How Artificial Intelligence Leads to Knowledge Why: An Inquiry Inspired by Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*

Guus Eelink^a, Kilian Rückschloß^b, Felix Weitkämper^{c,d}

^aUniversität Tübingen, Bursagasse 1, Tübingen, 72070, Germany ^bUniversität Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 10 (C-Bau), Tübingen, 72076, Germany ^cGerman University of Digital Science, Marlene-Dietrich-Allee 14, Potsdam, 14482, Germany ^dFakultät für Informatik der LMU München, Oettingenstr. 67, München, 80538, Germany

Abstract

Bayesian networks and causal models provide frameworks for handling queries about external interventions and counterfactuals, enabling tasks that go beyond what probability distributions alone can address. While these formalisms are often informally described as capturing causal knowledge, there is a lack of a formal theory characterizing the type of knowledge required to predict the effects of external interventions. This work introduces the theoretical framework of causal systems to clarify Aristotle's distinction between knowledge-*that* and knowledge-*why* within artificial intelligence. By interpreting existing artificial intelligence technologies as causal systems, it investigates the corresponding types of knowledge. Furthermore, it argues that predicting the effects of external interventions is feasible only with knowledge-*why*, providing a more precise understanding of the knowledge necessary for such tasks.

Keywords: Causality, Do-Calculus, Bayesian Networks, Causal Models

1. Introduction

Pearl (2000) introduces Bayesian networks and causal models, arguing that these frameworks capture causal knowledge, enabling the treatment of queries about the effects of external interventions and counterfactuals. Notably, such queries cannot be answered solely based on probability distributions. However, to our knowledge, no existing theory explicitly characterizes the additional knowledge required to answer them.

This work presents the theoretical framework of causal systems to clarify Aristotle's distinction between knowledge-*that* and knowledge-*why* within artificial intelligence. It then argues that answering queries about the effects of external interventions requires knowledge-*why*. Since probability distributions represent only knowledge-*that*, we address this theoretical gap and explain why Bayesian networks and causal models can account for the effects of external interventions.

1.1. The Notion of Knowledge in Aristotle's Posterior Analytics

In the Posterior Analytics Aristotle sets out his theory of scientific knowledge $(\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\dot{\eta}\mu\eta)^1$. According to Aristotle, a scientist must be able to explain facts on the basis of their most fundamental causes, which in Aristotle's metaphysical framework are essences. These essences are known through perception and induction, so that science has an empirical foundation. In the Posterior Analytics Aristotle sets out how exactly science can be built on this foundation and what the structure of scientific explanations should look like. Aristotle's account provides us with four key insights into the logic of causal explanations.

1.1.1. Knowledge by Demonstration

In an Aristotelian science facts are explained by way of a so-called *demon*stration ($\dot{\alpha}\pi \dot{\alpha}\delta \delta \epsilon \xi \varsigma$). A demonstration is a type of deduction which displays the scientific explanation of a fact by deducing it from the causally fundamental facts. Demonstrations are a proper subset of syllogisms, the valid deductions which Aristotle characterizes and classifies in his *Prior Analytics*.² Aristotle's theory of causal explanation in the *Posterior Analytics* thus builds on the logical theory set out in his *Prior Analytics*. In the *Posterior Analytics* Aristotle sets out the criteria which a syllogism must satisfy in order to count as a demonstration. In a nutshell, a demonstration is a syllogism which derives its conclusion from causally and explanatorily fundamental premises, thereby providing a scientific causal explanation of the fact which constitutes its conclusion.³ A scientific explanation therefore follows the causal order and derive its *explanandum* from the causally fundamental and explanatory facts.

1.1.2. Indemonstrable Knowledge

While demonstrations thus play a key role in an Aristotelian science, Aristotle denies that all scientific facts can be demonstrated and he thus denies that all scientific knowledge is demonstrative. Indeed, Aristotle argues that it would be impossible for all scientific knowledge to be demonstrative, for in that case scientific explanations would either have to form infinite chains, the premises of each given demonstrations being demonstrated by yet another demonstration, or be cyclical, the same premises functioning both as premises and as conclusions of demonstrations.⁴ Aristotle argues that both infinite chains and cyclical arguments cannot be genuinely explanatory and that demonstrations must therefore start with facts which cannot themselves be demonstrated. The Aristotelian scientist therefore also needs to have *indemonstrable knowledge*, knowledge of

¹While "ἐπιστήμη" in other contexts could be translated simply as "knowledge", in the context of the *Posterior Analytics* Aristotle is clearly concerned with a notion of ἐπιστήμη best understood as *scientific* knowledge. Barnes (1995) translates "ἐπιστήμη" with "understanding".

²Barnes (1995) also has a translation of the Prior Analytics.

³Cf. Posterior Analytics 1.2, 71b16-72b4, translated by Barnes (1995), pp. 115-116.

⁴Cf. Posterior Analytics 1.3, 72b5-73a20, translated by Barnes (1995), pp. 117-118.

the most fundamental facts of a science, on whose basis all the other facts are demonstrated.

But how can such indemonstrable knowledge be scientific if all scientific knowledge requires an understanding of the causes of facts? What does it mean to have an understanding of the cause of an indemonstrable fact? Aristotle argues that indemonstrable knowledge is based on insight into the essences of things, the fundamental constituents of reality to which all causal explanations in science should be traced back. This insight into the essences of things, acquired through perception and induction, is called *nous* $(vo\tilde{v}\varsigma)$.⁵ The indemonstrable facts are therefore known scientifically on the basis of the underlying essences and thus the ultimate causes of those facts. Rather than being a set of further facts about things, these essences are the fundamental things in the ontology, from which someone with *nous* directly infers the indemonstrable facts. Consequently, only someone with *nous* has an understanding of the causes of indemonstrable facts and is therefore in a position to have scientific knowledge at all. Without *nous* one has no scientific knowledge of the indemonstrable facts and a fortiori no scientific knowledge of the demonstrable facts.⁶ For this reason Aristotle calls nous the principle of scientific knowledge (ἀρχή ἐπιστήμης).⁷

1.1.3. Knowledge-that and Knowledge-why

Another key insight from Aristotle's theory of science is that the facts can be established even if one does not yet have scientific explanations of them. Aristotle allows for this by distinguishing between knowledge of the *that* ($\delta\tau\iota$) and knowledge of the *why* ($\delta\iota\delta\tau\iota$). The scientist first makes observations and collects data and thus acquires knowledge-*that* of a set of facts without yet knowing the scientific explanations of those facts —thus not yet having knowledge-*why*. In order to acquire knowledge-*why*, she must subsequently gain an understanding of the underlying essences and determine which facts follow directly from these essences and are thus indemonstrable and which facts can be demonstrated. On this basis she can then, in the final stage of her research, construct demonstrations and obtain knowledge-*why*.

Knowledge-*that* may itself come with a kind of explanation which falls short of being scientific and therefore does not yield knowledge-*why*. Such an explanation involved in knowledge-*that* is deficient in that it does not follow the causal order of things, but rather derives something that is causally fundamental from something which is causally not fundamental but which might be more observable. Aristotle's example is a syllogism which derives the proximity of the other

⁵Aristotle discusses *nous* in the last chapter of the *Posterior Analytics*, 2.19, translated by Barnes (1995), pp. 165-166, who renders "voic" as "comprehension".

⁶In Posterior Analytics 1.33, at 89a11-89b6 (translated by Barnes (1995), pp. 146-147), Aristotle argues that even someone who knows demonstrations lacks scientific knowledge if he does not know the indemonstrable facts which constitute their premises on the basis of the underlying essences and thus by way of *nous*. According to Aristotle, such a person has mere opinion (δόξα) as opposed to scientific knowledge.

⁷Cf. Posterior Analytics 2.19, 100b5-17, translated by Barnes (1995), p. 166.

planets to earth (when compared to the stars) from the observable fact that they do not twinkle (whereas stars do):⁸

- p1. Celestial bodies that do not twinkle are nearby.
- p2. The planets are celestial bodies that do not twinkle.
 - c. The planets are nearby.

This syllogism does not track the causal order since its middle term —nottwinkling —is not the cause of the planets' proximity to earth. Rather, the planets' proximity to earth is the cause of their not twinkling, so that the following syllogism does yield an adequate causal explanation:

- p1.' Nearby celestial bodies do not twinkle.
- p2.' The planets are nearby celestial bodies.
- c.' The planets do not twinkle.

In this case a directly observable fact —the planets' not twinkling —is explained on the basis of a fact that is not directly observable, but causally fundamental —the planets' proximity to earth. The middle term —proximity to earth —causally explains why the predicate —not twinkling —belongs to the subject —the planets.

1.1.4. Subordinate and Superordinate Areas of Science

The distinction between knowledge-*that* and knowledge-*why* also plays a role in Aristotle's subordination of areas of scientific inquiry. Aristotle holds that certain areas of science are subordinated to others, which means that the premises used by the subordinate areas — for instance, optics — are explained by the superordinate areas — for instance, geometry, in the case of optics. The subordinate area of science can take as a starting-point the results of the superordinate area and on this basis explain the phenomena it is concerned with and thus yield knowledge-*why*.

This subordination of areas of science applies in particular to the relationship between the theoretical and the empirical sciences. The empirical areas of science rely on the the results of the theoretical areas of science to explain the observed phenomena. For instance, the study of the rainbow, an empirical science, explains the phenomenon of the rainbow on the basis of results from optics, which themselves are again based on results from geometry.⁹

1.2. Applying Aristotle's Notion of Knowledge in Artificial Intelligence

The aim of this paper is to establish the distinction between knowledge-*that* and knowledge-*why*, as described in Section 1.1.3, within artificial intelligence by formalizing it within a logical framework. Aristotle's logic is a term logic in which each basic proposition describes a relationship between two terms.

⁸Cf. Posterior Analytics 1.13, 78a28-78b4, translated by Barnes (1995), pp. 127-128.

⁹Cf. Posterior Analytics 1.13, 79a10-16, translated by Barnes (1995), pp. 128-129.

However, we are not concerned with the internal structure of propositions in Aristotle's logic but rather with his conceptual distinction between a syllogism and a demonstration, as discussed in Section 1.1.1.

Following the approach of Bochman (2021), we extend propositional logic – where the provability operator $(\vdash)/2$ corresponds to Aristotle's syllogisms – by introducing an explainability operator $(\Longrightarrow)/2$ to capture demonstrations that establish knowledge-*why*. In propositional logic, for a set of statements Φ and a statement ψ , the expression $\Phi \vdash \psi$ means that there exists a syllogism with conclusion ψ and premises Φ .

Example 1.1. Consider a road that passes through a field with a sprinkler in it. Assume the sprinkler is switched on by a weather sensor if it is sunny. Suppose further that it rains whenever it is cloudy and that the road is wet if either it rains or the sprinkler is turned on. Finally, suppose that a wet road is slippery.

Denote by *cloudy* the event that the weather is cloudy, by *sprinkler* the event that the sprinkler is on, by *rain* the event of rainy weather, by *wet* the event that the road is wet, and by *slippery* the event that the road is slippery.

In this case, $\{slippery\} \vdash wet$ indicates that there is a syllogism for the road being wet with the premise that the road is slippery. However, according to Section 1.1.1, such a syllogism is not a demonstration, as it concludes from the effect that the road is slippery to the cause that the road is wet.

Bochman (2021) extends propositional logic by introducing an additional operator, $(\Rightarrow)/2$, to denote the acquisition of knowledge-*why*. For a set of statements Φ and a statement ψ , the expression $\Phi \Rightarrow \psi$ signifies that knowledge-*that* about the truth of all propositions in Φ leads to knowledge-*why* about ψ .

Example 1.2. In the context of Example 1.1, we write

$\{cloudy, rain\} \Rightarrow slippery$

to indicate that knowledge-why about the road being slippery can be derived from knowledge-that it is cloudy and raining, i.e., from the truth of the propositions in $\{cloudy, rain\}$.

Furthermore, Bochman (2021) applies the idea that causal relations are typically expressed in the form of rules or laws. According to Chapter 1 in Hulswit (2002), this idea was first articulated by Descartes as follows:

Principle 1 (Causal Rules). "...we can obtain knowledge of the rules or laws of nature, which are the secondary and particular causes..." (René Descartes: Principles of Philosophy II:37; translation by Miller and Miller (1982)).

According to Bochman (2021), causal knowledge should be expressed in a causal theory Δ , which consists of a set of causal rules of the form $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ for statements ϕ and ψ . A causal rule $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ signifies that there is a demonstration of ψ based on the premise ϕ , meaning that knowledge-*why* about ϕ leads to knowledge-*why* about ψ . The corresponding explainability operator $(\Rightarrow_{\Delta})/2$ is then derived by extending the causal theory Δ with well-motivated axioms.

Example 1.3. The causal knowledge in Example 1.1 leads to the following causal theory Δ :

$cloudy \Rightarrow rain$	(cloudy weather causes rain)
$\neg cloudy \Rightarrow sprinkler$	(sunny weather causes the sprinkler being on)
$rain \Rightarrow wet$	(rain causes the road to be wet)
$sprinkler \Rightarrow wet$	(the sprinkler causes the road to be wet)
$wet \Rightarrow slippery$	(a wet road is slippery)

The corresponding explainability operator $(\Rightarrow_{\Delta})/2$ is then obtained by completing Δ according to well-motivated axioms.

According to Section 1.1.3, in an area of science that describes a given situation, we find a set of external premises \mathcal{E} – that is, statements ϵ that, if observed, do not require any explanation or demonstration. One may then argue that the demonstration of ϵ would belong to another, superordinate area of science. We conclude that observing ϵ immediately yields knowledge-*why* about ϵ within the area of science under consideration.

Example 1.4. In Example 1.1, we consider the following external premises \mathcal{E} :

$\neg cloudy$,	(it is either cloudy or not)
$\neg rain$,	(it usually does not rain)
$\neg sprinkler,$	(the sprinkler is initially off)
$\neg wet$,	(the road is usually dry)
$\neg slippery$	(the road is usually not slippery)
	$\neg cloudy,$ $\neg rain,$ $\neg sprinkler,$ $\neg wet,$ $\neg slippery$

Suppose we observe that the weather is cloudy and rainy, i.e., we have knowledge-*that* it is cloudy and rainy. Example 1.3 states $cloudy \Rightarrow rain$, meaning that there is a demonstration of rainy weather based on the premise that it is cloudy. Since $cloudy \in \mathcal{E}$ is an external premise, demonstrating cloudy lies beyond the scope of the given area of science – one might argue that it belongs to meteorology. Thus, observing cloudy weather (i.e., cloudy) yields knowledge-*why* about *cloudy*, and a demonstration of *rain* from *cloudy* provides knowledge-*why* about *rain*. In other words, we obtain $cloudy \Rightarrow rain$.

On the other hand, if we observe that the sprinkler is off (i.e., $\neg sprinkler$), we immediately acquire knowledge-*why* about $\neg sprinkler \in \mathcal{E}$, as it is an external premise. Since external premises are taken as given without requiring further causal explanation, we conclude $\neg sprinkler \Rightarrow \neg sprinkler$. This reflects our expectation that the sprinkler remains off unless actively switched on.

Within a given area of science, we conclude that the demonstrations in Section 1.1.1 yield knowledge-*why* only if they originate from external premises $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$.

Principle 2 (Causal Foundation). Causal explanations or demonstrations that yield knowledge-why must originate from external premises in \mathcal{E} . That is, the external premises \mathcal{E} represent potential knowledge-that for which no further explanation is required by agreement.

In Definition 2.14, we formalize our observations as a consistent set of statements \mathcal{O} to obtain a deterministic causal system:

$$\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}).$$

To summarize, the causal theory Δ and the external premises \mathcal{E} formalize an area of science, as described in Section 1.1.4. The set \mathcal{O} denotes a collection of additional observations, i.e., knowledge-*that*, which the system **CS** uses to reason within the area of science under consideration.

Example 1.5. Recall the situation in Example 1.1. Assume we describe this situation using an area of science that consists of causal knowledge, as captured in the causal theory Δ of Example 1.3, and the external premises \mathcal{E} from Example 1.4.

Furthermore, assume that we observe rainy weather, that is, $\mathcal{O} := \{rain\}$, resulting in the causal system $\mathbf{CS}_1 := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$. Finally, assume we observe nothing, leading to the causal system $\mathbf{CS}_2 := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset)$.

Remark 1.1. Note that a causal theory Δ may also mention expressions like $\top \Rightarrow \phi$ for a statement ϕ , meaning $\emptyset \Rightarrow \phi$. The best interpretation of this construct is that the truth of ϕ is directly obtained from the essences of the area of science. This would be a formal analogue of the way in which the indemonstrable facts are grasped in an Aristotelian science, namely by inferring them directly from the underlying essences through *nous*, rather than deriving them from any further set of facts. However, this expression, so interpreted, requires additional justification in terms of the nature of essences.

Remark 1.2. Note that a causal theory Δ may also mention expressions like $\phi \Rightarrow \bot$ for a statements ϕ , which are not considered by Aristotle. What this expression signifies is infeasible within an Aristotelian science, in which one first gathers knowledge-*that* and then tries to arrange this knowledge-*that* by way of demonstrations. Such demonstrations only have knowledge-*that* as their premisses or conclusions, thus excluding falsehood, written " \bot ". We conclude that further investigation is needed in order to determine whether this expression is meaningful.

Relying on *nous*, causal systems assert knowledge-*why* causal reasoning satisfies the principle of *natural necessity*, which Aquinas formulated as follows:

Principle 3 (Natural Necessity). "... given the existence of the cause, the effect must necessarily follow." (Thomas Aquinas: Summa Contra Gentiles II: 35.4; translation by Anderson (1956))

Example 1.6. In Example 1.1, this means, for instance, that the road is wet whenever it rains.

Furthermore, relying on *nous*, causal systems assert knowledge-*why* causal reasoning satisfies the assumption of *sufficient causation*, which Leibniz formulated as follows:

Assumption 4 (Sufficient Causation). "...there is nothing without a reason, or no effect without a cause." (Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz: First Truths; translation by Loemker (1989), p. 268)

Example 1.7. In Example 1.1, this implies, for instance, that rain does not occur without a cause. Therefore, if we observe rain, it must be cloudy. We conclude that *sufficient causation*, as stated in Assumption 4, ensures that all possible occurrences are explained by the available causal knowledge and external premises.

Remark 1.3. The letters Δ , \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{O} in a causal system read "Deo," which is a Latin translation for "God." This represents a causal system that applies *causal sufficiency* in Assumption 4 in its reasoning and thus assumes something akin to God's perspective in the area of science under consideration.

Let $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset)$ be a causal system without observations. Denote by $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n$ all possible states of the situation under consideration. In this case, $\omega_i \cap \mathcal{E}$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, yields the possible states of the external premises, and the system \mathbf{CS} acquires knowledge-*why* about $\omega_1 \cap \mathcal{E}$ or ... or $\omega_n \cap \mathcal{E}$. Applying *natural necessity* in Principle 3 and *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4, the system \mathbf{CS} concludes that a state ω_i , for $1 \leq i \leq n$, is only possible if it can be demonstrated with premises in $\omega_i \cap \mathcal{E}$. The system now checks, for every state $\omega_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, whether there is a demonstration for ω_i with premises in $\omega_i \cap \mathcal{E}$ to determine possible states $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_k$. Since it assumes knowledge-*why* about *natural necessity* in Principle 3 and *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4, the system \mathbf{CS} acquires knowledge-*why* about ω_1 or ... or ω_k . Note that Aristotle does not consider disjunctions as an object of knowledge. Since we want causal systems to acquire further knowledge-*why* by case distinction, we agree on the following principle:

Principle 5 (Consistency with Deduction). Explainability $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is compatible with logical deduction $(\vdash)/2$ in both the explanandum and the explanans.

Suppose a statement ϕ holds in all possible states ω_i for $1 \le i \le k$; by case distinction, the system **CS** obtains knowledge-*why* about ϕ being true.

Example 1.8. Recall the causal system without observations $\mathbf{CS}_2 := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset)$ in Example 1.5. In the case of cloudy weather, it concludes that it rains and that the road is wet, and in the case of sunny weather, it concludes that the sprinkler is on and that the road is wet as well. This yields demonstrations for a wet road in both cases. As $cloudy \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\neg cloudy \in \mathcal{E}$ are external premises, the system \mathbf{CS}_2 acquires knowledge-*why* about the road being wet.

Let $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ be a causal system such that $\mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$, i.e., it observes something. To determine the possible states of the world, the system \mathbf{CS} first computes the states of the world $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n$ that the system $\mathbf{CS}' := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset)$ would consider possible, thereby acquiring knowledge-*why* about ω_1 or \ldots or ω_n . It then checks whether the states $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n$ are consistent with the observations in \mathcal{O} , yielding possible states $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_k$ and knowledge-*that* ω_1 or \ldots or ω_k . However, note that this does not lead to knowledge-*why*, as drawing conclusions from the observations generally runs counter to the direction of cause and effect.

Example 1.9. Recall the causal system $\mathbf{CS}_1 := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ from Example 1.5. It first determines the possible states of the world, as the system $\mathbf{CS}_2 := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset)$ would, and then checks these states for consistency with the observation that it is raining. In particular, relying on *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4, it concludes that it is cloudy and obtains the only possible state ω :

 $cloudy := True, rain := True, sprinkler := False, wet := True, \ldots$

In particular, the system \mathbf{CS}_1 acquires knowledge-*that* about the sprinkler being off, which requires concluding from the effect—rainy weather—to its cause—cloudy weather. Hence, the system \mathbf{CS}_1 does not possess knowledge-*why* about the sprinkler being off.

The following example illustrates that *natural necessity*, as stated in Principle 3, may fail in some situations:

Example 1.10. In Example 1.1, suppose that it is cloudy and raining. In this situation, the clouds are clearly a cause for the rain. However, it is not necessarily the case that clouds lead to rain, as one can easily imagine a heavily overcast day on which it is not raining.

Section 3 weakens *natural necessity* in Principle 3. We introduce weighted causal rules $(w, \phi \Rightarrow \psi)$, where the weight $w \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$ quantifies our uncertainty about whether *natural necessity* applies to the causal relation $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$. This idea leads us to the introduction of maximum entropy causal systems in Definition 3.11, which yield a probabilistic version of Aristotle's knowledge-*why*.

In this context, we reinterpret the Aristotelian distinction between syllogisms and demonstrations within the Bayesian networks and causal models of Pearl (2000). Specifically, by considering the principle of maximum entropy from Shannon (1948) as an analogue to Aristotle's syllogisms, we conclude that greedily maximizing entropy along a causal order serves as an analogue to demonstrations. Indeed, Williamson (2001) demonstrates that the distribution associated with a Bayesian network is obtained by extending its probabilistic information and greedily maximizing entropy along the given causal order. Consequently, Bayesian networks acquire a probabilistic analogue of Aristotle's knowledge-why, enabling them to answer queries about the effects of external interventions.

2. Knowledge in Deterministic Systems

We begin our inquiry by investigating causal reasoning in a deterministic Boolean setting, where all parameters of interest take one of two values, represented as true or false. Section 2.1.1 briefly reviews the basics of propositional logic and introduces the provability operator $(\vdash)/2$, which we use to represent knowledge-*that* and syllogisms. Following Bochman (2021), we consider explainability as a binary relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ on knowledge-*that* represented by propositional formulas. Section 2.1.2 introduces Bochman's logical theory of causality. Section 2.3 builds on the ideas of Bochman (2021) and introduces causal systems as the most general framework for reasoning about knowledge-*why* that evolves from well-motivated assertions. Finally, in Section 2.4, we interpret the structural causal models of Pearl (2000) as causal systems to evaluate the type of knowledge they provide. Section 2.5 then extends the treatment of external interventions from Pearl (2000) to causal systems, and Section 2.6 reformulates the semantics of causal systems to prepare for probabilistic generalizations in Section 3.

2.1. Preliminaries

Let us gather the necessary prerequisites for our endeavor and recall the fundamentals of propositional logic, along with the logical theory of causality as presented by Bochman (2021).

2.1.1. Propositional Logic: A Language for Knowledge-That

Propositional logic provides a framework for reasoning about truth, i.e., specifying sets of Boolean functions that satisfy certain constraints. We use the standard notations of propositions, (propositional) formulas and structures, which we identify with the set of propositions that are true in them, as laid out for instance by Franks (2024).

Example 2.1. To formalize reasoning about the situation described in Example 1.1, we introduce the propositional alphabet

$$\mathfrak{P} := \{ cloudy, rain, sprinkler, wet, slippery \}$$

along with the respective meanings.

A structure ω is then a complete state description such as

$cloudy \mapsto True$	$sprinkler \mapsto False$	$slippery \mapsto True$
$rain \mapsto True$	$wet \mapsto True$	

We then identify the structure ω with the set {*cloudy*, *rain*, *wet*, *slippery*}.

Propositional formulas are connected by the semantic notion of entailment, denoted $(\models)/2$, and the syntactic notion of derivation, denoted $(\vdash)/2$.

Definition 2.1 (Semantic Entailment). We call a set of formulas Φ deductively closed if whenever $\Phi \models \psi$ we find $\psi \in \Phi$. The deductive closure of a set of formulas Φ is the smallest deductively closed set $\overline{\Phi}$ such that $\Phi \subseteq \overline{\Phi}$. Finally, we call a consistent deductively closed set of formulas Φ a world if Φ is maximal with respect to the subset relation $(\subseteq)/2$.

Remark 2.1. Every world $\Phi = \overline{\mathbf{L}}$ is the deductive closure of the set of its literals

$$\mathbf{L} := \{l \in \{p, \neg p\} : p \in \mathfrak{P}, \ l \in \Phi\}$$

As Φ is consistent and maximal regarding the subset relation $(\subseteq)/2$, we find

$$\mathbf{L} := (\mathbf{L} \cap \mathfrak{P}) \cup \{\neg p: p \in \mathfrak{P}, p \notin \Phi\}$$

Hence, we can identify Φ with the set of propositions $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathfrak{P}$, which is also a synonym for structures.

We note that propositional logic admits a sound and complete deductive calculus, first outlined by Frege (1879). With such a calculus, the connection between semantic entailment and syntactic derivability is secured by the *completeness theorem* for propositional logic.

Theorem 2.1 (Completeness Theorem). A formula is semantically entailed by a set of formulas if and only if it is derivable from that set.

2.1.2. Bochman's Logical Theory of Causality

Bochman (2021) proposes a formalization of knowledge-*why*, as described in Section 1.1.3. He considers a system or agent that employs causal knowledge to explain instances of knowledge-*that* about the world. *Explainability* is then conceptualized as a binary relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$, which accounts for how instances of knowledge-*that* can be explained through other instances of knowledge-*that*. Finally, Bochman (2021) identifies knowledge-*why* as the subset of knowledge-*that* that can be justified through explainability.

Example 2.2. In the scenario of Example 1.1, suppose we observe sunny weather and that the sprinkler is switched on, meaning we have knowledge-*that* about both. If we further decide that weather information does not require further explanation, i.e., it is an external premise, we can use the observation of sunny weather to explain why the sprinkler is on. According to Bochman (2021), this leads to the conclusion: "Sunny weather causes the sprinkler to be on," which establishes knowledge-why about the sprinkler being on.

Bochman (2021) obverses that everyday causal reasoning behaves well with logical deduction in the explanans.

Example 2.3. If we accept the statement "Smoking or genetic predispositions may cause cancer", we typically also accept the statement "Smoking may cause cancer" because "Smoking or genetic predispositions" is a consequence of "Smoking".

Furthermore, Bochman (2021) claims that causal reasoning behaves well with logical deduction in the explanandum.

Example 2.4. In the scenario described in Example 2.3, it is reasonable to assume that cancer includes symptoms of cancer in a self-explanatory manner. Since symptoms are a logical consequence of cancer, we deduce the statement, "Smoking causes symptoms of cancer," thereby resulting in knowledge-*why* about the symptoms of a patient.

To begin, Bochman (2021) commits to propositional formulas in an alphabet \mathfrak{P} and the provability operator $(\vdash)/2$ to reason on knowledge-*that* and syllogisms, respectively. Hence, he fixes a propositional alphabet \mathfrak{P} and makes the following choice:

Language 6. Formulas in the alphabet \mathfrak{P} represent knowledge-that and the provability operator $(\vdash)/2$ represents the existence of syllogisms.

Example 2.5. To describe Example 1.1, we use the alphabet of Example 2.1. We may, for example, assume or observe knowledge-*that*

$$rain \rightarrow cloudy$$

This means we have knowledge-*that* about the weather being cloudy if it is rainy. If we now observe rainy weather, i.e., if we observe *rain*, we find that

$$\{rain, (rain \rightarrow cloudy)\} \vdash cloudy,$$

i.e., we deduce that it is cloudy. However, we would not accept *rain* as an explanation for *cloudy*; that is, we have knowledge-*that* about it being cloudy, but not knowledge-*why*.

Example 2.5 illustrates that material implication " \rightarrow " and the provability operator (\vdash)/2 generally do not capture causal knowledge and demonstrations. As mentioned earlier, Bochman (2021) therefore formalizes *explainability* as a binary relation on knowledge-*that*; that is, he makes the following assumption:

Language 7. Explainability $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is a binary relation on \mathfrak{P} -formulas. Specifically, for formulas ϕ and ψ , we write $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ to indicate that knowledge-that about ϕ leads to knowledge-why about ψ .

Example 2.6. In Example 2.5, explainability is a binary relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ on the formulas in the alphabet \mathfrak{P} of Example 2.1. For two propositional formulas ϕ and ψ , we have $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ whenever knowledge-*that* about ϕ explains $why \ \psi$ is true. Among many other relationships, we may find e.g. that rain or sprinkler explain why the road is wet and slippery:

 $(rain \lor sprinkler) \Rightarrow (wet \land slippery)$

We emphasize that explainability does not introduce a new logical connective; that is, nested expressions like $cloudy \Rightarrow (rain \Rightarrow wet)$ have no defined meaning.

Examples 2.3 and 2.4 illustrate that explainability $(\Rightarrow)/2$ gives rise to a production inference relation:

Definition 2.2 (Production Inference Relation). A **production inference relation** is a binary relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ on the set of formulas in the alphabet \mathfrak{P} that satisfies the following assertions for all propositional formulas ϕ , ψ and ρ :

- i) If we have $\phi \vdash \psi$ and $\psi \Rightarrow \rho$, then $\phi \Rightarrow \rho$ follows. (Strengthening)
- ii) If we have $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ and $\psi \vdash \rho$, then $\phi \Rightarrow \rho$ follows. (Weakening)
- iii) If we have $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ and $\phi \Rightarrow \rho$, then $\phi \Rightarrow \psi \land \rho$ follows. (And)
- iv) We have $\top \Rightarrow \top$ and $\bot \Rightarrow \bot$. (Truth and Falsity)

Note that the propositional formulas ϕ , ψ and ρ do not mention the binary relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$. If we find $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ for two formulas ϕ and ψ , we say that ϕ **explains** ψ or that ϕ is an **explanans** of ψ or that ψ is an **explanandum** of ϕ .

Given a production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$, we write $\Phi \Rightarrow \psi$ for a set of propositional formulas Φ and a formula ψ if there exists a finite subset $\Phi' \subseteq \Phi$ such that $\bigwedge_{\phi \in \Phi'} \phi \Rightarrow \psi$. Furthermore, we define the **consequence operator** \mathcal{C} by

assigning to a set of propositional formulas Φ the set of propositional formulas

 $\mathcal{C}(\Phi) := \{ \psi \text{ propositional formula: } \Phi \Rightarrow \psi \}.$

Again, Φ and $\mathcal{C}(\Phi)$ are sets of formulas that do not mention the relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$.

This work adopts the viewpoint that production inference relations $(\Rightarrow)/2$ capture *consistency with deduction*, as stated in Principle 5.

Formalization 8. A binary relation on propositional formulas $(\Rightarrow)/2$ satisfies consistency with deduction, as expressed in Principle 5, if and only if it is a production inference relation.

According to Language 7, the causal operator $\mathcal{C}(\Phi)$ denotes the knowledge-*why* that results from knowledge-*that* about the propositions in Φ being true.

Example 2.7. Recall the alphabet $\mathfrak{P} := \{ cloudy, rain, sprinkler, wet, slippery \}$ from Example 2.5 and let $\Phi := \{ cloudy, rain \}$. Suppose that cloudy weather is self-explanatory and explains why it rains, i.e.,

 $cloudy \Rightarrow cloudy$, and $cloudy \Rightarrow rain$.

Furthermore, suppose rain explains why the road is wet and slippery, i.e.,

 $rain \Rightarrow wet$, and $wet \Rightarrow slippery$.

Finally, suppose that our causal reasoning cannot explain why the sprinkler is off. We conclude that:

cloudy, rain, wet, slippery $\in \mathcal{C}(\Phi)$, and sprinkler $\notin \mathcal{C}(\Phi)$, \neg sprinkler $\notin \mathcal{C}(\Phi)$.

In summary, from Definition 2.2 ii) and iii), we conclude that $\mathcal{C}(\Phi)$ is the deductive closure of the set of literals {*cloudy*, *rain*, *wet*, *slippery*}, i.e.,

 $\mathcal{C}(\Phi) = \overline{\{cloudy, rain, wet, slippery\}}.$

Bochman (2021) further expresses the distinction between knowledge-*that* and knowledge-*why*, as described in Section 1.1.3, in the notion of a binary semantics:

Definition 2.3 (Bimodel, Binary Semantics). A pair (Φ, Ψ) of consistent deductively closed sets of formulas Φ and Ψ is called a **(classical) bimodel**. A **(classical) binary semantics** \mathcal{B} then is a set of bimodels.

We say that the expression $\psi \Rightarrow \phi$ is **valid** in a bimodel (Φ, Ψ) if either $\phi \notin \Phi$ or $\psi \in \Psi$, i.e., $\phi \in \Phi$ only if $\psi \in \Psi$. Finally, the expression $\psi \Rightarrow \phi$ is **valid** in a binary semantics \mathcal{B} if it is valid in all bimodels $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{B}$.

Example 2.8. Recall the situation in Example 2.7 and assume we possess the knowledge-*that*

$$\Phi := \overline{\{cloudy, \neg sprinkler, rain, wet, slippery\}},$$

which results from observing cloudy weather, rain, the sprinkler being off, and a road that is wet and slippery. Recall that in Example 2.7, explainability was assumed to make no statement about the sprinkler being off. Hence, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{C}(\Phi) = \{ cloudy, rain, wet, slippery \}$$

and obtain a bimodel $(\mathcal{C}(\Phi), \Phi)$. Observe that $rain \lor sprinkler \Rightarrow wet$ is valid in $(\mathcal{C}(\Phi), \Phi)$.

Fortunately, production inference relations and binary semantics correspond to each other.

Theorem 2.2. To a binary semantics \mathcal{B} we can associate the production inference relation $(\Rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}})/2$ that is given by setting $\psi \Rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}} \phi$ whenever $\psi \Rightarrow \phi$ is valid in \mathcal{B} . On the other hand, every production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ gives rise to a **canonical binary semantics**

 $\mathcal{B}_{\Rightarrow} := \{ (\mathcal{C}(\Phi), \Phi) : \Phi, \mathcal{C}(\Phi) \text{ consistent and deductively closed set of formulas} \}.$

Finally, one obtains that a binary relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is a production inference relation if and only if it is determined by its canonical binary semantics.

Proof. Bochman (2005) proves this result in Lemma 8.3 and Theorem 8.4. \Box

Next, Bochman (2021) asserts that explainability $(\Rightarrow)/2$ satisfies *natural necessity* in Principle 3. This means that once we have explained a formula ϕ , i.e., once we have a causal explanation for ϕ and know *why* ϕ occurs, we also know *that* ϕ occurs. In terms of Definition 2.3, Principle 3 means that explainability gives rise to a consistent binary semantics:

Definition 2.4 (Consistent Binary Semantics). A bimodel (Φ, Ψ) is **consistent** if $\Phi \subseteq \Psi$. A binary semantics \mathcal{B} is **consistent** if all bimodels $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{B}$ are.

Consistency of binary semantics yields the following property of production inference relations:

Definition 2.5 (Regular Production Inference Relation). A **regular** production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is a production inference relation that satisfies the following property for all formulas ϕ , ψ and ρ :

If $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ and $\phi \land \psi \Rightarrow \rho$ holds, we find that $\phi \Rightarrow \rho$ also holds. (Cut)

Remark 2.2. Regularity also means that we can substitute other demonstrations in our current demonstration.

As mentioned earlier, regular production inference relations correspond to consistent binary semantics.

Theorem 2.3 (Bochman (2005), Theorem 8.9). A production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is regular if and only if it is generated by a consistent binary semantics. In particular, the canonical binary semantics $\mathcal{B}_{\Rightarrow}$ is consistent. \Box

Bochman (2021) further commits to sufficient causation, as stated in Assumption 4. Together with natural necessity in Principle 3, this implies that within an area of science knowledge-that coincides with knowledge-why.

If explainability is a causal production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$, as enforced in Language 7 and Formalization 8, Theorem 2.3 establishes that all possible states of knowledge-*why* correspond to exact theories.

Definition 2.6 (Exact Theory). An **exact theory** of a production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is a deductively closed set of propositional formulas Φ such that $C(\Phi) = \Phi$, i.e.,

 $\mathcal{C}(\Phi) \subseteq \Phi$ (natural necessity) and $\mathcal{C}(\Phi) \supseteq \Phi$ (sufficient causation).

Sufficient causation asserts that all knowledge-that is causally explainable. For our purposes, this includes knowledge-that about " \perp ".

Recall that a world is a consistent, deductively closed set that is maximal with respect to inclusion. Now, suppose that ω is a world that is not an exact theory of the production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$. In this case, sufficient causation implies that ω cannot occur. Applying sufficient causation once more then yields that $\omega \Rightarrow \perp$ and $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$ is inconsistent. We conclude that all possible states of knowledge-why correspond to causal worlds.

Definition 2.7 (Causal Worlds Semantics). A **causal world** of a production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is a world ω that is an exact theory. We call the set of all causal worlds Causal(\Rightarrow) the **causal worlds semantics** of $(\Rightarrow)/2$.

Example 2.9. In the Examples 2.2 and 2.4, the causal worlds may correspond to the following sets of literals:

 $\{\neg cloudy, \neg rain, sprinkler, wet, slippery\}$ $\{cloudy, rain, \neg sprinkler, wet, slippery\}$ Suppose we have $\phi \Rightarrow \rho$ and $\psi \Rightarrow \rho$ for propositional formulas ϕ , ψ , and ρ . Additionally, assume that we possess knowledge-*that* about the disjunction $\phi \lor \psi$. Hence, we now know *that* either ϕ or ψ holds, and in both cases, we deduce knowledge-*that* about ρ using *natural necessity*, as stated in Principle 3. Invoking *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4, we conclude to knowledge-*why* about ρ . In summary, we therefore obtain $\phi \lor \psi \Rightarrow \rho$.

Example 2.10. Assume that both rain and the sprinkler explain *why* the road is wet. In the notation of Example 2.5, this gives us the statements:

 $rain \Rightarrow wet$, $sprinkler \Rightarrow wet$.

Now, suppose we have knowledge-*that* either the sprinkler is on or it is raining. Then, by *natural necessity* in Principle 3, we conclude knowledge-*that* the road is wet and *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4 yields knowledge-*why* the road is wet. Hence, we can use the disjunction $rain \lor sprinkler$ to explain *wet*. Overall, we infer

 $rain \lor sprinkler \Rightarrow wet.$

In summary, *natural necessity* in Principle 3 and *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4 yield that *explainability* is represented by basic production inference relations.

Definition 2.8 (Basic Production Inference Relation). A basic production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is one that satisfies the following property:

If $\phi \Rightarrow \rho$ and $\psi \Rightarrow \rho$ holds, we find that $\phi \lor \psi \Rightarrow \rho$ is valid. (Or)

Note that this is equivalent to asserting that $\mathcal{C}(\Phi \cap \Psi) = \mathcal{C}(\Phi) \cap \mathcal{C}(\Psi)$ for all sets of propositional formulas Φ and Ψ .

We have now characterized the binary relations on propositional formulas that can represent *explainability* in the sense of Bochman (2021). Specifically, this allows us to define causal production inference relations:

Definition 2.9 (Causal Production Inference Relation). A **causal** production inference relation is one that is both regular and basic.

To summarize, *natural necessity* in Principle 3 and *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4 imply that knowledge-*that* and knowledge-*why* coincide within an area of science. By formalizing *explainability* through production inference relations, as enforced in Languages 6, 7, and Formalization 8, we find that the possible states of knowledge-*why* correspond to the causal worlds in Definition 2.6. According to Definition 2.8, we further find

$$\mathcal{C}(\Phi) = \bigcap_{\substack{\Phi \subseteq \omega \\ \omega \text{ world}}} \mathcal{C}(\omega)$$

for every consistent deductively closed set of propositional formulas Φ . We conclude that Bochman (2021) applies the following assertion:

Formalization 9. The production inference relations $(\Rightarrow)/2$ satisfies natural necessity in Principle 3 and sufficient causation in Assumption 4 if and only if it corresponds to the binary semantics

$$\mathcal{B} := \left\{ (\Phi, \Phi) \colon \Phi \text{ set of formulas, } \Phi = \bigcap_{\substack{\Phi \subseteq \omega \\ \omega \in \text{Causal}(\Rightarrow)}} \mathcal{C}(\omega) \right\}.$$

Hence, causal reasoning $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is uniquely determined by its causal worlds. In particular, Theorem 2.3 and Definition 2.8 yield that $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is a causal production inference relation.

Recall from Section 1.1.4, that an area of science describing a given situation gives rise to a set of external propositions \mathcal{E} that do not require further explanation. Language 6 then yields that \mathcal{E} is a set of propositional formulas. As outlined in Section 1.2, we commit ourselves to *causal foundation* in Principle 2, stating that a causal explanation should start from external premises. We conclude that a world ω is a causal world if and only if it can be explained by the external premises in $\omega \cap \mathcal{E}$. Hence, this work applies the following assertion:

Formalization 10. Assume the production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ satisfies natural necessity in Principle 3 and sufficient causation in Assumption 4 according to Formalization 9. The production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ then satisfies causal foundation in Principle 2 if and only if every causal world $\omega \in \text{Causal}(\Rightarrow)$ is explained by the external premises in $\omega \cap \mathcal{E}$, i.e., $\omega \cap \mathcal{E} \Rightarrow \omega$.

So far, as illustrated in Example 2.6, *explainability* has been represented by specifying the entire binary relation between explanans and explanandum within a causal production inference relation. Bochman (2021) further applies the idea from Principle 1, which states that causal relations are typically expressed in the form of rules or laws. He concludes that causal production inference relations should be stated as causal rules and theories.

Definition 2.10 (Causal Rules and Causal Theories). A **causal rule** R is an expression of the form

$$\phi \Rightarrow \psi$$

for two propositional formulas ϕ and ψ , where we call ϕ the **cause** and ψ the **effect** of *R*. A **default** is a causal rule of the form $\phi \Rightarrow \phi$. In addition, a **causal theory** Δ is a set of causal rules.

We denote by $(\Rightarrow_{\Delta})/2$ the smallest causal production inference relation such that $\phi \Rightarrow_{\Delta} \psi$ whenever $\phi \Rightarrow \psi \in \Delta$ and by \mathcal{C}_{Δ} the corresponding consequence operator. Observe that $\phi \Rightarrow_{\Delta} \psi$ if and only if $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ follows from Δ with the rules (Strengthening), (Weakening), (And), (Truth and Falsity), (Cut) and (Or) in Definitions 2.2, 2.5, and 2.8, i.e., all rules that apply for the implication in propositional calculus except reflexivity $\phi \rightarrow \phi$. A **causal world** of Δ is a causal world of the production inference relation $(\Rightarrow_{\Delta})/2$. Finally, we write Causal(Δ) := Causal(\Rightarrow_{Δ}) for the **causal worlds semantics** of Δ . **Remark 2.3.** For any set of propositional formulas Φ , the set $\mathcal{C}_{\Delta}(\Phi)$ consists of all formulas ψ such that $\Phi \Rightarrow \psi$ can be derived from Δ using the rules of (Strengthening), (Weakening), (And), (Truth and Falsity), (Cut), and (Or).

We conclude from Section 1.1.4 that, within an area of science describing a given situation, we identify a set of external premises \mathcal{E} that do not require demonstration. In Section 4.5.1 Bochman (2021) interprets *causal foundation* in Principle 2 as the assertion that these external premises $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ yield defaults in the corresponding causal theory Δ . Overall, he commits to the following representation:

Language 11. According to Principle 1, a causal theory Δ represents the causal knowledge within an area of science. In particular, we have $\phi \Rightarrow \psi \in \Delta$ if ϕ is a direct cause of ψ , i.e., there exists a demonstration for ψ with premise ϕ , and the external premises $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ yield defaults, i.e., $\epsilon \Rightarrow \epsilon \in \Delta$.

Bochman (2021) interprets $\phi \Rightarrow_{\Delta} \psi$ as ϕ explaining ψ , i.e., knowledge-that ϕ holds explains knowledge-why about ψ .

Deviating from Bochman (2021), this work interprets $\phi \Rightarrow_{\Delta} \psi$ as stating that there exists a demonstration for ψ with premise ϕ , i.e., only knowledge-why about ϕ explains knowledge-why about ψ .

Example 2.11. In the formalism of Example 2.5, we consider the following causal theory Δ :

$cloudy \Rightarrow cloudy$	$\neg cloudy \Rightarrow \neg cloudy$
$cloudy \Rightarrow rain$	$\neg rain \Rightarrow \neg rain$
$\neg cloudy \Rightarrow sprinkler$	$\neg sprinkler \Rightarrow \neg sprinkler$
$\mathit{rain} \lor \mathit{sprinkler} \Rightarrow \mathit{wet}$	$\neg wet \Rightarrow \neg wet$
$wet \Rightarrow slippery$	$\neg slippery \Rightarrow \neg slippery$

The causal theory Δ has the causal worlds of Example 2.9. Furthermore, note that the causal theory Δ is designed to model the situation in Example 1.1.

Example 2.12. Consider the following causal theory Δ :

$(rain \lor sprinkler) \Rightarrow (rain \lor sprinkler)$	
$(\neg rain \land \neg sprinkler) \Rightarrow (\neg rain \land \neg sprinkler)$	
$rain \lor sprinkler \Rightarrow wet$	$\neg wet \Rightarrow \neg wet$
$wet \Rightarrow slippery$	$\neg slippery \Rightarrow \neg slippery$

Note that Δ does not make a statement about the proposition *rain*. Hence, the event *rain* cannot be explained by Δ and therefore *rain* should be false in any causal world of Δ . As the same argument holds also for \neg *rain*, we conclude that there is no causal world of Δ . We conclude further that the causal world semantics and *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4 is only suitable if we have enough causal knowledge to pin down whole worlds exactly.

Recall that any world is the deductive closure of its literals and that disjunctions in the causes of a rule can be separated into distinct causal rules due to (Or) in Definition 2.8. Therefore, by applying *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4, we can restrict our analysis to determinate causal theories.

Definition 2.11 (Literal, Atomic and Determinate Causal Theory). A literal causal rule is a causal rule of the form $b_1 \wedge ... \wedge b_n \Rightarrow l$ for literals $b_1, ..., b_n, l$. If, in addition, $l \in \mathfrak{P}$ is an atom, we call the rule **atomic**. Furthermore, a **constraint** is a causal rule $b_1 \wedge ... \wedge b_n \Rightarrow \bot$ for literals $b_1, ..., b_n$.

Now, a causal theory Δ is called **literal** or **atomic** if it only mentions literal or atomic causal rules. A **determinate** causal theory $\Delta \cup \mathbf{C}$ is the union of a literal causal theory Δ and a set of constraints \mathbf{C} . We further say that $\Delta \cup \mathbf{C}$ is **atomic determinate** if the causal theory Δ is atomic. Lastly, a literal l is a **default** of a determinate causal theory Δ if $l \Rightarrow l \in \Delta$.

Remark 2.4. Bochman (2021) refers to atomic causal rules and theories by positive literal causal rules and theories, respectively. He uses the term positive determinate causal theory for an atomic determinate causal theory in our sense.

Upon committing to *causal rules* in Principle 1, as well as *natural necessity* in Principle 3 and *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4, Bochman (2021) adopts the following approach:

Language 12. Causal knowledge, which underpins explainability and is captured by causal production inference relations that satisfy natural necessity in Principle 3 and sufficient causation in Assumption 4, is expressed in the form of determinate causal theories, as defined in Definition 2.11.

Bochman (2021) obtains the following characterization for the causal worlds of a determinate causal theory.

Definition 2.12 (Completion of a Determinate Causal Theory). The **completion** $comp(\Delta)$ of a determinate causal theory Δ is the set of all propositional formulas

$$l \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{\phi \Rightarrow l \in \Delta} \phi,$$

where l is a literal or \perp .

Theorem 2.4 (Bochman (2005), Theorem 8.115). The causal world semantics Causal(Δ) of a determinate causal theory Δ coincides with the set of all models of its completion, i.e. Causal(Δ) := { ω world: $\omega \models \text{comp}(\Delta)$ }. \Box

Assume that the production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ satisfies sufficient causation in Assumption 4 and expresses complete causal knowledge, thereby determining a set of causal worlds. Let ω be a world such that $\omega \not\equiv p$ for some proposition $p \in \mathfrak{P}$. In this case, we find that either ω is a causal world, meaning $\omega \Rightarrow \neg p$, or that ω is not a causal world, meaning $\omega \Rightarrow \bot$.

Thus, we conclude that the causal world semantics of $(\Rightarrow)/2$ can be characterized through the negative completion of an atomic determinate causal theory.

Definition 2.13 (Negative Completion and Default Negation). The **negative** completion Δ^{nc} of the atomic determinate causal theory Δ is given by

$$\Delta^{nc} := \Delta \cup \{\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p : p \in \mathfrak{P}\}.$$

We say that a causal theory has **default negation** if it is the negative completion of all its atomic causal rules and constraints.

If we choose to restrict ourselves to causal theories with default negation, we treat negations as self-evident priors. This reflects the modeling assumption that our parameters have a default state, which can, without loss of generality, be set to false. In this way, the dynamic nature of causality can be captured, explaining how values deviate from their defaults.

Example 2.13. For instance, a schedule states the departure of trains or flights, but not when nothing is departing; i.e., the default is that no trains or airplanes depart. Analogously, humans are born as nonsmokers, and the event of them starting to smoke requires an explanation. Similarly, houses usually do not burn, i.e., only a fire requires an explanation.

In modeling such scenarios, we initially employ atomic causal rules to identify the direct causes of each proposition p. For example, we might assert $rain \Rightarrow wet$ and $sprinkler \Rightarrow wet$ to indicate that rain or the sprinkler causes the road to be wet. If these atomic causal rules do not explain the proposition p, we interpret this as an explanation for the falsity of p, i.e., $\neg p$. In Bochman's framework, this principle is captured by forming the negative completion, which additionally states a default $\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p$ for all propositions p. Specifically, the default $\neg sprinkler \Rightarrow \neg sprinkler$ implies that the sprinkler is switched off unless there is an explanation for sprinkler.

We conclude that causal theories with default negation implement the following modeling assumption:

Assumption 13 (Default Negation). Every negative literal $\neg p$ is an external premise of the area of science under consideration, i.e., $\neg p \in \mathcal{E}$.

Committing to Bochman's version of Language 11 and Language 12, Assumption 13 is expressed as follows:

Formalization 14. Assumption 13 means that, the given area of science yields a causal theory with default negation.

In Language 6 and 7, Bochman (2021) decides to represent explainability as a binary relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$ on formulas in a propositional alphabet \mathfrak{P} , which represent knowledge-*that*. Formalizations 8 and 9, expressing Principles 3, 5 and Assumption 4, yield that $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is a causal production inference relation. Formalization 9, expressing Principle 3 and Assumption 4, further yields that the corresponding knowledge-*why* is captured in the resulting causal worlds.

Committing to Principle 1 and Languages 11, 12, Bochman (2021) represents explainability as determinate causal theories. Finally, Formalization 14, expressing *default negation* in Assumption 13, yields that Δ is a causal theory with default negation. Overall, we showed the following theorem: **Theorem 2.5.** Applying the choices in Language 6, 7, 11 and 12 as well as Formalization 9, expressing Principles 1, 3, 5 and Assumption 4, yield that explainability gives rise to a causal production inference relation $(\Rightarrow_{\Delta})/2$, which is represented by a determinate causal theory Δ . The possible states of knowledge-why are represented by the causal world semantics Causal(Δ). Finally, applying Formalization 14, expressing Assumption 13, leads to a causal theory Δ with default negation. \Box

2.2. Critique of Bochman's Logical Theory of Causality

We present two potential drawbacks of Bochman's theory, as discussed in Section 2.1.2. First, we illustrate that Principle 2, as expressed in Formalization 10, may fail in the presence of cyclic causal relations. Second, we highlight potential issues arising from compound effects in causal rules.

2.2.1. Cyclic Causal Relations

Let us take a closer look at the notion of knowledge-why as it is proposed by Bochman (2021) and presented in Section 2.1.2. In particular, we focus on cases involving cyclic causal relations.

Example 2.14. Let h_1 and h_2 be two neighboring houses. Both houses may start to burn, denoted by *start_fire*(h_1) and *start_fire*(h_2), causing a fire in h_1 and h_2 , respectively. Furthermore, h_1 catches fire, denoted by *fire*(h_1), if h_2 burns, denoted by *fire*(h_2), and vice versa.

Accepting $start_fire(h_1)$ and $start_fire(h_2)$ as external premises, this situation is captured by the following causal theory with default negation:

$f_{mo}(h) \rightarrow f_{mo}(h)$	$f_{mo}(h) \rightarrow f_{mo}(h)$	(1)
$fire(n_2) \Rightarrow fire(n_1),$	$fire(n_1) \Rightarrow fire(n_2),$	(1)

 $start_fire(h_1) \Rightarrow fire(h_1), \qquad start_fire(h_2) \Rightarrow fire(h_2), \qquad (2)$

 $start_fire(h_1) \Rightarrow start_fire(h_1), \qquad start_fire(h_2) \Rightarrow start_fire(h_2), \qquad (3)$

$$\neg fire(h_1) \Rightarrow \neg fire(h_1), \qquad \neg fire(h_2) \Rightarrow \neg fire(h_2), \qquad (4)$$

$$\neg$$
start_fire(h₁) $\Rightarrow \neg$ start_fire(h₁), \neg start_fire(h₂) $\Rightarrow \neg$ start_fire(h₂). (5)

Upon committing to *natural necessity* in Principle 3 and *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4, Theorem 2.4 yields the following causal worlds:

$$\begin{split} \omega_1 &:= \emptyset, \\ \omega_2 &:= \{ fire(h_1), fire(h_2) \}, \\ \omega_3 &:= \{ start_fire(h_1), fire(h_1), fire(h_2) \}, \\ \omega_4 &:= \{ start_fire(h_2), fire(h_1), fire(h_2) \}, \\ \omega_5 &:= \{ start_fire(h_1), start_fire(h_2), fire(h_1), fire(h_2) \}. \end{split}$$

In the causal world ω_2 , both houses h_1 and h_2 catch fire even though neither of them started burning. This contradicts everyday causal reasoning, as we do not expect houses to catch fire because they potentially influence each other. In particular, we observe that (Strengthening) and (Cut) in Definitions 2.2 and 2.3 imply that $fire(h_1) \Rightarrow_{\Delta} fire(h_1)$, even though $fire(h_1)$ cannot be demonstrated from the external premises in $\neg start_fire(h_1)$, $\neg start_fire(h_2) \in \omega_2$.

This contradicts Principle 2, as expressed in Formalization 10, if we adopt Bochman's version of Language 11.

Example 2.14 illustrates a drawback of the approach in Bochman (2021), where Principle 2, as expressed in Formalization 10, fails in the presence of cyclic causal relations, leading to circular "explanations" and counterintuitive results.

2.2.2. Compound Effects

Note that Aristotle did not study causal relations involving disjunctions or implications in the effect. In particular, it is unclear what it means to have a demonstration of a (logical) implication. As the following example illustrates, the approach in Bochman (2021) leads to "demonstrations" that allow conclusions to be drawn against the direction of cause and effect:

Example 2.15. Let Δ be a causal theory consisting of the causal rules:

$$\begin{array}{ll} a \Rightarrow a, & a \Rightarrow (a \rightarrow b), & b \Rightarrow a, \\ \neg a \Rightarrow \neg a, & \neg b \Rightarrow \neg b. \end{array}$$

In this case, (And) in Definition 2.2 yields $a \Longrightarrow_{\Delta} a \land (a \to b)$, and (Weakening) in Definition 2.2 yields $a \Longrightarrow_{\Delta} b$. This seems problematic, as the "demonstration" of b with premise a relies on the implication " $a \to b$ ", which contradicts the causal direction.

Since it is unclear what it means for an implication to be caused or whether entailment $(\vdash)/2$ in classical propositional logic is the appropriate choice in the (Weakening) axiom of Definition 2.2, Example 2.15 highlights a potential issue with general compound effects.

2.3. Causal Systems: A Generic Representation of Causal Reasoning

To address the issues raised in Remark 1.2 and Section 2.2, this work proposes the following notion of a deterministic causal system:

Definition 2.14 (Causal System). Let \mathfrak{P} be a propositional alphabet. A (deterministic) causal system is a tuple $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$, where:

- Δ is a literal causal theory called the **causal knowledge** of **CS**.
- \mathcal{E} is a set of literals called the **external premises** of **CS**.
- \mathcal{O} is a set of formulas called the **observations** of **CS**.

The causal system **CS** is without observations if $\mathcal{O} = \emptyset$. Otherwise, the causal system **CS** observes something. Furthermore, the causal system **CS** applies default negation if every negative literal $\neg p$ for $p \in \mathfrak{P}$ is an external premise, i.e., $\neg p \in \mathcal{E}$.

Example 2.16. Let Δ be the causal theory consisting of Rules (1) and (2) in Example 2.14:

$fire(h_2) \Rightarrow fire(h_1),$	$fire(h_1) \Rightarrow fire(h_2),$
$start_fire(h_1) \Rightarrow fire(h_1),$	$start_fire(h_2) \Rightarrow fire(h_2).$

We specify the observation $\mathcal{O} = \emptyset$ and external premises

$$\mathcal{E} := \{ start_fire(X), \neg start_fire(X), \neg fire(X) \mid X \in \{h_1, h_2\} \}$$

to obtain the causal system without observations $\mathbf{CS}_1 := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset)$.

If we additionally observe a fire in house h_1 , i.e., $\mathcal{O} := \{fire(h_1)\}$, this yields the causal system $\mathbf{CS}_2 := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \{fire(h_1)\})$ that observes something. Note that both causal systems \mathbf{CS}_1 and \mathbf{CS}_2 apply default negation.

This work uses Definition 2.10 together with the following guideline:

Language 15. Fix an area of science, as described in Section 1.2, which gives rise to a set of external premises \mathcal{E} that do not require further explanation. According to Principle 1, causal knowledge is stated in a causal theory Δ containing a causal rule $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ whenever the formula ϕ is a direct cause of the formula ψ , i.e., there exists a demonstration of ψ with premise ϕ . Finally, formalize all observations in a set of formulas \mathcal{O} to obtain a causal system $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$.

Hereby, we address the concerns in Remark 1.2 and Section 2.2.2 by committing to the following assumption:

Assumption 16. The causal theory Δ in Language 15 is literal.

According to causal foundation in Principle 2, explanations should start with external premises in \mathcal{E} . This motivated the following definition:

Definition 2.15 (Semantics of Causal Systems). Let $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ be a causal system. The **explanatory closure** of **CS** is the causal theory

$$\Delta(\mathbf{CS}) := \Delta \cup \{l \Rightarrow l \mid l \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

The consequence operator C of **CS** is the consequence operator of the explanatory closure $\Delta(\mathbf{CS})$.

A causal world ω is a world that satisfies $\mathcal{C}(\omega \cap \mathcal{E}) = \omega$ and $\omega \models \mathcal{O}$. The set of all causal worlds Causal(CS) is called the causal world semantics of CS.

The system **CS** has **knowledge**-*that* about a formula ϕ , written **CS** $\models \phi$, if $\phi \in \omega$ for all causal worlds $\omega \in \text{Causal}(\mathbf{CS})$. Finally, the causal system **CS** := $(\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ has **knowledge**-*why* about a formula ϕ , written **CS** $\models \phi$, if $(\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset) \models \phi$. **Example 2.17.** In the situation of Examples 2.14 and 2.16, we find that the causal system $\mathbf{CS}_1 := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset)$ has the causal world semantics:

$Causal(\mathbf{CS}_1) = \{\omega_1, \omega_3, \omega_4, \omega_5\}.$

Applying causal foundation in Principle 2 and sufficient causation in Assumption 4, the system \mathbf{CS}_1 assumes that the causal production inference relation $(\Rightarrow_{\Delta(\mathbf{CS})})/2$ explains the occurrence of every possible event based on premises in \mathcal{E} . Since it cannot explain why $fire(h_i) \in \omega_2$, it refutes ω_2 , meaning that ω_2 is not a causal world. As the system \mathbf{CS}_1 is without observations, it possesses knowledge-why.

The causal system $\mathbf{CS}_2 := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \{fire(h_1)\})$ additionally observes a fire in house h_1 and therefore additionally refutes the world ω_1 . It has the causal world semantics:

$$Causal(\mathbf{CS}_2) = Causal(\mathbf{CS}_1) \setminus \{\omega_1\}.$$
that

We observe that $\mathbf{CS}_2 \models start_fire(h_1) \lor start_fire(h_2)$, meaning that the system has knowledge-*that* one of the two houses has started to burn. Since concluding from the observation *fire*(h_1) to the event *start_fire*(h_1) \lor *start_fire*(h_2) goes against the causal direction, this does not constitute knowledge-*why*.

Fix an area of science with observations that is captured in a causal system $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ according to Language 15. Note that the explanatory closure $\Delta(\mathbf{CS})$ is the causal theory obtained by Language 11 and $\phi \Rightarrow_{\Delta(\mathbf{CS})} \psi$ means that knowledge-*why* about ϕ yields knowledge-*why* about ψ . From Section 2.2.1, we conclude that, in general, $\Delta(\mathbf{CS})$ yields a causal production inference relation that does not satisfy Principle 2 as stated in Formalization 10 and, therefore, results in too many causal worlds.

In Definition 2.15, we enforce Principle 2 by requiring that each causal world ω is fully explained by the external propositions in $\omega \cap \mathcal{E}$, i.e., $\mathcal{C}(\omega \cap \mathcal{E}) = \omega$. According to *natural necessity* in Principle 3 and *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4 as stated in Formalization 10, explainability $(\Rightarrow)/2$ is uniquely determined by its causal worlds. We conclude that Definition 2.15 provides the correct formalization of explainability and knowledge-*why* within the given area of science. Finally, we note that the given area of science satisfies *default negation* in Assumption 13 if and only if the causal system **CS** applies default negation.

Formalization 17. Let us apply Language 15 together with Assumption 16 and express a given area of science with observations in a causal system

$$CS := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}).$$

Furthermore, apply Languages 6, 7 and Formalization 8, expressing Principle 5, to represent explainability by a production inference relation $(\Rightarrow)/2$. Explainability $(\Rightarrow)/2$ then satisfies Principles 2 and 3, as well as Assumptions 4 if and only if it is determined by the causal world semantics of **CS** as indicated in Formalization 10. It then possesses knowledge-that and knowledge-why as indicated in Definition 2.15. Finally, Assumption 13 is satisfied if and only if the causal system **CS** applies default negation.

2.4. Interpreting Pearl's Structural Causal Models as Causal Systems

Finally, we show how the structural causal models of Pearl (2000) can be interpreted as causal systems. This allows us to apply Language 15 and Formalization 17 to evaluate the kind of knowledge provided by this formalism. Section 2.4.1 introduces the structural causal models of Pearl (2000), and Section 2.4.2 interprets these models as causal systems.

2.4.1. Pearl's Functional Causal Models

Pearl (2000) suggests modeling causal relationships with deterministic functions. This leads to the following definition of structural causal models.

Definition 2.16 (Structural Causal Model (Pearl, 2000, §7.1.1)). A (Boolean) structural causal model $\mathcal{M} := (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}, \operatorname{Error}, \operatorname{Pa}, \mathbf{F})$, is a tuple, where

- U is a finite set of **external** variables representing the part of the world outside the model
- V is a finite set of **internal** variables determined by the causal relationships in the model
- Error(_) is a function assigning to each internal variable $V \in \mathbf{V}$ its error terms $\operatorname{Error}(V) \subseteq \mathbf{U}$, i.e. the external variables V directly depends on
- Pa(_) is a function assigning to each internal variable $V \in \mathbf{V}$ its **parents** Pa(V) $\subseteq \mathbf{V}$, i.e. the set of internal variables V directly depends on
- $\mathbf{F}(-)$ is a function assigning to every internal variable $V \in \mathbf{V}$ a map

 $\mathbf{F}(V) := F_V : \{ \mathit{True, False} \}^{\operatorname{Pa}(V)} \times \{ \mathit{True, False} \}^{\operatorname{Error}(V)} \to \{ \mathit{True, False} \},$

which itself assigns to each value assignments pa(V) and error(V) of the parents Pa(V) and the error terms Error(V), respectively, a value

$$F_V(\operatorname{pa}(V), \operatorname{error}(V)) \in \{ \operatorname{True}, \operatorname{False} \}.$$

Here, for a subset of variables $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{U} \cup \mathbf{V}$, a value assignment is a function $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{X} \to \{ \text{True}, \text{False} \}$. A situation is a value assignment \mathbf{u} for the external variables \mathbf{U} . Finally, we identify \mathcal{M} with the system of equations

$$\mathcal{M} := \{ V := F_V(\operatorname{Pa}(V), \operatorname{Error}(V)) \}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}.$$

A solution s of \mathcal{M} then is a value assignment on the variables $\mathbf{U} \cup \mathbf{V}$ such that each equation in \mathcal{M} is satisfied.

To a structural causal model \mathcal{M} we associate its **causal diagram** or **causal** structure graph(\mathcal{M}), which is the directed graph on the internal variables \mathbf{V} obtained by drawing an edge $p \to q$ if and only if $p \in \operatorname{Pa}(q)$. The model \mathcal{M} is acyclic if its causal structure graph(\mathcal{M}) is a directed acyclic graph.

Remark 2.5. The solutions of a structural causal model can be interpreted as Pearl's formalization of knowledge-*why*, as described in Section 1.1.3.

Notation 2.1. Note that the parents Pa(V) and the error terms Error(V) of an internal variable $V \in \mathbf{V}$ can usually be read from the defining function F_V . Hence, in the following, we will not explicitly specify the parent map $Pa(_)$ and error term map $Error(_)$.

Example 2.18. The situation in Example 1.1 is represented by a structural causal model \mathcal{M} with internal variables $\mathbf{V} := \{rain, sprinkler, wet, slippery\},$ external variables $\mathbf{U} := \{cloudy\}$ and with functions, given by the equations

$$\mathcal{M}$$
: rain := cloudy sprinkler := \neg cloudy wet := rain \lor sprinkler slippery := wet.

We find for instance that $Pa(wet) = \{sprinkler\}$ and $Error(rain) = \{cloudy\}$. The causal structure graph(\mathcal{M}) of \mathcal{M} is the directed graph:



Hence, we conclude that \mathcal{M} is an acyclic causal model.

Structural causal models are of interest because they can represent the effects of external interventions:

Definition 2.17 (Modified Causal Model). Fix a structural causal model

$$\mathcal{M} := (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}, \operatorname{Error}, \operatorname{Pa}, \mathbf{F})$$

Given a subset of internal variables $I \subseteq V$ with a value assignment i, we define the modified (causal) model or submodel as:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{i}} := (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}, \operatorname{Error}, \operatorname{Pa}, \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{i}}).$$

In particular, we replace the function \mathbf{F} with \mathbf{F}_{i} , which is given by setting

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{i}}(V)(\mathrm{pa}(V),\mathrm{error}(V)) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{i}(V), & \text{if } V \in \mathbf{I}, \\ \mathbf{F}(V)(\mathrm{pa}(V),\mathrm{error}(V)), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

for every internal variable $V \in \mathbf{V}$, where pa(V) and error(V) denote value assignments for the parents Pa(V) and the error terms Error(V), respectively.

Notation 2.2. Let $V \in \mathbf{V}$ be an internal variable of a structural causal model \mathcal{M} . In this case, we write $\mathcal{M}_V := \mathcal{M}_{V:=True}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\neg V} := \mathcal{M}_{V:=False}$.

According to Chapter 7 of Pearl (2000), the key idea is that the modified model \mathcal{M}_i represents the minimal change to a model \mathcal{M} necessary to enforce the values specified by i.

Example 2.19. If we switch the sprinkler off in the model of Example 2.18, we obtain the modified model $\mathcal{M}_{\neg sprinkler} := \mathcal{M}_{sprinkler:=False}$, which is given by the following equations:

$$\mathcal{M}_{sprinkler}$$
: rain := cloudy, sprinkler := False, wet := rain \lor sprinkler, slippery := wet.

As in Example 2.19 our actions often force a variable in a causal model to attain a new value. Introducing the **do-operator** by setting

$$\mathcal{M}^{ ext{do}(\mathbf{i})} := \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{i}}$$

for a structural causal model \mathcal{M} and a value assignment on internal variables **i**, Pearl (2000) emphasizes that submodels $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{do}(\mathbf{i})}$ often result from doing something that forces some variables to values according to the assignment **i**. To obtain well-defined results, Pearl (2000) restricts himself to the study of functional causal models.

Definition 2.18 (Functional Causal Model). We say that a structural causal model $\mathcal{M} := (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{R}, \operatorname{Error}, \operatorname{Pa}, \mathbf{F})$ is a **(functional) causal model** if for each value assignment **i** on a subset of internal variables $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ every situation **u** of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{i}}$ yields a unique solution $\mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbf{u})$ of the modified model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{i}}$.

Remark 2.6. Acyclic structural causal model are functional causal models.

Example 2.20. Reconsider the causal model from Example 2.18 and assume that it is sunny. This corresponds to the situation \mathbf{u} , where cloudy = False. By analyzing the model \mathcal{M} and the modified model $\mathcal{M}_{\neg sprinkler}$ from Example 2.19, we find that slippery = True in the solution $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u})$, whereas slippery = False in the solution of the modified model $\mathbf{s}_{\neg sprinkler}(\mathbf{u})$. We conclude that the road will become dry if we intervene by manually switching off the sprinkler.

2.4.2. Interpreting Pearl's Structural Causal Models as Causal Systems

Causal systems without observations that apply default negation can also serve as a language for the structural causal models of Pearl (2000).

Definition 2.19 (Bochman Transformation). The **Bochman transformation** of a structural causal model $\mathcal{M} := (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}, \operatorname{Error}, \operatorname{Pa}, \mathbf{F})$ is the causal system without observation $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M}) := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset)$, defined as follows:

$$\Delta := \{ F_V \Rightarrow V \mid V \in \mathbf{V} \}, \qquad \mathcal{E} := \mathbf{U} \cup \{ \neg V \mid V \in \mathbf{U} \cup \mathbf{V} \}.$$

Example 2.21. Let $\mathcal{M} := (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}, \operatorname{Error}, \operatorname{Pa}, \mathbf{F})$ be as in Example 2.18. The Bochman transformation $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M}) := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset)$ is given by

 $\Delta := \{ cloudy \Rightarrow rain, \neg cloudy \Rightarrow sprinkler, r... \lor spr... \Rightarrow wet, wet \Rightarrow slippery \}$ $\mathcal{E} := \{ cloudy, \neg cloudy, \neg sprinkler, \neg rain, \neg wet, \neg slippery \}.$

Remark 2.7. Assuming that the functions $F_V(\text{pa}(V), \text{error}(V))$ are in disjunctive normal form and applying (Or) of Definition 2.8, we see that the Bochman transformation $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M})$ indeed yields a causal system with default negation while preserving the causal worlds.

Example 2.22. The causal theory Δ in Example 2.21 yields the atomic theory:

$cloudy \Rightarrow rain$	$\neg cloudy \Rightarrow sprinkler$	
$rain \Rightarrow wet$	$sprinkler \Rightarrow wet$	$wet \Rightarrow slippery$

The causal worlds ω of the Bochman transformation $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M})$ of a causal model \mathcal{M} correspond to solutions of \mathcal{M} .

Theorem 2.6. If \mathcal{M} is a structural causal model, every causal world ω of the Bochman transformation $CS(\mathcal{M})$ yields a solution of \mathcal{M} . The converse also holds if we additionally assume that the causal model \mathcal{M} is acyclic.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.4, as every possible world of $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M})$ is a model of the completion of the explanatory closure $\Delta(\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M}))$.

Applying Formalization 17 and Theorem 2.6, causal systems define the feasible solutions of structural causal models that align with Principles 2, 3, 5, as well as Assumptions 4 and 13. Since the Bochman transformation associates each structural causal model \mathcal{M} with a causal system without observations, we conclude the following result:

Corollary 2.7. Acyclic structural causal models represent knowledge-why.

Here, we conclude that the Bochman transformation extends the theory of causality in Pearl (2000) beyond the scope of acyclic causal models. In an upcoming paper, Rückschloß and Weikämper show that abductive logic programming, under the stable model semantics of Gelfond and Lifschitz (1988), correctly generalizes Pearl's theory beyond acyclic Boolean causal models.

2.5. External Interventions in Causal Systems

Recall that the key idea of modeling an external intervention \mathbf{i} is to minimally modify the causal description for a given situation so that \mathbf{i} is enforced as true. We propose the following approach to handling external interventions in causal systems, which also accounts for modifications to external premises.

Definition 2.20 (Modified Causal Systems). Let $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ be a causal system, and let **i** be a value assignment on a set of atoms $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}$. To represent the intervention of forcing the atoms in **I** to attain values according to the assignment **i**, we construct the **modified causal system**

$$\mathbf{CS}_{\mathbf{i}} := (\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathcal{O}),$$

which is obtained from **CS** by applying the following modifications:

- Remove all rules $\phi \Rightarrow p \in \Delta$ and $\phi \Rightarrow \neg p \in \Delta$ for all $p \in \mathbf{I}$.
- Remove external premises $p \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\neg p \in \mathcal{E}$ if $p \in \mathbf{I}$.
- Add a rule $\top \Rightarrow l$ to $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}$ for all literals $l \in \mathbf{i}$.

Remark 2.8. According to Remark 1.1, the causal rules of the form $\top \Rightarrow l$ in the modified causal system of Definition 2.20 require additional justification. This suggests potential issues regarding the interpretation of external interventions, as discussed, for instance, in Dong (2023).

Example 2.23. Recall the causal system $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset)$ from Example 2.21. Suppose we switch the sprinkler off, as in Example 2.19, by intervening according to $\mathbf{i} := \{\neg sprinkler\}$. This yields the modified system $\mathbf{CS}_{\mathbf{i}} := (\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{i}}, \emptyset)$, where:

 $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}} := \{ \top \Rightarrow \neg sprinkler, \ cloudy \Rightarrow rain, \ sprinkler \lor rain \Rightarrow wet, \ wet \Rightarrow slippery \}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{i}} = \{ cloudy, \ \neg cloudy, \ \neg rain, \ \neg wet, \ \neg slippery \}.$

If, instead, we switch the sprinkler on, i.e., $\mathbf{i} := \{sprinkler\}$, we obtain:

 $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}} := \{ \top \Rightarrow sprinkler, \ cloudy \Rightarrow rain, \ rain \lor sprinkler \Rightarrow wet, \ wet \Rightarrow slippery \}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{i}} := \{ cloudy, \ \neg cloudy, \ \neg rain, \ \neg wet, \ \neg slippery \}.$

Finally, suppose Petrus intervenes and forces the weather to be sunny, i.e., he intervenes according to $\mathbf{i} := \{\neg cloudy\}$. This yields:

 $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}} := \{ \top \Rightarrow \neg cloudy \} \cup \Delta, \quad \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{i}} := \{ \neg sprinkler, \ \neg rain, \ \neg wet, \ \neg slippery \}.$

As expected, the concept of intervention, defined in Definition 2.20, behaves consistently with the Bochman transformation in Definition 2.19.

Proposition 2.8. For any structural causal model $\mathcal{M} := (U, V, \text{Error}, \text{Pa}, F)$ and any truth value assignment *i* on the internal variables $I \subseteq V$, the causal systems $CS(\mathcal{M}_i)$ and $CS(\mathcal{M})_i$ have the same causal worlds.

Proof. We may, without loss of generality, assume that we intervene on only one variable, i.e., $\mathbf{i} := \{l\}$.

Case. Suppose we have $\mathbf{i} = \{p\}$ for some atom $p \in \mathfrak{P}$.

The causal systems $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{i}})$ and $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M})_{\mathbf{i}}$ coincide, except that $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{i}})$ includes the external premise $\neg p$, whereas $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M})_{\mathbf{i}}$ does not. However, since both systems contain the rule $\top \Rightarrow p$, the external premise $\neg p$ cannot be used to explain any world ω without leading to a contradiction \bot . We conclude that $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{i}})$ and $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M})_{\mathbf{i}}$ have the same causal worlds, as desired.

Case. Suppose we have $\mathbf{i} = \{\neg p\}$ for some atom $p \in \mathfrak{P}$.

The causal systems $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M}_i)$ and $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M})_i$ differ in the following ways:

- The system $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{i}})$ includes the rule $\perp \Rightarrow p$ and the external premise $\neg p$.
- The system $\mathbf{CS}(\mathcal{M})_i$ includes the rule $\top \Rightarrow \neg p$ but no external premise $\neg p$.

According to Theorem 4.23 in Bochman (2021), the rule $\perp \Rightarrow p$ cannot be used to explain a causal world. Therefore, in the absence of an external premise p, the external premise $\neg p$ is equivalent to stating the rule $\top \Rightarrow \neg p$.

Let $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ be a causal system, and let **i** be a value assignment on a set of atoms $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}$, leading to the modified causal system $\mathbf{CS}_{\mathbf{i}} := (\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathcal{O})$. We make the following assumption.

Assumption 18. The effect of an intervention according to i propagates only along the causal direction. Therefore, a formula ϕ is guaranteed to hold after intervening according to i only if the modified causal system CS_i possesses knowledge-why about ϕ .

Assumption 18 motivates the following definition:

Definition 2.21 (Semantics of External Interventions). Let $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ be a causal system, and let **i** be a value assignment on a set of atoms $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}$, leading to the modified causal system $\mathbf{CS}_{\mathbf{i}} := (\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathcal{O})$. We say that **CS knows** that a formula ϕ is true **after intervening** according to **i**, written $\mathbf{CS} \stackrel{\text{do}(\mathbf{i})}{\models} \phi$, if and only if $\mathbf{CS}_{\mathbf{i}} \models \phi$.

According to Pearl (2000), the joint act of intervening and observing generally leads to *counterfactual reasoning* – i.e., reasoning about alternative worlds – which lies beyond the scope of this work. Counterfactual reasoning yields statements of the form:

"Formula ϕ would have been true, had we intervened according to i."

rather than:

"Formula ϕ becomes true, if we intervene according to **i**."

Finally, we highlight that the notion of intervention in Definition 2.20 relies on the following assumption:

Assumption 19 (Causal Independence). Intervening with the truth value assignment *i* on the atoms $I \subseteq \mathfrak{P}$ has no influence on the external premises in \mathcal{E}_i .

To summarize, we argue for the following result.

Formalization 20. Let us fix an area of science such that Formalization 15 yields a causal system CS. Under these conditions, and given Assumptions 18 and 19, Definitions 2.20 and 2.21 correctly characterize the knowledge represented by CS regarding the effects of external interventions.

2.6. The Constraint and Explanatory Content of Causal Reasoning

Causal systems assess whether they possess knowledge-*that* or knowledge-*why* concerning the occurrence of an event. Next, we extend them to incorporate degrees of belief, represented by probabilities. As a prerequisite for this extension, we reformulate their semantics. Following Bochman (2021), we observe that causal theories can be separated into constraint and explanatory components:

Definition 2.22 (Constraint and Explanatory Content). The constraint content of a causal rule $R := (\phi \Rightarrow \psi)$ is the corresponding implication

 $\operatorname{constraint}(R) := \operatorname{constraint}(\phi \Rightarrow \psi) := (\phi \to \psi).$

For a causal theory Δ , the **constraint content** is defined to be

$$\operatorname{constraint}(\Delta) := \{\operatorname{constraint}(R) : R \in \Delta\}$$

The **explanatory content** of Δ for a world ω is the causal theory

$$\Delta|_{\omega} := \{ R \in \Delta : \omega \models \operatorname{constraint}(R) \}.$$

For a causal system $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ the constraint content is given by

 $\operatorname{constraint}(\mathbf{CS}) := \operatorname{constraint}(\Delta),$

and the explanatory content is defined to be

$$\mathbf{CS}|_{\omega} := (\Delta|_{\omega}, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset).$$

In this case, we denote by $\mathcal{C}|_{\omega}$ the corresponding consequence operator.

The constraint and explanatory content of a causal system **CS** allows for the definition of the following events.

Definition 2.23 (Explainability). Let $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ be a causal system, and let ω be a world. A formula ϕ is **explainable** in ω , written $\omega \models \operatorname{explains}(\phi)$, if

$$\phi \in \mathcal{C}|_{\omega}(\omega \cap \mathcal{E}) \quad \text{or} \quad \neg \phi \in \mathcal{C}|_{\omega}(\omega \cap \mathcal{E}).$$

A world ω satisfies (natural) necessity with respect to **CS** if $\omega \models \text{constraint}(\mathbf{CS})$. A world ω is **explainable** with respect to **CS** if all formulas $\phi \in \omega$ are explainable, i.e., $\omega \models \text{explains}(\phi)$ for all formulas ϕ , or equivalently, $\omega \models \text{explains}(l)$ for all literals l. The event necessary(**CS**) that **CS** satisfies (natural) necessity is the set

necessary(
$$\mathbf{CS}$$
) := { ω world: $\omega \models \text{constraint}(\mathbf{CS})$ }.

The event that **CS** is (causally) sufficient is the set of all explainable worlds,

sufficient(**CS**) := { ω world: $\omega \models \text{explains}(l)$ for all literals l}.

We start with the following observation about causal rules, which can also be found in Chapter 3 of Bochman (2021).

Lemma 2.9. Stating a causal rule $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ in a causal theory Δ is equivalent to stating the constraint $\phi \land \neg \psi \Rightarrow \bot$ and the explanatory rule $\phi \land \psi \Rightarrow \psi$.

Proof. Assume $\phi \Rightarrow \psi \in \Delta$. We show that $\phi \land \neg \psi \Rightarrow \bot$ and $\phi \land \psi \Rightarrow \psi$ can be obtained by using the axioms of a causal production inference relation:

Applying (Falsity) and (Stengthening) in Definition 2.2 we obtain

$$\phi \wedge \psi \wedge \neg \psi \Rightarrow \perp$$
.

Next, apply (Cut) of Definition 2.5 to obtain the desired constraint

$$\phi \wedge \neg \psi \Rightarrow \bot.$$

Note that the explanatory rule $\phi \wedge \psi \Rightarrow \psi$ follows from (Strengthening) in Definition 2.2.

Next , assume the $\phi \land \neg \psi \Rightarrow \bot \in \Delta$ and $\phi \land \psi \Rightarrow \psi \in \Delta$. We show now that the rule $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ follows as before:

Applying (Weakening) in Definition 2.2, we find

$$\phi \land \neg \psi \Rightarrow \psi.$$

Hence, (Or) in Definition 2.8 and (Strengthening) in Definition 2.2 yield

$$\phi \Rightarrow \psi$$
.

We are now able to give the desired reformulation of the semantics of causal systems.

Proposition 2.10. Let $CS := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ be a causal system. A world ω is a causal world of CS if and only if

 $\omega \in \operatorname{necessary}(CS) \cap \operatorname{sufficient}(CS) \cap \mathcal{O},$

where we identify the observations \mathcal{O} with the set of all worlds $\omega \models \mathcal{O}$.

Proof. Assume that ω is a causal world of **CS**. According to Definition 2.15, it follows that $\omega = \mathcal{C}(\omega \cap \mathcal{E})$ and $\omega \models \mathcal{O}$, i.e., $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$.

Suppose there is a causal rule $R := (\phi \Rightarrow \psi) \in \Delta$ such that $\omega \not\models \text{constraint}(R)$, i.e., $\omega \models \phi \land \neg \psi$. According to Lemma 2.9, we may, without loss of generality, assume that $\phi \land \neg \psi \Rightarrow \bot \in \Delta$.

Since $\omega = \mathcal{C}(\omega \cap \mathcal{E})$, it follows that $(\omega \cap \mathcal{E}) \Rightarrow_{\Delta} \phi \land \neg \psi$. Next, applying (Cut) in Definition 2.5 yields $(\mathcal{E} \cap \omega) \Rightarrow_{\Delta} \bot$ and $\bot \in \mathcal{C}(\omega \cap \mathcal{E})$, which contradicts the fact $\omega = \mathcal{C}(\omega \cap \mathcal{E})$. Hence, $\omega \models \text{constraint}(\mathbf{CS})$ and $\omega \in \text{necessary}(\mathbf{CS})$.

Since $\Delta = \Delta|_{\omega}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}|_{\omega}$, ω is explainable with **CS**, i.e., $\omega \in \text{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS})$.

Conversely, assume that $\omega \in \operatorname{necessary}(\mathbf{CS}) \cap \operatorname{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS}) \cap \mathcal{O}$. It follows that $\omega \models \operatorname{constraint}(\mathbf{CS}), \ \omega \models \mathcal{O}, \ \operatorname{and} \ \mathcal{C}|_{\omega}(\omega \cap \mathcal{E}) = \omega$. Thus, $\Delta|_{\omega} = \Delta$ and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}|_{\omega}$, concluding that ω is a causal world.

Let $\mathbf{CS} := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$ be a causal system. Recall that the axioms of a causal production inference relation in Definitions 2.2, 2.5, and 2.8 capture all properties of implication except reflexivity, i.e., $\phi \to \phi$. Hence, we argue for the following result:

Formalization 21 (Natural Necessity). Within a world ω , explainability, as represented by a causal system $CS := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$, satisfies natural necessity as stated in Principle 3 if and only if $\omega \models \text{constraint}(CS)$.

Thus, the set necessary (CS) consists of all worlds in which natural necessity, as defined in Principle 3, holds.

If we abandon *natural necessity* in Principle 3, then *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4 ensures that every world is explainable. We argue for the following result:

Formalization 22 (Sufficient Causation). Within a world ω , explainability, as represented by a causal system $CS := (\Delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O})$, satisfies sufficient causation as stated in Assumption 4 if and only if $\omega \models \text{explains}(l)$ for all literals l.

Thus, the set sufficient(CS) consists of all worlds in which sufficient causation, as defined in Assumption 4, holds.

3. Knowledge-why under Uncertainty

Since knowledge about the real world typically involves uncertainty, the next goal is to extend Aristotle's areas of science, as represented by causal systems in Section 2, by incorporating degrees of belief, specifically probabilities.

3.1. Preliminaries

As in Section 2, we begin by gathering the prerequisites for our endeavor: Section 3.1.1 introduces the basics of probability theory, and Section 3.1.2 reviews the principle of maximum entropy. Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 introduce Bayesian networks and probabilistic causal models – formalisms for representing probabilistic causal knowledge – along with the notions of external intervention from Pearl (2000).

3.1.1. Probability Theory

In this work, we restrict ourselves to finite probability spaces and reason about events using the basic terminology of random variables, conditional probabilities and independence. This material can be found in various introductory texts such as Chapter 5 of Michelucci (2024).

Example 3.1. Consider a field with a sprinkler in it. The grass is wet if the sprinkler is on or if it rains. We model this scenario using the random variables:

$sprinkler: \{ True, False \} \rightarrow \{ True, False \},$	$x\mapsto x,$
$rain: \{ True, False \} \rightarrow \{ True, False \},\$	$x\mapsto x,$
wet: { $True, False$ } \rightarrow { $True, False$ },	$x \mapsto x.$

Here, sprinkler = True indicates that the sprinkler is on, rain = True indicates that it is raining, and wet = True indicates that the grass is wet. A value assignment to the set of random variables $\mathfrak{P} := \{sprinkler, rain, wet\}$ defines a world $\omega : \mathfrak{P} \to \{True, False\}$, where \mathfrak{P} is understood as a propositional alphabet. A joint distribution on \mathfrak{P} is a distribution over the random variable

 $sprinkler \times rain \times wet : \{True, False\}^3 \rightarrow \{True, False\}^3, (x, y, z) \mapsto (x, y, z).$

For instance, we obtain a joint distribution by setting

 $\pi(False, False, False) := \pi(\neg sprinkler, \neg rain, \neg wet) = 0.2, \\ \pi(True, False, True) := \pi(sprinkler, \neg rain, wet) = 0.3, \\ \pi(False, True, True) := \pi(\neg sprinkler, rain, wet) = 0.2, \\ \pi(True, True, True) := \pi(sprinkler, rain, wet) = 0.3, \\ \pi(Sprinkler, rain, wet)$

and defining $\pi(\omega) = 0$ for the remaining worlds ω .

The sprinkler is on if the first component x of a tuple $(x, y, z) \in \{ True, False \}^3$ is true. Defining the projection onto the first component as

$$\pi_1: \{ True, False \}^3 \to \{ True, False \}, (x, y, z) \mapsto x,$$

we find that

$$sprinkler = \pi_1 \circ (sprinkler \times rain \times wet).$$

Thus, the probability that the sprinkler is on is given by

$$\pi(sprinkler) = \pi(\pi_1 \circ (sprinkler \times rain \times wet) = True) = \pi(sprinkler, \neg rain, wet) + \pi(sprinkler, rain, wet) = 0.6.$$

Informally, we adopt the viewpoint of Bayesianism, where the probability $\pi(A) \in [0, 1]$ of an event $A \subseteq \Omega$ represents a rational agent's degree of belief in A being true. Here, "rational" means that, for any amount of money $S \in \mathbb{R}$, the agent is willing to place at most $\pi(A) \cdot S$ on the truth of A in a bet with a return of S (Williamson, 2009, pp.500-501). When observing an event B, a rational agent is supposed to revise his beliefs by conditioning on the event B.

3.1.2. The Principle of Maximum Entropy

Fix a sample space Ω together with *n* probabilities $\pi(A_i) \in [0, 1]$ of pairwise disjoint events A_i , where $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. We expect a rational agent to assume the distribution π on Ω according to the principle of indifference:

Principle 23 (Indifference). Two events are equally probable if there is no reason to prefer one over the other.

Example 3.2. Consider a six-sided die, which gives rise to the sample space $\Omega := \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ of outcomes. If we have no further information about the die, according to *indifference* in Principle 23, we consider the die to be fair, i.e., we assume that throwing the die results in *i* with a probability of $\pi(i) := 1/6$ for all $1 \le i \le 6$.

Assume we are further informed that the die is biased and shows one or two with probability 1/2, that is, $\pi(\{1,2\}) = 1/2$, and six with probability 1/10, i.e., $\pi(6) = 1/10$. According to *indifference* in Principle 23, this results in:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(1) &= 1/4 & \pi(2) &= 1/4 & \pi(3) &= 4/30 \\ \pi(4) &= 4/30 & \pi(5) &= 4/30 & \pi(6) &= 1/10 \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we first distribute the probability $\pi(\{1,2\}) = 1/2$ uniformly to the events 1 and 2 and set $\pi(6) := 1/10$. Finally, we distribute the remaining probability mass of

$$1 - \pi(\{1, 2\}) - \pi(6) = 4/10$$

uniformly to the remaining events 3, 4, and 5.

Unfortunately, we need the mutual exclusivity of the events A_i , $1 \le i \le n$, to apply *indifference* in Principle 23.

Example 3.3. Recall the situation of Example 3.2 and suppose we learn that the die shows one or two with probability $\pi(\{1,2\}) = 1/3$. Further, assume we find the die to shows two or three with probability $\pi(\{2,3\}) = 1/3$. Now, *indifference* in Principle 23 does not tell us how to merge the information about throwing two, provided by the probabilities $\pi(\{1,2\}) = 1/3$ and $\pi(\{2,3\}) = 1/3$, to get a distribution π on Ω .

Suppose that we are given n probabilities $\pi(A_i) \in [0, 1]$ of the events A_i , where $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, which are no longer assumed to be pairwise disjoint. A rational agent assumes the distribution π on Ω that is given by the principle of maximum entropy:

Principle 24 (Maximum Entropy). The distribution π on Ω results from maximizing the entropy

$$H(\pi) := \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} (-\ln(\pi(\omega))) \cdot \pi(\omega)$$

under the constraint that A_i occurs with probability $\pi(A_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Since the function $-\ln : (0,1] \rightarrow [0,\infty)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing, with $-\ln(0) = \infty$ and $-\ln(1) = 0$, we interpret $-\ln(\pi(\omega))$ as our degree of surprise about the event $\omega \in \Omega$. In particular, the number $-\ln(\pi(\omega))$ becomes large for small probabilities $\pi(\omega)$; that is, the more we are surprised about ω being true, the larger the number $-\ln(\pi(\omega))$ becomes. Hence, we interpret $H(\pi)$ as the average degree of surprise in a distribution π . We further assume that the more we are surprised by our observations, the more randomness is captured in π , and that randomness stands for missing information. In fact, the entropy $H(\pi)$ is known to measure missing information in a distribution π (Shannon, 1948).

Given only knowledge about the probabilities $\pi(A_1), \ldots, \pi(A_n)$, it makes sense that a rational agent assumes the distribution π on Ω , which extends these probabilities by maximizing the missing information, i.e., the entropy $H(\pi)$. Maximizing entropy also resembles *indifference* in Principle 23 if the events A_i are pairwise disjoint (De Martino and De Martino, 2018).

Remark 3.1. Note that $-\ln : (0,1] \rightarrow [0,\infty)$ is used in the definition of entropy, as one wants the entropy to be additive regarding distributions of independent random variables.

Next, we assume the random variables in $\mathfrak{P} := \{p_1, ..., p_m\}$ to be Boolaen, i.e, they yield a propositional alphabet. As in Example 3.1, we identify a world ω with a value assignment on \mathfrak{P} and a formula ϕ with the event corresponding to the worlds ω with $\omega \models \phi$. Suppose that we are given the probabilities $\pi(\phi_i)$ of the formulas ϕ_i . In general, maximizing the entropy does not yield a distribution that can be easily described using the probabilities $\pi(\phi_i)$, $1 \le i \le n$. Nevertheless, as the distribution π is essentially determined by giving one number for every formula ϕ_i , $1 \le i \le n$, one aims for a parameterization of π that is also given by one number $w_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for every formula ϕ_i , $1 \le i \le n$.

Parametrization 25 (Berger et al. (1996)). We find n degrees of certainty, i.e., real numbers $w_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that π is given by setting

$$\pi(\omega) := \frac{\exp\left(\sum_{\omega \models \phi_i} w_i\right)}{\sum_{\omega' \text{ world}} \exp\left(\sum_{\omega' \models \phi_i} w_i\right)} \qquad \qquad for \text{ every world } \omega.$$

Finally, a LogLinear model of Richardson and Domingos (2006) formalizes a set of formulas with degrees of certainty in the sense of Parametrization 25.

Definition 3.1 (LogLinear Models). A LogLinear model is a finite set Φ consisting of weighted constraints (w, ϕ) , where $w \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$ is a real weight and ϕ is a formula.

Example 3.4. Recall the situation from Example 1.1, which is described by the propositional alphabet in Example 2.1. Reasoning on this scenario may lead to the LogLinear model:

$$\Phi := \{ (\ln(2), cloudy \to rain), (\ln(3), \neg cloudy \to sprinkler), (+\infty, wet \leftrightarrow rain) \}.$$

Parametrization 25 then yields the following semantics for LogLinear models.

Definition 3.2 (Semantics of LogLinear Models). Given a LogLinear model Φ , a **possible world** ω is a world that models each **hard constraint** $(\pm \infty, \phi) \in \Phi$, i.e., $\omega \models \phi$ whenever $(+\infty, \phi) \in \Phi$ and $\omega \models \neg \phi$ whenever $(-\infty, \phi) \in \Phi$. We then associate with every possible world ω the **weight**

$$w_{\Phi}(\omega) := w(\omega) := \prod_{\substack{(w,\phi) \in \Phi \\ w \notin \{\pm \infty\} \\ \omega \models \phi}} \exp(w) = \exp\left(\sum_{\substack{(w,\phi) \in \Phi \\ w \notin \{\pm \infty\} \\ \omega \models \phi}} w\right)$$

and set $w(\omega) = 0$ for every world ω that is not a possible world. Furthermore, we define the **weight** of a formula ϕ to be

$$w(\phi) := \sum_{\substack{\omega \text{ world} \\ \omega \models \phi}} w(\omega).$$

Finally, we interpret weights as degrees of certainty and assign to each world or formula _ the **probability**

$$\pi_{\Phi}(\underline{\ }) := \pi(\underline{\ }) := \frac{w(\underline{\ })}{w(\top)}.$$

Remark 3.2. Let Φ be a LogLinear model. Upon committing to Parametrization 25, the weighted constraints $(w, \phi) \in \Phi$, where $w \in \mathbb{R}$, lack an intuitive interpretation. Only hard constraints $(\pm \infty, \phi) \in \Phi$ enforce that the formula ϕ or $\neg \phi$ necessarily holds.

Example 3.5. In the situation of Example 3.4, we find $\pi(rain|cloudy) := 2/3$ as well as $\pi(sprinkler|\neg cloudy) := 3/4$. Furthermore, we deduce that the road is slippery if and only if it is wet.

3.1.3. Bayesian Networks: Causal Relations and Independence

Let us recall how causal relations give rise to conditional independencies: We identify a **causal structure** on a set of random variables \mathbf{V} with a directed acyclic graph G, i.e. a partial order, on \mathbf{V} . The intuition is that $V_1 \in \mathbf{V}$ is a **cause** of $V_2 \in \mathbf{V}$ if there is a directed path from V_1 to V_2 in G. In this case, we also say that V_2 is an **effect** of V_1 . Furthermore, we say that V_1 is a **direct cause** of V_2 if the edge $V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ exists in G, i.e. if and only if the node $V_1 \in \operatorname{Pa}(V_2)$ lies in the set $\operatorname{Pa}(V_2)$ of **parents** of V_2 .

Example 3.6. Example 1.1 gives rise to the following causal structure on the Boolean random variables $\mathfrak{P} := \{ cloudy, rain, sprinkler, wet, slippery \} :$



In particular, we observe that:

- *cloudy* is a cause of *slippery* but not a direct cause.
- *wet* is a direct cause of *slippery*.
- there is no causal relationship between *sprinkler* and *rain*.

A joint distribution π on the random variables V is consistent with a causal structure G if the influence of any cause V_1 on an effect V_2 is moderated by the direct causes of V_2 . This intuition is captured in the Markov condition:

Definition 3.3 (Markov Condition). The joint distribution π on the set of random variables **V** satisfies the **Markov condition** with respect to a causal structure *G* if a random variable $V_2 \in \mathbf{V}$ is independent of its causes $V_1 \in \mathbf{V}$ in *G*, once we observe its direct causes in $\operatorname{Pa}(p)$. In this case, we say that π is **Markov** to *G* and write $\pi \models G$.

Example 3.7. In Example 3.6 the Markov condition states for instance that the influence of *cloudy* on the event *slippery* is completely moderated by the event *wet*. Once we know that the pavement of the road is wet, we expect it to be slippery regardless of the event that caused the road to be wet.

If a distribution $\pi \models G$ satisfies the Markov condition with respect to a given causal structure G, it is represented by a Bayesian network on G and vice versa (Pearl, 2000, §1.2.3):

Definition 3.4 (Bayesian Network). Let **V** be a finite set of random variables. A **Bayesian network BN** := $(G, \pi(_| pa(_)))$ on **V** consists of a causal structure *G* and the probabilities $\pi(v| pa(V)) \in [0, 1]$ of the possible values *v* of the random variables $V \in \mathbf{V}$ conditioned on value assignments pa(V) of their direct causes. By applying the chain rule of probability calculus and the Markov condition in Definition 3.3, the Bayesian network **BN** assigns to a value assignment **v** on **V** the probability:

$$\pi_{\mathbf{BN}}(\mathbf{v}) := \pi(\mathbf{v}) := \prod_{i=1}^{k} \pi(\mathbf{v}(V_i) | \operatorname{pa}(V_i)), \text{ where } \operatorname{pa}(V_i) := \mathbf{v}|_{\operatorname{Pa}(p_i)} \text{ for } 1 \le i \le k$$

Example 3.8. The causal structure G from Example 3.6, together with the probabilities below, gives rise to a Bayesian network **BN** := $(G, \pi(_| pa(_)))$:

$\pi(cloudy) = 0.5,$	
$\pi(rain cloudy) = 0.6,$	$\pi(\operatorname{rain} \neg\operatorname{cloudy}) = 0,$
$\pi(sprinkler cloudy) = 0.1,$	$\pi(sprinkler \neg cloudy) = 0.7,$
$\pi(wet rain, sprinkler) = 0.9,$	$\pi(wet \neg rain, sprinkler) = 0.9,$
$\pi(wet rain, \neg sprinkler) = 0.9,$	$\pi(wet \neg rain, \neg sprinkler) = 0,$
$\pi(slippery wet) = 0.8,$	$\pi(slippery \neg wet) = 0.$

We obtain $\pi(cloudy, rain, sprinkler, wet, slippery) = 0.5 \cdot 0.6 \cdot 0.1 \cdot 0.9 \cdot 0.8$.

3.1.4. Probabilistic Causal Models

Pearl (2000) introduces probabilities into a functional causal model \mathcal{M} by specifying a probability distribution over the situations of \mathcal{M} .

Definition 3.5 (Probabilistic Causal Model). A **probabilistic (Boolean) causal model** $\mathbb{M} := (\mathcal{M}, \pi)$ is given by a (Boolean) functional causal model \mathcal{M} together with a probability distribution π on the situations of \mathcal{M} . The **causal diagram** graph(\mathbb{M}) of the probabilistic causal model \mathbb{M} is given by the causal diagram graph(\mathcal{M}) of the functional causal model \mathcal{M} . We call the model \mathbb{M} **acyclic** if the functional causal model \mathcal{M} is.

Example 3.9. Modify Example 2.18 and consider a road that passes through a field with a sprinkler in it. The sprinkler is turned on, written *sprinkler*, by a weather sensor with probability 0.1 if it is cloudy, denoted by *cloudy* and with probability 0.7 if it is not cloudy. In addition, it rains, denoted by *rain*, with probability 0.6 if the weather is cloudy. If it rains or the sprinkler is on, the pavement of the road gets wet, denoted by *wet*, with probability 0.9. And in the case where the pavement is wet, we observe with a probability of 0.8 that the road is slippery, denoted by *slippery*.

This mechanism can be represented by a Boolean functional causal model, \mathcal{M} , with internal variables $\mathbf{V} := \{ cloudy, rain, sprinkler, wet, slippery \}$, external variables $\mathbf{U} := \{ u_1, ..., u_6 \}$ and structural equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}: \quad cloudy &:= u_1 \\ rain &:= cloudy \wedge u_2 \\ sprinkler &:= (cloudy \wedge u_3) \vee (\neg cloudy \wedge u_4) \\ wet &:= (rain \vee sprinkler) \wedge u_5 \qquad slippery := wet \wedge u_6 \end{aligned}$$

To represent the uncertainties in our story, we specify the probabilities: $\pi(u_1) = 0.5, \pi(u_2) = 0.6, \pi(u_3) = 0.1, \pi(u_4) = 0.7, \pi(u_5) = 0.9$ and $\pi(u_6) = 0.8$. Asserting that $u_1, ..., u_6$ are mutually independent random variables defines a unique distribution π on the situations of \mathcal{M} , resulting in the probabilistic Boolean causal model $\mathbb{M} := (\mathcal{M}, \pi)$.

Here, we assume that uncertainty arises from hidden variables that we do not explicitly model. However, the influence of these hidden variables is encapsulated in the external variables $\mathbf{U} := \{u_1, ..., u_6\}$. For example, the variable u_3 summarizes the potential causes of why the sprinkler could be on if it is cloudy. These potential causes, such as sensor failure or children playing and manually switching on the sprinkler, are not explicitly modeled in \mathcal{M} . Nevertheless, the potential influence of these missing parameters is represented by the external variables \mathbf{U} and the distribution π .

Let $\mathbb{M} := (\mathcal{M}, \pi)$ be a probabilistic causal model. Since this implies that \mathcal{M} is a functional causal model, every situation **u** corresponds to a unique solution $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u})$ of the corresponding system of equations. Hence, by defining

$$\pi_{\mathbb{M}}(\omega) := \begin{cases} \pi(\mathbf{u}), & \text{if } \omega = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}) \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

for every value assignment ω of the variables $\mathbf{U} \cup \mathbf{V}$, the model \mathbb{M} gives rise to a joint probability distribution of the random variables in $\mathbf{U} \cup \mathbf{V}$.

Example 3.10. In Example 3.9, the causal model \mathbb{M} yields a probability distribution $\pi_{\mathbb{M}}$ on the truth value assignments for the variables

$$\mathbf{U} \cup \mathbf{V} := \{ cloudy, rain, sprinkler, wet, slippery, u_1, ..., u_6 \}$$

This allows us, for instance, to calculate the probability $\pi_{\mathbb{M}}(rain)$ that it rains:

$$\pi_{\mathbb{M}}(rain) = \pi(u_1) \cdot \pi(u_2) = 0.5 \cdot 0.6 = 0.3$$

Let us recall the relation between Bayesian networks and causal models:

Definition 3.6 (Markovian Causal Models). An acyclic probabilistic causal model $\mathbb{M} := (\mathcal{M}, \pi)$ is **Markovian** if π interprets the error terms as mutually independent random variables.

Theorem 3.1 (Pearl (2000), §1.4.2). A Markovian causal model \mathbb{M} gives rise to a distribution π that is Markov to its causal diagram, i.e., $\pi \models \operatorname{graph}(\mathbb{M})$. We conclude that the distribution π can be represented by a Bayesian network on the causal diagram graph(\mathbb{M}). \Box

Example 3.11. The causal model in Example 3.9 is Markovian. It gives rise to the Bayesian network in Example 3.8.

Finally, probabilistic causal models do not only support queries about conditional and unconditional probabilities. They also support queries for the effect of external interventions:

Fix a probabilistic causal model $\mathbb{M} := (\mathcal{M}, \pi)$ with external variables **U** and internal variables **V**. Assume we are given a subset of internal variables $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ together with a value assignment **i**. To calculate the effect of forcing the variables in **I** to attain the values specified by **i**, we build the **modified model** or **submodel** $\mathbb{M}_{\mathbf{i}} := (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{i}}, \pi)$. From the modified model $\mathbb{M}_{\mathbf{i}}$ we can then calculate the desired **post-interventional probabilities**. According to §1.4.3 in Pearl (2000), we denote the resulting probability distribution by

$$\pi_{\mathbb{M}}(\underline{\ }| \operatorname{do}(\mathbf{I} := \mathbf{i})) := \pi_{\mathbb{M}}(\underline{\ }| \operatorname{do}(\mathbf{i})).$$

Here, again Pearl's do-operator do(_) indicates that we actively intervene to change our model. For an event A we therefore call $\pi(A|\operatorname{do}(\mathbf{i}))$ the probability of A after **intervening** according to \mathbf{i} .

Example 3.12. We recall Example 3.9 and ask for the post-interventional probability that the road is slippery after turning off the sprinkler. In this case, we query the modified model $\mathbb{M}_{\neg sprinkler}$ for *slippery* to obtain the probability

$$\pi_{\mathbb{M}}(slippery|\operatorname{do}(\neg sprinkler)) = \pi(u_1) \cdot \pi(u_2) \cdot \pi(u_5) \cdot \pi(u_6) = 0.216$$

for the road to be slippery after switching the sprinkler off.

We highlight that this result differs from the conditional probability

$$\pi_{\mathbb{M}}(slippery|\neg sprinkler) = \frac{\pi(u_1) \cdot \pi(u_2) \cdot \pi(\neg u_3) \cdot \pi(u_5) \cdot \pi(u_6)}{\pi(u_1) \cdot \pi(\neg u_3) + \pi(\neg u_1) \cdot \pi(\neg u_4)} = 0.432$$

that it is slippery if we observe the sprinkler to be off. In particular, observing the sprinkler being off enhances the probability that it is cloudy, making rain more probable, while manually turning the sprinkler off does not allow such a conclusion. Therefore, in general, intervening in a model yields outcomes that differ from deriving conclusions solely from observations.

Theorem 3.1 yields the following notion of intervention in Bayesian networks:

Definition 3.7 (Intervention in Bayesian Networks). Let $G := (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ be a directed acyclic graph and let $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ be a subset of its nodes. The graph

$$G_{\mathbf{I}} := (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{I}}), \, \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{I}} := \{ (V_1, V_2) \in \mathbf{E} \colon V_2 \notin \mathbf{I} \}$$

is obtained by erasing all arrows from G that point into a node in \mathbf{I} .

Let $\mathbf{BN} := (G, \pi(_|\operatorname{pa}(_)))$ be a Bayesian network that induceds the distribution π and let \mathbf{i} be a value assignment on the random variables in \mathbf{I} . Intervening and forcing the variables in \mathbf{I} to attain the valued specified by \mathbf{i} leads to the **modified Bayesian network \mathbf{BN}_{\mathbf{i}} := (G_{\mathbf{I}}, \pi_{\mathbf{i}}(_|\operatorname{pa}_{G_{\mathbf{I}}}(_)))**, where

$$\pi_{\mathbf{i}}(v|\operatorname{pa}_{G_{\mathbf{I}}}(V)) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } V \in \mathbf{I} \text{ and } v = \mathbf{i}(V) \\ 0, & \text{if } V \in \mathbf{I} \text{ and } v \neq \mathbf{i}(V) \\ \pi(v|\operatorname{pa}(V)), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The modified Bayesian network gives rise to the **post-interventional** distribution $\pi(-|\operatorname{do}(\mathbf{i}))$. For an event A we call $\pi(A|\operatorname{do}(\mathbf{i}))$ the probability of A being true after **intervening according** to **i**.

Example 3.13. Recall the Bayesian network from Example 3.8. Intervening and switching the sprinkler on results in the modified Bayesian network \mathbf{BN}_{i} with the causal structure:



The corresponding probabilities are obtained by replacing the conditional probabilities $\pi(sprinkler|(\neg)cloudy)$ with $\pi(sprinkler) = 1$, reflecting the intervention.

Observe that the notion of intervention in causal models aligns with that in Bayesian networks.

Theorem 3.2 (Pearl (2000), §1.4.3). Let \mathbb{M} be a Markovian causal model that gives rise to the Bayesian network **BN**. Further, let \mathbf{i} be a value assignment on a subset of internal variables \mathbf{I} on \mathbb{M} . The modified causal model \mathbb{M}_i and the modified Bayesian network \mathbf{BN}_i induce the same post-interventional distribution $\pi(-|\operatorname{do}(\mathbf{i}))$. \Box

3.2. Causal Irrelevance and Reichenbach's Common Cause Assumption

Similar to *sufficient causation* in Assumption 4, Reichenbach (1956) argues in Chapter 19 that probabilistic dependence typically arises from causal relations, leading to the following assertion:

Assumption 26 (Common Causes). If two random variables X and Y are dependent, then either X is a cause of Y, Y is a cause of X, or there exists a common cause Z of X and Y.

Let \mathbb{M} be an acyclic probabilistic causal model. In this case, *common causes* in Assumption 26 states that all probabilistic dependencies in the induced distribution $\pi(_)$ originate from causal knowledge in \mathbb{M} . Here, we adopt the viewpoint that this holds if and only if $\pi(_)$ interprets the error terms as mutually independent random variables. In summary, an acyclic probabilistic causal model \mathbb{M} satisfies *common causes* in Assumption 26 if and only if it is Markovian.

According to Theorem 3.1, a Markovian causal model corresponds to a Bayesian network **BN** := $(G, \pi(\lfloor pa(_)))$ on the internal variables **V** of M. Williamson (2001) further shows that the induced distribution $\pi(_)$ is obtained by maximizing the entropy $H(\pi)$ under the following constraints:

- Each variable $V \in \mathbf{V}$ attains the value v with probability $\pi(v | \operatorname{pa}(V))$, conditioned on its direct causes $\operatorname{Pa}(V)$ taking the values $\operatorname{pa}(V)$.
- The following principle of *causal irrelevance* holds:

Principle 27 (Causal Irrelevance). Observing that a random variable V_1 has an effect V_2 with an unknown value does not affect our belief in V_1 .

Intuitively, causal irrelevance in Principle 27 implies that a rational agent expects information to flow only from causes to effects. Thus, the agent assumes a joint distribution $\pi(_)$ on **V** that maximizes the entropy $H(\pi)$ greedily along an order consistent with the causal structure G:

Formalization 28. The agent begins by maximizing the entropy $H(\pi)$ under the constraint that the source variables V in G take their possible values v with probabilities $\pi(v)$ as specified in $\mathbf{BN} = (G, \pi(_ | \operatorname{pa}(_))$. This yields a joint distribution $\tilde{\pi}(_)$ on a subset of variables $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$. The agent then iteratively maximizes the entropy $H(\pi)$ under the following constraints until a distribution π on \mathbf{V} is obtained:

- The joint distribution on \boldsymbol{W} is given by $\tilde{\pi}$.
- For each variable $V \in \mathbf{V}$ with direct causes $\operatorname{Pa}(V) \subseteq \mathbf{W}$, the variable V takes its possible values v with probability $\pi(v|\operatorname{pa}(V))$ when its direct causes $\operatorname{Pa}(V)$ take the values $\operatorname{pa}(V)$.

To summarize, Williamson (2001) obtains the following result:

Theorem 3.3 (§5.2, Williamson (2001)). Let $BN := (G, \pi(\lfloor pa(_)))$ be a Bayesian network. The induced distribution $\pi_{BN}(_)$ is the distribution extending the probability specifications $\pi(_| pa(_))$ by maximizing entropy under causal irrelevance in Principle 27, as expressed in Formalization 28.

We henceforth assume that a rational agent applies *causal irrelevance* in Principle 27 if and only if he excludes the possibility that information eventually flows through omitted common causes. Thus, we argue for the following result:

Formalization 29. A rational agent applies causal irrelevance in Principle 27, as expressed in Formalization 28, if and only if common causes in Assumption 26 is satisfied.

We adopt the viewpoint that the principle of maximum entropy corresponds to the *syllogisms* in Section 1.1.1. According to Section 1.1.3, knowledge-*why* arises from *demonstrations*, i.e., *syllogisms* that follow a given causal order. We argue that greedily maximizing entropy along the causal order in Bayesian networks in Formalization 28 provides a probabilistic generalization of Aristotle's notion of knowledge-*why*.

3.3. Causal Systems: A Generic Representation of Causal Reasoning

To express uncertainty about *natural necessity* in Principle 3, we propose the following notion of a weighted causal theory:

Definition 3.8 (Weighted Causal Theory). A weighted causal rule (w, R) consists of a weight $w \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$ and a literal causal rule R. A weighted causal theory Θ is a finite set of weighted causal rules.

The **explanatory content** of a weighted causal theory Θ is the causal theory

explanatory(Θ) := { $R \mid \exists w \text{ such that } (w, R) \in \Theta$ }.

The constraint content of a weighted causal theory Θ is the LogLinear model

$$constraint(\Theta) := \{(w, constraint(R)) \mid (w, R) \in \Theta\}.$$

The **causal structure** graph(Θ) of Θ is the directed graph where an edge $p \to q$ is drawn if and only if there exists a weighted causal rule of the form

 $(w, b_1 \wedge \dots \wedge (\neg)p \wedge \dots \wedge b_n \Rightarrow (\neg)q) \in \Theta.$

Motivated by Formalizations 21 and 22, we adopt the following approach to introducing uncertainty into causal reasoning:

Language 30 (Uncertainty in Causal Reasoning). Weights $w \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$ in a weighted causal theory Θ represent our degree of belief in natural necessity, as stated in Principle 3. Specifically, the information in constraint(Θ) defines a distribution that quantifies our degree of belief that a given world ω satisfies natural necessity with respect to explanatory(Θ). The causal theory explanatory(Θ) is then used to determine whether a given world ω can be causally explained, i.e., whether sufficient causation, as formulated in Assumption 4, applies. **Example 3.14.** Recall the situation in Example 2.14. However, this time we are uncertain whether a fire in house h_1 necessarily leads to a fire in the neighboring house h_2 and vice versa. Our uncertainty may lead to the weighted causal theory Θ :

$$(\ln(2), fire(h_2) \Rightarrow fire(h_1)), \qquad (\ln(2), fire(h_1) \Rightarrow fire(h_2)).$$

Example 3.15. Calculating the weights $w_1 - w_8$ according to Equation (6), the situation in Examples 3.8 and 3.9 give rise to the weighted causal theory Θ :

$(w_1, \top \Rightarrow cloudy)$	
$(w_2, \ cloudy \Rightarrow rain)$	$(-\infty, \neg cloudy \Rightarrow rain),$
$(w_3, cloudy \Rightarrow sprinkler)$	$(w_4, \neg cloudy \Rightarrow sprinkler)$
$(w_5, rain \land sprinkler \Rightarrow wet)$	$(w_6, \neg rain \land sprinkler \Rightarrow wet)$
$(w_7, rain \land \neg sprinkler \Rightarrow wet)$	$(-\infty, \neg rain \land \neg sprinkler \Rightarrow wet)$
$(w_8, wet \Rightarrow slippery)$	$(-\infty, \neg wet \Rightarrow slippery)$

Note, however, that according to Remark 1.1 the expression $\top \Rightarrow cloudy$ requires additional justification.

Let Θ be a weighted causal theory. We begin by examining the impact of *common causes*, as stated in Assumption 26, on the distribution π associated with the LogLinear model constraint(Θ).

Suppose the causal knowledge represented by the causal structure graph(Θ) satisfies *common causes*, as stated in Assumption 26. According to Formalization 29, we conclude that *causal irrelevance* in Principle 27, as expressed in Formalization 28, applies. Together with Parametrization 25, this leads to the following semantics of the weighted causal theory Θ :

Definition 3.9 (Common Cause Semantics of a Weighted Causal Theory). Recall that two nodes p and q of a directed graph G := (V, E) are **strongly connected**, written $p \sim q$, if there exist directed paths from p to q and from q to p in G. Strong connectedness $(\sim)/2$ is an equivalence relation, and the equivalence classes $[p] \in V/ \sim$ are called the **strongly connected components** of G. Lastly, the resulting **factor graph** $G/\sim:= (V/\sim, E/\sim)$ is a directed acyclic graph, where $E/\sim:= \{([p], [q]) \in (V/\sim)^2 \mid (p, q) \in E\}$.

Let Θ be a weighted causal theory. We write $\mathbf{G} := (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ for the factor graph graph(Θ)/ ~ on the strongly connected components \mathbf{V} of the causal structure graph(Θ). To each strongly connected component $V \in \mathbf{V}$, we associate a random variable that takes the assignments $v : V \to \{ True, False \}$ as its values. Furthermore, we associate with a strongly connected component $V \in \mathbf{V}$ the LogLinear model:

$$\operatorname{constraint}(\Theta)_V := \{ (w, \phi \to p) \in \operatorname{constraint}(\Theta) \mid p \in V \}.$$

The common cause semantics of the weighted causal theory Θ is then given by the Bayesian network $\mathbf{BN}(\Theta) := (\mathbf{G}, \pi_{\Theta}(_ | \operatorname{pa}(_)))$, where

$$\pi_{\Theta}(v \mid \mathrm{pa}(V)) := \pi_{\mathrm{constraint}(\Theta)_V}(v \mid \mathrm{pa}(V))$$

for $V \in \mathbf{V}$, a possible value v of V, and a value assignment pa(V) on the direct causes $Pa_{\mathbf{G}}(V)$. By abuse of language, we also call the joint distribution $\pi_{\Theta}(_) := \pi_{\mathbf{BN}(\Theta)}(_)$ the **common cause semantics**. As every value assignment on \mathbf{V} can be identified with a world ω , the common cause semantics π_{Θ} yields a distribution on worlds ω .

Example 3.16. The common cause semantics of the weighted causal theory Θ in Example 3.14 is the distribution of the LogLinear model constraint(Θ), as both propositions *fire*(h_1) and *fire*(h_2) lie in the same strongly connected component of the causal structure graph(Θ). Theorem 3.5 yields that the weighted causal theory in Example 3.15 results in the same distribution as the Bayesian network in Example 3.8.

Further analysis of the common cause semantics leads to the following result:

Proposition 3.4. Let Θ be a weighted causal theory. The common cause semantics π_{Θ} is obtained by greedily maximizing the entropy $H(\pi)$ along an order consistent with the causal structure graph(Θ), subject to the constraint

$$\pi(\operatorname{constraint}(R)) = \sum_{\operatorname{pa}(V)} \pi_{\operatorname{constraint}(\Theta)_V}(\operatorname{constraint}(R)|\operatorname{pa}(V)) \cdot \pi(\operatorname{pa}(V))$$

for every causal rule $R \in \text{explanatory}(\Theta)$ with effect in the strongly connected component V of graph(Θ).

Proof. All nodes in a strongly connected component V of graph(Θ) cannot be distinguished in any causal order consistent with graph(Θ). Hence, according to Principle 27, as expressed in Formalization 28, the entropy $H(\pi)$ for all random variables in V needs to be maximized simultaneously under the constraint that for all rules $R := (w, \phi \Rightarrow p) \in \Theta$ with $p \in V$ we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\operatorname{constraint}(R)) &= \sum_{\operatorname{pa}(V)} \pi(\operatorname{constraint}(R)|\operatorname{pa}(V)) \cdot \pi(\operatorname{pa}(V)) = \\ &= \sum_{\operatorname{pa}(V)} \pi_{\operatorname{constraint}(\Theta)_V}(\operatorname{constraint}(R)|\operatorname{pa}(V)) \cdot \pi(\operatorname{pa}(V)) = \\ &= \left(\sum_{\substack{v \text{ ass. on } V \\ v \cup \operatorname{pa}(V) \models \operatorname{constraint}(R)} \pi_{\operatorname{constraint}(\Theta)_V}(v|\operatorname{pa}(V))\right) \cdot \pi(\operatorname{pa}(V)) \end{aligned}$$

Conclude inductively that $\pi_{\Theta}(\operatorname{pa}(V)) = \pi(\operatorname{pa}(V))$. The result then follows from Theorem 3.3, Parametrization 25 and Definition 3.9 as the distribution $\pi_{\operatorname{constraint}(\Delta)_V}(_|\operatorname{pa}(V))$ is obtained by maximizing the entropy $H(\pi)$ under the constraints $\pi(\operatorname{constraint}(R)|\operatorname{pa}(V)) = \pi_{\operatorname{constraint}(\Theta)_V}(\operatorname{constraint}(R)|\operatorname{pa}(V))$. According to Proposition 3.4, the common cause semantics π_{Θ} follows from the following principles:

- Maximum entropy, as stated in Principle 24, and Parametrization 25.
- *Causal irrelevance*, as formulated in Principle 27 and Formalization 28, which corresponds to *common causes*, as stated in Assumption 26, according to Formalization 29.

Language 30 implies that under Assumption 26 the common cause semantics π_{Θ} quantifies our degree of belief that *natural necessity*, as expressed in Principle 3, holds with respect to explanatory(Θ). We argue for the following result:

Formalization 31. According to Languages 6, 7, 11, 30, and Parametrization 25, causal reasoning under uncertainty gives rise to a weighted causal theory Θ . If we further assume that Assumption 26 is satisfied, the common cause semantics $\pi_{\Theta}(_)$ quantifies our degree of belief that natural necessity, as expressed in Principle 3, holds with respect to explanatory(Θ).

Weighted causal theories under the common cause semantics consistently generalize Bayesian networks:

Definition 3.10 (Necessity Interpretation). Define the sigmoid function by

$$\sigma \quad : \quad \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\} \quad \to \quad [0, 1]$$
$$w \quad \mapsto \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(w)}{1 + \exp(w)}, & w \in \mathbb{R}, \\ 0, & w = -\infty, \\ 1, & w = +\infty. \end{cases}$$

The sigmoid function is bijective, and we write $\sigma^{-1}:[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ for its inverse.

Let $\mathbf{BN} := (G, \pi(|\operatorname{pa}(-)))$ be a Boolean Bayesian network on the set of random variables \mathfrak{P} . The **necessity interpretation** of \mathbf{BN} is the weighted causal theory $\Theta(\mathbf{BN})$ with one weighted causal rule

$$(w, \operatorname{pa}(p) \Rightarrow p), \quad w := \sigma^{-1} \left[\pi_{\mathbf{BN}}(p | \operatorname{pa}(p)) \cdot \pi_{\mathbf{BN}}(\operatorname{pa}(p)) + \pi_{\mathbf{BN}}(\neg \operatorname{pa}(p)) \right]$$
(6)

for every $p \in \mathfrak{P}$ and value assignment $\operatorname{pa}(p)$ on the direct causes $\operatorname{Pa}(p)$ of p. Here, we associate truth value assignments $\operatorname{pa}(p)$ with formulas $\operatorname{pa}(p) := \bigwedge_{\substack{l \text{ literal} \\ \operatorname{pa}(p) \models l}} l$.

Example 3.17. The necessity interpretation of the Bayesian network in Example 3.8 is presented in Example 3.15.

Theorem 3.5. Let $BN := (G, \pi(-|\operatorname{pa}(-)))$ be a Boolean Bayesian network. The necessity interpretation $\Theta := \Theta(BN)$ induces the same joint distribution as BN, i.e., $\pi_{BN}(\omega) = \pi_{\Theta}(\omega)$ for all worlds ω . *Proof.* According to Proposition 3.4, the distribution $\pi_{\Theta}(_)$ results from greedly maximizing the entropy $H(\pi)$ along an order consistent with the causal structure G under the constraint that for every rule $R := (w, \operatorname{pa}(p) \Rightarrow p) \in \Theta(\mathbf{BN})$ we find

$$\pi_{\Theta}(\operatorname{pa}(p) \to p) = \pi_{\operatorname{constraint}(\Theta)_{\{p\}}}(\operatorname{pa}(p) \to p | \operatorname{pa}(p)) \cdot \pi_{\Theta}(\operatorname{pa}(p)) =$$

$$\stackrel{\operatorname{construction}}{=} \pi_{\mathbf{BN}}(p | \operatorname{pa}(p)) \cdot \pi_{\Theta}(\operatorname{pa}(p)).$$

As we may inductively conclude that $\pi_{\Theta}(\operatorname{pa}(p)) = \pi_{\mathbf{BN}}(\operatorname{pa}(p))$, we obtain that $\pi_{\Theta}(_)$ also results from greedly maximizing the entropy $H(\pi)$ along an order consistent with the causal structure G under the constraint that

$$\pi_{\Theta}(p|\operatorname{pa}(p)) := \pi_{\mathbf{BN}}(p|\operatorname{pa}(p))$$

Hence, the desired result follows from Theorem 3.3.

To reason on knowledge-*why* within an area of science, we extend causal reasoning, as captured in weighted causal theories, by incorporating external premises and propose the notion of a maximum entropy causal system.

Definition 3.11 (Maximum Entropy Causal System). A (maximum entropy) causal system is a tuple

$$\mathbf{CS} := (\Theta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}, \Sigma, \text{ complete})$$

consisting of the following components:

- A weighted causal theory $\Theta(\mathbf{CS}) := \Theta$, called **causal knowledge** of **CS**.
- A set of literals $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{CS}) := \mathcal{E}$, called the **external premises** of **CS**.
- A set of formulas $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{CS}) := \mathcal{O}$, called the **observations** of **CS**.
- A superordinate science, that is, a LogLinear model $\Sigma(\mathbf{CS}) := \Sigma$.
- A Boolean value complete $\in \{\top, \bot\}$.

If $complete = \top$, we say that the causal system **CS** is **complete**. Otherwise, we say that the causal system **CS** is **incomplete**.

A situation $\mathbf{s} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ is a subset of external premises such that $\mathbf{s} = \omega \cap \mathcal{E}$ for a world ω . The external domain $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{CS})$ of \mathbf{CS} is the set of all situations.

The constraint part of the causal system CS is the LogLinear model

$$\operatorname{constraint}(\mathbf{CS}) := \operatorname{constraint}(\Theta).$$

The explanatory part of CS is the deterministic causal system

explanatory(**CS**) := (explanatory(
$$\Theta$$
), \mathcal{E} , \mathcal{O}).

The causal system **CS** has the **causal structure** graph(**CS**) := graph(Θ). The system **CS** is **without observations** or applies **default negation** if its explanatory content explanatory(**CS**) does.

Remark 3.3. The letters Θ , \mathcal{E} , \mathcal{O} , and Σ in Definition 3.11 spell "Theos," which is the Greek word for "God."

This work uses Definition 3.11 together with the following guideline:

Language 32. Fix an area of science, as described in Section 1.2. Let \mathcal{E} denote a set of external premises that do not require further explanation. If \mathcal{E} represents the entire set of external premises, we set complete := \top ; otherwise, we set complete := \bot .

Let Θ be the weighted causal theory in Language 30, assume the knowledge-that of the superordinate science is captured in a LogLinear model Σ , and express all observations as a set of formulas \mathcal{O} to obtain a maximum entropy causal system:

$$\mathbf{CS} := (\Theta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}, \Sigma, \textit{complete})$$

We assume that the causal structure graph(CS) satisfies common causes in Assumption 26 if and only if $complete = \top$. Note that default negation in Assumption 13 is satisfied if and only if the system CS applies default negation.

Example 3.18. Recall the causal theory Θ from Example 3.15. The scenario in Examples 3.8 and 3.9 give rise to the maximum entropy causal system

 $\mathbf{CS} := (\Theta \setminus \{(w_1, \top \Rightarrow cloudy)\}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}, \Sigma, \texttt{complete}).$

Here, the external premises are given by

 $\mathcal{E} := \{ cloudy, \neg cloudy, \neg rain, \neg sprinkler, \neg wet, \neg slippery \}.$

There are no observations, i.e., $\mathcal{O} = \emptyset$, and the superordinate science gives rise to the LogLinear model:

$$\Sigma := \{ (w_1, cloudy) \}.$$

If we are convinced that no causal relation has been omitted in modeling this scenario, we set complete := \top ; otherwise, we set complete := \bot .

Note that we have avoided the expression $\top \Rightarrow cloudy$, which requires additional justification, as discussed in Remark 1.1.

Languages 30, 32 and Formalization 29 motivate the following definition:

Definition 3.12 (Explainability and A Priori Distribution). Choose a maximum entropy causal system $\mathbf{CS} := (\Theta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}, \Sigma, \text{ complete}).$

A formula ϕ is **explainable** in a world ω , written $\omega \models \operatorname{explains}(\phi)$, if it is explainable with the explanatory content explanatory(**CS**). A world ω is **explainable** with **CS** if it is explainable with the explanatory content explanatory(**CS**), that is, if every literal $l \in \omega$ is explainable in ω . We define the event that **CS** is (causally) sufficient as the set of all explainable worlds, i.e.,

sufficient(**CS**) := {
$$\omega$$
 world: $\omega \models \text{explains}(l)$ for all literals l }.

If **CS** is incomplete, the **a priori distribution** $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}} := \pi_{\Phi}$ of **CS** is given by the LogLinear model $\Phi := \text{constraint}(\mathbf{CS}) \cup \Sigma$. Otherwise, the **a priori distribution** $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}}$ of **CS** is defined for every world ω as:

$$\pi_{\mathbf{CS}}(\omega) := \pi_{\Theta}(\omega \mid \omega \cap \mathcal{E}) \cdot \pi_{\Sigma}(\omega \cap \mathcal{E} \mid \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{CS})),$$

where π_{Θ} denotes the common cause semantics of Θ , and $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{CS})$ denotes the external domain of the system \mathbf{CS} .

Example 3.19. For the causal system **CS** in Example 3.18, we find that every world is explainable, i.e., sufficient(**CS**) is the set of all worlds. Furthermore, if complete = \top , the a priori distribution π_{CS} is given by the Bayesian network in Example 3.8.

Let $\mathbf{CS} := (\Theta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}, \Sigma, \text{ complete})$ be a maximum entropy causal system, and let ω be a world. According to Languages 30 and 32, the probability $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}}(\omega)$ represents our degree of belief that *natural necessity*, as stated in Principle 3, is satisfied in ω . Furthermore, *sufficient causation*, as formulated in Assumption 4, holds in ω if and only if $\omega \in \text{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS})$. These observations motivate the following definition:

Definition 3.13 (Semantics of Maximum Entropy Causal Systems). Let

 $\mathbf{CS} := (\Theta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}, \Sigma, \text{ complete})$

be a maximum entropy causal system with a priori distribution π_{CS} .

The causal system **CS** assumes **knowledge**-*that* about a formula ϕ with probability:

$$\pi_{\mathbf{CS}}^{that}(\phi) := \pi_{\mathbf{CS}}(\phi|\mathcal{O}).$$

If the events ϕ and \mathcal{O} are independent with respect to the conditional distribution $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}}(-|\operatorname{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS}))$, the causal system **CS** assumes **knowledge**-*why* about ϕ with probability:

$$\pi_{\mathbf{CS}}^{why}(\phi) := \pi_{\mathbf{CS}}(\phi|\mathcal{O}, \text{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS})) = \pi_{\mathbf{CS}}(\phi| \text{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS}))$$

and confidence $\pi(\operatorname{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS})|\mathcal{O})$.

Remark 3.4. According to Languages 30 and 32, $\pi(\text{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS})|\mathcal{O})$ represents the degree of belief that *sufficient causation*, as stated in Assumption 4, applies, given that *natural necessity*, as described in Principle 3, holds and the evidence \mathcal{O} is observed. We therefore interpret $\pi(\text{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS})|\mathcal{O})$ as an epistemic probability in the definition of knowledge-*why*.

Example 3.20. According to Example 3.19, the causal system in Example 3.18 assumes knowledge-*why* with confidence one whenever it assumes knowledge-*that*.

To summarize, we argue for the following result:

Formalization 33. Upon committing to Principles 1, 24, Languages 6, 7, 11 and Parametrization 25, we model an area of science with a maximum entropy causal system, as described in Languages 30 and 32. In this case, causal foundation in Principle 2, natural necessity in Principle 3, and sufficient causation in Assumption 4 yield that the system **CS** possesses knowledge-that and knowledge-why, as described in Definition 3.13.

3.4. Interpreting Current Artificial Intelligence Technologies as Causal Systems

This section embeds LogLinear models (Richardson and Domingos, 2006), as well as Bayesian networks and probabilistic causal models (Pearl, 2000), into the framework of causal systems. This enables the application of Language 32 and Formalization 33 to assess the type of knowledge captured by these formalisms and to extend the treatment of external interventions.

3.4.1. Pearl's Probabilistic Causal Models

Maximum entropy causal systems without observations, which apply default negation, can express the probabilistic causal models of Pearl (2000):

Definition 3.14 (Bochman Transformation). The **Bochman transformation** of a probabilistic causal model $\mathbb{M} := (\mathcal{M}, \pi)$ with $\mathcal{M} := (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}, \text{Error}, \text{Pa}, \mathbf{F})$ is the causal system $\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M}) := (\Theta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset, \Sigma, \top)$, defined as follows:

$$\Theta := \{ (+\infty, F_V \Rightarrow V) \mid V \in \mathbf{V} \}, \qquad \qquad \mathcal{E} := \mathbf{U} \cup \{ \neg V \mid V \in \mathbf{U} \cup \mathbf{V} \} \\ \Sigma := \{ (\ln(\pi(\mathbf{s})), \ \mathbf{s}) : \ \mathbf{s} \text{ situation of } \mathcal{M} \}$$

Here, we identify a situation **s** of \mathcal{M} with the formula $\bigwedge_{\substack{l \text{ literal} \\ \mathbf{s} \models l}} l$.

Example 3.21. Let $\mathbb{M} := (\mathcal{M}, \pi)$ be as in Example 3.9. The Bochman transformation $\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M}) := (\Theta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset, \Sigma, \top)$ is given by the following data:

$$\begin{split} \Theta &:= & \{(+\infty, \ cloudy \land u_2 \Rightarrow rain), \\ & (+\infty, \ (cloudy \land u_3) \lor (\neg cloudy \land u_4) \Rightarrow sprinkler), \\ & (+\infty, \ (rain \lor sprinkler) \land u_5 \Rightarrow wet), \\ & (+\infty, \ wet \land u_6 \Rightarrow slippery)\} \\ \mathcal{E} &:= & \{u_1, \neg u_1, ..., u_6, \neg u_6, \neg cloudy, ..., \neg sprinkler\} \\ \Sigma &:= & \{(\ln(0.5 \cdot 0.6 \cdot 0.1 \cdot 0.9 \cdot 0.8), u_1 \land ... \land u_6), \\ & , ..., \\ & (\ln(0.5 \cdot 0.4 \cdot 0.9 \cdot 0.1 \cdot 0.2), \neg u_1 \land ... \land \neg u_6)\} \end{split}$$

The knowledge-*why* $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M})}^{why}$ of the Bochman transformation $\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M})$ of an acyclic causal model \mathbb{M} corresponds to the distribution $\pi_{\mathbb{M}}$ associated with \mathbb{M} .

Theorem 3.6. Let \mathbb{M} be an acyclic probabilistic causal model with Bochman transformation $CS(\mathbb{M})$. For every formula ϕ , the causal system $CS(\mathbb{M})$ assumes the knowledge-why $\pi_{CS}^{why}(\phi) = \pi_{\mathbb{M}}(\phi)$ with confidence one.

Proof. Since the system $\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M})$ is without observations, it follows that it assumes knowledge-*why* whenever it assumes knowledge-*that*. By Theorems 2.4 and 3.1, every world ω with $\pi_{\mathbb{M}}(\omega) > 0$ is a causal world of explanatory($\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M})$). Finally, by Theorem 2.10, we conclude that $\pi(\text{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M}))) = 1$.

3.5. External Interventions in Maximum Entropy Causal Systems

Similar to Section 2.5, we introduce the following notion of intervention in maximum entropy causal systems.

Definition 3.15 (Modified Causal Systems). Let $\mathbf{CS} := (\Theta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}, \Sigma, \texttt{complete})$ be a causal system, and let **i** be a value assignment on a set of atoms $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}$. To represent the intervention of forcing the atoms in **I** to attain values according to the assignment **i**, we construct the **modified causal system**

$$\mathbf{CS_i} := (\Theta_i, \mathcal{E}_i, \mathcal{O}, \Sigma, \texttt{complete}),$$

which is obtained from **CS** by applying the following modifications:

- Remove all rules $(w, \phi \Rightarrow p) \in \Theta$ and $(w, \phi \Rightarrow \neg p) \in \Theta$ for all $p \in \mathbf{I}$.
- Remove all external premises $p \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\neg p \in \mathcal{E}$ for all $p \in \mathbf{I}$.
- Add a weighted rule $(+\infty, \top \Rightarrow l)$ to Θ_i for all literals $l \in \mathbf{I}$.

Remark 3.5. Definition 3.15 does not modify the superordinate science Σ , because LogLinear models are not modular with respect to the removal of weighted constraints. Hence, modifying the superordinate science Σ would conflict with Assumption 19.

Example 3.22. Recall the causal system $\mathbf{CS} := (\Theta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset, \Sigma, \texttt{complete})$ from Example 3.18. Suppose we intervene by switching the sprinkler off, i.e., we apply the intervention $\mathbf{i} := \{\neg sprinkler\}$.

The modified system $CS_i := (\Theta_i, \mathcal{E}_i, \emptyset, \Sigma, \texttt{complete})$ is then given by the following data:

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\mathbf{i}} &:= (\Theta \setminus \{ (w_{3/4}, (\neg) cloudy \Rightarrow sprinkler) \}) \cup \{ (+\infty, \ \top \Rightarrow \neg sprinkler) \}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{i}} &:= \{ cloudy, \ \neg cloudy, \ \neg rain, \ \neg wet, \ \neg slippery \}. \end{aligned}$$

Once again, for acyclic probabilistic causal models, the concept of intervention defined in Definition 3.15 is consistent with the Bochman transformation in Definition 3.14. **Proposition 3.7.** Let $\mathbb{M} := (\mathcal{M}, \pi)$ be an acyclic probabilistic causal model and let *i* be a truth value assignment on the internal variables $I \subseteq V$.

The causal systems $CS(\mathbb{M}_i)$ and $CS(\mathbb{M})_i$ assume the same knowledge-why, i.e., $\pi_{CS(\mathbb{M}_i)}^{why}(\omega) = \pi_{CS(\mathbb{M})_i}^{why}(\omega)$ for every world ω .

Proof. Let ω be a world. According to Proposition 2.8, the deterministic causal systems explanatory $(\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M}_i))$ and explanatory $(\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M})_i) = \exp[\operatorname{anatory}(\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M}))_i]$ have the same causal worlds. Since all rules in the causal systems under consideration have weight $+\infty$, Proposition 2.10 implies that $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M}_i)}^{why}(\omega) > 0$ if and only if $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}(\mathbb{M})_i}^{why}(\omega) > 0$, and in that case, ω is a causal world of the aforementioned deterministic causal systems. In particular, the probability of ω is uniquely determined by the corresponding situation, which is calculated from the same LogLinear model in all causal systems under consideration.

Assumption 18 then motivates the following definition:

Definition 3.16 (Semantics of External Interventions). Let **CS** be a causal system, and let **i** be a value assignment on a set of atoms $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}$, leading to the modified causal system **CS**_i. We say that **CS** assumes that a formula ϕ is true **after intervening** according to **i** with probability $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}}(\phi | \operatorname{do}(\mathbf{i})) \in [0, 1]$, if and only if $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}}(\phi | \operatorname{do}(\mathbf{i})) = \pi_{\mathbf{CS}}^{why}(\phi)$.

Relying on Assumption 19, we argue for the following result.

Formalization 34. Let us fix an area of science such that Formalization 33 yields a causal system CS. Under these conditions and Assumptions 18 and 19, Definitions 3.15 and 3.16 correctly characterize the knowledge represented by CS regarding the effects of external interventions.

3.5.1. LogLinear Models

We define the **Bochman interpretation** of a LogLinear model Φ as the maximum entropy causal system

$$\mathbf{CS}(\Phi) := (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \Phi, \bot).$$

It follows that $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}(\Phi)}^{that}(\omega) = \pi_{\Phi}(\omega)$ for all worlds ω . Since sufficient $(\mathbf{CS}(\Phi)) = \emptyset$, the causal system $\mathbf{CS}(\Phi) := (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \Phi, \bot)$ does not possess knowledge-*why*.

Now, assume that we intervene according to a truth value assignment i on the atoms $I \subseteq \mathfrak{P}$, yielding the modified system

$$\mathbf{CS}(\Phi)_{\mathbf{i}} := (\{\top \Rightarrow l \mid l \in \mathbf{i}\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \Phi, \bot).$$

Unless i represents a world with $\mathbf{I} = \mathfrak{P}$, we find that $\operatorname{sufficient}(\mathbf{CS}(\Phi)_i) = \emptyset$, implying that $\mathbf{CS}(\Phi)$ lacks knowledge about the effects of external intervention. Hence, we conclude that LogLinear models do not encode knowledge about the effects of external interventions.

Interpreting every probability distribution as a LogLinear model, we conclude that probability distributions neither possess knowledge-*why* nor knowledge of the effects of external interventions.

3.5.2. Bayesian Networks

To a Boolean Bayesian network **BN** := $(G, \pi(_, pa(_)))$ we assign the **Bochman** transformation, which is the causal system with default negation

$$\mathbf{CS}(\mathbf{BN}) := (\Theta, \mathcal{E}, \emptyset, \Sigma, \top),$$

defined as follows:

• The weighted causal theory Θ consists of the weighted causal rules

$$(w, \operatorname{pa}(p) \Rightarrow p)$$

for every non-source node p in G and every truth value assignment pa(p) of its parents $Pa(p) \neq \emptyset$, where w is computed as in Equation (6).

• The external premises are given by

$$\mathcal{E} := \mathbf{S} \cup \{\neg p \mid p \in \mathfrak{P}\},\$$

where **S** denotes the set of source nodes in the graph G.

• The superordinate science is given by $\Sigma := \{(\sigma^{-1}(\pi(s)), s) \mid s \in \mathbf{S}\}.$

We observe that every world ω is explainable with **CS**(**BN**). Moreover, a similar argument as in Theorem 3.5 shows that

$$\pi_{\mathbf{BN}}(\omega) = \pi_{\mathbf{CS}(\mathbf{BN})}^{why}(\omega)$$

for every world ω . Hence, Bayesian networks encode knowledge-*why* with confidence one.

Example 3.23. The maximum entropy causal system in Example 3.18 is the Bochman transformation of the Bayesian network in Example 3.8.

Now, consider a Boolean Bayesian network $\mathbf{BN} := (G, \pi(_, \operatorname{pa}(_)))$ on the variables \mathfrak{P} , and let \mathbf{i} be a truth value assignment on a subset of variables $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}$. Intervene according to \mathbf{i} to obtain the Bayesian network $\mathbf{BN}_{\mathbf{i}} := (G_{\mathbf{I}}, \pi_{\mathbf{i}}(_, \operatorname{pa}(_)))$ and the causal system $\mathbf{CS}_{\mathbf{i}} := \mathbf{CS}(\mathbf{BN})_{\mathbf{i}} := (\Theta_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{i}}, \emptyset, \Sigma, \top)$.

By definition, the distribution $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}}^{why}$ is Markov to the graph $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{I}}$. As in Theorem 3.5, we can verify that $\pi_{\mathbf{CS}}^{why}(p \mid \operatorname{pa}(p)) = \pi_{\mathbf{BN}_{\mathbf{i}}}(p \mid \operatorname{pa}(p))$ for all $p \in \mathfrak{P}$. We conclude that the Bayesian network **BN** and its Bochman transformation $\mathbf{CS}(\mathbf{BN})$ predict the same effects of external interventions, i.e.,

$$\pi_{\mathbf{BN}}(- \mid \mathrm{do}(\mathbf{i})) = \pi_{\mathbf{CS}(\mathbf{BN})}(- \mid \mathrm{do}(\mathbf{i})).$$

4. Conclusion

This paper introduces causal systems as a formal framework for distinguishing between knowledge-*that* and knowledge-*why*, as defined in Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*. It argues that external interventions can be meaningfully treated only on the basis of knowledge-*why*. Embedding existing artificial intelligence technologies into the formalism of causal systems enables a classification of the type of knowledge they provide and an assessment of the feasibility of handling external interventions.

This work embeds LogLinear models (Richardson and Domingos, 2006), as well as Bayesian networks and causal models (Pearl, 2000), into the framework of causal systems. In future work, it is envisaged to interpret abductive logic programs (Denecker and Kakas, 2002) as deterministic causal systems, while ProbLog programs (De Raedt et al., 2007; Fierens et al., 2015), along with LP^{MLN} programs (Lee and Wang, 2016), will be analyzed as maximum entropy causal systems.

We further propose extending maximum entropy causal systems to the context of first-order logic. We conjecture that the resulting theory will be expressive enough to encompass probabilistic logic programming (Riguzzi, 2020), Markov logic networks (Richardson and Domingos, 2006), and relational Bayesian networks (Jaeger, 1997). This would establish a unifying framework for *relational artificial intelligence* (Raedt et al., 2016), interpreting it as the study of formalisms that capture the fundamental concepts of symmetry, uncertainty, and causal explanation.

According to Pearl (2000), causal models can answer counterfactual queries, whereas Bayesian networks cannot. As a direction for future research, we propose characterizing the additional knowledge captured in causal models that enables this type of query.

References

- Anderson, J.F., 1956. Summa Contra Gentiles, 2: Book Two: Creation. University of Notre Dame Press. URL: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvpj74rh.
- Barnes, J., 1995. The Complete Works of Aristotle. Volume One. Princeton University Press. URL: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5vjv4w.
- Berger, A.L., Pietra, V.J.D., Pietra, S.A.D., 1996. A maximum entropy approach to natural language processing. Computational Linguistics, 39–71URL: https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/234285.234289.
- Bochman, A., 2005. Explanatory Nonmonotonic Reasoning. World Scientific. URL: https://doi.org/10.1142/5707.
- Bochman, A., 2021. A Logical Theory of Causality. The MIT Press. URL: https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12387.001.0001.
- De Martino, A., De Martino, D., 2018. An introduction to the maximum entropy approach and its application to inference problems in biology. Heliyon URL: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e00596.
- De Raedt, L., Kimmig, A., Toivonen, H., 2007. ProbLog: A probabilistic Prolog and its application in link discovery, in: Proceedings of the 20th International

Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2007), AAAI Press. pp. 2462–2467. URL: https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/1625275.1625673.

- Denecker, M., Kakas, A.C., 2002. Abduction in logic programming, in: Computational Logic: Logic Programming and Beyond, Essays in Honour of Robert A. Kowalski, Part I, Springer. pp. 402–436. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45628-7_16.
- Dong, Z., 2023. Well-defined interventions and causal variable choice. Philosophy of Science 90, 395–412. URL: https://doi.org/10.1017/psa.2022.88.
- Fierens, D., van den Broeck, G., Renkens, J., Shterionov, D., Gutmann, B., Thon, I., Janssens, G., De Raedt, L., 2015. Inference and learning in probabilistic logic programs using weighted boolean formulas. Theory and Practice of Logic Programming, 358–401URL: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068414000076.
- Franks, C., 2024. Propositional logic, in: The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Winter 2024 ed.. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. URL: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2024/entries/logic-propositional/.
- Frege, G., 1879. Begriffsschrift, eine der arithmetischen nachgebildete Formelsprache des reinen Denkens. Verlag von Louis Nebert. URL: https://gdz.sub.uni-goettingen.de/id/PPN538957069.
- Gelfond, M., Lifschitz, V., 1988. The stable model semantics for logic programming, in: Proceedings of International Logic Programming Conference and Symposium, MIT Press. pp. 1070-1080. URL: http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/ai-lab?gel88.
- Hulswit, M., 2002. Some key moments in the history of the concept of causation, in: From Cause to Causation: A Peircean Perspective, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht. pp. 1–45. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0297-4_1.
- Jaeger, M., 1997. Relational Bayesian networks, in: Geiger, D., Shenoy, P.P. (Eds.), UAI '97: Proceedings of the Thirteenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, Morgan Kaufmann. pp. 266-273. URL: https://homes.cs.aau.dk/~jaeger/publications/UAI97.pdf.
- Lee, J., Wang, Y., 2016. Weighted rules under the stable model semantics, in: KR'16: Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, AAAI Press. p. 145–154. URL: https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.5555/3032027.3032045.
- Loemker, L.E., 1989. First truths, in: Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Philosophical Papers and Letters, Springer Netherlands. pp. 267–271. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1426-7_31.

- Michelucci, U., 2024. Fundamental Mathematical Concepts for Machine Learning in Science. Springer. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-56431-4.
- Miller, V., Miller, R., 1982. René Descartes: Principles of Philosophy. Springer Dordrecht. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-7888-1.
- Pearl, J., 2000. Causality. 2 ed., Cambridge University Press. URL: https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511803161.
- Raedt, L.D., Kersting, K., Natarajan, S., 2016. Statistical Relational Artificial Intelligence: Logic, Probability, and Computation. Morgan & Claypool Publishers. URL: https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/3027718.
- Reichenbach, H., 1956. The Direction of Time. Dover Publications. URL: https://doi.org/10.2307/2216858.
- Richardson, M., Domingos, P., 2006. Markov logic networks. Machine Learning , 107–136URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-006-5833-1.
- Riguzzi, F., 2020. Foundations of Probabilistic Logic Programming: Languages, Semantics, Inference and Learning. River Publishers. URL: https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003338192.
- Shannon, C.E., 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. The Bell System Technical Journal , 379-423URL: https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x.
- Williamson, J., 2001. Foundations for Bayesian networks, in: Foundations of Bayesianism. Springer Netherlands, pp. 75–115. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1586-7_4.
- Williamson, J., 2009. Philosophies of probability, in: Philosophy of Mathematics. North-Holland, pp. 493-533. URL: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-51555-1.50016-X.