

# Boolean-Valued Multiagent Coalgebraic Logic

Alexander Kurz<sup>1</sup> and Nima Motamed<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Chapman University, Orange CA, USA  
akurz@chapman.edu

<sup>2</sup> Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands  
n.motamed@uu.nl

In his article ‘How True It Is = Who Says It’s True’ [2], Fitting constructs a modal logic with truth values in the powerset  $2^A$  for some set  $A$  of ‘agents’. This logic generalises two-valued modal logic and has a natural interpretation suggested by the title of the article: *the truth value of a formula is the set of agents for whom the formula is true*.

This can naturally be made precise through an equation, referred to by Fitting [2] as a Slicing Theorem. For each formula  $\varphi \in \text{Form}$  of modal logic with a  $\Box$ -modality, and state  $x \in X$  in a labelled Kripke model  $\mathbb{M} = (X, R_a)_{a \in A}$ , it holds that

$$\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}^A(x) = \{a \in A \mid x \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}_a}\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\llbracket - \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}^A : \text{Form} \rightarrow (2^A)^X$  is the semantics of Fitting’s logic, and  $\llbracket - \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}_a} : \text{Form} \rightarrow 2^X$  is the semantics of two-valued modal logic over  $\mathbb{M}_a = (X, R_a)$ . This logic also comes with a natural notion of agent-indexed bisimulations, which is similar in spirit to Equation (1).

We show how coalgebraic logic generalises Fitting-style logics to agent-indexed **Set**-coalgebras parametric in a functor  $T$ . We also generalise to coalgebras over **Pos**, in which the set  $A$  of agents carries an ordering of ‘expertise’ (cf. [1]) or ‘ability’.

Recall the (dual) adjunction between **Set** and **BA**, consisting of contravariant functors  $P : \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{BA}$  (taking powersets) and  $S : \text{BA} \rightarrow \text{Set}$  (taking ultrafilters). Let  $T$  and  $L$  be functors as indicated in

$$T \circlearrowleft \text{Set} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{P} \\ \xleftarrow{S} \end{array} \text{BA} \circlearrowright L \quad (2)$$

The set of formulas of the coalgebraic modal logic is given by the initial  $L$ -algebra  $I$ . Given a  $T$ -coalgebra  $(X, \xi)$ , we *algebraify* it into an  $L$ -algebra  $(PX, \delta_X \circ P\xi)$  by way of a so-called *one-step semantics*  $\delta : LP \Rightarrow PT$ . By initiality, we then get the semantics  $\llbracket - \rrbracket_{\xi} : I \rightarrow PX$ .

To extend this to Fitting-style agent-indexing, we extend this adjunction to the (co-)Kleisli categories formed from the **Set**-comonad  $A \times (-)$  and the **BA**-monad  $(-)^A$ . We denote their corresponding (co-)Kleisli categories by **ASet** and **ABA**.

The adjunction given by  $P$  and  $S$  lifts to a corresponding adjunction  $\bar{P}, \bar{L}$  for **ASet** – **ABA** by way of obvious natural transformations  $P(A \times (-)) \Rightarrow (PX)^A$  and  $A \times S(-) \Rightarrow S((-)^A)$ . The functors  $L$  and  $T$  lift to  $\bar{L}$  and  $\bar{T}$  on **ABA** and

$A\text{Set}$  by way of distributive laws  $L((-)^A) \Rightarrow (L-)^A$  and  $A \times T(-) \Rightarrow T(A \times (-))$ . The former is guaranteed to exist here by the universal property of the product  $(LB)^A \cong \prod_{a \in A} LB$ ; we are unsure whether the latter generally exists, although we have not found a  $T$  for which this is not the case. Note that all of these lifted functors are defined on objects as the original functors.

Having extended (2) to  $A\text{Set}$  and  $ABA$ , we can now proceed as before, through the initial  $\bar{L}$ -algebra  $I$  (which has the same underlying set as that of  $L$ ) and one-step semantics  $\bar{\delta} : \bar{L}\bar{P} \Rightarrow \bar{P}\bar{T}$  defined by putting  $(\bar{\delta}_X)_a = \delta$  for each  $a \in A$ , where  $(\bar{\delta}_X)_a$  is the ‘slice’ of  $\bar{\delta}_X : \bar{L}PX \rightarrow (\bar{P}TX)^A$  corresponding to  $a$ . The algebraification of  $\bar{T}$ -coalgebras is defined analogously to before. By initiality and the definition of  $ABA$ , we then finally get as the semantics a function  $\llbracket - \rrbracket_\xi^A : I \rightarrow (PX)^A$ , satisfying (1) in which  $M$  is replaced by the  $\bar{T}$ -coalgebra  $\xi$ . It is easily verified that this logic instantiated with  $T = \mathcal{P}$  and with  $L$ -algebras being modal algebras gives us precisely Fitting’s original logic, together with its corresponding notions of bisimilarity.

This framework generalises beyond the  $\text{Set-BA}$  adjunction: tracing our steps for the well-known  $\text{Pos-DL}$  (or  $\text{Pre-DL}$ ) adjunction (and noting that the (co)monads we considered before are given through (co)powers which generalise to this new setting), we obtain *positive* coalgebraic logics with truth values from  $2^A$  in which an analogous version of (1) holds again. In this setting, the set  $A$  of agents has an *ordering*  $\preceq$ , akin to earlier work by Fitting [1]. By definition of the  $\text{Pos-DL}$  adjunction, the semantics  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_\xi^A$  must be upward-closed with respect to  $A$ : if  $a \preceq b$ , then  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_\xi^A(a) \subseteq \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_\xi^A(b)$ . As in [1], this allows us to naturally interpret the ordering on  $A$  as one of *relative expertise*: if  $a$  dominates  $b$  in expertise (i.e.  $a \preceq b$ ), then everything considered true by  $a$  must also be considered true by  $b$ .

This framework is ripe for further generalisations exploring ways of exploiting structure on agents. As noted by [3], including logical operators acting as permutations on the set of agents can drastically increase these logics’ expressive power. This could correspond to equipping the set of agents with a symmetric group action. Taking this idea further, one may be interested in adding operations that create and delete agents (by e.g. using a more general presheaf model of agents). Moreover, topologies on agents could be used to account for potentially infinite sets of agents.

**Acknowledgements.** Daniel Eckert suggested that [2] may have a coalgebraic generalisation. We are grateful to Yde Venema, under whose supervision the second author wrote his Master’s thesis [3], on which this note is based.

## References

1. Fitting, M.: Many-valued modal logics II. *Fundamenta Informaticae* **17**, (1992).
2. Fitting, M.: How True It Is = Who Says It’s True. *Studia Logica: An International Journal for Symbolic Logic* **91**(3), (2009).
3. Motamed, N.: Multivalued Coalgebraic Modal Logic for Multiagent Systems and Multiplayer Games. Master’s thesis, Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, Universiteit van Amsterdam (2021)