

Fun with Constructive Modalities

Valeria de Paiva

Cuil, Inc.

PUC Rio de Janeiro, June 2009

An applied logician's job is never done...

- When modeling an implemented system as a logic you can start from the system



- Or you can start from logics that could fit it
- Hopefully the two meet up...

This talk: Off-the-shelf logical systems



The pieces of the puzzle...

- FOL
- HOL
- Modal logic
- Description logic
- Hybrid logic
- MCS/LMS
- Intensional Logic
- Etc...

Outline

- Motivation
- Brief history?
- Constructive modal logic
- Constructive hybrid logic
- Constructive description logic
- Discussion

Motivation: Constructive Modalities?

- Modalities and modal logic: the **most** successful logical framework in CS
- Temporal logic, knowledge operators, BDI models, security issues, AI, natural language understanding and inference, databases, etc..
- Logic used both to create logical representation of information and to reason about it
- Usually **classical** modalities
- What about **constructive** modalities?

Motivation: Constructive Modalities?

- **Constructive** logic: a logical basis for programming via Curry-Howard correspondences
- Modalities extremely useful
- Constructive modalities twice as useful?
- examples from applications abound
- **Which** constructive modalities?
- Usual phenomenon: classical facts can be construed in many different ways constructively, choosing is an art...

• **Constructive reasoning: what, why, how...**

- What: Reasoning principles that are safer
- if I ask you whether “There is x such that $P(x)$ ”,
- I'm happier with an answer “yes, x_0 ”, than with an answer “yes, for all x it is not the case that not $P(x)$ ”.
- Why: want reasoning to be as precise and safe as possible
- How: constructive reasoning as much as possible, but classical if need be

A brief history

- Debates over constructive or classical logics since the beginning of the 20th century
- Modal logics from 1920's - Lewis
- Kripke-like semantics in the 60s.
- Connections constructive/modal logic:
 - Algebraic McKinsey/Tarski 30s
 - Kripke semantics, for both 65
 - Modal type theories, 90's
- Putting constructive and modal together:
- Fitch 1948 MIPC, Bull 1966, Prawitz 1965, Curry,

More brief history...

- Intuitionistic modal logic:
 - Analogy
 - Semantics
 - Translations
 - Other
- Fisher-Servi 80's,
- Bozic-Dosen, 84, Volter/Zacharyashev 88
- Simpson, Gabbay, Masini/Martini early 90's
- Mendler, Fairtlough, Bierman/dePaiva, etc
- Overviews: Goldblatt, IMLA'04 (dePaiva, Mendler, Gore')

Constructive modal logics

- Basic ideas:
 - Box, Diamond like forall/exists
 - Intuitionistic logic like S4-modal logic,
 - where $A \multimap B = \Box A \rightarrow B$
 - Combining modalities not that easy...
- To have “intuitionistic modal logic” need to have two modalities, how do they interact?
 - Commuting squares possibilities
- Adding syntax: hypersequents, labelled deduction systems, adding semantics to syntax (many ways...)

Constructive modal logics

- Personal programme:
- constructive modal logics with axioms, sequents and natural deduction formulations
- Also with algebraic, Kripke and categorical semantics
- With translations between formulations and proved equivalences/embeddings
- Translating proofs more than simply theorems
- broad view of constructive and/or modality

Simpson Desiderata for IML '94

- IML is a conservative extension of IPL.
- IML contains all substitutions instances of theorems of IPL and is closed under modus ponens.
- Adding excluded middle to IML yields a standard classical modal logic
- If “A or B” is a theorem of IML either A is a theorem or B is a theorem too.
- Box and Diamond are independent in IML.
- (Intuitionistic) Meaning of the modalities, wrt it IML is sound and complete

Extensions: Description and Hybrid Logics

- Description and Hybrid logics are closely associated with modal logics
- Both classes tend to be classical logics, for the same reasons above
- We discuss both constructive hybrid logics (Brauner/dePaiva 03) and constructive description logics (dePaiva05) in turn.

Constructive Hybrid Logic?

- What are hybrid logics?
- Extension of modal logic, where we make part of the syntax of the formulae the worlds at which they're evaluated.
- Add to basic modal logic second kind of propositional symbols (nominals) and satisfaction operators
- A nominal is assumed to be true at exactly one world
- A formula like $a:A$ where a is a nominal and A is a formula is called a satisfaction statement

Constructive Hybrid Logic!

- Brauner/dePaiva ('03, '05)
- Which kind of constructive?
- Depends on kind of constructive modal logic
- Many choices for syntax and for models.
- Our choice: modal base Simpson-style, Natural Deduction style.
- Results: IHL as a ND system, models, soundness and completeness, extensions to geometric theories
- Open problem: hybrid system CK style?...

What Are Description Logics?

- A family of logic based Knowledge Representation formalisms
 - Descendants of **semantic networks** and **KL-ONE**
 - Describe domain in terms of **concepts** (classes), **roles** (properties, relationships) and **individuals**
- Distinguished by:
 - **Formal semantics** (typically model theoretic)
 - » Decidable fragments of FOL (often contained in C_2)
 - » **Closely related to Propositional Modal, Hybrid & Dynamic Logics**
 - » Closely related to Guarded Fragment
 - Provision of **inference services**
 - » Decision procedures for key problems (satisfiability, subsumption, etc)
 - » Implemented systems (highly optimised)


Thanks Ian Horrocks!

DL Basics

- **Concepts (formulae/unary predicates)**
 - E.g., Person, Doctor, HappyParent, etc.
- **Roles (modalities/relations)**
 - E.g., hasChild, loves
- **Individuals (nominals/constants)**
 - E.g., John, Mary, Italy
- **Operators (for forming concepts and roles) restricted so that:**
 - Satisfiability/subsumption is decidable and, *if possible*, of low complexity
 - No need for explicit use of variables
 - Features such as counting (**graded modalities**) succinctly expressed

What are description logics?

- A sublogic of FOL?
- Or a sublogic of Modal logic?



Constructive Description Logic via Translation

- DL can be defined via t_1 translation into FOL
- To constructivize it transform FOL into IFOL
Call system IALC
- DL can be defined via t_2 translation into multimodal K (Schild's91)
- Need to choose a constructive K
- Using IK (Simpson) call system iALC, using CK (Mendler & de Paiva) call system cALC

Two translations

- Into first-order logic $t1:ALC \rightarrow FOL$
- concept C maps to $C(x)$, role R maps to relation, quantifiers the point
- Into modal logic $t2:ALC \rightarrow Kn$, roles into boxes, diamonds

Constructive Description Logic: IALC

- Basic idea: translate description syntax using t_1 into IFOL, instead of FOL
- No excluded middle, no duality between existential and universal quantifiers, no duality between conjunction and disjunction
- Pros: IFOL fairly standard
 - Can provide IALC models easily
- Cons: semantics of IFOL more complicated...
- Result: Given IALC model M , given formula A M satisfies A iff M satisfies $t_1(A)$, that is t_1 is truth-preserving translation

Constructive Description Logic: iALC and cALC

- Basic idea: translate description syntax using \mathcal{L}_2 into constructive modal logic, instead of classical modal \mathcal{K}_n .
- Which constructive \mathcal{K} ?
- If Simpson's $\mathcal{IK} \rightarrow \text{iALC}$,
- if Mendler/de Paiva $\mathcal{CK} \rightarrow \text{cALC}$
- Difference: distribution of possibility over disjunction and nullary one:
 - $\text{Dia}(A \text{ or } B) \rightarrow \text{Dia } A \text{ or } \text{Dia } B$
 - $\text{Dia}(\text{false}) \rightarrow \text{false}$

Constructive Description Logic II: iALC

- Note that translation t_2 into constructive modal logic is the same for both iALC and cALC, just the target language change.
- For iALC, can use our work on intuitionistic hybrid logic
- Models easily described
- Framework: several modal logics + geometric theories
- Referee's remark: complexity?

Constructive Description Logic II: cALC

- For cALC, can use our work on an extended Curry-Howard isomorphism for constructive modal logic
- No Framework: can only do S4 and K
- Can do Kripke models and categorical models
- Haven't investigated interpolation, decidability or complexity
- New work by Mendler and Schiele

Related Work

- Mandler/Schiele on constructive description for auditing
- Bozzato, Ferrari et al, CHI for ALC, diff HH and A Rademaker?
- Odintsov and Wansing's "Inconsistent-tolerant description logic I and II"
 - Motivation is paraconsistency, not constructivity
- Hofmann's "Proof theoretical Approach to DL"
 - Motivation fixpoints in description logics and their complexity
- Straccia's and Patel-Schneider's papers on 4-valued description logic
 - Motivations are fuzziness and uncertainty

Discussion

- This is very preliminary
- While it is true that constructive reasoning multiply concepts, there should be criteria to identify best system(s?)
- Part of bigger programme of constructivizing logics for computer science
- Want to keep criteria both from theory and applications
- Next steps: criteria from modal/hybrid logic, bisimulations, complexity bounds, temporal logics, etc...

References

- *Natural Deduction and Context as (Constructive) Modality* (V. de Paiva). In Proceedings of the 4th International and Interdisciplinary Conference CONTEXT 2003, Stanford, CA, USA, Springer Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence, vol 2680, 2003.
- *Constructive CK for Contexts* (M. Mendler, V de Paiva), In Proceedings of the Worskhop on Context Representation and Reasoning, Paris, France, July 2005.
- *Intuitionistic Hybrid Logic* (T. Brauner, V. de Paiva), Presented at Methods for Modalities 3, LORIA, Nancy, France, September 22-23, 2003. Full paper in Journal of Applied Logic 2005
- .Modalities in Constructive Logics and Type Theories Preface to the special issue on Intuitionistic Modal Logic and Application of the Journal of Logic and Computation, volume 14, number 4, August 2004. Guest Editors: Valeria de Paiva, Rajeev Gore' and Michael Mendler.
- Constructive Description Logics: what, why and how. (extended draft) Presented at Context Representation and Reasoning, Riva del Garda, August 2006.

Thanks!

papers/preprints at

<http://www.cs.bham.ac.uk/~vdp/publications/papers.html>