

### Game semantics for constructive modal logic

#### Matteo Acclavio, Davide Catta & Lutz Straßburger

#### LATD & MOSAIC

Game semantics for constructive modal logic

イロト イボト イヨト イヨト

## Background

э

・ロト ・ 御 ト ・ 臣 ト ・ 臣 ト ・

$$\mathcal{A} = \{1, a, b, c, d \ldots\}$$

$$\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{A} | \mathcal{F} \land \mathcal{F} | \mathcal{F} \supset \mathcal{F} | \Diamond \mathcal{F} | \Box \mathcal{F}$$

The modal logic CK is the smallest set of formulas containing:

- any instance of an intuitionistic theorem ;
- any instance of the axiom  $\Box(A \supset B) \supset (\Box A) \supset (\Box B)$ ;
- any instance of the axiom  $\Box(A \supset B) \supset (\diamond A) \supset (\diamond B)$

and closed for :

- modus ponens: if A and  $A \supset B$  are in CK so is B;
- **necessitation**: if A is in CK so is  $\Box A$ .
- **substitution**: if A is in CK so is  $A[B_1/a_1, \ldots, B_n/a_n]$

$$\frac{\overline{A} + \overline{A} \quad AX}{\overline{A} + \overline{A} \quad \overline{C} \quad$$

#### Theorem

There is a derivation  $\mathscr{D}$  of the sequent  $\vdash A$  iff  $A \in CK$ .

#### Theorem

There is a procedure P that turns every derivation  $\mathcal{D}$  in which the cut rule is used in a derivation  $\mathcal{D}'$  of the same sequent in which the cut rule is never used.

2

#### **Proof Semantics**

 $\{\!\{-\}\!\}: \{ \text{ derivations } \} \rightarrow \{ \text{mathematical objects } \}$ 

 $\mathscr{D} \longrightarrow \{\!\{\mathcal{D}\}\!\}$ 

#### **Denotational Semantics**

 $\mathscr{D} \rightsquigarrow \mathscr{D}' \quad \Rightarrow \quad \{\!\!\{\mathscr{D}\}\!\!\} = \{\!\!\{\mathscr{D}'\}\!\!\}$ 

Game semantics for constructive modal logic

▲□▶▲□▶▲目▶▲目▶ 目 のへで

# Denotational Semantics for Constructives Modal Logics (Bellin-De Paiva-Ritter)

 $\{\lambda \text{-termes}\}\$  $\beta \text{-reduction}$ 

### Morally

{Proofs} Cut elimination

Game semantics for constructive modal logic

3

くロト (行) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

## **Game Semantics**

3

ヘロト ヘ部ト ヘミト ヘミト

 $\{\text{Derivations}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Winning Strategies}\}$ 

 $\mathscr{D}_{F} \longrightarrow \text{Winning Strategy over}[[F]]$ 

- [[F]] is a finite graph representing F;
- A strategy is a particular set of plays over [[F]];
- A play is a particular sequence of nodes of [[F]].

イロト 不得 とくき とくき とうせい

### Arenas

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  two bi-colored DAGS and let  $\emptyset$  be the empty DAG.



 $[[a]] = a \qquad [[1]] = \emptyset \qquad [[A \land B]] = [[A]] + [[B]] \qquad [[A \supset B]] = [[A]] \rightarrow [[B]]$ 

 $\llbracket \Box A \rrbracket = \Box \rightsquigarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket \qquad \llbracket \Diamond A \rrbracket = \Diamond \rightsquigarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$ 

・ロト ・四ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

### Arenas

Each vertex v of an arena has a polarity. Such a polarity, positive  $(\circ)$  or negative  $(\bullet)$ , is the same as that of the occurrence of the atomic formula (or modality) of A that labels v.



An **intuitionistic move** in  $\llbracket F \rrbracket$  is a node v of  $\llbracket F \rrbracket$  labeled by a propositional variable. It is a **P**-move if v is of negative polarity and an **O**-move otherwise

An **intuitionistic play** for F is a finite alternate sequence of moves of  $\llbracket F \rrbracket$  such that:

- O-starts : the first node of the sequence is an arena-root.
- any move w of the play, but the first, is justified by a preceding move made by the other player : w→v in the arena ;
- each **O**-move is justified by the immediately preceding **P**-move.
- each P-move w has the same label as the immediately preceding
   O-move: if v is labeled by a so is w.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 三日



э

イロト イロト イヨト イヨト



12/30

э

イロト イロト イヨト イヨト



э



< ---> < --->

A strategy is a plan of action.

For any move that my Opponent can make, there is a move I can make that will eventually led me to victory.

## Winning Strategy

If  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$  are two plays over  $\llbracket A \rrbracket$ , we say that  $\rho$  is a **successor** of  $\sigma$  iff  $\rho = \sigma v$  for some  $v \in \llbracket A \rrbracket$ .

A **Winning Strategy** S for F is a non-empty finite prefix-closed set of plays over  $\llbracket F \rrbracket$  such that :

**O**-completeness: if  $p \in S$  has even length, then **any** successor of p belongs to S;

**P**-determinism and totality: if  $p \in S$  has odd length, then **exactly one** successor of p belongs to S.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 三日

A strategy for 
$$((a \land a) \supset b) \supset a \supset b$$



ヘロア 人間 アメヨアメヨア

consider the following strategy over  $\llbracket \Box a \supset a \rrbracket$ 



#### ... this formula is not a theorem of CK !

## Well batched strategies

**the address** of a vertex  $v \in [[A]]$  is the sequence of modalities  $add_v = m_1, \ldots m_k$  in the path in the formula tree of *F* connecting the node *v* to the root of *F*.

A play p is **well batched** whenever it respects the following:

- every move of p is either a ◊-modality or a propositional variable.
- if  $p = \sigma v^{O} w^{P}$  then  $|add_{w}| = |add_{v}|$ ;

A winning strategy is well batched iff any of its plays is well batched.

・ロト ・ 同ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨト ・ りゅう

#### ... it is not enough, consider $\llbracket (\Box a \supset \Box b) \supset \Box (a \supset b) \rrbracket$



э

イロト イロト イヨト イヨト

#### ... it is not enough, consider $\llbracket (\Box a \supset \Box b) \supset \Box (a \supset b) \rrbracket$



#### this is a well batched winning strategy

э

イロト イロト イヨト イヨト

$$-\frac{A_1^{\bullet},\ldots,A_n^{\bullet} \vdash C^{\circ}}{(\Box_1 A_1)^{\bullet},\ldots,(\Box_n A_n)^{\bullet} \vdash (\Box C)^{\circ}} \mathsf{K}^{\Box} - \frac{B_1^{\bullet},\ldots,B_m^{\bullet},D^{\bullet} \vdash F^{\circ}}{(\Box_1 B_1)^{\bullet},\ldots,(\Box_n B_m)^{\bullet},(\diamond D)^{\bullet} \vdash (\diamond F)^{\circ}} \mathsf{K}^{\diamond}$$

Game semantics for constructive modal logic

$$\frac{A_1^{\mathbf{P}}, \dots, A_n^{\mathbf{P}} \vdash C^{\mathbf{O}}}{(\Box_1 A_1)^{\mathbf{P}}, \dots (\Box_n A_n)^{\mathbf{P}} \vdash (\Box C)^{\mathbf{O}}} \mathsf{K}^{\Box} \qquad \frac{B_1^{\mathbf{P}}, \dots, B_m^{\mathbf{P}}, D^{\mathbf{P}} \vdash F^{\mathbf{O}}}{(\Box_1 B_1)^{\mathbf{P}}, \dots, (\Box_n B_m)^{\mathbf{P}}, (\diamondsuit D)^{\mathbf{P}} \vdash (\diamondsuit F)^{\mathbf{O}}} \mathsf{K}^{\diamondsuit}$$

Game semantics for constructive modal logic

・ロト ・ 日本 ・ 日本 ・ 日本 ・ 日本

#### ... again on $\llbracket (\Box a \supset \Box b) \supset \Box (a \supset b) \rrbracket$



문어 문

given two modalities *m* and *m'* and a play p, we write  $m \stackrel{p}{\sim} m'$  whenever  $m = \operatorname{add}_{k}^{v}$ ,  $m' = \operatorname{add}_{k}^{v'}$  where *v* and *v'* are two consecutive moves in p and *v'* is a **P**-move.

□□		□□	
$b_0$	<i>b</i> <sub>1</sub>	$a_0$	a <sub>1</sub>
0	Р	ο	Р

the reflexive, transitive and symmetric closure of the relation  $\stackrel{p}{\sim}$  contains two positive modalities .

## Winning modal strategies

Let S be a winning, well batched strategy. We say that S is **well framed** iff for any  $p \in S$ , any  $\stackrel{p}{\sim}$ -class is of the form  $\{m_1^P, \dots, m_n^P, m^O\}$ 

A winning well framed strategy S is a **modal** strategy iff for any  $\sigma \in S$  for any modal node  $m^0$  appearing in the address of some move v of  $\sigma$ 

• if 
$$m = \Box$$
 then  $m' = \Box$  for any  $m' \stackrel{p}{\sim} m$ ;

2 if  $m = \diamond$  then there is a unique  $m'^{\mathbf{P}} = \diamond$  such that  $m \stackrel{\mathsf{p}}{\sim} m'$ .

## Results

Game semantics for constructive modal logic

#### Theorem

Given two modal strategies S for  $A \supset B$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  for  $B \supset C$  we can define their composition S;  $\mathcal{T}$  which is a modal strategy for  $B \supset C$ . Moreover  $(S; \mathcal{T})$ ;  $\mathcal{R} = S$ ;  $(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{R})$ .

#### Theorem

There is a function  $\{\!\{-\}\!\}$  mapping any derivation  $\mathcal{D}$  of  $\vdash A$  to a winning strategy  $\{\!\{\mathcal{D}\}\!\}$  for A dubbed its interpretation. Moreover:

- If D reduces to D' in 0 or more steps of cut elimination, then {{D}} = {{D'}}.
- 2 for any winning strategy S, there is a proof  $\mathcal{D}$  such that  $S = \{ \mathcal{D} \}$ .

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト 二日

## Perspectives

Déduction naturelle pour CK



27/30

æ

 $\mathsf{CT} = \mathsf{CK} \cup \{ (\Box A \supset A) \land (A \supset \Diamond A) | \text{ for any } A \in \mathcal{F} \}$ 

 $\mathsf{CS4} = \mathsf{CT} \cup \{ (\Box A \supset \Box \Box A) \land (\Diamond \Diamond A \supset \Diamond A) | \text{ for any } A \in \mathcal{F} \}$ 

Game semantics for constructive modal logic

 Matteo Acclavio, Davide Catta et Lutz Straßburger (2021), Game Semantics for Constructive Modal Logics. In: Das A., Negri S. (eds) Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods. TABLEAUX 2021. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 12842. Springer,

Cham.https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86059-2\_25

• My PhD thesis. Proofs as games and games as proofs: dialogical semantics for logic and natural language.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > 、 回 > 、 回

# Thank You !