

Abstractly Interpreting Argumentation Frameworks for Sharpening Extensions

Ryuta Arisaka and J eremie Dauphin
ryutaarisaka@gmail.com, jeremie.dauphin@uni.lu

Abstract


Cycles of attacking arguments pose non-trivial issues in Dung style argumentation theory, apparent behavioural difference between odd and even length cycles being a notable one. While a few methods were proposed for treating them, to - in particular - enable selection of acceptable arguments in an odd-length cycle when Dung semantics could select none, so far the issues have been observed from a purely argument-graph-theoretic perspective. Per contra, we consider argument graphs together with a certain lattice like semantic structure over arguments e.g. ontology. As we show, the semantic-argument-graphic hybrid theory allows us to apply *abstract interpretation*, a widely known methodology in static program analysis, to formal argumentation. With this, even where no arguments in a cycle could be selected sensibly, we could say more about arguments acceptability of an argument framework that contains it. In a certain sense, we can ‘verify’ Dung extensions with respect to a semantic structure in this hybrid theory, to consolidate our confidence in their suitability. By defining the theory, and by making comparisons to existing approaches, we ultimately discover that whether Dung semantics, or an alternative semantics such as cf2, is adequate or problematic depends not just on an argument graph but also on the semantic relation among the arguments in the graph.

Introduction

Consider the following scenario: the members of a board of directors are gathered in a meeting to decide the future general strategy of their company.

- a_1 : “We should focus on improving our business organization structure, because it determines our economic conduct.” (focusOnOs and OsDeterminesEc, to shorten) is advanced by one member.
- a_2 : “We should focus on improving our market performance, because it determines our business organization structure.” (focusOnMp and MpDeterminesOs) is then advanced by another member, as an attack on a_1 .
- a_3 : “We should focus on improving our economic conduct, because it determines our market performance.” (focusOnEc and EcDeterminesMp), is then given in response to a_2 .
- The first member attacks a_3 , however, with a_1 , to an inconclusive argumentation.

- a_5 : “Our firm needs 1 billion dollars revenue this fiscal year.”, meanwhile, is an argument expressed by another member.
- a_4 : “Let our company just sink into bankruptcy!” (focusOnLiq), another member impatiently declares in response, against which, however, all the first three speakers promptly express dissent with their arguments.



We can represent this argumentation as AF_1 of Figure A. In Dung’s abstract argumentation theory (Dung 1995), an admissible set of arguments is such that (1) no argument in the set is attacking an argument of the same set and (2) each argument attacking an argument in the set is attacked back by some argument in the set. Clearly, there is no non-empty admissible set in AF_1 . With labelling (Caminada 2006) (an argument is in if all its attackers are out, is out if there exists an attacker that is in, and is undecided, otherwise), every argument is labelled undecided, and so we gain almost no information on the acceptability of the arguments.

However, notice that a_1 , a_2 and a_3 are arguments for the benefit of their company’s growth. So, by aggregating them into a new argument a_x : “We should focus on our company’s further growth” (focusOnImp), and by thus deriving the framework as in Figure B, we could obtain some more useful information on the acceptability of arguments, namely, that a_x is in, a_4 is out, and a_5 is in. Hence we have sharpened acceptability statuses of a_4 and, in particular, a_5 of AF_1 .

Abstract interpretation for cycles

What we saw is effectively abstract interpretation (Cousot and Cousot 1977), a powerful methodology known in static program analysis to map concrete space semantics to abstract space semantics and to do inferences in the latter space

to say something about the former space. The abstract semantics is typically coarser than the concrete semantics; in our example, the detail of what exactly their company should focus on was abstracted away. In return, we were able to conclude that a_x is in and, moreover, that a_4 is out. Compared to existing approaches to deal with cycles e.g. (Baroni, Giamcomin, and Guida 2005), which gives in state to a_5 by enforcing acceptance of either of a_1 , a_2 and a_3 to reject a_4 , this approach that we propose does not require one to accept any of the arguments within the cycle, even provisionally, in order to be able to reject a_4 , and thus accept a_5 . By abstracting away some or all of the cyclic arguments, we avoid having to accept any of them while rejecting others.

In general, abstract interpretation is applicable to cycles of any length. There can be more than one way of interpreting an argumentation framework abstractly, however, and the key for obtaining a good outcome is to find properties sufficiently fine for abstraction. For the attacks among a_1 , a_2 , a_3 and a_4 in AF_1 , we observe that, specifically: a_1 's `focusOnOs`, a_3 's `focusOnEc`, and a_2 's `focusOnMp` attacks a_4 's `focusOnLiq`; and a_1 's `focusOnOs`, a_3 's `focusOnEc` and a_2 's `focusOnEc` form a cycle of attacks. For these, the semantic information fine enough to abstract a_1 , a_2 , a_3 into a_x is shown below (only `focusOnX` expressions are explicitly stated here). In this




Figure C: AF and some ontological abstract-concrete relation over its arguments. `focusOnImp` is more abstract an argument than `focusOnOs`, `focusOnMp`, and `focusOnEc`. Neither of the three is more abstract or more concrete than the other two. `focusOnLiq` is not a concrete instance of `focusOnImp`.

figure, a_x (`focusOnImp`: focus on further growth), sits as more abstract an argument of a_1 , a_2 and a_3 . While there may be other alternatives for abstracting them, `focusOnImp` belongs to a class of good abstractions, as it satisfies the property that the three arguments but not `focusOnLiq` fall into it, which gives justification as to why the attack relation in the initial argumentation framework is expected to preserve in the abstractly interpreted argumentation framework (from a_x to a_4). This is what we might describe the condition of *attack-preservation*.

Further, the three concrete arguments exhibit a kind of competition for the objective: their company's business focus. While "organisation structure", "market performance", and "economic conduct" all vie for it and in that sense they indeed oppose, neither of them actually contradicts the ob-

jective, which is why abstraction of the three arguments is possible here.

We will formulate abstract interpretation for argumentation frameworks, the first study of the kind, as far as we are aware. We will go through technical preliminaries (in Section 2), and develop our formal frameworks and make comparisons to Dung preferred and cf2 semantics (in Section 3), before drawing conclusions. The discovery we ultimately make is that whether Dung preferred or cf2 semantics is adequate or problematic depends not only on the argumentation framework's structure, but also on the semantic relation between its arguments. We will show that our methodology is one viable way of enhancing accuracy in judgement as to which set of arguments should be accepted.

Technical preliminaries

Abstract argumentation

Let \mathcal{A} be a class of abstract entities. An *argumentation framework* according to Dung's argumentation theory is a 2-tuple (A, R) for $A \subseteq_{\text{fin}} \mathcal{A}$ and $R : A \times A$. Let a with a subscript refer to a member of A , and let A with or without a subscript refer to a subset of A . An argument a_1 is said to *attack* another argument a_2 if and only if, or iff, $(a_1, a_2) \in R$. A subset A_1 is said to *accept*, synonymously to *defend*, a_x iff, for each a_y attacking a_x , it is possible to find some $a_z \in A_1$ such that a_z attacks a_x . A subset A_1 is said to be: *conflict-free* iff no element of A_1 attacks an element of A_1 ; an *admissible set* iff it is conflict-free and defends all the elements of A_1 ; and a *preferred set (extension)* iff it is a set-theoretically maximal admissible set. There are other classifications to admissibility, and an interested reader will find details in (Dung 1995). An argument is *skeptically accepted* iff it is in all preferred sets and *credulously accepted* iff it is in at least one preferred set.

Order and Galois connection for abstract interpretation

Let L_1 and L_2 (each) be an ordered set, ordered in \sqsubseteq_1 and \sqsubseteq_2 respectively. Let α be an abstraction function that maps each element of L_1 onto an element of L_2 , and let γ be a concretisation function that maps each element of L_2 onto an element of L_1 . $\alpha(l_1)$ for $l_1 \in L_1$ is said to be an abstraction of l_1 in L_2 , and $\gamma(l_2)$ for $l_2 \in L_2$ is said to be a concretisation of l_2 in L_1 . If $\alpha(l_1) \sqsubseteq_2 l_2$ implies $l_1 \sqsubseteq_1 \gamma(l_2)$ and vice versa for every $l_1 \in L_1$ and every $l_2 \in L_2$, then the pair of α and γ is said to be a Galois connection. Galois connection is contractive: $\alpha \circ \gamma(l_2) \sqsubseteq_2 l_2$ for every $l_2 \in L_2$, and extensive: $l_1 \sqsubseteq_1 \gamma \circ \alpha(l_1)$ for every $l_1 \in L_1$. Also, both α and γ are monotone with $\alpha \circ \gamma \circ \alpha = \alpha$ and $\gamma \circ \alpha \circ \gamma = \gamma$. An ordered set L_1 , ordered by a partial order \sqsubseteq_1 , is a complete lattice just when it is closed under join and meet for every $L'_1 \subseteq L_1$. Every finite lattice is a complete lattice.

Argumentation frameworks for abstraction

While, for our purpose, Dung's theory is not expressive enough, all we have to do is to detail the components of the tuple so that we gain access to some internal information of each argument.

Lattices

Let $(L'_2, \sqsubseteq, \vee, \wedge)$ be a finite lattice. Let \mathcal{E} be the class of expressions as abstract entities. We denote each element of \mathcal{E} by e with or without a subscript and a superscript. Those `focusOnMP` and others in our earlier example are expressions. Let $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow L'_2$ be a function that maps an expression onto an element in the lattice. This function is basically a semantic interpretation of \mathcal{E} , which could be some chosen ontology representation with annotations of general-specific relation among entities. For example, in Introduction, `focusOnImp` was more general than `focusOnMp`, `focusOnEc` and `focusOnOs`, which should enforce `focusOnImp` mapped onto an upper part in L'_2 than the three, i.e. $f(\text{focusOnEc}), f(\text{focusOnMp}), f(\text{focusOnOs}) \sqsubseteq f(\text{focusOnImp})$. In the rest, rather than L'_2 itself, we will talk of the sub-complete-lattice L_2 of all $f(e)$ for $e \in \mathcal{E}$ as well as its top and its bottom.

\mathcal{E} form abstract space arguments with the relation as defined in L_2 . Concrete space arguments, in comparison, are just a set of expressions that can possibly be arguments. Let $\text{low} : L_2 \rightarrow 2^{L_2}$ be such that: $\text{low}(l_2) := \{l_2\}$ if $l_2 = \wedge L_2$ (the bottom element); else $\text{low}(l_2) := \{x \in L_2 \mid x \sqsubset l_2 \text{ and } \nexists y \in L_2. x \sqsubset y \sqsubset l_2\}$. We let $(L_1, \sqsubseteq', \cup, \cap)$ be another complete lattice where $L_1 := 2^{\mathcal{E}}$ and \sqsubseteq' satisfies:

- $x \sqsubseteq' y$ if $x \subseteq y$.
- $x \sqsubseteq' y$ and $y \sqsubseteq' x$ iff: $x = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and $y = \{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}, e'_1, \dots, e'_m, e_{i+1}, \dots, e_n\}$ with $\text{low}(f(e_i)) = \{e'_1, \dots, e'_m\}$.

The lattices shown in Figure D illustrate the second condition. Notice that $\text{low}(f(\text{focusOnImp})) = \{f(\text{focusOnMp}), f(\text{focusOnEc}), f(\text{focusOnOs})\}$ in L_2 . $\{\text{focusOnImp}\}$ and $\{\text{focusOnMp}, \text{focusOnEc}, \text{focusOnOs}\}$ are equivalent in L_1 which is indeed a quotient lattice. This equivalence reflects the following interpretation of ours of expressions. Any expression e_1 has concrete instances e_2, \dots, e_i if $f(e_2), \dots, f(e_i)$ are children of $f(e_1)$ in abstract lattice. If, here, $f(e_2), \dots, f(e_i)$ are all the children of $f(e_1)$, our interpretation is that mentioning $f(e_1)$ is just a short-hand of mentioning all $f(e_2), \dots, f(e_i)$, i.e. both mean the same thing with respect to the structure of L_2 . It is because of this that we place all equivalent sets of expressions at the same node in L_1 .

Argumentation frameworks

We call an expression with an ID - which we just take from \mathcal{A} - an argument-let, so the class of all argument-lets is $\mathcal{A}^b : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{E}$. Each argument-let shall be denoted by a^b with a subscript.

We update Dung's (A, R) into (A^b, R^b) for $A^b \subseteq_{\text{fin}} \mathcal{A}^b$, and $R^b : A^b \times A^b$. To readers interested in knowing compatibility with Dung's argumentation frameworks, Dung's argument corresponds to a set of all argument-lets in A^b that share the same ID. For example, we may have $A^b = \{(a_1, e_1), (a_1, e_2), (a_1, e_3), (a_2, e_1), (a_2, e_4)\}$, in which case A^b maps into $A = \{a_1, a_2\}$ if projected into Dung's argumentation framework. For compatibility of attack relation, too, Dung's $(a_1, a_2) \in R$, i.e. a_1 attacks a_2 , (assuming that both a_1 and a_2 are in A) corresponds to




Figure D: Illustration of a concrete lattice and an abstract lattice.

$((a_1, e_1), (a_2, e_2)) \in R^b$ for some e_1 and some e_2 (assuming both (a_1, e_1) and (a_2, e_2) are in A^b). For convenience hereafter, by argument a with or without a subscript, we refer to a set of argument-lets in A^b that share the ID a . We do not consider any more structured arguments than a finite subset of A^b in this work; further structuring, while of interest, is not the main focus, which is left to a future work. All notations around extensions: conflict-freeness, acceptance and defence, admissible and preferred sets, are carried over here for arguments (note, not for argument-lets).

Abstraction and concretisation

Now, let $\alpha : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ be the abstraction function, and let $\gamma : L_2 \rightarrow L_1$ be the concretisation function. We require: $\alpha(l_1) = \bigvee_{e_u \in l_1} f(e_u)$; and $\gamma(l_2) = \{x \in \mathcal{E} \mid f(x) \in \text{low}(l_2)\}$. Intuition is as we described earlier in 3.1. Note $\gamma(l_2)$ is an empty set when $\text{low}(l_2)$ does not contain any $f(e)$ for $e \in \mathcal{E}$. We say that e_x is the best abstraction of $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ iff $f(e_x) = \alpha(\{e_1, \dots, e_n\})$, but more generally we say that e_x is an abstraction of e_1, \dots, e_n iff $\alpha(\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}) \sqsubseteq f(e_x)$. We say that $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is the most general concretisation of e_x iff $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\} = \gamma(f(e_x))$. More generally, we say that $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is a concretisation of e_x iff $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\} \sqsubseteq' \gamma(f(e_x))$.

Proposition 1 (Galois connection) For every $l_1 \in L_1$ and every $l_2 \in L_2$, we have $\alpha(l_1) \sqsubseteq l_2$ iff $l_1 \sqsubseteq' \gamma(l_2)$.

Proof If: Suppose $l_2 \sqsubset \alpha(l_1)$, i.e. $l_2 \sqsubset \bigvee_{e_u \in l_1} f(e_u)$ by definition of α . \sqsubset is a standard abbreviation. Then we have $\gamma(l_2) \sqsubset' l_1$, contradiction. Suppose l_2 and $\alpha(l_1)$ are not comparable in \sqsubseteq , then clearly $l_1 \not\sqsubseteq' \gamma(l_2)$, contradiction. Only if: Suppose $\gamma(l_2) \sqsubset' l_1$, then there exists at least one e in l_1 which is not in any set equivalent to $\gamma(l_2)$ under \sqsubseteq' . Then by definition of α , we have $l_2 \sqsubset \alpha(l_1)$, contradiction. \square

Example 1 In Figure D, $\text{low}(f(\text{focusOnImp})) = \{\text{focusOnMp}, \text{focusOnEc}, \text{focusOnOs}\}$. We see that, for instance, $\{\text{focusOnMp}, \text{focusOnEc}\}$ is mapped to $f(\text{focusOnImp})$ by α as $\alpha(\{\text{focusOnMp}, \text{focusOnEc}\}) = f(\text{focusOnMp}) \vee f(\text{focusOnEc})$. `focusOnImp` is hence

(the best) abstraction of $\{\text{focusOnMp}, \text{focusOnEc}\}$. Meanwhile, $\gamma(f(\text{focusOnImp})) = \{\text{focusOnMp}, \text{focusOnEc}, \text{focusOnOs}\} = X$. Since (α, γ) is a Galois connection, $\alpha(X) = f(\text{focusOnImp})$ again.

Let $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ with or without a subscript denote a set of expressions. Each argument-let comes with a singleton set of expression, so an argument comes with a set of expressions. When we write E_{a_x} , we mean to refer to all expressions associated with a_x . For abstraction, we say that an argument a_x is:

abstraction-covering for a set of arguments a_1, \dots, a_n iff, if $e_x \in E_{a_x}$ is an abstraction of $E \subseteq \{E_{a_1}, \dots, E_{a_n}\}$, then it is an abstraction of $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} E'_{a_i}$ where E'_{a_i} is a non-empty subset of E_{a_i} .

abstraction-disjoint for a set of arguments a_1, \dots, a_n iff, for each a_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, if $e_k \in E_{a_x}$ is an abstraction of $e_u \in E_{a_i}$, then $e_j \in E_{a_x}$, $j \neq k$, is not e_u 's abstraction.

abstraction-sound for a set of arguments a_1, \dots, a_n iff, for each a_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, there is no $e \in E_{a_i}$ that is not abstracted by any $e \in E_{a_x}$.

abstraction-complete for a set of arguments a_1, \dots, a_n iff, for each $e \in a_x$, e is an abstraction of $E \subseteq \bigcup_{1 \leq m \leq n} E_{a_m}$.




Figure E: Illustration for abstraction-covering-ness [A], abstraction-disjointness [B], abstraction-soundness [C] and abstraction-completeness [D].

Figure E illustrates these 4 conditions. a_x comes with $\{e'_1, e'_2, e'_3\}$, a_1 with $\{e_1, e_2\}$, and a_2 with $\{e_3, e_4\}$. In [A], a_x is abstraction-covering for $\{a_1, a_2\}$ because $e'_1 \in E_{a_x}$ abstracts from a non-empty subset of both E_{a_1} and E_{a_2} . If e'_1 should abstract only from a non-empty subset of E_{a_1} but not of E_{a_2} , abstraction-covering-ness would not be satisfied. In [B], a_x satisfies abstraction-disjointness because any expression is abstracted at most by one expression in E_{a_x} . If, here, e'_1 should abstract both from e_1 and e_2 , this condition would fail to hold. In [C], a_x satisfies abstraction-soundness because all expressions in $E_{a_1} \cup E_{a_2}$ are abstracted. If there should be even one expression in $E_{a_1} \cup E_{a_2}$ that is not abstracted, this condition would fail to hold. In [D], a_x satisfies abstraction-completeness because each expression in E_{a_x} abstracts expressions in $E_{a_1} \cup E_{a_2}$. If there should be even one expression in E_{a_x} that does not abstract any expressions in $E_{a_1} \cup E_{a_2}$, this condition would fail to hold.

Proposition 2 (Independence)

Let ω, β be one of the propositions

$\{a_x \text{ is abstraction-covering}, a_x \text{ is abstraction-sound}, a_x \text{ is abstraction-disjoint}, a_x \text{ is abstraction-complete}\}$. Then ω materially implies β iff $\omega = \beta$.

As for motivation of the four conditions, our goal for abstraction of a given set A of arguments dictates that, in whatever manner we may abstract, eventually we abstract from all expressions of all the arguments in A . Hence we have abstraction-soundness. However, consider an extreme case where each e'_i abstracts from a single argument a_1 . Then, certainly, such abstraction weakens each member of A , but there is no guarantee that the weakening is a weakening of A , because abstraction of $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is necessarily abstraction of each of e_1, \dots, e_n , but abstraction of e_1 is not necessarily that of $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. Not abstracting from each and every $a_1 \in A$ is problematic for this reason. Abstraction-covering-ness is therefore desired. Abstraction-disjointness discourages redundancy in abstraction. Abstraction-completeness ensures relevance of abstraction to a given set of arguments to be abstracted. In the rest, whenever we state a_u is an abstraction of $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$, a_u will be assumed to be abstraction-covering, abstraction-disjoint, abstraction-sound and abstraction-complete for them. We say that the abstraction is the best abstraction iff it is the best abstraction of all expressions associated with $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$.

Proposition 3 If a_x is the best abstraction of a set A of arguments, then every abstraction of A is an abstraction of a_x .

Proposition 4 (Existence) There exists at least one abstraction for every set of arguments.

Proof L_2 is a complete lattice. □

However, some abstraction, including the top element of L_2 if it is in $\{f(e) \in L_2 \mid e \in \mathcal{E}\}$, can be so general that all arguments are abstracted by it. In the first example in Introduction, ‘‘Argumentation is taking place.’’ could be such an argument, in which one may not be normally interested for reasoning about argumentation: the whole point of argumentation theory is for us to be able to judge which set(s) of arguments may be acceptable when the others are unacceptable, so we should not trivialise a given argumentation by a big summary argument.

Conditions for conservative abstraction Hence, a few conditions ought to be defined in order to ensure conservative abstraction. Assume an argumentation framework (A^b, R^b) . We assume that those elements of L_2 that are so abstract that they could abstract all argument-lets in A^b into a single argument-let are forming a non-empty upper set M of L_2 : $M (\subseteq L_2)$ is an upper set iff, if $x \in M$ and $x \sqsubseteq y$, then $y \in M$. Intuition is that once we find some $f(e)$ in L_2 that is so general, then any $f(e_1)$ such that $f(e) \sqsubseteq f(e_1)$ is also. For example, if $f(\text{focusOnImp})$ in L_2 is so general, then $f(\text{‘‘Argumentation is taking place.’’})$ is also so general.

Let us say that there is a path from an argument a_1 to an argument a_2 iff either a_1 attacks a_2 , or else there is a path from a_1 to some argument a_3 which attacks a_2 . Let us say that a set A_1 of arguments is strongly connected component in (A^b, R^b) iff (1) there is a path from any $a_1 \in A_1$

to any $a_2 \in A_1$ and (2) there exists no $A_1 \subset A_x \subset A^b$ such that A_x satisfies (1). For an argumentation framework (A^b, R^b) , we define that abstraction a_x of a set A_1 of arguments is: *valid* iff there exists a strongly connected component $A_s \subseteq A^b$ such that: (1) $A_1 \subseteq A_s$; and (2) there exists no $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset A_s$ such that a_x is an abstraction of A_2 (abstraction is over as many members of a strongly connected component as possible); *non-trivial* iff $\alpha(E_{a_x}) \notin M$ (abstraction cannot be too general); and *compatible* iff: there exist no argument-lets $(a_1, e_1), (a_2, e_2) \in A$ that satisfy both (1) $((a_1, e_1), (a_2, e_2)) \in R^b$ and (2) $f(e_1)$ and $f(e_2)$ are comparable in \sqsubseteq (abstraction cannot be over arguments that contain an attack from more abstract an argument on more concrete an argument or vice versa).

What compatibility expresses is: a pair of arguments a_1 and a_2 with an attack between them is not suited for abstraction if a_1 (or a_2) is more, if not equally, abstract than a_2 (or a_1). For justification, suppose firstly that a_2 is a_1 . Then it is a self-attack. Let us suppose that abstraction of a_1 and a_2 is feasible, then we can get rid of all self-attacks by means of abstraction. But that would render all such self-attacks not playing any role in argumentation, which cannot be the case (Baumann et al. 2017). In a more general setting where a_2 is not a_1 , if it is a_1 that attacks a_2 , given that a_2 is more concrete an argument of a_1 , the attack is again a type of self-attack. Still, it is not safe to compile away the attack by taking abstraction of a_1 and a_2 , because the abstraction is more, if not equally, abstract than a_1 which a_2 was attacking. The second condition of validity is motivated in a way by compatibility.¹ Let us consider the example in Introduction again (a part of it is re-listed in Figure F on the left). There are three arguments in the cycle, and $\alpha(E_{a_1}), \alpha(E_{a_2})$




Figure F: Left: an argumentation framework before abstraction. Right: an argumentation framework after a compatible but invalid abstraction.

and $\alpha(E_{a_3})$ are not comparable in \sqsubseteq (Cf. Figure D). The least upper bound of any two among the three, by the way, is the same element in L_2 . Hence, by taking abstraction of only two among them, say a_1 and a_2 , we obtain an abstract space argumentation framework as in the right figure of Figure F. As the attacks between a_y and a_3 are both of abstract-concrete and of concrete-abstract, the compatibility condition prevents any further abstraction on this argumentation framework. This, however, is amiss, because such abstract-concrete (concrete-abstract) relation among the participants

¹We, however, have a more recent result on abstraction of self-attacks. An interested reader can contact either of the authors for detail.

of the cycle were not present (they were not comparable in \sqsubseteq) in the original argumentation framework. The validity condition precludes this anomaly.

Proposition 5 (Independence) Let ω, β be one of the propositions: $\{a_x$ is valid, a_x is non-trivial, a_x is compatible $\}$. ω materially implies β iff $\omega = \beta$.

These are conditions that apply for abstraction of a given set of arguments alone. In an argumentation framework, however, we also consider attacks between a set of arguments and the arguments that are not in the set. We say that abstraction a_x of a set A_1 of arguments is *attack-preserving* iff, for each $a^b \in A^b \setminus A_1$ and each $a_1^b \in A_1$, if at least either $(a^b, a_1^b) \in R^b$ or $(a_1^b, a^b) \in R^b$, then $\alpha(E_{a_x})$ and $\alpha(E_{a_1^b})$ are not comparable in \sqsubseteq (abstraction of a_x and external attackers/attackees shall not be in abstract-concrete (concrete-abstract) relation). For intuition behind this condition, let us consider Figure G. For simplicity, let us assume that E_{a_i} ,




Figure G: Left: an argumentation framework with 4 arguments. E_{a_i} is assumed to be a singleton $\{e_i\}$. Right: abstract lattice L_2 . $\alpha(a_i)$ is assumed to be $f(e_i)$.

$1 \leq i \leq 4$, is a singleton $\{e_i\}$. The abstract lattice L_2 is shown in Figure G. See to it that the attack of a_1 on a_4 is not of absolute-concrete (concrete-absolute). Now, with (the best) abstraction of a_1, a_2 and a_3 , we obtain a_5 with $E_{a_5} = \{e_5\}$. While, in general, there is no continuity between some argument a_1 attacking some argument a_4 and some abstraction a_x of a_1 attacking a_4 , an exception is taken when there exists some pivotal point in L_2 that strongly distinguishes $\alpha(E_{a_x})$ and $\alpha(E_{a_4}) = f(e_4)$ (which, by the definition of abstraction, means a_1 and a_4 are equally distinguished), a_x to one group, and a_4 to another distinct group. In such a case, as the attack of a_1 on a_4 can be viewed as the attack of the group that a_1 belongs to on the group that a_4 belongs to, and as a_1 and a_x belong to the same group, abstraction of a_1 into a_x does not modify the attack. This strong distinction holds just when $\alpha(E_{a_x})$ and $\alpha(E_{a_4})$ are not comparable in \sqsubseteq . This justifies retention of the attack by a_5 on a_4 (the pivot is $f(e_6)$) in the abstract space argumentation framework.

We say that abstraction a_x of a set A_1 of arguments is *conservative* iff it is valid, non-trivial, compatible, and attack-preserving.

Theorem 1 For a given (A^b, R^b) , if an abstraction a_x of $A_1 \subseteq A^b$ is conservative, then each abstraction a_y of A_1 such that a_x is an abstraction of a_y is conservative.

Proof Suffice it to check the four conditions one by one. \square

Computation of abstract space argumentation frameworks from a concrete space argumentation framework

Algorithm 1 Computation of the set of abstract space argumentation frameworks for a given concrete space argumentation framework

Require: X is an argumentation framework, $X.addSet(Y)$ adds the elements of Y into X , but is assumed to discard duplicates.

```

1: function DERIVEABS( $X$ )
2:    $\Sigma \leftarrow$  an empty set.
3:    $\triangleright$  abs.space.arg.framwrks to be added to  $\Sigma$ 
4:    $\Sigma.addSet(X)$   $\triangleright$  Initially only  $X$  is in  $\Sigma$ 
5:    $\Gamma \leftarrow$  all distinct sets of arguments in  $X$  that are strongly
   connected.
6:   for all  $A$  in  $\Gamma$  do
7:      $\Sigma_1 \leftarrow \Sigma$   $\triangleright$  Copy  $\Sigma$ 
8:      $\Sigma \leftarrow$  an empty set.  $\triangleright$  Reset
9:      $\Pi \leftarrow$  the set of all maximal subsets of  $A$  that satisfy
   conservative abstraction.
10:    while  $\Sigma_1$  is not empty do
11:      while  $\Pi$  is not empty do
12:         $X_1 \leftarrow$  the 1st element of  $\Sigma_1$ 
13:         $A_1 \leftarrow$  the 1st element of  $\Pi$ 
14:         $a_x \leftarrow$  the best abstraction of  $A_1$ 
15:        Replace  $A_1$  in  $X_1$  with  $a_x$ , while preserving
   attacks.
16:         $\Sigma.addSet(X_1)$ 
17:        Remove the 1st element of  $\Pi$ 
18:      end while
19:      Remove the 1st element of  $\Sigma_1$ 
20:    end while
21:  end for
22:  return  $\Sigma$ 
23: end function

```

All abstract space argumentation frameworks with conservative and best abstraction can be computed for a given argumentation framework, \mathcal{E} , f , L_2 and $M \subseteq L_2$ with Algorithm 1 which, informally, just keeps replacing, where possible at all, a part of, or an entire, cycle with an abstract argument for all possibilities. Concerning Line 9, for a set of arguments A_1 in a given argumentation framework, we say that $A_2 \subseteq A_1$ is a maximal subset of A_1 that satisfies conservative abstraction iff (1) the best abstraction of A_2 is conservative and (2) there exists no A_3 that satisfy both (2A): $A_2 \subset A_3 \subset A_1$ and (2B): the best abstraction of A_3 is conservative.

Proposition 6 (Complexity) Algorithm 1 runs at worst in exponential time.

Proof. Strongly connected components are known to be computable in linear time (Line 5). Line 9 is computable at worst in exponential time. With n argument-lets (with possibly less than n arguments), we can over-estimate that the for loop executes at most n times, the 1st while loop at most $({}_nC_{\lceil n/2 \rceil})^n$ times, and the 2nd while loop at most ${}_nC_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ times. \square

Preferred sets in concrete and abstract spaces

We now subject preferred sets in concrete space to those in abstract space for more clues on arguments acceptability in concrete space. Let us denote Algorithm 1 by g_α , and a function with [inputs = a set of argumentation frameworks] and [output = a set of all preferred sets for each given argumentation framework] by g_p (the procedure can be found in the literature). Further, let g_γ be a projection function with [inputs = a set of sets of sets of arguments (i.e. all preferred sets for each argumentation framework)] and [outputs = a set of sets of sets of arguments], with the following description. Let σ be a function with [inputs = a set of sets of arguments \times arguments] and [outputs = a set of sets of arguments] such that $\sigma(X, A) = \{\{A_1\} \mid \exists A_2 \in X. A_1 = A_2 \cap A\}$. Then $g_\gamma^{(A^b, R^b)}(Z) = \{\{X_1\} \mid \exists X \in Z. X_1 = \sigma(X, A^b)\}$. For example, if $A^b = \{a_1, a_2\}$, then $g_\gamma^{(A^b, R^b)}(\{\{\{a_1, a_3\}\}, \{\{a_4\}, \{a_2, a_5\}\}\})$ is $\{\{\{a_1\}\}, \{\{a_2\}\}\}$. Figure H illustrates on one hand




Figure H: Relating abstract and concrete preferred extensions. It is assumed that $AF_c = (A^b, R^b)$.

$g_p(\{AF_c\})$ for an argumentation framework AF_c in concrete space, which gives us all preferred sets of AF_c , and on the other hand $g_\gamma^{(A^b, R^b)} \circ g_p \circ g_\alpha(\{AF_c\})$, which also gives us a set of all preferred sets in concrete space but through abstraction. The abstract transformations proceed by transforming the given concrete space argumentation framework into a set of abstract space argumentation frameworks ($g_\alpha(\{AF_c\})$), deriving preferred sets for them ($g_p \circ g_\alpha(\{AF_c\})$), and projecting them to concrete space preferred sets ($g_\gamma^{(A^b, R^b)} \circ g_p \circ g_\alpha(\{AF_c\})$) so that comparisons to the preferred sets obtained directly within concrete space can be done. In particular, we can learn: (1) an argument deemed credulously/skeptically acceptable within concrete space is *positively approved* by abstract space preferred sets, thus we gain more confidence in the set members being acceptable; (2) arguments not deemed acceptable within concrete space, i.e. those that are not in any preferred set, are *negatively approved* also by abstract space preferred sets, thus we gain more confidence in those arguments not acceptable. But also: (3) arguments deemed credulously/skeptically acceptable within concrete space may be *questioned* when their acceptability is not inferred from any abstract space preferred set; and, on the other hand, (4) ar-

guments deemed not acceptable within concrete space may be credulously/skeptically *implied* by abstract space preferred set(s). To summarise formally, given an argumentation framework $AF : (A^b, R^b)$, we say that an argument that is deemed credulously/skeptically acceptable in concrete space is:

+approved iff, for some/every element X of $g_\gamma^{(A^b, R^b)} \circ g_p \circ g_\alpha(\{AF_c\})$, it belongs to some/every element A of X .

questioned iff, for every element X of $g_\gamma^{(A^b, R^b)} \circ g_p \circ g_\alpha(\{AF_c\})$, it belongs to no element A of X .

And we say that an argument that is deemed not acceptable in concrete space is:

-approved iff, for every element X of $g_\gamma^{(A^b, R^b)} \circ g_p \circ g_\alpha(\{AF_c\})$, it belongs to no element A of X .

credulously/skeptically implied iff, for some/every element X of $g_\gamma^{(A^b, R^b)} \circ g_p \circ g_\alpha(\{AF_c\})$, it belongs to some/all member(s) A of X .

Comparisons to Dung preferred semantics and cf2 semantics, and observations

We conclude this section with comparisons to Dung preferred semantics and cf2 semantics (Baroni, Giacomin, and Guida 2005). Let us first consider AF_1 in Figure A and the lattices as shown in Figure D. Let us denote $g_\gamma^{AF} \circ g_p \circ g_\alpha$ by \mathbb{G}^{AF} , then we have: \emptyset for $g_p(AF_1)$ (i.e. Dung preferred set); $\{\{a_1, a_5\}, \{a_2, a_5\}, \{a_3, a_5\}\}$ for $cf2(AF_1)$; while $\{a_5\}$ for $\mathbb{G}^{AF_1}(AF_1)$ (as we have already shown the only one abstract space argumentation framework, in Figure B, we omit the derivation process). By comparisons between $g_p(AF_1)$ and $\mathbb{G}^{AF_1}(AF_1)$, we observe that all a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 are *-approved*, while a_5 is *implied*. Hence in this case, with respect to the semantic structure of L_2 , we might say that Dung preferred set behaves more conservative than necessary. On the other hand, by comparisons between $cf2(AF_1)$ and $\mathbb{G}^{AF_1}(AF_1)$, we observe that $cf2(AF_1)$ accepts either of the arguments in the odd cycle, which is more liberal than necessary with respect to L_2 - since no arguments in AF_1 could break the preference pre-order $focusOnOs < focusOnMp < focusOnEc < focusOnOs$ of the three arguments. Therefore, for AF_1 , Dung semantics seems to give false-negative to a_5 acceptability, while $cf2$ seems to give false-positives to either of a_1, a_2, a_3 acceptability. If those acceptability semantics aim to answer ‘‘Which arguments should be (credulously) accepted?’’, false-negatives only signal omission, but false-positives signal unintuitive results and are less desirable.

Let us, however, consider another argumentation framework AF_3 in Figure I borrowed from (Baroni, Giacomin, and Guida 2005). Consider:

- a_1 The downpour has been relentless since the morning.
- a_2 It was burning hot today.
- a_3 All our employees ran a pleasant full marathon today.
- a_4 Nobody stayed indoor.
- a_5 Many enjoyed TV shows at home.




Figure I: Top left: an argumentation framework AF_3 . Bottom-left: AF_3 's abstraction. Right: an abstract lattice L_2 .

We assume the abstract lattice as shown in Figure I for AF_3 . We assume $M = \bigvee L_2$, and any nodes below $f(Fm)$, $f(TV)$, $f(Dp)$, $f(Bn)$ not explicitly shown there are still assumed to be there. W, A, M, H, Id, Fm, Dp, Br each abbreviates Weather, Activity, Mild, Hard, Indoor, Full-marathon, Downpour and Burning. The lattice expresses in particular that a downpour and the burning sun relate under the hard weather, and the hard weather and indoor activities such as watching TV shows relate under hard weather activity (that is, an activity to do under a hard weather condition), but that hard weather and mild weather activities do not go together. Also, indoor and no-indoor oppose. Here we have: $\{\{a_5\}\}$ for $g_p(AF_3)$; $\{\{a_1, a_4\}, \{a_1, a_5\}, \{a_2, a_5\}, \{a_3, a_4\}, \{a_3, a_5\}\}$ for $cf2(AF_3)$. Meanwhile, for $\mathbb{G}^{AF_3}(AF_3)$, $\{a_1, a_2\}$ is first of all the set of a maximal subset of $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$. It is attack-preserving: $\alpha(\{DP, Br\}) = f(HW)$, which is not comparable with $f(Nold)$ or $f(Fm)$, valid because $f(HW)$ does not abstract Fm, non-trivial, and compatible. Hence the argumentation framework shown under AF_3 in Figure I is the abstract space argumentation framework with respect to L_2 . Consequently, $\mathbb{G}^{AF_3}(AF_3) = \{\{a_3, a_4\}, \{a_3, a_5\}, \{a_5\}\}$. Therefore, in this example, $\mathbb{G}^{AF_3}(AF_3)$, too, credulously accepts an argument in the odd-cycle as $cf2(AF_3)$ does. Notice, however, that we still obtain the Dung conservative preferred set $\{a_5\}$ which obtains from $\{a_y, a_5\}$.

It is safe to observe that the traditional Dung, or $cf2$, which is more appropriate depends not just on an argument graph but also the semantic relation among the arguments in the graph; and that combination of abstract argumentation and abstract interpretation is one viable methodology to address this problem around cycles in argumentation frameworks.

Related work

As far as we are aware, this is the first study that incorporates abstract interpretation into abstract argumentation theory. Odd-sized cycles have been a popular topic of research in the literature for some time, as they tend to prevent the acceptability of all subsequent arguments with respect to directionality. Noting the difference between preferred and the grounded semantics, Baroni et al. (Baroni, Giacomin, and Guida 2005) proposed to accept maximal conflict-free subsets of a cycle for gaining more acceptable arguments off an odd-length cycle, which led to $cf1/cf2$ semantics. They

are regarded as improvements on more traditional naive semantics (Bondarenko et al. 1997). They also weaken Dung defence around strongly connected components of an argumentation framework into SCC-recursiveness.

The stage2 semantics that took inspiration from cf2 is another approach with a similar SCC-recursive aspect, but which is based on the stage semantics (Verheij 1996) rather than the naive semantics, the incentive being to maximise range (the range of a set of arguments is itself plus all arguments it attacks).

The fundamental motivation behind those semantics was to treat an odd-length cycle in a similar manner to an even-length cycle. As we showed, however, specialisation of Dung semantics without regard to semantic relation among arguments in a given argumentation framework seems not fully generalisable. To an extent, that any such systematic resolution of acceptability of cyclic arguments based only on a Dung argumentation graph is tricky relates to the fact that attacking arguments in a cycle can be contrarily (Horn 2001) but not necessarily contradictorily opposing. As the study in (Baroni, Giacomin, and Liao 2015) shows and as is known in linguistics, dealing with contrary relations is difficult in Fregean logic. However, with abstract interpretation, we can take advantage of semantic information of arguments in partitioning those attacking arguments in a cycle into mutually incompatible subsets, by which uniform treatment of cycles come into reach.

Conclusion

We introduced abstract interpretation into argumentation frameworks. Our formulation shows it is also a powerful methodology in AI reasoning. We believe that more and more attention will be directed towards semantic-argumentgraph hybrid studies within argumentation community, and we hope that our work will provide one fruitful research direction.

Acknowledgement

We thank Leon van der Torre and Ken Satoh for discussion on related topics which greatly influenced this work of ours.

References

- [Baroni, Giacomin, and Guida 2005] Baroni, P.; Giacomin, M.; and Guida, G. 2005. SCC-recursiveness: a general schema for argumentation semantics. *Artificial Intelligence* 168:162–210.
- [Baroni, Giacomin, and Liao 2015] Baroni, P.; Giacomin, M.; and Liao, B. 2015. Dealing with Generic Contrariness in Structured Argumentation. In *IJCAI*, 2727–2733.
- [Baumann et al. 2017] Baumann, R.; Dvorák, W.; Linsbichler, T.; and Woltran, S. 2017. A General Notion of Equivalence for Abstract Argumentation. In *IJCAI*, 800–806.
- [Bondarenko et al. 1997] Bondarenko, A.; Dung, P. M.; Kowalski, R. A.; and Toni, F. 1997. An abstract, argumentation-theoretic approach to default reasoning. *Artificial intelligence* 93(1-2):63–101.
- [Caminada 2006] Caminada, M. 2006. On the Issue of Reinstatement in Argumentation. In *JELIA*, 111–123.
- [Cousot and Cousot 1977] Cousot, P., and Cousot, R. 1977. Abstract interpretation: a unified lattice model for static analysis of programs by construction or approximation of fixpoints. In *POPL*, 238–252.
- [Dung 1995] Dung, P. M. 1995. On the Acceptability of Arguments and Its Fundamental Role in Nonmonotonic Reasoning, Logic Programming, and n-Person Games. *Artificial Intelligence* 77(2):321–357.
- [Horn 2001] Horn, L. R. 2001. *A Natural History of Negation*. The University Chicago Press., 2nd edition.
- [Verheij 1996] Verheij, B. 1996. Two approaches to dialectical argumentation: admissible sets and argumentation stages. *Proc. NAIC* 96:357–368.