IN, OUT, UNDEC [Caminada, 2006]. Particularly, the label IN indicates that the argument is justified (under one of Dung’s semantics), OUT indicates that the argument is overruled, and UNDEC indicates that the status of the argument is undecided (since there is not enough information to justify or overrule it). Argument labellings intuitively encode the extension-based approach and the *reinstatement* principle¹. Indeed, the correlations existing between argument labellings and argument extensions have been thoroughly investigated in the literature. For example, [Caminada and Gabbay, 2009] formally proved that *s-labellings are equivalent to s-extensions for $s \in \{\text{admissible, complete, grounded, preferred, semi-stable, stable}\}$* . Finally, employing the 3-value labellings method, many algorithms have been designed to address the main reasoning problems (i.e., enumeration, verification, sceptical and credulous acceptance of arguments) for a variety of semantics.

1 Introduction

Argumentation has been developed as a theory able to characterise the essence of non-monotonic reasoning through the dialectical interplay of arguments [Dung, 1995]. Intuitively, in order to determine if a piece of information is reliable, it suffices to show that the argument (in which the specific information is embedded) is justified under one of Dung’s semantics. A way of doing this is to show the membership of the argument to an admissible extension (extension-based approach).

Notice that, although a plethora of works has successfully shown instantiations of Dung’s abstract argumentation framework (AF) and reached different goals, none of these approaches managed to closely approximate the dialectical accuracy of an everyday real-world interplay of arguments. Nonetheless, some steps have been made in this direction, for instance,

¹The reinstatement principle can be summarized by the words of [Horty, 2001]: “*Even certain defeated arguments should be regarded as justified, as long as the arguments defeating them are themselves defeated.*”

with the introduction of the rationality postulates for AF instantiations ([Caminada and Amgoud, 2007] and [Caminada et al., 2012]).

Stemming from a novel approach that provides real-world dialectical characterisations of AF by resource-bounded agents while preserving the rationality postulates ([D’Agostino and Modgil, 2018]), this paper will give a short description of how to handle labellings ‘dialectically’. The result yields labellings and labelling procedures for Dialectical Cl-Arg (fully-fledged developed as part of my PhD research). These *dialectical labellings* provide two main advantages: (1) procedural dialectical shortcuts in designing labelling algorithms; (2) a theoretical-accurate approximation of real-world uses of arguments by resource-bounded agents.

2 Method

This research made use of (a) the labelling method presented in [Modgil and Caminada, 2009] in order to develop dialectical labellings for (b) Dialectical Cl-Arg [D’Agostino and Modgil, 2018].

(a) This method describes the properties and the rules that determine the legality of the 3-value standard labellings approach, along with the main procedures involving them:

- A labelling \mathcal{L} of an AF can be seen as a tuple $(\text{in}(\mathcal{L}), \text{out}(\mathcal{L}), \text{undec}(\mathcal{L}))$ where each argument of the framework is labelled either IN, OUT or UNDEC. Notice that different semantics have different definitions in terms of \mathcal{L} . For example, an admissible labelling \mathcal{L} corresponds to a labelling without illegally IN and illegally OUT arguments.
- The core procedural aspect is based on the idea of gradually modifying the illegal labels assigned to the arguments of an AF. It begins with the all-IN labelling and proceeds with the performance of a *transition step* that will change an argument illegally IN to OUT (which,

in turn, will change to UNDEC if the step has made it illegally OUT). This procedure will then be iterated (generating, in this way, a *transition sequence*) until there will be no more illegally IN arguments. It can be shown that the result of a transition sequence constitutes an admissible labelling.

(b) Dialectical Cl-Arg builds a formalization, for Classical Logic Argumentation ², that considers real-world dialectical exchanges of arguments by resource-bounded agents. This entails:

- A new internal structure of the arguments is employed.
- Due to the limited availability of resources to real-world agents, only a subset of all the arguments of the AF will be taken into account (namely, *pdAF*) while still preserving satisfaction of the rationality postulates.
- The subset minimality and the consistency check on the premises, required by Cl-Arg, are computationally unfeasible for resource-bounded agents. This is why the properties of Dialectical Cl-Arg allow to eschew them while still preserving satisfaction of the rationality postulates.

3 Discussion

The development of the dialectical labelling approach requires adapting the results achieved in [Modgil and Caminada, 2009] without losing track of the unique features of Dialectical Cl-Arg. The most problematic of such features is the different internal structure of the arguments since it includes *suppositions*. To clarify, assume that $X = (\Delta, \Gamma, \alpha)$ is a Dialectical Cl-Arg argument, while $X' = (\Delta, \alpha)$ is a Cl-Arg argument. Δ and α are called, respectively, premises (Prem) and conclusion,

²Detailed descriptions of Classical Logic Argumentation can be found in [Besnard and Hunter, 2008] and [Gorogiannis and Hunter, 2011].

while Γ represents the suppositions (Supp). In general, when challenging the acceptability of an argument with respect to an admissible set \mathcal{S} (the so-called *dialectical defeat* ³), the defeating argument can suppose premises from all the arguments in \mathcal{S} . Whereas, the argument that defends \mathcal{S} can only suppose the premises of the defeating argument. In terms of dialectical labellings, the set \mathcal{S} corresponds to the set of arguments labelled IN, as shown by the dialectical legal labelling definition:

Definition 1 (Dialectical legal labelling). *Let $d\mathcal{L}$ be a dialectical labelling for the $pdAF = \langle AR, defeats \rangle$. Let also $X, Y \in AR$ and $\mathcal{S} = in(d\mathcal{L})$.*

- *X is dialectically legally IN iff X is dialectically labelled IN and for every Y that dialectically defeats X , i.e., $Y \Rightarrow_{\mathcal{S}} X$, it implies that Y is dialectically labelled OUT;*
- *X is dialectically legally OUT iff X is dialectically labelled OUT and there is at least one Y that dialectically defeats X , i.e., $Y \Rightarrow_{\{X\}} X$, such that Y is dialectically labelled IN;*
- *X is dialectically legally UNDEC iff X is dialectically labelled UNDEC and not every Y that dialectically defeats X , i.e., $Y \Rightarrow_{\{X\}} X$, is such that Y is dialectically labelled OUT, and there is no Y that dialectically defeats X such that Y is dialectically labelled IN.*

Observe that if a dialectically labelled argument X is not legally labelled, it is considered *illegally* labelled. Moreover, if X is illegally IN and is defeated by a legally IN or UNDEC argument, X is deemed as *super-illegally* IN.

Notice that Definition 1 implies that dialectical defeats can affect dialectical labellings and vice versa. As an example, consider Figure 1. Frame 2) depicts an argument X which is (changed to) legally OUT due to a dialectical defeat moved by an argument Y . To defeat X (frame 1), Y supposes premises from

³Indeed, the considered $pdAF$ s are based on the defeat relation among arguments (defined by a strict partial ordering $<$ over the arguments of the framework) rather than the regular attack relation.

X and \mathcal{S} (where \mathcal{S} corresponds to $in(d\mathcal{L})$ according to Definition 1). However, if the supposed premises are no longer available to Y (because X is no longer a member of $\mathcal{S} = in(d\mathcal{L})$), the dialectical defeat will be ‘invalidated’, meaning that the legally OUT label of X will become illegal (frame 3). Although the addition of suppositions and the reference to a set \mathcal{S} complicate the formalisms of the labelling procedures, it also enables additional dialectical shortcuts, better approximating a real-world reasoning process. Similarly to transition sequences,




Figure 1: An example of how dialectical defeats can affect dialectical labellings and vice versa.

dialectical transition sequences procedurally generate admissible extension for Dialectical Cl-Arg and are broadly employed as sub-routines for dialectical labelling algorithms.

Dialectical labellings properties

In the following, we are going to list the main features enjoyed by the dialectical labelling approach in comparison with the standard (non-dialectical) labellings. Among these, we will only consider the properties inherited from Dialectical Cl-Arg deemed useful for this purpose (in particular, properties involving elementary ⁴ and logically equivalent

⁴Elementary arguments are arguments of the kind $X = (\{\alpha\}, \emptyset, \alpha)$, where α is a classical logic well-formed-formula (wff).

arguments ⁵):

- (1) Set \mathcal{S} *The set of arguments dialectically IN corresponds to the admissible set \mathcal{S} targeted by the dialectical defeats. That is to say, $\text{in}(d\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{S}$.*
- (2) $d\mathcal{L} = \text{all-IN}$ *Dialectical all-IN labellings have the special feature of always having at least one argument legally IN. Indeed, if $\text{pdAF} = \langle AR, \emptyset \rangle$ and AR is not empty, then there is (trivially) at least one legally IN argument. Otherwise, in case of conflicts, there is at least one unassailable argument which, being undefeated, is legally IN.*
- (3) Dialectically super-illegally IN arguments *In case of conflicts in a dialectical all-IN labelling, as stated in (2), Dialectical Cl-Arg properties ensure the presence of unassailable arguments that dialectically defeat the conflicting arguments. Such super-illegally IN conflicting arguments will always change their labels to dialectically legally OUT.*
- (4) Elementary arguments *In a complete $d\mathcal{L}$, for each argument dialectically legally labelled IN, all of its corresponding elementary arguments will be legally labelled IN too. The intuitive meaning is that it is illogical to defend an argument but not one of its premises.*
- (5) Logically equivalent arguments *In a complete $d\mathcal{L}$, for each argument X dialectically legally labelled IN, all of its corresponding logically equivalent arguments X' will be also legally labelled IN if $\text{Prem}(X') \subset \text{Prem}(X)$. The intuitive meaning is that it is illogical to defend an argument X but not X' where the premises in X' are a subset of the premises in X .*
- (6) Self-defeating arguments *Dialectical all-IN labellings will prevent self-defeating arguments to be members of any admissible extension by*

dialectically labelling them OUT (thanks to (3)). Indeed, no rational real-world agent would state an argument that defeats itself.

4 Conclusion

The introduced properties outline a 3-value labellings method composed of labels more aligned with the real-world uses of arguments by resource-bounded agents. In addition, algorithms that compute argument extensions by employing dialectical labellings may enhance their efficiency thanks to the described properties. Indeed, the entailed automatic assignment of labels reduces the search space of every such procedure (especially the ones involving dialectical transition sequences) improving, in this way, their efficiency. Unfortunately, the limited space prevented us to fully appreciate the extent of the formalism, which also includes dialectical labellings algorithms designed for Dung's grounded and preferred semantics.

The overall aim of my PhD is to investigate and develop proof theories and algorithms for Dialectical Cl-Arg. As part of my research, I have already explored dialectical argument games proof theories [Castagna, 2020], which approximate monological real-world reasoning processes, adapting them from the standard games presented in [Modgil and Caminada, 2009]. A natural extension of the work outlined in this paper is the generation of dialectical labellings algorithms (along with dialectical argument games) for computing stable ([Caminada and Wu, 2009]), semi-stable ([Caminada, 2007]) and ideal semantics ([Dung et al., 2007] [Caminada, 2011]). If time permits, another research path that will be pursued will involve the generalisation of the developed dialectical argument games to dialogues by following the guidelines of the already existing literature in the field (mainly [Prakken, 2005]). This generalisation would have the intriguing consequence of allowing the investigation to move from non-monotonic single-agent inferences to distributed non-monotonic reasoning processes.

⁵Logically equivalent arguments, say Y and Y' , are arguments that differ only for the epistemic disposition of their premises and suppositions. That is to say: $\text{Prem}(Y) \cup \text{Supp}(Y) = \text{Prem}(Y') \cup \text{Supp}(Y')$

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank S.Modgil and M.D'Agostino for their precious help and valuable suggestions: without them, this research could not have been possible.

References

- [Besnard and Hunter, 2008] Besnard, P. and Hunter, A. (2008). *Elements of argumentation*, volume 47. MIT press Cambridge.
- [Caminada, 2006] Caminada, M. (2006). On the issue of reinstatement in argumentation. In *European Workshop on Logics in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 111–123. Springer.
- [Caminada, 2007] Caminada, M. (2007). An algorithm for computing semi-stable semantics. In *European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning and Uncertainty*, pages 222–234. Springer.
- [Caminada, 2011] Caminada, M. (2011). A labelling approach for ideal and stage semantics. *Argument and Computation*, 2(1):1–21.
- [Caminada and Amgoud, 2007] Caminada, M. and Amgoud, L. (2007). On the evaluation of argumentation formalisms. *Artificial Intelligence*, 171(5-6):286–310.
- [Caminada et al., 2012] Caminada, M., Carnielli, W., and Dunne, P. (2012). Semi-stable semantics. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 22(5):1207–1254.
- [Caminada and Wu, 2009] Caminada, M. and Wu, Y. (2009). An argument game for stable semantics. *Logic Journal of IGPL*, 17(1):77–90.
- [Caminada and Gabbay, 2009] Caminada, M. W. and Gabbay, D. M. (2009). A logical account of formal argumentation. *Studia Logica*, 93(2):109–145.
- [Castagna, 2020] Castagna, F. (2020). Argument games for dialectical classical logic argumentation. *Online Handbook of Argumentation for AI*, page 2.
- [D'Agostino and Modgil, 2018] D'Agostino, M. and Modgil, S. (2018). Classical logic, argument and dialectic. *Artificial Intelligence*, 262:15–51.
- [Dung, 1995] Dung, P. M. (1995). On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games. *Artificial intelligence*, 77(2):321–357.
- [Dung et al., 2007] Dung, P. M., Mancarella, P., and Toni, F. (2007). Computing ideal sceptical argumentation. *Artificial Intelligence*, 171(10-15):642–674.
- [Gorogiannis and Hunter, 2011] Gorogiannis, N. and Hunter, A. (2011). Instantiating abstract argumentation with classical logic arguments: Postulates and properties. *Artificial Intelligence*, 175(9-10):1479–1497.
- [Horty, 2001] Horty, J. F. (2001). Argument construction and reinstatement in logics for defeasible reasoning. *Artificial intelligence and Law*, 9(1):1–28.
- [Modgil and Caminada, 2009] Modgil, S. and Caminada, M. (2009). Proof theories and algorithms for abstract argumentation frameworks. *Argumentation in artificial intelligence*, 105129.
- [Prakken, 2005] Prakken, H. (2005). Coherence and flexibility in dialogue games for argumentation. *Journal of logic and computation*, 15(6):1009–1040.