

On some formal relations between arguing and believing

Antonio Yuste-Ginel

Department of Philosophy. University of Málaga

Abstract

Arguing and believing are two central dimensions of human cognition that are taken into account when designing autonomous intelligent agents. Both dimensions are connected in several ways. In this paper, I summarize the central features of my PhD project, which consists in the formal study of some of these connections. Methodologically, the project combines tools imported from formal argumentation and (dynamic) epistemic logic.

1 Introduction

Humans hold beliefs in order to interact successfully with their environment, to coordinate their actions, and to be able to communicate. Moreover, humans use arguments to influence others' actions and beliefs, to reach reasonable agreements, and to jointly find the best solution for a given problem. Consequently, it is not surprising that many attempts to model artificial intelligent agents have taken into account argumentation and/or beliefs.

Both aspects of cognition are connected in the daily life of human beings. These connections happen in, at least, two different ways. First,

- C1 belief formation, i.e., the process through which an individual comes to believe a certain proposition, takes as an input the set of arguments that she entertains and how strong she considers them to be.

As an example of C1, consider an individual that is forming her belief about this evening's weather. She

asks a colleague, who says “the sky looks cloudless”. She also checks the weather forecast, that predicts 95% of rain. After assessing pros and cons, she comes to believe that it will rain. Second,

- C2 argument evaluation (the process of determining the strength of an argument) is conditioned by the beliefs previously held by the agent.

As an example of C2, consider a suspect of a crime that is deciding to use either of two alibis in a trial. Suppose that the suspect believes that the court has good evidence to undermine his first alibi but not the second one. Then, it seems more likely that the suspect will disclose the second alibi during the trial (from now on, we shall refer to this example as the *alibis' example*).

Although both connections have been identified and studied from several perspectives, it seems fair to say that the problem is relatively unexplored in its formal aspects. The main objective of my PhD project is to investigate these relations through formal methods.

2 Method

The problem introduced above calls for a hybrid methodological approach, more specifically, a combination of a method for representing beliefs with one for representing argumentation.

Among the heterogeneous options for representing belief formally [Genin and Huber, 2021], epistemic logic with possible states semantics provides a qualitative model for arbitrarily nested beliefs in a multi-agent context (see e.g., [Fagin et al., 2004]).

The main semantic constructs here are **multi-agent epistemic models**, i.e., triples of the form $\mathcal{K} = (S, \{\rightarrow_i \mid i \in \text{Ag}\}, V)$; where S is a non-empty set of possible states; Ag is a finite, non-empty set of agents; each $\rightarrow_i \subseteq S \times S$ is an epistemic accessibility relation;¹ and $V : \text{At} \rightarrow \wp(S)$, where At is a countable set of atomic propositions. Intuitively, $V(p)$ denotes the set of states where p is true. These structures are described using a modal language \mathcal{L}_\square that extends the language of propositional logic with one modal operator \square_i for each agent $i \in \text{Ag}$, whose informal reading is “agent i believes that ...”. The new formulas are interpreted in pointed models (pairs of the form (model, state)) as follows: $\mathcal{K}, s \models \square_i \varphi$ iff $s \rightarrow_i s'$ implies $\mathcal{K}, s' \models \varphi$. In words, a sentence is believed at s iff it holds at every accessible state, providing the mentioned qualitative picture of (high-order) beliefs.

Epistemic logic has been extended to model dynamic phenomena (e.g., learning, communicating, or observing) within the research field known as *dynamic epistemic logic* (DEL) [van Ditmarsch et al., 2007]. Roughly sketched, DEL studies different kinds of operations on epistemic models and how these can be described through dynamic operators.

Regarding argumentation, there are many formalisms for representing arguments as well as interactions among them [Baroni et al., 2018, Part B]. The main tool used in this project are Dung’s argumentation frameworks (AFs) [Dung, 1995], i.e., directed graphs (A, R) where nodes are interpreted as arguments and edges as some kind of conflict relation among arguments (typically, an attack relation). In order to compute the set(s) of acceptable arguments, argumentation semantics are then applied over AFs. In all semantics studied in [Dung, 1995], a set of arguments is minimally required to be admissible, informally meaning that (i) it lacks internal conflicts and (ii) it attacks all its attackers. As an example, Figure 1 depicts an AF capturing the relevant arguments and conflicts of the alibis’ example. Node a stands for an argument claiming the suspect’s guilt,




Figure 1: An AF.

b and c represent her two possible alibis, and d and e represent the (potential) counterarguments of the court. Note that, if all information was on the table, the suspect should be blamed guilty (a is acceptable under all standard semantics).

This brief analysis shows that abstract argumentation (i.e., leaving unspecified the nature and structure of arguments) provides the argumentative basis for analysing some readings of C2. Nevertheless, C1 seems to require some kind of arguments’ structure or, at least, some mechanism to meaningfully assign conclusions to arguments, since the objects of beliefs are typically considered to be sentences (and not arguments). Again, there is an important amount of options available in the literature. In this project we have used ASPIC⁺ [Modgil and Prakken, 2013], since it has been shown to be a comprehensive and flexible approach to structured argumentation.

Finally, we use the notion of awareness as a conceptual and technical bridge among both families of formalisms (argumentation and epistemic logic). An **awareness-epistemic model** adds an awareness function $\text{Aw} : (S \times \text{Ag}) \rightarrow \wp(\mathcal{L}_\square)$ to the epistemic models defined above (see e.g., [Fagin et al., 2004, Chapter 9]). This kind of models were introduced as a means of avoiding the unwanted phenomenon of logical omniscience. We revisit them and vary the range of Aw , substituting $\wp(\mathcal{L}_\square)$ with $\wp(X)$ where X is some kind of argumentative construct, e.g., (but not necessarily) a set of arguments. In the next section, we sketch how two instantiations of this idea have been used to deal with the problem presented in the introduction.

3 Results

Epistemic reasoning about AFs

It is not casual that in the alibis’ example we have an agent (the suspect) trying to convince another one (the court), as the first reading of C2 we focus on is:

¹Intuitively, $s \rightarrow_i s'$ means that i , situated at s , considers s' as a candidate for the actual world.

$C2'$ *rhetoric* argument evaluation (the process of determining the *persuasive power* of an argument within a discussion) is conditioned by the beliefs previously held by the agent.

In [Proietti and Yuste-Ginel, 2020], we gave a formal account of $C2'$ by extending one of the logics proposed in [Schwarzentruber et al., 2012] with argument communication operators. The idea of [Schwarzentruber et al., 2012] was to embed AFs into epistemic models, in a way such that each state of an epistemic model becomes an AF. There is a preliminary question though: what is the appropriate way to bring a finite set of agents \mathbf{Ag} into the picture of abstract argumentation? This question arises because persuasion typically takes place in multi-agent scenarios. There are different possibilities to answer this question. The option of [Schwarzentruber et al., 2012] (shared by many other proposals), that we followed in our work, is to define multi-agent AFs as tuples $(A, R, \{A_i\}_{i \in \mathbf{Ag}})$, where (A, R) is an AF, and where each $A_i \subseteq A$ represents the set of arguments that agent i is aware of. In this version of multi-agent AFs, awareness of conflicts is informally assumed to be sound and complete modulo awareness of arguments. Formally, this means that given $(A, R, \{A_i\}_{i \in \mathbf{Ag}})$ the set of conflicts agent i is aware of is defined as $R_i := R \cap (A_i \times A_i)$. So, given a signature of arguments' names A together with a conflict relation R , an **epistemic model for abstract argumentation** can be seen as a tuple $(S, \{\rightarrow_i\}_{i \in \mathbf{Ag}}, V, \mathbf{Aw})$ where $\mathbf{Aw} : (\mathbf{Ag} \times S) \rightarrow \wp(A)$. If we assume that our set of propositional variables \mathbf{At} comes equipped with awareness variables $\mathbf{aw}_i(x)$ for each $i \in \mathbf{Ag}$ and each $x \in A$, then epistemic models for abstract argumentation can be simply understood as epistemic models for a distinguished set of variables (because \mathbf{Aw} is contained in V). As an illustration, Figure 2 depicts an epistemic model for the alibis' example, where ellipses represent the arguments that each agent is aware of at each state. Note that the suspect, agent 1, wrongly believes that s_1 is the actual state. Moreover, she thinks that the court (agent 2) can only counter-argue her alibi c with e , while it is actually the case that the court can counter-argue her alibi b with d (s_0).




Figure 2: An epistemic model for the alibis' example.

What is still missing for a minimal formalization of $C2'$ is a notion of argument communication. In [Proietti and Yuste-Ginel, 2020], we proposed to treat it as a simple DEL action altering awareness sets. More precisely, the action $+_i x$ (informally meaning that i communicates x), if applied to an epistemic model \mathcal{K} , returns $\mathcal{K}^{+_i x}$ where x has been added to the awareness of every agent at every state (whenever i was actually aware of x before the action). We axiomatised such an action, providing axioms that describe its effects on epistemic models. In the resulting framework, we are able to distinguish actions that are actually persuasive from those that are merely thought to be persuasive by a given agent. We moreover provided some conditions under which the beliefs of an agent are safe, i.e., they are good enough to guarantee its communicative success, hence digging deeper in $C2'$.

In ongoing work, we have extended the setting of our first paper in several directions. First, designing a propositional language that is able to capture argumentation semantics and the notion of fine-grained justification status, something that was missing both in [Schwarzentruber et al., 2012] and our previous work. Second, systematically studying completeness theory w.r.t. restricted classes of models. Third, extending the dynamic apparatus with so-

called action models (see [van Ditmarsch et al., 2007, Chapter 6]) in order to capture much more subtle forms of argument communication. Fourth, showing that the resulting logic is expressive enough to subsume existing formalisms for qualitative uncertainty about AFs and argumentation dynamics, such as incomplete AFs [Baumeister et al., 2018] and control AFs [Dimopoulos et al., 2018].

Justified belief and argument strength

In the second main track of this PhD project, we turn our attention to C1: belief formation is conditioned by argument evaluation. Arguably, this thesis is one of the core intuitions underlying research in formal argumentation (including the seminal work [Dung, 1995]). Moreover, recent efforts made in the epistemic logic literature in order to include the heretofore missing justification component can be understood as broadly motivated by C1. These efforts have been accomplished through very heterogeneous methods, for instance, justification logic [Artemov and Fitting, 2016] or neighbourhood semantics [van Benthem et al., 2012]. There are works explicitly integrating some kind of argumentative mechanism within epistemic models, such as [Shi et al., 2017], which combines topological and argumentation semantics, or [Wáng and Li, 2021], which argues for a semantic notion of argument but abstracts away from the conflict relation.

Our main contribution here consists in two ideas. First, we point out that there is a specific interpretation of C2 that might be relevant for C1, namely,

C2'' when determining the relative strength of a set of arguments, arguments with believed premises should be considered stronger to arguments whose premises are not believed.

We developed this idea from a justification logic perspective in [Burrieza and Yuste-Ginel, 2019]. Interestingly, there exists a conceptual tension between C2'' and the notion of justified belief advocated in C1. In [Burrieza and Yuste-Ginel, 2020], we identified that tension and proposed a formal solution for it, philosophically inspired by foundationalist theories of

epistemic justification. This has been done by accommodating structured argumentation tools taken from ASPIC⁺ [Modgil and Prakken, 2013] within awareness-epistemic models. More concretely, we used awareness-epistemic models where the awareness function Aw assigns a set of ASPIC⁺ argument to the formalized agent (the set of arguments the agent is aware of). After that, a preference relation between arguments can be computed using the beliefs of the agent towards the premises of the argument she is aware of, giving a formal treatment of C2''. Departing from these preferences together with the usual attack relation among ASPIC⁺ arguments, we can obtain an argumentation framework from which a second kind of beliefs (argument-based beliefs) can be defined via standard argumentation semantics. This clearly accounts for a qualified reading of C1.

The resulting logic has a minimal character though, since argument-based beliefs satisfy two of the four rationality postulates established in [Caminada and Amgoud, 2007]. Therefore, an immediate line of work is studying whether any restrictions on the awareness set of the formalized agent may make him more rational, i.e., by satisfying more postulates.

4 Conclusion

The PhD project that this paper summarizes studies some of the formal connections between arguing and believing. The chosen method consists in combining argumentation and epistemic logic tools. This has crystallized in two main tracks of research, the first one is the study of epistemic models for abstract argumentation as well as their dynamics. The second one is constructing a (syntactically-oriented) alternative to the notion of justified belief within the recent epistemic logic literature.

Acknowledgements

I am really thankful to my PhD advisor, Alfredo Burrieza, as well as to my supervisors during my two research visits: Fernando R. Velázquez Quesada

(ILLC) and Andreas Herzig (IRIT), and to Carlo Proietti (ILC), with whom I have had the pleasure to work. I would also like to thank Alfredo and Carlo for commenting previous versions of this text. My research activity is supported by the predoctoral grant MECD-FPU 2016/04113.

References

- [Artemov and Fitting, 2016] Artemov, S. and Fitting, M. (2016). Justification logic. In Zalta, E. N., editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- [Baroni et al., 2018] Baroni, P., Gabbay, D. M., Giacomini, M., and van der Torre, L. (2018). *Handbook of formal argumentation*. College Publications.
- [Baumeister et al., 2018] Baumeister, D., Neugebauer, D., Rothe, J., and Schadrack, H. (2018). Verification in incomplete argumentation frameworks. *Artificial Intelligence*, 264:1–26.
- [Burrieza and Yuste-Ginel, 2019] Burrieza, A. and Yuste-Ginel, A. (2019). Argument evaluation in multi-agent justification logics. *Logic Journal of the IGPL*. DOI:10.1093/jigpal/jzz046.
- [Burrieza and Yuste-Ginel, 2020] Burrieza, A. and Yuste-Ginel, A. (2020). Basic beliefs and argument-based beliefs in awareness epistemic logic with structured arguments. In *Proceedings of the COMMA 2020*, pages 123–134. IOS Press.
- [Caminada and Amgoud, 2007] Caminada, M. and Amgoud, L. (2007). On the evaluation of argumentation formalisms. *Artificial Intelligence*, 171(5–6):286–310.
- [Dimopoulos et al., 2018] Dimopoulos, Y., Mailly, J.-G., and Moraitis, P. (2018). Control argumentation frameworks. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. AAAI Press.
- [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.
- [Fagin et al., 2004] Fagin, R., Halpern, J. Y., Moses, Y., and Vardi, M. (2004). *Reasoning about knowledge*. MIT press.
- [Genin and Huber, 2021] Genin, K. and Huber, F. (2021). Formal Representations of Belief. In Zalta, E. N., editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- [Modgil and Prakken, 2013] Modgil, S. and Prakken, H. (2013). A general account of argumentation with preferences. *Artificial Intelligence*, 195:361–397.
- [Proietti and Yuste-Ginel, 2020] Proietti, C. and Yuste-Ginel, A. (2020). Persuasive argumentation and epistemic attitudes. In Soares Barbosa, L. and Baltag, A., editors, *Dynamic Logic. New Trends and Applications*, volume 12005 of *LNCS*, pages 104–123. Springer.
- [Schwarzentruber et al., 2012] Schwarzentruber, F., Vesic, S., and Rienstra, T. (2012). Building an epistemic logic for argumentation. In Fariñas del Cerro, L., Herzig, A., and Mengin, J., editors, *Logics in Artificial Intelligence*, volume 7519 of *LNCS*, pages 359–371. Springer.
- [Shi et al., 2017] Shi, C., Smets, S., and Velázquez-Quesada, F. (2017). Argument-based belief in topological structures. In Lang, J., editor, *Proceedings TARK 2017. EPTCS*. Open Publishing Association.
- [van Benthem et al., 2012] van Benthem, J., Fernández-Duque, D., Pacuit, E., et al. (2012). Evidence logic: A new look at neighborhood structures. *Advances in modal logic*, 9:97–118.
- [van Ditmarsch et al., 2007] van Ditmarsch, H., van der Hoek, W., and Kooi, B. (2007). *Dynamic epistemic logic*. Springer.
- [Wáng and Li, 2021] Wáng, Y. N. and Li, X. (2021). A logic of knowledge based on abstract arguments. *Journal of Logic and Computation*. DOI:exab002.