

# Towards completeness of logics of common belief and information

Marta Bílková

Institute of Computer Science of the Czech Academy of Sciences

18 June 2019

# Flat fixpoint modalities

- In PDL:

$$\langle \alpha^* \rangle a \equiv \mu x. a \vee \langle \alpha \rangle x \quad [\alpha^*] a \equiv \nu x. a \wedge [\alpha] x$$

- in CTL

$$AFa \equiv \mu x. a \vee \Box x$$

- In logics of common knowledge (belief):

$$Ca \equiv \nu x. \bigwedge_{i \in I} \Box_i (a \wedge x)$$

$$Ca \equiv \nu x. \bigwedge_{i \in I} \Diamond_i (a \wedge x)$$

(the latter in case of a diamond-like notion of **confirmed** belief)

# Flat fixpoint modalities

We start with a (multi)modal propositional language

and, for a modal scheme  $c(p, x)$  we add a modality  $b_c(p)$  expressing  $\nu x.c(p, x)$

Semantically

$$\|b_c(p)\| = \bigcup \{Y \in \mathbb{U}X \mid Y \subseteq \|c(x, p)\|_{x:Y}\}$$

## Two axiomatizations

For a modal scheme  $c(p, x)$  and a modality  $b_c(p)$

- Kozen's axiomatization of  $b_c$  as the greatest fixed point:

$$b_c(p) \vdash c(p, b_c(p)) \quad \frac{q \vdash c(p, q)}{q \vdash b_c(p)}$$

- An **infinitary** axiomatization, with the following rule replacing the induction rule and using finite approximations of  $b_c(p)$   
 $c^0(p) = \top$  and  $c^{n+1}(p) = c(p, c^n(p))$ :

$$\{c^n(p) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \vdash_\omega b_c(p).$$

## (Strong) completeness?

In many interesting cases

- Kozen's axiomatization known to be complete (over multimodal K plus some syntactical restrictions on  $c$ , covering classical PDL, and common knowledge logic).
- Infinitary axiomatization known strongly complete (classical PDL and common knowledge logic)

Our goal: to advance in both directions for modal logics with non-classical base such as Dunn-Belnap logic BD, or (distributive) substructural logics (i.e. non-classical versions of PDL or logics of belief based on information).

## Running example

Syntax of BD extended with individual belief modalities  $\{\diamond_i \mid i \in I\}$  and a common belief modality  $b_c$  for  $c(p, x) = \bigwedge_i \diamond_i(p \wedge x)$

$$a ::= p \mid t \mid f \mid a \vee a \mid a \wedge a \mid \neg a \mid \diamond_i a \mid b_c a$$

Plus a suitable axiomatization of the purely modal part (DL, de Morgan and involutive negation, normal diamonds, ...), and of the  $b_c$  modality.

# Frames

Frames for BD are based on involutive posets  $(X, \leq, *)$ , equipped with monotone relations  $\{S_i \mid i \in I\}$

$$S_i : X^{op} \times X \longrightarrow 2$$

Valuation of atoms by **uppersets** in  $X$  are extended in the obvious way to constants and  $\wedge, \vee$ .

$$\begin{aligned}x \Vdash \neg \alpha &\equiv *x \not\Vdash \alpha \\x \Vdash \diamond_i \alpha &\equiv \exists s (s S_i x \wedge s \Vdash \alpha) \\x \Vdash \square_i \alpha &\equiv \forall s (*s S_i *x \longrightarrow s \Vdash \alpha)\end{aligned}$$

$S$ -frames can be seen as poset coalgebras for the lower set functor  $\mathbb{L}$ , or,  $S, *S*$ -frames as  $\mathbb{L} \times \mathbb{U}$  coalgebras.

## Cover modalities over poset coalgebras

For a polynomial poset (locally monotone) endofunctor  $T$

$$T ::= E \mid Id \mid T + T \mid T \times T \mid T^E \mid T^\partial \mid \mathbb{L}T \quad (\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{L}^\partial)$$

an alternative modal language is available, based on cover modalities  $\nabla^T : T\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  and  $\Delta^T : T\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  to reason about  $T^\partial$ -coalgebras.

- DNF based on  $\nabla^T$  is available (and CNF based on  $\Delta^T$ )
- they are mutually definable, and often inter-definable with usual modalities
- for example,

$$\nabla^{\mathbb{U}\omega} A \equiv \bigwedge_{a \in A} \diamond a \text{ and } \diamond a \equiv \nabla^{\mathbb{U}\omega} a\uparrow$$

$$\nabla^{\mathbb{U}\omega \times \mathbb{L}\omega} (A, B) \equiv \bigwedge \diamond A \wedge \square \bigvee B \text{ and } \diamond a \equiv \nabla^{\mathbb{U}\omega \times \mathbb{L}\omega} (a\uparrow, T\downarrow)$$

Bílková, M. and Dostál, M., Moss' logic for ordered coalgebras, to appear in LMCS.  
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1901.06547>.



## Relative finitary adjoints

For a polynomial finitary functor  $T$ , and a L.T. (b) modal algebra  $\mathcal{L}$ ,

- $\nabla^T : T\mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}$  is **left** relative adjoint: there is  $r : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathbb{L}_\omega T\mathcal{L}$

$$\nabla^T(A) \leq b \text{ iff } A \bar{\leq}^T C \text{ for some } C \in r(b).$$

(using the  $T$ -lifting of relation  $\leq$ )

- $\Delta^T : T\mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}$  is **right** relative adjoint: there is  $l : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathbb{U}_\omega T\mathcal{L}$

$$a \leq \Delta^T(B) \text{ iff } C \bar{\leq} B \text{ for some } C \in l(a).$$

## Constructivity of fixed points

We know that whenever each  $c$  is a right relative adjoint, the  $\flat$  modal algebra  $\mathcal{L}$  is constructive: for each  $c, a$ :

$$[\flat_c(a)] = \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [c^n(a)]$$

Thus we can show that the common belief modality over BD, and some implication-free fragments of distributive substructural logics is constructive.

Over classical (multi)modal logic  $K$  and all  $c$  harmless w.r.t.  $x$ , this consequently yields completeness of Kozen's axiomatization.

- L. Santocanale: Completions of  $\mu$ -algebras, LICS 2005.
- L. Santocanale, Y. Venema: Completeness for flat modal fixpoint logics, APAL 2010.

## Strong completeness of $\vdash_\omega$

From the constructivity we see that

- the infinitary rule

$$\{c^n(p) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \vdash_\omega b_c(p)$$

is (globally) sound,

- $\vdash_\omega$  is a **conservative** expansion of  $\vdash$

$$\alpha \not\vdash \beta \text{ then } \alpha \not\vdash_\omega \beta,$$

- and that  $\mathcal{L}$  embeds into the complex algebra of the **canonical model** of  $\vdash_\omega$  (yet to be constructed).

## Pair extension lemma

For a logic  $\vdash_\omega$  we define a relation  $\Vdash$ :

$$\Gamma \Vdash \Delta \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{there is a finite } \Delta' \subseteq \Delta \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma \vdash_\omega \bigvee \Delta'.$$

A tuple  $\langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle$  is a **pair** if  $\Gamma \not\Vdash \Delta$ , it is **full** if  $\Gamma \cup \Delta = \text{Fm}_{\mathcal{L}}$  (iff  $\Gamma$  is a prime theory)

### Proposition (Pair extension property)

*Every pair of  $\Vdash$  with **finite**  $\Delta$  can be extended in a full pair, provided  $\vdash_\omega$  be a countably axiomatizable logic with a strong disjunction.*

M. Bílková, P. Cintula, and T. Lávička. Lindenbaum and Pair Extension Lemma in Infinitary Logics. WOLLIC 2018.

- Pair Extension Property for finite  $\Delta$ s suffices to obtain a separation by prime theories,
- for a canonical model construction we moreover need to prove **valuation lemma** for normal diamond-like operators (diamonds or fusion):

$$\diamond a \in \Gamma \text{ implies } \langle \{a\}, \{b \mid \diamond b \notin \Gamma\} \rangle$$

is a pair that can be extended to a full one.

- for the argument to work we need to start with a **countable** axiomatization of  $\vdash_\omega$ , with a strong disjunction, and all infinitary rule instances closed under **boxes** (meet preserving definable modalities).

## Canonical model of $\vdash_\omega$

We use pair-extension property to build **saturated** theories:

- $\Gamma \vdash_\omega a$  and  $\Gamma \subseteq T$  implies  $a \in T$ ,
- $\Gamma \vdash_\omega a$  and  $\neg a \in T$  implies  $T \cap \neg\Gamma \neq \emptyset$  (case of BD),
- $T$  is prime.

Canonical frame is defined on the poset  $(ST, \subseteq)$  by

- $*T = \{a \mid \neg a \notin T\}$
- $TS_i T'$  if and only if  $\forall a (a \in T \longrightarrow \diamond_i a \in T')$

### Lemma

For all formulas  $a$  and all saturated theories  $T$ ,

$$T \Vdash a \text{ iff } a \in T.$$

## To conclude

We have provided:

- completeness for a logic of confirmed common belief over BD (both finitary and strong infinitary completeness),
- over some substructural logics (dFL) we only understand the infinitary part of the story (for implication-free fragments, finitary part also works)

Further challenges:

- adding modal axioms (e.g. expressing factivity or consistency of belief)
- extending language with e.g. implication(s)