

Encoding Argumentation Frameworks to Propositional Logic Systems

Shuai Tang, Jiachao Wu* and Ning Zhou

Abstract. The theory of argumentation frameworks (*AFs*) has been a useful tool for artificial intelligence. The research of the connection between *AFs* and logic is an important branch. This paper generalizes the encoding method by encoding *AFs* as logical formulas in different propositional logic systems. It studies the relationship between models of an *AF* by argumentation semantics, including Dung’s classical semantics and Gabbay’s equational semantics, and models of the encoded formulas by semantics of propositional logic systems. Firstly, we supplement the proof of the regular encoding function in the case of encoding *AFs* to the 2-valued propositional logic system. Then we encode *AFs* to 3-valued propositional logic systems and fuzzy propositional logic systems and explore the model relationship. This paper enhances the connection between *AFs* and propositional logic systems. It also provides a new way to construct new equational semantics by choosing different fuzzy logic operations.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010). Primary 68T27; Secondary 03B70, 03B50, 03B52, 68Q55.

Keywords. argumentation framework, model, encoding function, propositional logic system, triangular norm.

1. Introduction

Since Dung came up with argumentation frameworks (*AFs*) [32], this theory has been a hot topic in the fields of artificial intelligence [9] and law [5]. *AFs* represent arguments by nodes, and attacks by directed edges. Thus *AFs* represent the argumentation problems as directed graphs. After the Dung-style *AFs*, in the aspect of syntax structure, many variations of *AFs* are proposed, such as *AFs* with sets of attacking arguments [36, 50], the bipolar *AFs* [22, 47, 53] with two kinds of relation named the attack relation and the support relation, the higher-level *AFs* [7] with higher-level attack relation and the bipolar *AFs* with higher-level relations [15]. Furthermore, numerical

semantics have been developed in many forms, such as real equational *AFs* [37, 38], fuzzy *AFs* [26, 30, 46, 55], weighted *AFs* [1, 14, 28, 33, 49] and probabilistic *AFs* [31, 41, 44, 45, 52].

A research branch connects *AFs* and logic. Logical *AFs* are developed in many aspects [2, 11]. Besnard and Doutre [12, 13] give the encoding approach which encodes *AFs* to the 2-valued propositional logic system (PL_2). Abstract dialectical frameworks [16, 17] express acceptance condition of each argument as a propositional formula. Cayrol et al. [23, 25] propose extending each argument or attack as accepted atom and not accepted atom and then encoding *AFs* as logical formulas. Arieli and Caminada [3, 4] suggest encoding an *AF* as a quantified Boolean formula whose models coincide with the extensions of the *AF*. The seminal literature [32] first studies connection between *AF* semantics and logic programming, and the approach of logic programming is developed in [19, 21, 34, 51]. Moreover, some works [20, 42, 54] connect *AFs* with modal logic and some works [35, 39] translate *AFs* into intuitionistic logic.

Particularly, we emphasize works in [12, 38, 41] and claim our motivations. Besnard and Doutre [12] give the method of model checking which encodes an *AF* as a propositional formula of the PL_2 such that models of the propositional formula are equivalent to extensions of the *AF*. Then they give the formal expression in [13] and some other literature [2, 11, 24] reports this work. However, they just give the encoded formulas associated with PL_2 . Gabbay [41] encodes *AFs* to Kleene's 3-valued propositional logic system (PL_3) and gives the encoded formula of Dung's complete semantics. Gabbay think that for an given $AF = (\{x\}, \{(x, x)\})$, the encoded formula $x \leftrightarrow \neg x$ has model which values $\frac{1}{2}$ to x . But to the best of our knowledge, the valuation that values $\frac{1}{2}$ to x is not a model of the encoded formula $x \leftrightarrow \neg x$. So we rewrite the model relationship when *AFs* are encoded to Kleene's PL_3 . Lukasiewicz's PL_3 is very important and famous among so many PL_3 s. As a natural expansion, we also encode *AFs* to Lukasiewicz's PL_3 . Gabbay [38] gives the real equational *AFs* and proposes four forms of real equations. Each form of real equations corresponds to a kind of semantics of *AFs*. Since the values of arguments is among $[0, 1]$, we want to encode real equational *AFs* to fuzzy logic systems ($PL_{[0,1]s}$).

We devote to exploring the relationship between complete labellings of the *AF* and models of encoded formulas $ec(AF)$ and exploring the relationship between Gabbay's equational approach and the encoding method. Firstly, in the case of PL_2 , we supply some proofs of translating formulas and give a new interesting view of translating *AFs* as propositional formulas associated with conflict-free semantics. Secondly, we encode *AFs* to two 3-valued propositional logic systems (PL_3s), including Kleene's PL_3 and Lukasiewicz's PL_3 . We get the relationship between complete labellings of an *AF* and models of $ec(AF)$ in Kleene's PL_3 or in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 . Thirdly, we encode *AFs* to fuzzy propositional logic systems ($PL_{[0,1]s}$), and get the result that the equational systems Eq_{max} and $Eq_{inverse}$ can be derived by the normal

encoding with corresponding fuzzy operations. In addition, we propose a new equational system by the normal encoding associated with Łukasiewicz fuzzy operations. We also discuss general cases and provide a way to produce new equational semantics.

This paper develops the model checking method by encoding *AFs* to different propositional logic systems (*PLSs*). By several given encoding functions, we find the relationship between models of an *AF* by a kind of given argumentation semantics and the models of the encoded formula in a *PLS*. In practice, the question of model solving of an *AF* can be turn into the question of model solving of the encoded formula of the *AF*. We find the relationship between models of the normal encoded formula of an *AF* in $PL_{[0,1]}$ s and models of the *AF* by equational semantics. In addition, new equational semantics can be induced by encoding method and we underline the new semantics induced by the normal encoding with Łukasiewicz fuzzy operations.

In Section 2, we provide some basic knowledge. In Section 3, we give some supplements of encoding *AFs* to the PL_2 . In Section 4 and Section 5, we respectively encode *AFs* to PL_3 s and $PL_{[0,1]}$ s. In Section 6, we explore general cases. Section 7 is the conclusion.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we will give some basic knowledge about *AFs*, *PLSs* and the method of model checking.

2.1. Argumentation Frameworks and Argumentation Semantics

Definition 2.1. An argumentation framework (*AF*) is a pair (A, R) where A is a finite set of arguments and $R \subseteq A \times A$ is the attack relation. $(b, a) \in R$ denoted as $b \rightsquigarrow a$.

Definition 2.2. The universe \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{AF} is the set of all arguments of all *AFs* where \mathcal{AF} is the set of all *AFs*.

Definition 2.3. \mathcal{A} is called finitary, if for each $AF = (A, R)$, $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is finite.

Only finitary \mathcal{A} are considered in this paper. We will give some necessary background for argumentation semantics below.

Definition 2.4. The extension-based semantics of \mathcal{AF} is a function $\mathfrak{ES}: \mathcal{AF} \rightarrow 2^{2^A}$, $AF \mapsto \mathfrak{ES}_{AF}$, where \mathfrak{ES}_{AF} is a subset of 2^A .

An element ES_{AF} in \mathfrak{ES}_{AF} is a subset of A and ES_{AF} is called an extension of an *AF* under the extension-based semantics \mathfrak{ES} . \mathfrak{ES}_{AF} is called the extension set of the *AF*.

According to [32], some classical semantic are defined. Given an $AF = (A, R)$ and a set $S \subseteq A$, we say that:

- S is conflict-free iff $\nexists a, b \in S$ s.t. $(a, b) \in R$.
- $a \in A$ is acceptable w.r.t. S iff $b \in A$ s.t. $(b, a) \in R$, $\exists c \in S$ s.t. $(c, b) \in R$.

- S is admissible iff it is conflict-free and $\forall a \in S$, a is acceptable w.r.t. S .
- S is a complete extension of an AF iff it is admissible and $\forall a \in A$, $a \in S$ when a is acceptable w.r.t. S .
- S is a preferred extension of an AF iff it is a maximal (w.r.t. \subseteq) complete extension of the AF .
- S is a stable extension of an AF iff it is a complete extension of the AF and $\forall a \in A \setminus S$, $\exists b \in S$ s.t. $(b, a) \in R$.
- S is the grounded extension of an AF iff it is the smallest (w.r.t. \subseteq) complete extension of the AF .

Complete semantics is fundamental among these Dung's classical semantics, because it can induce preferred semantics, stable semantics and grounded semantics.

Definition 2.5. Let $AF = (A, R)$ be an argumentation framework and L be a set of labels. A labelling of an AF is a function $lab : A \rightarrow L$.

The set of all labellings of an AF is denoted as \mathcal{LAB}_{AF} . The set of all labellings of all AF 's is denoted as \mathcal{LAB} . $lab(a)$ can also be denoted as $\|a\|$.

Definition 2.6. The labelling-based semantics of the \mathcal{AF} is an function $\mathcal{LS} : \mathcal{AF} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{LAB}}$, $AF \mapsto \mathcal{LS}_{AF} \subseteq \mathcal{LAB}_{AF} \subseteq \mathcal{LAB}$, where \mathcal{LS}_{AF} is a labelling set of the AF .

Definition 2.7. Each labelling $lab \in \mathcal{LS}_{AF}$ is called a model of an AF associated with a semantics \mathcal{LS} .

In the case of $L = \{in, out, und\}$, [6, 18] gives conceptions of legal labels and proves that extension-based semantics and labelling-based semantics are equivalent by Lab2Ext and Ext2Lab. If readers are not familiar with the expression of classical semantics by labellings, please refer to [6, 18]. Further more, letting $in = 1, out = 0$ and $und = \frac{1}{2}$, we will use numerical labels $L = \{1, 0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ instead of $L = \{in, out, und\}$ to express the same meaning. In order to keep clear and simple, we will use 3-valued numerical labellings instead of extension sets in this paper.

2.2. Propositional Logic Systems (PLSs)

About detailed basic knowledge of PLSs, readers can refer to [8, 10, 43, 48]. We only provide some necessary knowledge here.

Definition 2.8. An assignment of propositional variables in a propositional logic system is a function $\| \cdot \| : S \rightarrow L$, where S is the set of all propositional variables in the propositional logic system and L is a subset of $[0, 1]$. An assignment on a formula ϕ is the function $\| \cdot \| : S_\phi \rightarrow L$, where S_ϕ is the set of all propositional variables in ϕ and L is a subset of $[0, 1]$.

An assignment of propositional variables extends uniquely to the evaluation of all formulas in each PLS. Without confusion, we also denote the evaluation of all formulas as $\| \cdot \|$.

TABLE 1. Truth degree table of \Rightarrow in Kleene's PL_3

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---|
| \Rightarrow | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |

 TABLE 2. Truth degree table of \Rightarrow in Łukasiewicz's PL_3

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---|
| \Rightarrow | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |

Definition 2.9. A model of a formula ϕ in a propositional logic system is an assignment on ϕ such that the evaluation of ϕ is 1, i.e. $\|\phi\| = 1$.

The “assignment” on a formula ϕ in a PLS is similar to the “labelling” of an AF in \mathcal{AF} and we allow that both words can substitute each other.

In this paper, we will use the PL_2 , PL_3 s and $PL_{[0,1]}$ s. In each PLS s, we will use same connective symbols. Propositional connectives \neg, \wedge, \vee and \rightarrow respectively represent the negation connective, the conjunction connective, the disjunction connective and the implication connective. We suppose that readers are familiar with the semantics interpretation of these propositional connectives in the case of the PL_2 . These connectives will be interpreted for PL_3 s and $PL_{[0,1]}$ s.

2.2.1. Truth Degree Tables of Connective \rightarrow in PL_3 s. In this paper we only consider two kinds of PL_3 , Kleene's PL_3 and Łukasiewicz's PL_3 . Connectives \neg, \wedge and \vee are interpreted as the same meaning in the two kinds of PL_3 : $\|\neg a\| = 1 - \|a\|$, $\|a \wedge b\| = \min\{\|a\|, \|b\|\}$ and $\|a \vee b\| = \max\{\|a\|, \|b\|\}$, where a, b are propositional formulas.

For propositional formulas a and b , we have $\|a \rightarrow b\| = \|a\| \Rightarrow \|b\|$. However, the interpretation of operation \Rightarrow is different in Kleene's PL_3 and Łukasiewicz's PL_3 . Truth degree table of operation \Rightarrow in Kleene's PL_3 is listed in Table 1 [8, 10, 48].

Truth degree table of operation \Rightarrow in Łukasiewicz's PL_3 is listed in Table 2 [8, 10, 48].

2.2.2. Fuzzy Operations in $PL_{[0,1]}$ s. We give some basic knowledge of fuzzy operations in $PL_{[0,1]}$ s [43].

Definition 2.10. A function $N : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is called a negation if $N(0) = 1$, $N(1) = 0$ and N is non-increasing ($x \leq y \Rightarrow N(x) \geq N(y)$). A negation is called a strict negation if it is strictly decreasing ($x < y \Rightarrow N(x) > N(y)$) and continuous.

Negations are truth degree operations associated with connective \neg , i.e. for a propositional formula a in a given $PL_{[0,1]}$, we have $\|\neg a\| = N(a)$. The most important example of negations is the standard negation N satisfying $N(x) = 1 - x$.

Definition 2.11. A triangular norm (t-norm) is a function $T : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that satisfies the following properties:

- $T_1 : T(x, 1) = x$;
- $T_2 : T(x, y) = T(y, x)$;
- $T_3 : T(x, T(y, z)) = T(T(x, y), z)$;
- $T_4 : \text{If } x \leq u \text{ and } y \leq v \text{ then } T(x, y) \leq T(u, v)$.

The definition of triangular conorms is similar, and we will omit it here. Triangular norms are truth degree operations associated with connective \wedge , i.e. for propositional formulas a, b in a given $PL_{[0,1]}$, we have $\|a \wedge b\| = T(\|a\|, \|b\|)$. We also denote $T(x, y)$ as $x * y$, where $x, y \in [0, 1]$. The following are our most important examples of continuous t-norms:

- Gödel t-norm: $T_G(x, y) = \min\{x, y\}$;
- Lukasiewicz t-norm: $T_L(x, y) = \max\{0, x + y - 1\}$;
- Product t-norm: $T_P(x, y) = x \cdot y$.

The definition of triangular conorms is similar, and we will omit it here.

Definition 2.12. A fuzzy implication is a function $I : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that satisfies the following properties:

- $I1 : \text{If } x \leq y, \text{ then } I(x, z) \geq I(y, z), \text{ i.e., } I \text{ is decreasing in its first variable;}$
- $I2 : \text{If } y \leq z, \text{ then } I(x, y) \leq I(x, z), \text{ i.e., } I \text{ is increasing in its second variable;}$
- $I3 : I(1, 0) = 0, I(0, 0) = I(1, 1) = 1$.

Fuzzy implications are truth degree operations associated with connective \rightarrow , i.e. for propositional formulas a, b in a given $PL_{[0,1]}$, we have $\|a \rightarrow b\| = I(\|a\|, \|b\|)$.

Definition 2.13. Let T be a t-norm. $I_T(x, y) = \sup\{z | T(x, z) \leq y\}$ is called a residual implication (an R -implication).

The following are R -implications associated with T_G, T_L and T_P :

$$I_G(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq y \\ y & x > y \end{cases};$$

$$I_L(x, y) = \min\{1 - x + y, 1\};$$

$$I_P(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq y \\ \frac{y}{x} & x > y \end{cases}.$$

In this paper, evaluations of formulas with connectives $\neg, \wedge, \rightarrow$ and \leftrightarrow in $PL_{[0,1]}$ s are extended as follows: $\|\neg a\| = N(\|a\|)$, $\|a \wedge b\| = T(\|a\|, \|b\|) = \|a\| * \|b\|$, $\|a \rightarrow b\| = I(\|a\|, \|b\|)$ and $\|a \leftrightarrow b\| = \|(a \rightarrow b) \wedge (b \rightarrow a)\| = I(\|a\|, \|b\|) * I(\|b\|, \|a\|)$ where a and b are any propositional formulas.

Remark 2.14. In $PL_{[0,1]}$ s, the evaluation of formulas with connective $\&$ is traditionally extended as $\|a\&b\| = T(\|a\|, \|b\|) = \|a\| * \|b\|$ and the evaluation of formulas with connective \wedge is extended as $\|a \wedge b\| = \min\{\|a\|, \|b\|\}$. For keeping the unification of form of the normal encoding function, we extend the evaluation of formulas with connective \wedge as $\|a \wedge b\| = T(\|a\|, \|b\|) = \|a\| * \|b\|$, which will not cause any confusion in this paper.

2.3. Model Checking

Besnard and Doutre [12] give a method of model checking. The method aims to translate an AF as a propositional formula in the PL_2 , such that the models of the propositional formula are corresponding to extensions of the AF under a kind of semantics. In fact, the core of each model is an extension of the AF and vice versa. The translating functions depend on various semantics. The mainly results in the chapter “model checking” in [12] are listed as the following, where each Φ is a translating function.

Let $AF = (A, R)$ be an argumentation framework.

1. Translating the AF to the PL_2 for conflict-free semantics.

A set $S \subseteq A$ is conflict-free iff S is the core of a model of any formula below:

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b); \quad (2.1)$$

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (a,b) \in R} \neg b); \quad (2.2)$$

$$\bigwedge_{(a,b) \in R} (\neg a \vee \neg b). \quad (2.3)$$

2. Translating the AF to the PL_2 for stable semantics.

A set $S \subseteq A$ is a stable extension iff S is the core of a model of the formula below:

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b). \quad (2.4)$$

This formula is come up with by Creignou in [29] to characterize the kernels of a graph, and is applied in [12] to characterize the stable extensions of an AF .

3. Translating the AF to the PL_2 for admissible semantics.

A set $S \subseteq A$ is a admissible set iff S is the core of a model of the formula below:

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A} ((a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b) \wedge (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c: (c,b) \in R} c))). \quad (2.5)$$

4. Translating the AF to the PL_2 for complete semantics.

A set $S \subseteq A$ is a complete extension iff S is the core of a model of the formula below:

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A} ((a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b) \wedge (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c: (c,b) \in R} c))). \quad (2.6)$$

Note that an empty conjunction is treated as \top with $\|\top\| = 1$, whereas the empty disjunction is treated as \perp with $\|\perp\| = 0$.

3. Functions and the Method

We will clarify some new definitions to simplify the expression in the following sections. Some conceptions may have been used in past papers but the meaning of these conceptions are not always same. So we give some formal definitions to keep unified and clear in our paper.

Definition 3.1. Suppose that ES_{AF} is an extension of an $AF = (A, R)$. The 2-valued function of ES_{AF} is $h : A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, s.t.

$$h(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in ES_{AF} \\ 0 & x \notin ES_{AF} \end{cases}. \quad (3.1)$$

Obviously, there exists a unique extension ES_{AF} corresponding to a 2-valued function h and vice versa.

Definition 3.2. A labelling is called a numerical labelling, if the set of labels is a subset of unit real interval $[0, 1]$. A labelling is called a 2-valued labelling, if the set of labels is $\{0, 1\}$. A labelling is called a 3-valued labelling, if the set of labels is $\{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$. A labelling is called a $[0, 1]$ -valued labelling, if the set of labels is the unit real interval $[0, 1]$.

Suppose that lab_{num} is a numerical labelling and $\{lab_{num}\}$ is a set of numerical labellings and lab_2 is a 2-valued labelling and $\{lab_2\}$ is a set of 2-valued labellings and lab_3 is a 3-valued labelling and $\{lab_3\}$ is a set of 3-valued labellings.

Definition 3.3. The binarization of numerical labellings is a total function $T_2 : \{lab_{num}\} \rightarrow \{lab_2\}$, $lab_{num} \mapsto lab_2$ s.t.

$$lab_2(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & lab_{num}(a) = 1 \\ 0 & lab_{num}(a) \neq 1 \end{cases}. \quad (3.2)$$

Definition 3.4. The ternarization of numerical labellings is a partial function $T_3 : \{lab_{num}\} \rightarrow \{lab_3\}$, $lab_{num} \mapsto lab_3$ s.t.

$$lab_3(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } lab_{num}(a) = 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \exists b, b \rightsquigarrow a, lab_{num}(b) = 1 \text{ or } \exists c, a \rightsquigarrow c, lab_{num}(c) = 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Because complete semantics is conflict-free, the ternarization on the set of all models of an AF by complete semantics is a total function.

Taking the universe \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{AF} as the universe of a PLS , i.e. arguments of \mathcal{A} one-to-one corresponding to propositional variables of a PLS . Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{PL}}$ be all formulas in a particular PLS . We give some definitions related with encoding and translating below.




FIGURE 1. Translating method

Definition 3.5. An encoding of \mathcal{AF} is a map $ec : \mathcal{AF} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{PL}}$, s.t. the set of all propositional variables in formula $ec(AF)$ is A , where $AF = (A, R)$.

When we say that encode AF s to a PLS , we mean that map \mathcal{AF} to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{PL}}$ by an encoding. Each encoding can induce a kind of semantics of \mathcal{AF} only if we let each model of $ec(AF)$ is a model of the AF . We stress three important encodings below.

Definition 3.6. $ec_0 : \mathcal{AF} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{PL}}, AF \mapsto ec_0(AF) = \bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b,a) \in R} \neg b)$ is called the elementary encoding.

$ec_1 : \mathcal{AF} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{PL}}, AF \mapsto ec_1(AF) = \bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b,a) \in R} \neg b)$ is called the normal encoding.

$ec_2 : \mathcal{AF} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{PL}}, AF \mapsto ec_2(AF) = \bigwedge_{a \in A} ((a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b,a) \in R} \neg b) \wedge (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c)))$ is called the regular encoding.

Definition 3.7. Suppose that PLS is a given propositional logic system and $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}$ is a given semantics of \mathcal{AF} . A translating of $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}$ is an encoding $tr : \mathcal{AF} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{PL}}, AF \mapsto tr(AF)$, s.t. models of $tr(AF)$ in the PLS are same as models of the AF under the semantics $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}$.

For a given PLS , let the function $\mathfrak{P}\mathcal{L}$ map any formula ϕ in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{PL}}$ as a set of all models of ϕ . Then we have $\mathfrak{P}\mathcal{L} \circ tr = \mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}$, where \circ is the composition operation of functions. We explain the translating method by the commutative diagram as the Figure 1.

Definition 3.8. For a given semantic $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}$ of \mathcal{AF} , the semantics $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}$ is called translatable if there exists a translating function of $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}$.

4. Some Supplements of Encoding AF s to the PL_2

In this section, we first supply proofs of some conclusions in [12]. Then we give a new method to get the translating function associated with conflict-free semantics. This new method provides a new view to treat attack relation and it connects AF s and the PL_2 by substituting $a \rightsquigarrow b$ as $a \uparrow b$, where \uparrow is the Sheffer stroke in the PL_2 .

4.1. Supplements of Proofs

[12] shows the analysis of design of these translating functions (2.1) - (2.6), but it does not give rigorous proofs. We will restate some theorems in [12] and prove them in this subsection.

For conflict-free semantics, the formula (2.1) associated with elementary encoding function ec_0 is equivalent with (2.2) or (2.3). We restate this equivalence theorem and prove it below. We note that “ \iff ” represents the meaning of “if and only if”.

Theorem 4.1. *The following three propositions are equivalent.*

- (1) An assignment is a model of $\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b)$;
- (2) An assignment is a model of $\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (a,b) \in R} \neg b)$;
- (3) An assignment is a model of $\bigwedge_{(a,b) \in R} (\neg a \vee \neg b)$.

Proof. We first prove (1) \iff (3).

$$\begin{aligned} \bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b) &= \bigwedge_{a \in A} (\neg a \vee \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b) \\ &= \bigwedge_{a \in A} \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} (\neg a \vee \neg b) \\ &= \bigwedge_{(a,b) \in R} (\neg a \vee \neg b) \end{aligned}$$

Then we prove (2) \iff (3).

$$\begin{aligned} \bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (a,b) \in R} \neg b) &= \bigwedge_{a \in A} (\neg a \vee \bigwedge_{b: (a,b) \in R} \neg b) \\ &= \bigwedge_{a \in A} \bigwedge_{b: (a,b) \in R} (\neg a \vee \neg b) \\ &= \bigwedge_{(a,b) \in R} (\neg a \vee \neg b) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

For complete semantics, we restate the theorem related to formula (2.6) and prove it.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $AF = (A, R)$. If a labelling lab_3 is a model of the AF by complete semantics, then $T_2(lab_3)$ is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ by the PL_2 semantics. If an assignment lab_2 is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ in the PL_2 , then $T_3(lab_2)$ is a model of the AF by complete semantics.*

Proof. According to the semantics of the PL_2 , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\| \bigwedge_{a \in A} ((a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b) \wedge (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c: (c,b) \in R} c))) \| = 1 \\ \iff &\forall a \in A, \\ &\| a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b \| = \| a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c: (c,b) \in R} c) \| = 1. \quad (4.1) \end{aligned}$$

Firstly, we prove that for a model lab_3 of the AF , $T_2(lab_3)$ is a model of $ec_2(AF)$.

- If $T_2(lab_3)(a) = lab_3(a) = 1$, then by complete semantics $\forall b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, T_2(lab_3)(b_i) = lab_3(b_i) = 0$ and $\exists c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, T_2(lab_3)(c_j) = lab_3(c_j) = 1$. Thus in the PL_2 we have

$$\|a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b\| = 1$$

and

$$\|a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c)\| = 1.$$

- If $T_2(lab_3)(a) = 0$, then $lab_3(a) = 0$ or $lab_3(a) = \frac{1}{2}$. If $lab_3(a) = 0$, then by complete semantics $\exists b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, T_2(lab_3)(b_i) = lab_3(b_i) = 1$ and $\forall c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, T_2(lab_3)(c_j) = lab_3(c_j) = 0$. Hence in the PL_2 we have

$$\|a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b\| = 1$$

and

$$\|a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c)\| = 1.$$

If $lab_3(a) = \frac{1}{2}$, then by complete semantics $\exists b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, lab_3(b_i) = \frac{1}{2}$. Thus $\neg \exists c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, lab_3(c_j) = 1$, i.e. $\forall c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, lab_3(c_j) = 0$ or $lab_3(c_j) = \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore $T_2(lab_3)(c_j) = 0$. Hence in the PL_2 we have

$$\| \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c) \| = 0.$$

So by $T_2(lab_3)$ we have

$$\|a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b\| = 1$$

and

$$\|a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c)\| = 1.$$

So equation (4.1) holds for $\forall a \in A$, i.e. $\|ec_2(AF)\| = 1$ in the PL_2 .

Secondly, we prove that for a model lab_2 of the $ec_2(AF)$, $T_3(lab_2)$ is a model of the AF by complete semantics.

Since $\|ec_2(AF)\| = 1$, i.e. $\forall a \in A$, (4.1) holds, thus

$$lab_2(a) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \exists b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, \forall c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, lab(c_j) = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } \forall b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, lab(b_i) = 0, \exists c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, lab(c_j) = 1. \end{cases}$$

TABLE 3. The truth table of \uparrow

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| \uparrow | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 |

Therefore

$$T_3(\text{lab}_2)(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{lab}_2(a) = 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \exists b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, T_3(\text{lab}_2)(b_i) = \text{lab}_2(b_i) = 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \exists b_j, (a, b_j) \in R, T_3(\text{lab}_2)(b_j) = \text{lab}_2(b_j) = 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- If a is labelled *in* i.e. $T_3(\text{lab}_2)(a) = 1$, then, by T_3 , $\forall b_i, (b_i, a) \in R$, $\text{lab}_2(b_i) = 0$, $\exists c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R$, $\text{lab}_2(c_j) = 1$. Thus $\forall b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, T_3(\text{lab}_2)(b_i) = 0$. So $T_3(\text{lab}_2)(a) = 1 = \textit{in}$ is legal. If $\forall b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, T_3(\text{lab}_2)(b_i) = 0$, then $\exists c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, T_3(\text{lab}_2)(c_j) = \text{lab}_2(c_j) = 1$. So according to

$$\|(a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c))\| = 1,$$

we can get $T_3(\text{lab}_2)(a) = 1 = \textit{in}$. Thus each legal *in* is labelled *in*.

- If a is labelled *out* i.e. $T_3(\text{lab}_2)(a) = 0$, then, by T_3 , $\exists b_i, (b_i, a) \in R$, $T_3(\text{lab}_2)(b_i) = \text{lab}_2(b_i) = 1$. So $T_3(\text{lab}_2)(a) = 0 = \textit{out}$ is legal. If $\exists b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, T_3(\text{lab}_2)(b_i) = \text{lab}_2(b_i) = 1$. So, by T_3 , we can get $T_3(\text{lab}_2)(a) = 0 = \textit{out}$. Thus each legal *out* is labelled *out*.

Hence $T_3(\text{lab}_2)$ is a complete labelling of the *AF*, i.e. $T_3(\text{lab}_2)$ is a model of the *AF* by complete semantics. \square

The proof of admissible encoding is similar with the above proof and it is left for the reader.

4.2. A New Method to Get the Elementary Encoding

In [40], Gabbay gives the conclusion that the Dung's argumentation is essentially equivalent to classical propositional logic with the Peirce–Quine dagger. We now give an interesting method to encoding an *AF* as a formula in the PL_2 by substituting $a \rightsquigarrow b$ as $a \uparrow b$, where \uparrow is Sheffer stroke in the PL_2 . With this substitution, we regard \rightsquigarrow as a connective in the PL_2 .

Let us contrast the truth tables of operation \uparrow associated with \uparrow and operation \rightsquigarrow associated with \rightsquigarrow . First let us view the truth table of \uparrow as Table 3. Then for conflict free semantics we can get truth table of \rightsquigarrow as Table 4. In fact, we can see that \uparrow and \rightsquigarrow have the same truth table.

If we use \wedge connecting all pairs of \rightsquigarrow in an *AF* and at the same time substitute \rightsquigarrow as the connective \uparrow , then in the PL_2 we can get a formula $\bigwedge_{(b,a) \in R} (a \uparrow b)$, equivalently $\bigwedge_{a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R} (b_i \uparrow a)$.

TABLE 4. The truth table of \rightsquigarrow

| \rightsquigarrow | 0 | 1 |
|--------------------|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 |

Theorem 4.3. *An assignment is a model of $\bigwedge_{(a,b) \in R} (\neg a \vee \neg b)$ iff it's a model of $\bigwedge_{a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R} (b_i \uparrow a)$.*

Proof. In fact, the proof is simple.

$$\begin{aligned} \bigwedge_{(a,b) \in R} (\neg a \vee \neg b) &= \bigwedge_{(a,b) \in R} (a \uparrow b) \\ &= \bigwedge_{a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R} (b_i \uparrow a) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.4. *The encoding $ec : \mathcal{AF} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{PL}}, AF \mapsto \bigwedge_{a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R} (b_i \uparrow a)$ is equivalent with the elementary encoding ec_0 .*

Proof. From Theorem 4.1, we have

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b) = \bigwedge_{(a,b) \in R} (\neg a \vee \neg b).$$

From Theorem 4.3, we have

$$\bigwedge_{(a,b) \in R} (\neg a \vee \neg b) = \bigwedge_{a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R} (b_i \uparrow a).$$

So we have

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b,a) \in R} \neg b) = \bigwedge_{a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R} (b_i \uparrow a),$$

i.e. the encoding $ec : \mathcal{AF} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{PL}}, AF \mapsto \bigwedge_{a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R} (b_i \uparrow a)$ is equivalent with the elementary encoding ec_0 . \square

Let us analyze the reason why the substitution can get the result in Corollary 4.4. The attack relation \rightsquigarrow of *AFs* has the meaning of negation. If $a, b \in A$, $a \rightsquigarrow b$, then a negate b . Thus a support the opposite of b , i.e. $a \rightarrow \neg b$. If we substitute $a \rightsquigarrow b$ as $a \rightarrow \neg b$ and use \wedge to connect all relations in the *AF*, we can get the elementary encoded formula associated with conflict free semantics. Above analysis just provide the comprehension of Corollary 4.4.

At the same time, we can see that \uparrow has the meaning of attack in the PL_2 and \uparrow represents mutual attack because of $a \uparrow b = b \uparrow a$. In addition, when we let the attack \rightsquigarrow be symmetric nonempty and irreflexive relation, we can get the symmetric argumentation framework [27].

5. Encoding AF s to PL_3 s

In this section, we study two encodings which are normal encoding ec_1 and regular encoding ec_2 and we consider two 3-valued PL_3 s which are Kleene's PL_3 and Łukasiewicz's PL_3 . So four cases need to be studied. In each case, we explore the relationship between models of an AF under a given classical semantics and models of the encoded formula in a PL_3 . Note that the label set of AF s is $\{0, 1, \frac{1}{2}\}$.

5.1. Encoding AF s to PL_3 s by ec_1

First, we encode AF s to Kleene's PL_3 by ec_1 and explore the model relationship.

Theorem 5.1. *An assignment is a model of an AF under stable semantics iff it is a model of the $ec_1(AF)$ in Kleene's PL_3 .*

Proof. An assignment is a model of $\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i)$ iff $\forall a \in A$, by Table 1, the assignment is a solution of equations

$$\|a\| = \left\| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \right\| = 1 \quad (5.1)$$

or

$$\|a\| = \left\| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \right\| = 0. \quad (5.2)$$

For equation (5.1), we have $\|a\| = 1$ and $\forall b_i, \|\neg b_i\| = 1$, i.e. $\|a\| = 1$ and $\forall b_i, \|b_i\| = 0$. For equation (5.2), we have $\|a\| = 0$ and $\exists b_i, \|\neg b_i\| = 0$, i.e. $\|a\| = 0$ and $\exists b_i, \|b_i\| = 1$. $\forall a \in A$, $\|a\|$ is 0 or 1 but not $\frac{1}{2}$. So each solution satisfies stable semantics, i.e. a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in Kleene's PL_3 is a model of the AF for stable semantics.

On the other hand, a model of the AF for stable semantics obviously satisfies (5.1) and (5.2), i.e. a model of the AF is a model of $ec_1(AF)$. \square

Corollary 5.2. *Stable semantics is translatable by ec_1 and Kleene's PL_3 .*

Next, we encode AF s to Łukasiewicz's PL_3 by ec_1 and explore the model relationship.

Theorem 5.3. *An assignment is a model of an AF for complete semantics iff it is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in Łukasiewicz's PL_3 .*

Proof. An assignment is a model of $\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i)$ iff $\forall a \in A$, by Table 2, the assignment is a solution of equations

$$\|a\| = \left\| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \right\| = 1 \quad (5.3)$$

or

$$\|a\| = \left\| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \right\| = 0 \quad (5.4)$$

or

$$\|a\| = \left\| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \right\| = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (5.5)$$

For equation (5.3), we have $\|a\| = 1$ and $\forall b_i, \|\neg b_i\| = 1$, i.e. $\|a\| = 1$ and $\forall b_i, \|b_i\| = 0$. For equation (5.4), we have $\|a\| = 0$ and $\exists b_i, \|\neg b_i\| = 0$, i.e. $\|a\| = 0$ and $\exists b_i, \|b_i\| = 1$. For equation (5.5), we have $\|a\| = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\exists b_i, \|\neg b_i\| = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\neg \exists b_i, \|\neg b_i\| = 0$, i.e. $\|a\| = 0$ and $\exists b_i, \|b_i\| = 0$ and $\neg \exists b_i, \|b_i\| = 1$. $\forall a \in A$, the solution satisfies complete semantics, i.e. a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in Łukasiewicz's PL_3 is a model of the AF for complete semantics.

On the other hand, a model of the AF for complete semantics obviously satisfies the three equations, i.e. a model of the AF is a model of $ec_1(AF)$. \square

Corollary 5.4. *Complete semantics is translatable by ec_1 and Łukasiewicz's PL_3 .*

According to the truth tables of PL_3 s [48], for complete semantics, as well as preferred semantics, stable semantics and grounded semantics, we can know that in Heyting's PL_3 and Reichenbach's PL_3 related conclusions are same as Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 5.4.

5.2. Encoding AF s to PL_3 s by ec_2

First, we encode AF s to Kleene's PL_3 by ec_2 and explore the model relationship.

Theorem 5.5. *If lab is a model of an AF by complete semantics, then $T_2(lab)$ is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ by Kleene's PL_3 . If lab' is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ by Kleene's PL_3 , then $T_3(lab')$ is a model of the AF by complete semantics.*

Proof. Firstly, according to Theorem 4.2, if lab is a model of an AF by complete semantics, then $T_2(lab)$ is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ by the PL_2 . Because Kleene's PL_3 is consistent with the PL_2 when the truth values are limited to $\{0, 1\}$, hence $T_2(lab)$ is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ by Kleene's PL_3 .

Secondly, if lab' is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ by Kleene's PL_3 , then

$$\left\| \bigwedge_{a \in A} \left((a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b, a) \in R} \neg b) \wedge (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b, a) \in R} \left(\bigvee_{c: (c, b) \in R} c \right)) \right) \right\| = 1$$

i.e. $\forall a \in A$,

$$\|a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b, a) \in R} \neg b\| = 1$$

and

$$\|a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b, a) \in R} \left(\bigvee_{c: (c, b) \in R} c \right)\| = 1.$$

Since $\|a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b: (b, a) \in R} \left(\bigvee_{c: (c, b) \in R} c \right)\| = 1$, hence $\forall a \in A, a \neq \frac{1}{2}$. Thus $lab' = T_2(lab')$. So the model lab' of $ec_2(AF)$ by Kleene's PL_3 is also a model of $ec_2(AF)$ by the PL_2 . By Theorem 4.2, if lab' is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ by the PL_2 , then $T_3(lab')$ is a model of the AF by complete semantics. So we finish the proof. \square

Next, we encode AF s to Lukasiewicz's PL_3 by ec_2 and explore the model relationship.

Theorem 5.6. *Each model of an AF by complete semantics is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 .*

Proof. Let any model of the AF by complete semantics be lab . Then we discuss three cases below. For each case, we need to prove

$$\|(a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b) \wedge (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c))\| = 1. \quad (5.6)$$

If $lab(a) = 1$, $a \in A$, then $\forall b_i, (b_i, a) \in R$, $lab(b_i) = 0$, and $\exists c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R$, $lab(c_j) = 1$. Thus

$$\|\bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b\| = 1$$

and

$$\|\bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c)\| = 1.$$

Hence

$$\|(a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b)\| = 1$$

and

$$\|(a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c))\| = 1.$$

So equation (5.6) holds.

If $lab(a) = 0$, $a \in A$, then $\exists b_i, (b_i, a) \in R$, $lab(b_i) = 1$, and $\forall c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R$, $lab(c_j) = 0$. Thus

$$\|\bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c)\| = 0.$$

Hence

$$\|(a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b)\| = 1$$

and

$$\|(a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c))\| = 1.$$

So equation (5.6) holds.

If $lab(a) = \frac{1}{2}$, $a \in A$, then $\exists b_i, (b_i, a) \in R$, $lab(b_i) = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\neg \exists b_k, (b_k, a) \in R$, $lab(b_k) = 1$. Thus

$$\|\bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b\| = \frac{1}{2}$$

and then

$$\|(a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b)\| = 1.$$

In addition, we have $\exists b_i \neg \exists c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, lab(c_j) = 1$, and $\neg \exists b_k \forall c_l, (c_l, b_k) \in R, lab(c_l) = 0$. So

$$\| \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c) \| = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence

$$\| (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c)) \| = 1.$$

So equation (5.6) holds.

For three cases, equation (5.6) holds. So

$$\| \bigwedge_{a \in A} ((a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b) \wedge (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c))) \| = 1$$

i.e. each model of an AF by complete semantics is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 . \square

In fact, we have proposition that a model of $ec_2(AF)$ in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 may be not a model of the AF by complete semantics. From the example below, we can know this proposition is right.

Example. Let $AF = (A, R), A = \{a, b\}, R = \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$. $\|a\| = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\|b\| = 0$ can satisfy $ec_2(AF)$ in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 but can not satisfy complete semantics.

By function T_3 , each model of $ec_2(AF)$ in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 is turned as a model of the AF by complete semantics. We give the lemma and the theorem below.

Lemma 5.7. *For a given $AF = (A, R)$, if lab is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 , then $T_2(lab)$ is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ in the PL_2 .*

Proof. Since lab is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 , so we have

$$\| \bigwedge_{a \in A} ((a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b) \wedge (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c))) \| = 1,$$

i.e. $\forall a \in A$,

$$\| a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b \| = \| a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} (\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c) \| = 1.$$

Then, for $\forall a \in A$, we discuss three cases.

- Case 1, $lab(a) = 1$. Then $\forall b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, lab(b_i) = 0$ and $\exists c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, lab(c_j) = 1$. Thus, $T_2(lab)(a) = 1, \forall b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, T_2(lab)(b_i) = 0$ and $\exists c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, T_2(lab)(c_j) = 1$. So, in this case, $\|ec_2(AF)\| = 1$ in the PL_2 .
- Case 2, $lab(a) = 0$. Then $\exists b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, lab(b_i) = 1$ and $\forall c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, lab(c_j) = 0$. Thus, $T_2(lab)(a) = 0, \exists b_i, (b_i, a) \in R, T_2(lab)(b_i) = 1$ and $\forall c_j, (c_j, b_i) \in R, T_2(lab)(c_j) = 0$. So, in this case, $\|ec_2(AF)\| = 1$ in the PL_2 .

- Case 3, $lab(a) = \frac{1}{2}$. Then in the PL_2 , we have $T_2(lab)(a) = 0$ and

$$\|a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \neg b\| = 1$$

What's more, by

$$\|a\| = \left\| \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \left(\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c \right) \right\|$$

in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 , we have

$$\left\| \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \left(\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c \right) \right\| = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then $\exists b_k, (b_k, a) \in R, \forall c_j, (c_j, b_k) \in R, lab(c_j) \neq 1$. Thus $\exists b_k, (b_k, a) \in R, \forall c_j, (c_j, b_k) \in R, T_2(lab)(c_j) = 0$. Hence $T_2(lab)(a) = 0$ and

$$\left\| \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \left(\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c \right) \right\| = 0$$

in the PL_2 . Therefore in the PL_2 we have

$$\|(a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{b:(b,a) \in R} \left(\bigvee_{c:(c,b) \in R} c \right))\| = 1.$$

So, in this case, $\|ec_2(AF)\| = 1$ in the PL_2 .

Through the three cases, we have proved that $T_2(lab)$ is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ in the PL_2 . \square

Theorem 5.8. *For a given $AF = (A, R)$, if lab is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 , then $T_3(lab)$ is a model of the AF by complete semantics.*

Proof. According to Lemma 5.7, $T_2(lab)$ is a model of $ec_2(AF)$ in the PL_2 . According to Theorem 4.2, $T_3(T_2(lab))$ is a model of the AF by complete semantics. Since $T_3(T_2(lab)) = T_3(lab)$, so $T_3(lab)$ is a model of the AF by complete semantics. \square

Although it may not have one-to-one relationship between the set of models of an AF by complete semantics and the set of models of $ec_2(AF)$ in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 , it has one-to-one relationship between the set of extensions of an AF by complete semantics and the set of propositional variables that have truth value 1 from the model of $ec_2(AF)$ in Lukasiewicz's PL_3 .

6. Encoding AF s to $PL_{[0,1]}$ s

Gabbay [38] proposes equational approach to argumentation networks. Gabbay gives the definition of real numbers equational argumentation networks, real equation functions and extensions. In order to provide convenience for readers, we quote these definitions below.

A real equation function with k variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ over the real interval $[0, 1]$ is a continuous function $h : [0, 1]^k \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

- (a) $h(0, \dots, 0) = 1$,
- (b) $h(x_1, \dots, 1, \dots, x_k) = 0$,
- (c) Ordinarily, $h(x_1, \dots, x_k) = h(y_1, \dots, y_k)$, where (x_1, \dots, x_k) and (y_1, \dots, y_k) are permutations of each other.

An equational argumentation network over $[0, 1]$ has the form (A, R, h_a) , $a \in A$ where

- (a) (A, R) is a Dung-style AF ,
- (b) For each $a \in A$, h_a is a real equation function, with the suitable number of variables k , where k being the number of nodes attacking a ,
- (c) If $\neg\exists c((c, a) \in R)$ then $h_a = 1$.

A real equation extension is a function $\| \cdot \|$ from A into $[0, 1]$ such that the following holds:

- (a) $\|a\| = 1$ if $\neg\exists c((c, a) \in R)$,
- (b) If $\{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ are all the arguments in A such that $(b_i, a) \in R$, then $\|a\| = h_a(\|b_1\|, \dots, \|b_k\|)$ where h_a is a real equation function of k variables.

Each real equation function corresponding to an equational system and each solution of the equational system is a real equation extension for an AF . Gabbay gives four specific equational systems. For a given $AF = (A, F)$ and $a \in A$, we list two of them which are used most in [38]:

$Eq_{inverse}$

$$f(a) = \prod_i (1 - f(b_i))$$

and Eq_{max}

$$f(a) = 1 - \max\{f(b_i)\}_i,$$

where f is the labelling function $f : [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ and b_i is an attacker of a and $\{b_i\}_i$ is the set of all attackers of a . In fact, each equational system corresponds to a kind of equational semantics. Without confusion, we use the same symbol to express an equational system or an equational semantics. For example, $Eq_{inverse}$ expresses the equational system $Eq_{inverse}$ or the equational semantics $Eq_{inverse}$.

In this section, we will study the normal encoding ec_1 from AF s to $PL_{[0,1]}$ s and explore the relationship between models of an AF under a given equational semantics and models of the encoded formula in a $PL_{[0,1]}$. The results show that the above two equational systems $Eq_{inverse}$ and Eq_{max} are translatable from AF s to $PL_{[0,1]}$ s by normal encoding ec_1 and particular fuzzy operations. In addition, we propose a new semantics by encoding method. Note that the label set of AF s is $[0, 1]$.

6.1. Deriving Gabbay's Equations from the Encoding Method

Let $PL_{[0,1]}^G$ be a fuzzy propositional logic system with standard negation for \neg , T_G for \wedge and I_G for \rightarrow . We have the theorem below.

Theorem 6.1. *An assignment is a model of an AF under equational semantics Eq_{max} iff it is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in $PL_{[0,1]}^G$.*

Proof. $\|\bigwedge_{a \in A}(a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i)\| = 1$
 $\iff \|(\bigwedge_{a \in A}(a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i)) \wedge ((\bigwedge_{a \in A}(a \leftarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i))\| = 1$
 $\iff \forall a \in A, \|a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| = 1$ and $\|a \leftarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| = 1$
 $\iff \forall a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R, \|a\| \leq \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\|$ and $\|a\| \geq \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\|$
 $\iff \forall a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R, \|a\| = \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| = \min\{1 - \|b_i\|\}_i = 1 - \max\{\|b_i\|\}_i$
 \iff the equational system Eq_{max} for a given AF . \square

From this theorem, we can get the relationship of equivalence of models between equational system Eq_{max} and $PL_{[0,1]}^G$ i.e. we have the corollary below.

Corollary 6.2. *Equational semantics Eq_{max} is translatable by ec_1 and $PL_{[0,1]}^G$.*

In order to emphasize the connected fuzzy logic system $PL_{[0,1]}^G$, we also denote equational system Eq_{max} as Eq^G .

Let $PL_{[0,1]}^P$ be a fuzzy propositional logic system with standard negation for \neg , T_P for \wedge and I_P for \rightarrow . We have the theorem below.

Theorem 6.3. *An assignment is a model of an AF under equational semantics $Eq_{inverse}$ iff it is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in $PL_{[0,1]}^P$.*

Proof. $\|\bigwedge_{a \in A}(a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i)\| = 1$
 $\iff \|(\bigwedge_{a \in A}(a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i)) \wedge ((\bigwedge_{a \in A}(a \leftarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i))\| = 1$
 $\iff \forall a \in A, \|a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| = 1$ and $\|a \leftarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| = 1$
 $\iff \forall a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R, \|a\| \leq \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\|$ and $\|a\| \geq \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\|$
 $\iff \forall a \in A, (b_i, a) \in R, \|a\| = \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| = \prod_i(1 - b_i)$
 \iff the equational system $Eq_{inverse}$ for a given AF . \square

From this theorem, we can get the relationship of equivalence of models between equational system $Eq_{inverse}$ and $PL_{[0,1]}^P$ i.e. we have the corollary below.

Corollary 6.4. *Equational semantics $Eq_{inverse}$ is translatable by ec_1 and $PL_{[0,1]}^P$.*

In order to emphasize the connected fuzzy logic system $PL_{[0,1]}^P$, we also denote equational system $Eq_{inverse}$ as Eq^P .

Definition 6.5. For a encoding function ec and a $PL_{[0,1]}$, fuzzy encoded argumentation semantics associated with the ec and the $PL_{[0,1]}$ is a function $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{F}}: \mathcal{A}\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}}$, $AF \mapsto \mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}_{AF}$, where $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}_{AF}$ is the set of all models of $ec(AF)$ in the $PL_{[0,1]}$. If the encoding function is normal encoding function

ec_1 , then we call the fuzzy encoded argumentation semantics as fuzzy normal encoded argumentation semantics.

So, equational semantics Eq^G and Eq^P are two kinds of fuzzy normal encoded argumentation semantics. Eq^G is a fuzzy encoded argumentation semantics under $PL_{[0,1]}^G$ and Eq^P is a fuzzy encoded argumentation semantics under $PL_{[0,1]}^P$.

Let $PL_{[0,1]}^L$ be a fuzzy propositional logic system with standard negation for \neg , T_L for \wedge and I_L for \rightarrow . $PL_{[0,1]}^G$, $PL_{[0,1]}^P$ and $PL_{[0,1]}^L$ are three most important $PL_{[0,1]}$ s [43]. So it is necessary for us to propose a equational system Eq^L associated with $PL_{[0,1]}^L$. We will give this equational semantics Eq^L and explore the model relationship in the next subsection.

6.2. A New Equational System

First, for a given $AF = (A, F)$ and $\forall a \in A$, we propose the equational system Eq^L :

$$\|a\| = \begin{cases} 0 & \|x_1\| + \|x_2\| + \cdots + \|x_n\| \geq 1 \\ 1 - \|x_1\| - \|x_2\| - \cdots - \|x_n\| & \|x_1\| + \|x_2\| + \cdots + \|x_n\| < 1 \end{cases},$$

where $\| \cdot \|$ is the labelling function and $\{x_i\}_i$ is the set of all attackers of a .

This equational semantics Eq^L shows that a is totally defeated, i.e. $\|a\| = 0$, when the sum of valuations of all attackers of a is not less than 1. The solution sets of Eq^L for an AF are models of the AF under equational semantics Eq^L . We have the theorem about the model relationship below.

Theorem 6.6. *An assignment is a model of an AF under equational semantics Eq^L iff it is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in $PL_{[0,1]}^L$.*

Proof. Firstly, for $\forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $x_j \in [0, 1]$, we prove the formula

$$T_L(\dots(T_L(T_L(x_1, x_2), x_3), \dots), x_n) = \begin{cases} 0 & x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n \leq n - 1 \\ x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n - n + 1 & x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n > n - 1 \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

by induction.

Since $T_L(x, y) = \max\{0, x + y - 1\}$, so for $n = 2$ (6.1) holds, i.e.

$$T_L(x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} 0 & x_1 + x_2 \leq 1 \\ x_1 + x_2 - 1 & x_1 + x_2 > 1 \end{cases}. \quad (6.2)$$

If we assume that for $n = k$ (6.1) holds, i.e.

$$T_k = T_L(\dots(T_L(T_L(x_1, x_2), x_3), \dots), x_k) = \begin{cases} 0 & x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k \leq k - 1 \\ x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k - k + 1 & x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k > k - 1 \end{cases}, \quad (6.3)$$

then for $n = k + 1$ we have

$$T_{k+1} = T_L(\dots(T_L(T_L(x_1, x_2), x_3), \dots), x_{k+1}) = T_L(T_k, x_{k+1})$$

$$= \begin{cases} 0 & T_k + x_{k+1} \leq 1 \\ T_k + x_{k+1} - 1 & T_k + x_{k+1} > 1 \end{cases}. \quad (6.4)$$

Then we discuss three cases below.

- Case 1: $x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k \leq k - 1$
 $\iff T_k = 0$
 $\implies T_k + x_{k+1} = x_{k+1} \leq 1$
 $\implies T_{k+1} = 0.$
- Case 2: $k - 1 < x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k \leq k - x_{k+1}$
 $\implies T_k = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k - k + 1$
 $\implies T_k + x_{k+1} = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k + x_{k+1} - k + 1 \leq k - x_{k+1} + x_{k+1} - k + 1 = 1$
 $\implies T_{k+1} = 0.$
- Case 3: $x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k > k - x_{k+1}$
 $\implies x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k > k - 1$
 $\implies T_k = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k - k + 1$
 $\implies T_k + x_{k+1} = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k + x_{k+1} - k + 1 > k - x_{k+1} + x_{k+1} - k + 1 = 1.$

From the three cases and (6.4), we have

$$T_{k+1} = \begin{cases} 0 & x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_{k+1} \leq k \\ x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_{k+1} - k & x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_{k+1} > k \end{cases},$$

i.e.

$$T_L(\dots(T_L(T_L(x_1, x_2), x_3), \dots), x_{k+1})) = \begin{cases} 0 & x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_{k+1} \leq (k+1) - 1 \\ x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_{k+1} - (k+1) + 1 & x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_{k+1} > (k+1) - 1 \end{cases}.$$

Then (6.1) holds for $n = k + 1$. So (6.1) holds for $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ (\mathbb{N}^+ is the set of all positive integers).

Secondly, we prove the final result below.

$$\begin{aligned} \|ec_1(AF)\| &= \|\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i)\| = 1 \\ \iff &\|(\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i)) \wedge ((\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \leftarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i))\| = 1 \\ \iff &\forall a \in A, \|a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| = 1 \text{ and } \|a \leftarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| = 1 \\ \iff &\forall a \in A, \min\{1 - \|a\| + \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\|, 1\} = \min\{1 - \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| + \|a\|, 1\} = 1 \\ \iff &\forall a \in A, 1 - \|a\| + \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| \geq 1 \text{ and } 1 - \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| + \|a\| \geq 1 \\ \iff &\forall a \in A, \|a\| \leq \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| \text{ and } \|a\| \geq \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| \\ \iff &\forall a \in A, \|a\| = \|\bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i\| \\ \iff &\forall a \in A, \|a\| = T_L(\dots(T_L(T_L(\|\neg b_1\|, \|\neg b_2\|), \|\neg b_3\|), \dots), \|\neg b_{n_a}\|) \\ &= T_L(\dots(T_L(T_L(1 - \|b_1\|, 1 - \|b_2\|), 1 - \|b_3\|), \dots), 1 - \|b_{n_a}\|) \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \|b_1\| + \|b_2\| + \cdots + \|b_{n_a}\| \geq 1 \\ \|b_1\| + \|b_2\| + \cdots + \|b_{n_a}\| - n + 1 & \|b_1\| + \|b_2\| + \cdots + \|b_{n_a}\| < 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

by substituting x_j as $1 - \|b_i\|$ in (6.1), where n_a is the number of attackers of argument a and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_a\}$

\iff the equational system Eq^L of the AF holds. \square

From the above theorem, Eq^L is a fuzzy normal encoded argumentation semantics under $PL_{[0,1]}^L$ and we have the corollary below.

Corollary 6.7. *Equational semantics Eq^L is translatable by ec_1 and $PL_{[0,1]}^L$.*

6.3. General Expression

Firstly we explore the general expression of the model relationship corresponding to Eq^G , Eq^P and Eq^L . Then we explore the relationship of fuzzy normal encoded argumentation semantics and Gabbay's equational semantics.

6.3.1. Model Relationships Resulting from Inclusion of Domains. In this part, we separate the form of an equational system and the label set of the \mathcal{AF} . When we talk about an equational system, we do not mean that it must be used on the label set $[0, 1]$ but allow that it is used on a subset of $[0, 1]$. Similarly, we separate the form of fuzzy operations in a given PLS and the domain of truth degree of the PLS .

In order to keep clearer and simpler, we set some symbols. Suppose that $L \subseteq [0, 1]$ is the label set of the \mathcal{AF} and $D \subseteq [0, 1]$ is the domain of truth degree of a PLS . The \mathcal{AF} with label set L is denoted as \mathcal{AF}_L and an AF in \mathcal{AF}_L is denoted as AF_L . The equational system Eq^G (respectively Eq^P and Eq^L) with label set L is denoted as Eq_L^G (respectively Eq_L^P and Eq_L^L). The fuzzy propositional logic system with domain D is denoted as PL_D . Let PL_D^G (respectively PL_D^P and PL_D^L) be the PL_D with standard negation for \neg , T_G (respectively T_P and T_L) for \wedge and I_G (respectively I_P and I_L) for \rightarrow . In addition, note that the label set of \mathcal{AF} is also called the domain of \mathcal{AF} .

In next three theorems, we explore the model relationship when domains of \mathcal{AF} and a PLS are adjusted.

- Theorem 6.8.**
1. If $L = D$, then an assignment is a model of an AF by equational system Eq_L^G iff the assignment is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^G .
 2. If $L \supseteq D$, then a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^G is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^G .
 3. If $L \subseteq D$, then a model of an AF by equational system Eq_L^G is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^G .

- Proof.*
1. $\| \bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i) \| = 1$
 $\iff \| (\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i)) \wedge ((\bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \leftarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i)) \| = 1$
 $\iff \forall a \in A, \| a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \| = 1$ and $\| a \leftarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \| = 1$
 $\iff \forall a \in A, \| a \| \leq \| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \|$ and $\| a \| \geq \| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \|$ where $\| a \| \in D$
 $\iff \forall a \in A, \| a \| = \| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \| = \min\{1 - \| b_i \| \}_i = 1 - \max\{\| b_i \| \}_i$
 where $\| a \| \in D$
 $\iff \forall a \in A, \| a \| = 1 - \max\{\| b_i \| \}_i$ where $\| a \| \in L$
 \iff the equational system Eq_L^G for the given AF .
 2. A model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^G is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_L^G . By item 1., a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_L^G is a model of the AF by equational system

Eq_L^G . So a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^G is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^G .

3. A model of the AF by equational system Eq_D^G is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_D^G . By item 1., a model of the AF by equational system Eq_D^G is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^G . So, a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^G is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^G . \square

Theorem 6.9. 1. If $L = D$, then an assignment is a model of an AF by equational system Eq_L^P iff the assignment is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^P .

2. If $L \supseteq D$, then a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^P is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^P .
3. If $L \subseteq D$, then a model of an AF by equational system Eq_L^P is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^P .

Proof. 1. Similar with the proof of Theorem 6.8.

2. A model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^P is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_L^P . By item 1., a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_L^P is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^P . So a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^P is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^P .
3. A model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^P is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_D^P . By item 1., a model of the AF by equational system Eq_D^P is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^P . So, a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^P is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^P . \square

Theorem 6.10. 1. If $L = D$, then an assignment is a model of an AF by equational system Eq_L^L iff the assignment is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^L .

2. If $L \supseteq D$, then a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^L is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^L .
3. If $L \subseteq D$, then a model of an AF by equational system Eq_L^L is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^L .

Proof. 1. Similar with the proof of Theorem 6.8.

2. A model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^L is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_L^L . By item 1., a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_L^L is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^L . So a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^L is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^L .
3. A model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^L is a model of the AF by equational system Eq_D^L . By item 1., a model of the AF by equational system Eq_D^L is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^L . So, a model of the AF by equational system Eq_L^L is a model of $ec_1(AF)$ in PL_D^L . \square

6.3.2. Relationship of Fuzzy Normal Encoded Argumentation Semantics and Equational Semantics.

In this part, we only consider the case that the domain of \mathcal{AF} and a PLS is $[0, 1]$. We will explore the relationship between fuzzy normal encoded argumentation semantics and equational semantics. Let $PL_{[0,1]}^*$ be the fuzzy propositional logic system equipped with continuous negation N^* , continuous t-norm T and R -implication I_T . Let $PL_{[0,1]}^* \text{ }^*$

be the fuzzy propositional logic system equipped with strict negation N^{**} , continuous t-norm T and R -implication I_T . For an given $AF = (A, R)$, let $Eq_{ec_1}^*$ be an equational system which is yielded by the model of $ec_1(AF)$ in $PL_{[0,1]}^*$ and let $Eq_{ec_1}^{**}$ be an equational system which is yielded by the model of $ec_1(AF)$ in $PL_{[0,1]}^{**}$. By the following theorem, we get a class of equational systems induced by fuzzy normal encoded argumentation semantics.

Theorem 6.11. *Each equational system $Eq_{ec_1}^*$ is a Gabbay's equational system.*

Proof. Firstly we prove that for any $x, y \in [0, 1], x = y$ can be derived from $I_T(x, y) = I_T(y, x) = 1$, where I_T is an R -implication and T is a continuous t-norm. Since $I_T(x, y) = \sup\{z | T(x, z) \leq y\} = 1$ and T is continuous, so $T(x, 1) \leq y$, i.e. $x \leq y$. Since $I_T(y, x) = \sup\{z | T(y, z) \leq x\} = 1$ and T is continuous, so $T(y, 1) \leq x$, i.e. $y \leq x$. Thus $x = y$.

Secondly we simplify the model condition by fuzzy operations. Since

$$ec_1(AF) = \bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i),$$

so the model of $ec_1(AF)$ yield that

$$\| \bigwedge_{a \in A} (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i) \| = 1.$$

Thus for each $a \in A$,

$$\| (a \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i) \| = 1.$$

Then we have

$$\| (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i) \wedge (a \leftarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i) \| = 1.$$

By t-norm, we can get

$$\| (a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i) \| = \| (a \leftarrow \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i) \| = 1.$$

By R -implication I_T , we have

$$I_T(\|a\|, \| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \|) = I_T(\| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \|, \|a\|) = 1.$$

Thirdly we prove the final result. By what we firstly have proved, we can get $\|a\| = \| \bigwedge_{(b_i, a) \in R} \neg b_i \|$. By continuous negation N^* and continuous t-norm T , the equational system $Eq_{ec_1}^*$ yielded by the model of $ec_1(AF)$ is

$$\|a\| = N^*(\|b_1\|) * N^*(\|b_2\|) * \cdots * N^*(\|b_k\|),$$

where $\{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ is the set of all the arguments in A s.t. $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\} (b_i, a) \in R$. The equational system $Eq_{ec_1}^*$ associates with a continuous function $h : [0, 1]^k \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $(\|b_1\|, \|b_2\|, \dots, \|b_k\|) \mapsto N^*(\|b_1\|) * N^*(\|b_2\|) * \cdots * N^*(\|b_k\|)$ and then we can check that h is a real equation function:

- $h(0, \dots, 0) = N^*(0) * N^*(0) * \cdots * N^*(0) = 1 * 1 * \cdots * 1 = 1$;

- $h(\|b_1\|, \dots, 1, \dots, \|b_k\|) = N^*(\|b_1\|) * N^*(\|b_2\|) * \dots * N^*(1) * \dots * N^*(\|b_k\|)$
 $= N^*(\|b_1\|) * N^*(\|b_2\|) * \dots * 0 * \dots * N^*(\|b_k\|) = 0;$
- $h(\|b_1\|, \dots, \|b_k\|) = N^*(\|b_1\|) * N^*(\|b_2\|) * \dots * N^*(\|b_k\|) = N^*(\|c_1\|) * N^*(\|c_2\|) * \dots * N^*(\|c_k\|) = h(\|c_1\|, \dots, \|c_k\|)$, where $(\|b_1\|, \dots, \|b_k\|) = (\|c_1\|, \dots, \|c_k\|)$ are permutations of each other.

So each equational system $Eq_{ec_1}^*$ is a Gabbay's equational system. \square

Corollary 6.12. *Each equational system $Eq_{ec_1}^{**}$ is a Gabbay's equational system.*

Corollary 6.13. *A model of $ec_1(AF)$ in a $PL_{[0,1]}^*$ is a real equation extension of the AF under a real equation function.*

Proof. A model of $ec_1(AF)$ in $PL_{[0,1]}^*$ is the solution of the equational system $Eq_{ec_1}^*$. By Theorem 6.11, the equational system $Eq_{ec_1}^*$ has the form $\|a\| = h_a(\|b_1\|, \dots, \|b_k\|)$, where h_a is a real equation function. So the model of $ec_1(AF)$ is the solution of equational system $\|a\| = h_a(\|b_1\|, \dots, \|b_k\|)$. So the model of $ec_1(AF)$ is a real equation extension of the AF under the real equation function h_a . \square

Corollary 6.14. *A model of $ec_1(AF)$ in a $PL_{[0,1]}^{**}$ is a real equation extension of the AF under a real equation function.*

By Theorem 6.11 and Corollary 6.13, we can construct many new specific real equational semantics via encoding \mathcal{AF} to different $PL_{[0,1]}^*$ s. We claim that the inversion of Corollary 6.12 is not true, i.e. a Gabbay's equational system may be not an equational system $Eq_{ec_1}^{**}$. We give an example to explain this claim below.

Example. The equational system $Eq_{geometrical}$ [38] associates with a real equation function $h(b_1, \dots, b_k) = \frac{\prod_i (1-b_i)}{\prod_i (1-b_i) + \prod_i b_i}$, but $Eq_{geometrical}$ can not be yielded by the model of $ec_1(AF)$ in a $PL_{[0,1]}^*$. Considering $a \in A$ has only two attackers b_1 and b_2 . By $Eq_{geometrical}$, $\|a\| = \frac{(1-\|b_1\|)(1-\|b_2\|)}{(1-\|b_1\|)(1-\|b_2\|) + \|b_1\|\|b_2\|}$. If $\|b_1\| = 0$ and $\|b_2\| = \frac{1}{2}$ then $\|a\| = 1$, but $N^{**}(0) * N^{**}(\frac{1}{2}) = 1 * N^{**}(\frac{1}{2}) = N^{**}(\frac{1}{2}) \neq 1$.

In fact, a Gabbay's equational system may be not an equational system $Eq_{ec_1}^*$. We give an example below.

Example. Still consider the equational system $Eq_{geometrical}$ associated with the real equation function $h(b_1, \dots, b_k) = \frac{\prod_i (1-b_i)}{\prod_i (1-b_i) + \prod_i b_i}$. Then we prove that $Eq_{geometrical}$ can not be yielded by the model of $ec_1(AF)$ in a $PL_{[0,1]}^*$. Suppose that $Eq_{geometrical}$ can be yielded by the model of $ec_1(AF)$ in a $PL_{[0,1]}^*$. Considering $m \in A$ has only one attackers n . By $Eq_{geometrical}$, $\|m\| = \frac{(1-\|n\|)}{(1-\|n\|) + \|n\|} = 1 - \|n\|$. By the model of $ec_1(AF)$ in the $PL_{[0,1]}^*$, we have $\|m\| = N^*(\|n\|)$. Thus we get $N^*(\|n\|) = 1 - \|n\|$. Considering $a \in A$ has only two attackers b_1 and b_2 . By $Eq_{geometrical}$, $\|a\| = \frac{(1-\|b_1\|)(1-\|b_2\|)}{(1-\|b_1\|)(1-\|b_2\|) + \|b_1\|\|b_2\|}$. By

the model of $ec_1(AF)$ in the $PL_{[0,1]}^*$, we have $\|a\| = N^*(\|b_1\|) * N^*(\|b_2\|) = (1 - \|b_1\|) * (1 - \|b_2\|)$ and then $(1 - \|b_1\|) * (1 - \|b_2\|) = \frac{(1 - \|b_1\|)(1 - \|b_2\|)}{(1 - \|b_1\|)(1 - \|b_2\|) + \|b_1\|\|b_2\|}$. Hence t-norm $*$ satisfies $x * y = \frac{xy}{xy + (1-x)(1-y)}$ where $x, y \in [0, 1]$. But we can get a contradiction that t-norm $*$ is not associative.

7. Conclusion

Besnard and Doutre propose the method of encoding AF s to the PL_2 . We add some proofs of the existing results and provide a new view of encoding associated with conflict-free semantics. In order to extend the encoding method and enhance the relationship between the AF theory and PLS s, we encode AF s to some other logic systems. We encode AF s to Kleene's PL_3 and Lukasiewicz's PL_3 by normal encoding function and regular encoding function.

We get some results about model relationship. Stable semantics is translatable by ec_1 and Kleene's PL_3 . Complete semantics is translatable by ec_1 and Lukasiewicz's PL_3 . By T_2 and T_3 , the equivalent relationship of models is established between complete semantics and two PL_3 s. We also encode AF s to $PL_{[0,1]}$ s by normal encoding function. We get results about model relationship under equational semantics of AF s and semantics of $PL_{[0,1]}$ s. Equational semantics Eq_{max} is translatable by ec_1 and $PL_{[0,1]}^G$. Equational semantics $Eq_{inverse}$ is translatable by ec_1 and $PL_{[0,1]}^P$. General cases are also explored. Model relationships resulting from inclusion of domains are studied. Each equational system $Eq_{ec_1}^*$ is a Gabbay's equational system. We also provide a method to establish new concrete equational semantics for AF s by encoding AF s to a certain fuzzy logic system. Particularly, a new equational system Eq^L is proposed. Equational semantics Eq^L is translatable by ec_1 and $PL_{[0,1]}^L$.

We formalize and generalize the encoding method and bridge the gap between AF s and PLS s. We will explore more relationship between the AF theory and logic systems in the next paper.

References

- [1] L. Amgoud, D. Doder, S. Vesic, *Evaluation of argument strength in attack graphs: Foundations and semantics*. J. Artificial Intelligence **302** (2022), 103607.
- [2] O. Arieli, A. M. Borg, J. Heyninck, et al, *Logic-Based Approaches to Formal Argumentation*. J. College Publications **8**(6) (2021), 1793–1898.
- [3] O. Arieli, M. W. A. Caminada, *A general QBF-based formalization of abstract argumentation theory*. In: Computational Models of Argument, pp. 105–116. IOS Press (2012)
- [4] O. Arieli, M. W. A. Caminada, *A QBF-based formalization of abstract argumentation semantics*. J. Journal of Applied Logic **11**(2) (2013), 229–252.

- [5] K. Atkinson, T. J. M. Bench-Capon, *Argumentation schemes in AI and Law*. J. Argument & Computation **12**(3) (2021), 417–434.
- [6] P. Baroni, M. W. A. Caminada, M. Giacomin, *An introduction to argumentation semantics*. J. The knowledge engineering review **26**(4) (2011), 365–410.
- [7] H. Barringer, D. M. Gabbay, J. Woods, *Mechanizing Mathematical Reasoning: Essays in Honor of Jörg H. Siekmann on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*. 1st Edition, Springer, 2005, 59–98.
- [8] R. Belohlavek, J. W. Dauben, G. J. Klir, *Fuzzy logic and mathematics: a historical perspective*. 1st Edition, Oxford University Press, 2017.
- [9] T. J. M. Bench-Capon, P. E. Dunne, *Argumentation in artificial intelligence*. J. Artificial intelligence **171**(10-15) (2007), 619–641.
- [10] M. Bergmann, *An introduction to many-valued and fuzzy logic: semantics, algebras, and derivation systems*. 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [11] P. Besnard, C. Cayrol, M. C. Lagasquie-Schiex, *Logical theories and abstract argumentation: A survey of existing works*. J. Argument & Computation **11**(1-2) (2020), 41–102.
- [12] P. Besnard, S. Doutre, *Checking the acceptability of a set of arguments*. In: Proceedings of the Tenth International Workshop on Non-Monotonic Reasoning, pp. 59–64. CEUR Workshop Proceedings (2004)
- [13] P. Besnard, S. Doutre, A. Herzig, *Encoding argument graphs in logic*. In: Information Processing and Management of Uncertainty in Knowledge-Based Systems: 15th International Conference, pp. 345–354. Springer (2014)
- [14] S. Bistarelli, F. Santini, *Well-foundedness in weighted argumentation frameworks*. In: Logics in Artificial Intelligence: 16th European Conference, pp. 69–84. Springer (2019)
- [15] G. Boella, D. M. Gabbay, L. van der Torre, et al, *Support in abstract argumentation*. In: Computational Models of Argument, pp. 111–122. IOS Press (2010)
- [16] G. Brewka, S. Ellmauthaler, H. Strass, et al, *Abstract dialectical frameworks. An overview*. J. IfCoLog Journal of Logics and their Applications **4**(8) (2017), 2263–2317.
- [17] G. Brewka, S. Woltran, *Abstract dialectical frameworks*. In: Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, pp. 102–111. AAAI Press (2010)
- [18] M. W. A. Caminada, *On the issue of reinstatement in argumentation*. In: European Workshop on Logics in Artificial Intelligence, pp. 111–123. Springer (2006)
- [19] M. W. A. Caminada, S. Sá, J. Alcântara, et al, *On the equivalence between logic programming semantics and argumentation semantics*. J. International Journal of Approximate Reasoning **58** (2015), 87–111.
- [20] M. W. A. Caminada, D. M. Gabbay, *A logical account of formal argumentation*. J. Studia Logica **93** (2009), 109–145.
- [21] J. L. Carballido, J. C. Nieves, M. Osorio, *Inferring preferred extensions by pstable semantics*. J. Inteligencia Artificial. Revista Iberoamericana de Inteligencia Artificial **13**(41) (2009), 38–53.
- [22] C. Cayrol, M. C. Lagasquie-Schiex, *On the acceptability of arguments in bipolar argumentation frameworks*. In: European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning and Uncertainty, pp. 378–389. Springer (2005)

- [23] C. Cayrol, M. C. Lagasquie-Schiex, L. F. del Cerro, *Logical encodings of interactions in an argumentation graph with recursive attacks*. D. IRIT-Institut de recherche en informatique de Toulouse, 2017.
- [24] G. Charwat, W. Dvořák, S. A. Gaggl, et al, *Methods for solving reasoning problems in abstract argumentation—a survey*. J. Artificial intelligence **220** (2015), 28–63.
- [25] C. Claudette, L. S. Marie-Christine, *Logical encoding of argumentation frameworks with higher-order attacks*. In: 2018 IEEE 30th International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence, pp. 667–674. IEEE (2018)
- [26] E. A. Corsi, C. G. Fermüller, *Connecting fuzzy logic and argumentation frames via logical attack principles*. J. Soft Computing **23**(7) (2019), 2255–2270.
- [27] S. Coste-Marquis, C. Devred, P. Marquis, *Symmetric argumentation frameworks*. In: European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning and Uncertainty, pp. 317–328. Springer (2005)
- [28] S. Coste-Marquis, S. Konieczny, P. Marquis, et al, *Weighted attacks in argumentation frameworks*. In: Thirteenth international conference on the principles of knowledge representation and reasoning, pp. 593–597. AAAI Press (2012)
- [29] N. Creignou, *The class of problems that are linearly equivalent to satisfiability or a uniform method for proving NP-completeness*. J. Theoretical Computer Science **145**(1-2) (1995), 111–145.
- [30] C. da Costa Pereira, A. G. B. Tettamanzi, S. Villata, *Changing one’s mind: Erase or rewind? possibilistic belief revision with fuzzy argumentation based on trust*. In: International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, pp. 164–171. Archive ouverte HAL (2011)
- [31] P. M. Dung, P. M. Thang, *Towards (probabilistic) argumentation for jury-based dispute resolution*. In: Computational Models of Argument, pp. 171–182. IOS Press (2010)
- [32] P. M. Dung, *On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games*. J. Artificial intelligence **77**(2) (1995), 321–357.
- [33] P. E. Dunne, A. Hunter, P. McBurney, et al, *Weighted argument systems: Basic definitions, algorithms, and complexity results*. J. Artificial Intelligence **175**(2) (2011), 457–486.
- [34] U. Egly, S. A. Gaggl, S. Woltran, *Answer-set programming encodings for argumentation frameworks*. J. Argument & Computation **1**(2) 2010, 147–177.
- [35] J. Fandinno, L. F. del Cerro, *Constructive logic covers argumentation and logic programming*. In: Sixteenth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, pp. 128–137. AAAI Press (2018)
- [36] G. Flouris, A. Bikakis, *A comprehensive study of argumentation frameworks with sets of attacking arguments*. J. International Journal of Approximate Reasoning **109** (2019), 55–86.
- [37] D. M. Gabbay, *Introducing equational semantics for argumentation networks*. In: European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning and Uncertainty, pp. 19–35. Springer (2011)
- [38] D. M. Gabbay, *Equational approach to argumentation networks*. J. Argument & Computation **3**(2-3) 2012, 87–142.

- [39] D. M. Gabbay, M. Gabbay, *The attack as intuitionistic negation*. J. Logic Journal of the IGPL **24**(5) (2016), 807–837.
- [40] D. M. Gabbay, *Dung’s argumentation is essentially equivalent to classical propositional logic with the Peirce–Quine dagger*. J. Logica universalis **5**(2) 2011, 255–318.
- [41] D. M. Gabbay, O. Rodrigues, *Probabilistic argumentation: An equational approach*. J. Logica Universalis **9** (2015), 345–382.
- [42] D. Grossi, *On the logic of argumentation theory*. In: Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, pp. 409–416. Springer (2010)
- [43] P. Hájek, *Metamathematics of fuzzy logic*. 1st Edition, Springer, 2013.
- [44] A. Hunter, *Probabilistic qualification of attack in abstract argumentation*. J. International Journal of Approximate Reasoning **55**(2) (2014), 607–638.
- [45] A. Hunter, S. Polberg, M. Thimm, *Epistemic graphs for representing and reasoning with positive and negative influences of arguments*. J. Artificial Intelligence **281** (2020), 103236.
- [46] J. Janssen, M. De Cock, D. Vermeir, *Fuzzy argumentation frameworks*. In: Information processing and management of uncertainty in knowledge-based systems, pp. 513–520. Springer (2008)
- [47] N. Karacapilidis, D. Papadias, *Computer supported argumentation and collaborative decision making: the HERMES system*. J. Information systems **26**(4) (2001), 259–277.
- [48] G. J. Klir, B. Yuan, *Fuzzy sets and fuzzy logic*. 1st Edition, New Jersey: Prentice hall, 1995.
- [49] D. C. Martinez, A. J. Garcia, G. R. Simari, *An abstract argumentation framework with varied-strength attacks*. In: Proceedings of the eleventh international conference on principles of knowledge representation and reasoning, pp. 135–144. AAAI Press (2008)
- [50] S. H. Nielsen, S. Parsons, *A generalization of Dung’s abstract framework for argumentation: Arguing with sets of attacking arguments*. In: International Workshop on Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems, pp. 54–73. Springer (2006)
- [51] C. Sakama, T. Rienstra, *Representing argumentation frameworks in answer set programming*. J. Fundamenta Informaticae **155**(3) (2017), 261–292.
- [52] M. Thimm, *A probabilistic semantics for abstract argumentation*. C. European Conference on Artificial Intelligence 2012. IOS Press, 2012: 750–755.
- [53] B. Verheij, *Deflog: on the logical interpretation of prima facie justified assumptions*. J. Journal of Logic and Computation **13**(3) (2003), 319–346.
- [54] S. Villata, G. Boella, D. M. Gabbay, et al, *A logic of argumentation for specification and verification of abstract argumentation frameworks*. J. Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence **66** (2012), 199–230.
- [55] J. Wu, H. Li, N. Oren, et al, *Gödel fuzzy argumentation frameworks*. In: Computational Models of Argument, pp. 447–458. IOS Press (2016)

Shuai Tang
School of Mathematics and Statistics
Shandong Normal University
250358
Jinan
China
e-mail: TangShuaiMath@outlook.com

Jiachao Wu*
School of Mathematics and Statistics
Shandong Normal University
250358
Jinan
China
e-mail: wujiachao@sdu.edu.cn

Ning Zhou
School of Mathematics and Statistics
Shandong Normal University
250358
Jinan
China
e-mail: 1679659758@qq.com