

# HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Preconditions, Common Sense Reasoning, and Context Shifts
Author(s)	Yamada, Tomoyuki
Citation	Proceedings of SOCREAL 2013 : 3rd International Workshop on Philosophy and Ethics of Social Reality 2013, 80-91
Issue Date	2013-10-25
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/55047
Туре	proceedings
Note	SOCREAL 2013 : 3rd International Workshop on Philosophy and Ethics of Social Reality 2013. Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan, 25-27 October 2013. Session 4 : Agency, Responsibility, and Intentionality
File Information	10Tomo_precondition2h4.pdf

\*

Instructions for use

# Preconditions, Common Sense Reasoning, and Context Shifts

Tomoyuki Yamada

Research Group of Philosophy Hokkaido University

SOCREAL 2013 25–27 October 2013, Hokkaido University, Sapporo

> 北海道大学 HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

1 北海道大学

80

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts

Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

The problem

2 Logical dynamics of speech acts

3 Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997)

What failures tell us

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

# Outline



sergeant: You don't have the authority to give me command.

Normally, privates would not say things like this to a sergeant. But how can we theorize about normality?

The attempted command misfired. But was it a "command"?

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions



# Judith's flashlight (Barwise and Seligman, 1997, p. 23)

In doing things in everyday life, we rely on various regularities that hold normally.

For example, by turning the switch of her flashlight on, Judith light its bulb.

Preconditions

(1) The switch being on entails that the bulb is lit.

What will happen, however, if the battery is dead?

Tomoyuki Yamada

\_\_\_\_\_

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

# Background conditions and context shifts

The switch being on entails that the bulb is lit.

 $\Downarrow$  The issue of whether the battery is alive or not is raised.

If the battery is live, the switch being on entails that the bulb is lit.

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

Weakening ?

1 北海道大学

1 北海道大学

81

(Barwise & Seligman, p. 23)

By applying the inference rule called weakening, we could derive the following:

(2) The switch being on and the battery being dead entails that the bulb is lit.

Since this conclusion is unacceptable, we might wish to revise (1) and say:

(3) The switch being on and the battery being live entails that the bulb is lit.

What will happen, however, if the bulb is gone?

金 北海道大学

1 北海道大学

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

1 The problem

2 Logical dynamics of speech acts

- 3 Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997)
- What failures tell us

# Two points to be noted about DEL (or PAL)

The formulas of the form  $\varphi \rightarrow [\varphi]K_i\varphi$  are shown to be valid for any  $i \in I$  if no operators of the form  $K_i$  occur in  $\varphi$ .

- This is too strong for interpreting natural language public announcements.
- There is a gap between announcing and getting people to know.
- φ! can be reinterpreted as a type of an event in which people simultaneously and commonly learn that φ.

The method used in developing *DEL* can be used to develop logics that deal with a much wider variety of speech acts.

!<sub>a</sub>p

The problem

What failures tell us

Logical dynamics of speech acts

Your boss's act of commanding in ECL

Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997)

 $\Diamond p \land \Diamond q \land \Diamond r$ 

 $[!_a p] O_a p$ 

 $\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{w} \models [!_i \varphi] \psi$  iff  $\mathcal{M}_{!_{i \ell \varrho}}, \mathbf{w} \models \psi$ .

 $\mathcal{M}$ 

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

 $\mathcal{M}_{!_{aD}}$ 

D

 $\Diamond p \land \Diamond q \land \Diamond r$ 

 $O_{a}p$ 

a

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

## The recipe (Yamada, 2008c)

- Carefully identify the aspects affected by the speech acts you want to study
- Ind the modal logic that characterizes these aspects
- add dynamic modalities that represent types of those speech acts
- expand truth definition by adding clauses that interpret the speech acts under study as what update the very aspects
- (if possible) find a complete set of reduction axioms for the resulting dynamic logic.

北海道大学 HOKKAIDO UNIVERSIT

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

# Refinements and applications to other speech acts

Conflicting obligations, commanding and promising,

Dynamified deontic logics (Yamada 07a, 07b, 08a).

Differentiating illocutionary acts of commanding from perlocutionary acts that affects preferences

Dynamified deontic preference logic (Yamada 08b).

Asserting, conceding, and their withdrawals

Dynamic logics of propositional commitments (Yamada, 2012).

Differentiating acts of requesting from acts of commanding A dynamified deontic epistemic logic (Yamada, 2011).



82

首大学 UNIVERSITY

1 北海道大学

# Acts of Commanding and Acts of Promising

#### The CUGO Principle

If  $\varphi$  is a formula of MDL<sup>+</sup>III and is free of modal operators of the form  $O_{(j,i,i)}$ , the following formula is valid:

 $[Com_{(i,j)}\varphi]O_{(j,i,i)}\varphi$ 

#### The PUGO Principle

If  $\varphi$  is a formula of MDL<sup>+</sup>III and is free of modal operators of the form  $O_{(i,j,i)}$ , the following formula is valid:

 $[Prom_{(i,i)}\varphi]O_{(i,i,i)}\varphi$ 

HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

Acts of requesting

#### The RUGO Principle

If  $\varphi$  is a formula of MEDL and is free of modal operators of the form  $O_{(j,i,i)}$ ,  $[Req_{(i,j)}\varphi]O_{(j,i,i)}(\varphi \lor K_iO_{(j,i,j)}\varphi \lor K_i \neg O_{(j,i,j)}\varphi)$  is valid.

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

# A command and a promise can lead to a dilemma

#### A contingent dilemma

 $[\mathit{Prom}_{(a,b)}p][\mathit{Com}_{(c,a)}q](\mathit{O}_{(a,b,a)}p\wedge \mathit{O}_{(a,c,c)}q)\wedge \neg \Diamond (p\wedge q)$ .

- *p* You will attend the conference in São Paulo on 11 July 2013.
- *q* You will join the demonstration in Sapporo on 11 July 2013.

北海道大学

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

## An unexpected results

### The CUGU Principle

If  $\varphi$  is a formula of DMEDL and is free of modal operators of the form  $O_{(j,i,i)}$ ,  $[Com_{(i,j)}\varphi]K_IO_{(j,i,i)}\varphi$  is valid.

#### The PUGU Principle

If  $\varphi$  is a formula of DMEDL and is free of modal operators of the form  $O_{(i,j,i)}$ ,  $[Prom_{(i,j)}\varphi]K_IO_{(i,j,i)}\varphi$  is valid.

#### The RUGU Principle

If  $\varphi$  is a formula of MEDL and is free of modal operators of the form  $O_{(j,i,i)}$ ,  $[Req_{(i,j)}\varphi]K_lO_{(j,i,i)}(\varphi \lor K_iO_{(j,i,j)}\varphi \lor K_i \neg O_{(j,i,j)}\varphi)$  is valid.

**北海道大学** HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

83

## Why such things happen

## Product update?



# Sequents, constraints, the complete theory (Barwise & Seligman, p. 29)

By a *sequent* we just mean a pair  $\langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle$  of sets of types.

**D**efinition. Let A be a classification and let  $\langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle$  be a sequent of A. A token *a* of A satisfies  $\langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle$  provided that if *a* is of type  $\alpha$  for every  $\alpha \in \Gamma$  then *a* is of type  $\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \in \Delta$ . We say that  $\Gamma$  *entails*  $\Delta$  in A, written  $\Gamma \vdash_A \Delta$ , if every token *a* of A satisfies  $\langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle$ . If  $\Gamma \vdash_A \Delta$  then the pair  $\langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle$  is called a *constraint* supported by the classification A.

The set of all constraints supported by A is called the complete theory of A and is denoted by Th(A). The complete theory of A represents all the regularities supported by the system being modeled by A.

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

### Infomorphisms

# (Barwise & Seligman, p. 32)

1 北海道大学

**D**efinition. If  $A = \langle A, \Sigma_A, \models_A \rangle$  and  $C = \langle C, \Sigma_C, \models_C \rangle$  are classifications, then an *infomorphism* is a pair  $f = \langle f^{\wedge}, f^{\vee} \rangle$  of functions

The problem



satisfying the biconditional:

$$f^{\vee}(c) \models_{\mathsf{A}} \alpha$$
 iff  $c \models_{\mathsf{C}} f^{\wedge}(\alpha)$ 

for all tokens c of C and all types  $\alpha$  of A.

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

## Sums of Classifications

(Barwise & Seligman, p. 33)

Given two (or more) classifications A and B, these classifications can be combined into a single classification A + B with important properties. The tokens of A + B consist of pairs  $\langle a, b \rangle$  of tokens from each. The types of A + B consist of the types of both, except that if there are any types in common, then we make distinct copies, so as not to confuse them. This construction works nicely with infomorphism as well. First of all, there are natural infomorphisms  $\sigma_A : A \rightleftharpoons A + B$  and  $\sigma_B : B \rightleftharpoons A + B$  defined as follows:

• 
$$\sigma_A(\alpha) = \alpha_A$$
 (the A-copy of  $\alpha$ ) for each  $\alpha \in type(A)$ ,

**2**  $\sigma_{\mathsf{B}}(\beta) = \beta_{\mathsf{B}}$  for each  $\beta \in type(\mathsf{B})$ , and

• for each pair 
$$\langle a, b \rangle \in tok(A + B)$$
,  $\sigma_A(\langle a, b \rangle) = a$  and  $\sigma_B(\langle a, b \rangle) = b$ .

北海道大学 HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY



More importantly, given any classification C and infomorphism  $f : A \rightleftharpoons C$  and  $g : B \rightleftharpoons C$ , there is a unique infomorphism h = f + g such that the following diagram commutes.



Each of the arrow represents an infomorphism. On tokens,  $h(c) = \langle f(c), g(c) \rangle$ . On types of the form  $\alpha_A$ , h gives  $f(\alpha)$ . On types of the form  $\alpha_B$ , h gives  $g(\alpha)$ .

85

# Information Channels(Barwise & Seligman, pp. 34–35)

**D**efinition. An *information channel* consists of an indexed family  $C = \{f_i : A_i \rightleftharpoons C\}$  of infomorphisms with a common codomain *C* called the *core* of the channel.

**A** God's eye analysis of information flow Suppose that the token *a* is of type  $\alpha$ . Then *a*'s being of type  $\alpha$  carries the information that *b* is of type  $\beta$ , relative to the channel *C*, if *a* and *b* are connected in *C* and if the translation  $\alpha'$  of  $\alpha$  entails the translation  $\beta'$  of  $\beta$  in the theory Th(*C*), where *C* is the core of *C*.



Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

Reasoning at a distance

(Barwise & Seligman, pp. 38-39)

Let arbitrary classification *A* and *B* and an infomorphism  $f : A \rightleftharpoons B$  are given. We write  $\Gamma^f$  for the set of translations of types in  $\Gamma$  when  $\Gamma$  is a set of types of *A*. If  $\Gamma$  is a set of types of *B*, we write  $\Gamma^{-f}$  for the set of types whose translations are in  $\Gamma$ .

$$f\text{-Intro}: \frac{\Gamma^{-f} \vdash_{\mathsf{A}} \Delta^{-f}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathsf{B}} \Delta}$$
$$f\text{-Elim}: \frac{\Gamma^{f} \vdash_{\mathsf{B}} \Delta^{f}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathsf{A}} \Delta}$$

The rule *f*-Intro preserves validity but not non-validity. The rule *f*-Elim preserves non-validity but not validity.

 The problem

 Logical dynamics of speech acts

 Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997)

 What failures tell us

 Local logic

 (Barwise & Seligman, p. 40)

The problem

 $\{f^{\wedge}_{Switch}(ON)\} \vdash_{\mathsf{Flushlight}} \{f^{\wedge}_{Bulb}(LIT)\}$ .

Flashlight

f<sub>Switch</sub>

Switch

1 北海道大学

What failures tell us

Logical dynamics of speech acts

t<sub>Bulb</sub>

Bulb

Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997)

An example.

**Definition**. A *local logic*  $\mathfrak{L} = \langle \mathsf{A}, \vdash_{\mathfrak{L}}, N_{\mathfrak{L}} \rangle$  consists of a classification A, a set  $\vdash_{\mathfrak{L}}$  of sequents (satisfying certain structural rules) involving the types of A, called the *constraints* of  $\mathfrak{L}$ , and a subset  $N_{\mathfrak{L}}$  of the set of all the tokens of A, called the *normal tokens* of  $\mathfrak{L}$ , which satisfy all the constraints of  $\vdash_{\mathfrak{L}}$ .

A local logic  $\mathfrak{L}$  is *sound* if every token is normal; it is *complete* if every sequent that holds of all normal tokens is in the consequence relation  $\vdash_{\mathfrak{L}}$ .

## Moving logics

(Barwise & Seligman, pp. 40-41)

Given an infomorphism  $f : A \rightleftharpoons B$  and a logic  $\mathcal{L}$  on one of these classifications, we obtain a natural logic on the other.

If  $\mathcal{L}$  is a logic on A, then  $f|\mathcal{L}|$  is the logic on B obtained from  $\mathcal{L}$  by *f*-intro.

If  $\mathcal{L}$  is a logic on B, then  $f^{-1}|\mathcal{L}|$  is the logic on A obtained from  $\mathcal{L}$  by *f*-Elim.

Tomoyuki Yamada





S



 ${h'(ON)} \vdash_{F'} {h'(LIT)}$  might not hold.

Preconditions

 Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997)

 What failures tell us

 tate spaces and classifications
 (B & S, pp. 46–48)

 State space consists of a set S of tokens, a set Ω<sub>S</sub> of states,

and a function state that maps S into  $\Omega_S$ .

ogical dynamics of speech acts

The problem

Subsets of  $\Omega_S$  can be used to classify states. Such subsets are called events. Thus the power set of  $\Omega_S$ , called  $Evt(\Omega_S)$  is the set of types of the event classification Evt(S) that classifies the tokens in S. A token  $s \in S$  is of type  $\alpha \in Evt(\Omega_S)$  iff state(s)  $\in \alpha$ .



R

1 北海道大学

1 北海道大学



Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

# Regularities and failures in dynamic cases

(1) By pushing the switch into the on position, you can light the bulb.

(2) If the battery is dead, even if you push the switch into the on position, you cannot light the bulb.

It seems that we need to consider the relation between action types.

(For exmple): Pushing the switch into the on position involves lighting the bulb.

HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

What about illocutionary acts?

Similarly, when an attempted act of commanding misfires, there seems to be no token of an act of commanding.

This implies that there are no non-normal token of an act of commanding in this case.

This enables us to justify our procedure of dealing only with normal tokens of illocutionary acts in studying their conventional (or institutional) effects. (The promised connection between the two initial questions!) The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

What tokens are there in the failures.

If you fail to light the bulb, there seems to be no token of an act of lighting the bulb.

But a token of an act of pushing the switch into the on position does exist.

In successful cases, tokens of an act of pushing the switch into the on position are also tokens of an act of lighting the bulb.

In unsuccessful cases of the above kind, tokens of an act of pushing the switch into the on position fail to be tokens of an act of lighting the bulb. In this sense, there seem to be no non-normal tokens of an act of lighting the bulb here.

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

But, if so ...

Does this mean that there are no tokens to be classified in the cases of failure?

Austin would say that a locutionary act is performed in this case.

But Searle would deny this. He has rejected the distinction between locutionary acts and illocutionary acts. He would say that, in such a case, not a locutionary acts but an utterance act is performed.

北海道大学 HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

89

首大学

## Count-as relation

According to Searle's theory of social reality, illocutionary acts are performed according to the rule of the following form:

#### X counts as Y in context C.

Types of illocutionary acts occupy the Y position here. So the above question boils down to the question of what kind of acts occupy the X position here.

The above rule can be reformulated as the following:

X-ing involves Y-ing in context C.

Whether channel theory enables us to study the count-as relation in modal contexts in a fruitful way is yet to be seen.

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us



- Austin, J. L., *How to do Things with Words*, The Williams James Lectures, Harvard University, 1955. In: J. O. Urmson, and M. Sbisà, (eds.), *How to do Things with Words*, 2nd. ed., Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Barwise, J. and Seligman, J., *Information Flow: The Logic of Distributed Systems*, Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- van Ditmarsch, H., van der Hoek, W., and Kooi, B., Dynamic Epistemic Logic, Springer, 2007.

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

# A cojecture (Yamada 2013)

#### Definition

Let  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  be action types (or programs). Then  $\pi_1$  involves  $\pi_2$  iff for any formula  $\varphi$ , the validity of  $[\pi_2]\varphi$  implies the validity of  $[\pi_1]\varphi$ .

#### An example

 $\operatorname{Com}_{(b,a)}(p \wedge q)$  involves  $\operatorname{Com}_{(b,a)}p$  .

Proof: Note that we have  $(M_{\text{Com}_{(b,a)}q})_{\text{Com}_{(b,a)}p} = M_{\text{Com}_{(b,a)}(p \land q)}$ , for any  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DMDL}^+\text{III}}$ -model M and any world w of M.

#### A conjecture

By generalizing, we conjecture that  $Com_{(i,j)}\varphi$  involves  $Com_{(i,j)}\psi$  if  $\varphi \to \psi$  is valid.

道大学

北海道大学

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

### References (2/5)

- John Searle, *Speech Acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- John Searle, *The construction of social reality*. Free Press, 1995.
- Tomoyuki Yamada. Acts of commanding and changing obligations. In Katsumi Inoue, Ken Sato, and Francesca Toni, editors, *Computational Logic in Multi-Agent Systems*, *7th International Workshop*, *CLIMA VII*, *Hakodate*, *Japan*, *May 2006*, *Revised Selected and Invited Papers*, volume 4371 of *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1–19, Berlin / Heidelberg / New York, 2007a. Springer-Verlag.

1 北海道大学

首大学

## References (3/5)

 Tomoyuki Yamada. Logical dynamics of commands and obligations. In Takashi Washio, Ken Satoh, Hideaki Takeda, and Akihiro Inokuchi, editors, New Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, JSAI 2006 Conference and Workshops, Tokyo, Japan, June 2006, Revised Selected Papers, volume 4384 of Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence, pages 133–46, Berlin / Heidelberg / New York, 2007b. Springer-Verlag.

	· 北海道大学 HARCADO UNVESTIV	
Tomoyuki Yamada	Preconditions	
The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us		



- Tomoyuki Yamada. Acts of requesting in dynamic logic of knowledge and obligation. *European Journal of Analytic Philosophy*, 7(2):59–82, 2011.
- Tomoyuki Yamada. Dynamic logic of propositional commitments. In Majda Trobok, Nenad Miščvić, and Berislav Žarnić, editors, *Between Logic and Reality: Modeling Inference, Action, and Understanding*, pages 183–200. Springer-Verlag, Berlin / Heidelberg / New York, 2012.
- Tomoyuki Yamada. On the very idea of imperative inference, In Anna Brożek, Jacek Jadacki, and Berislav Žarnić, (eds.), *Theory of Imperatives from Different Points of View (2)*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 2013, pp. 33–46.

The problem Logical dynamics of speech acts Actions in channel theory (Barwise & Seligman 1997) What failures tell us

## References (4/5)

- Tomoyuki Yamada. Acts of promising in dynamified deontic logic. In Ken Sato, Akihiro Inokuchi, Katashi Nagao, and Takahiro Kawamura, editors, New Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, JSAI 2007 Conference and Workshops, Miyazaki, Japan, June 18-22, 2007, Revised Selected Papers, volume 4914 of Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence, pages 95–108, Berlin / Heidelberg / New York, 2008a. Springer-Verlag.
- Tomoyuki Yamada. Logical dynamics of some speech acts that affect obligations and preferences. *Synthese*, 165:295–315, 2008b.

北海道大学

Tomoyuki Yamada Preconditions