Agent-Knowledge Logic for Alternative Epistemic Logic

Yuki Nishimura

Tokyo Insititute of Technology

nishimura.y.as@m.titech.ac.jp

Epistemic logic is known as logic that captures the knowledge and beliefs of agents and has undergone various developments since Hintikka (1962). In this paper, we propose a new logic called agentknowledge logic by multiplying the individual knowledge structure with the relationships among agents. This logic is based on the Facebook logic proposed by Seligman et al. (2011) and the Logic of Hide and Seek Game proposed by Li et al. (2021). We show that this logic can embed the epistemic logic we know well. We also discuss various sentences and inferences that this logic can express.

1 Introduction

Knowledge and belief form part of philosophy, which is now called epistemology. This area have been the subject of various studies from the standpoint of logic. One of these was created by applying modal logic, which is nowadays called epistemic logic. The operator, which is the key element of this logic, is in the form $K_i \varphi$, which expresses that "agent *i* knows that φ ." On this basis, it is possible to represent various concepts related to knowledge and belief in formal language. As far as I know, the pioneering work on epistemic logic was done by Hintikka in 1962 [8], and there is a wide range of research being done today; see Fagin et al. (1995) [7] and van Bentham (2006) [2].

A more recent logic for human knowledge is Facebook logic, developed by Seligman et al. in 2011 [14]. This logic was invented to describe personal knowledge plus the friendships of agents in twodimensional hybrid logic. For instance, consider this sentence: "I am Andy's friend, and Andy knows he has pollen allergy. Then, one of my friends knows that they have pollen allergy." This inference can be written using the language of Facebook logic as follows:

 $\langle \texttt{Friend} \rangle i \land @_i [\texttt{Know}] p \rightarrow \langle \texttt{Friend} \rangle [\texttt{Know}] p$

where p = "they have pollen allergy." and i = "This is Andy." Some readers will find the at sign @ in the logical formula unfamiliar. This is the operator of hybrid logic, where @_ip can be read as "p holds at point *i*." Facebook logic uses nominal, a tool of hybrid logic, to make reference to individual agents. Not much is explained here about hybrid logic: Blackburn & ten Cate (2006) [4], Indrzejczak (2007) [9], and Braüner (2011) [6] may be helpful. Sano (2010) [12] provides further details on two-dimensional hybrid logic.

In fact, Facebook logic treats propositional variables differently from epistemic logic. The truth of a propositional variable p depends not only on the epistemic alternative but also on the agent under consideration. Therefore, the propositions represented by the propositional variables here are personal properties, such as, "I have a pollen allergy."

The new logic proposed in this paper — we will call it *agent-knowledge logic* — is a modification of the aforementioned Facebook logic. One feature of this logic is that it is compatible with epistemic

Submitted to: NCL '24

© Y. Nishimura This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License. logic. This property allows us to use agent-knowledge logic as an alternative to epistemic logic. Indeed, this paper shows how to embed epistemic logic into our new logic. Furthermore, agent-knowledge logic is able to formalize a variety of sentences that cannot be represented by traditional epistemic logic, such as "one of my friends knows p." Some of the examples given in this paper may be only part of the possibilities of our new logic.

This logic has two parents: one is Facebook logic, and the other is, which seems to have nothing to do with epistemic logic, the Logic of Hide and Seek Game (LHS, in short) created by Li et al. in 2021 [10, 11]. This logic was originally invented to illustrate the hide and seek game (also known as cops and robbers). In LHS, propositional variables are split into two sets, which are related to hider and seeker, respectively. We borrow this idea to express the *agent-free* propositions ("the sun rises in the east," for example.)

We proceed as follows: Section 2 reviews the well-known epistemic logic and explains the parents of agent-knowledge logic, Facebook logic and LHS, briefly. In Section 3, we introduce our new logic, agent-knowledge logic. Section 4 shows how we embed epistemic logic into our new logic. In Section 5, we discuss how we use and develop agent-knowledge logic. Finally, in Section 6, we write about some future prospects.

2 Preliminary

2.1 Epistemic Logic

Here, we review the basic epistemic logic.

In the epistemic logic, we have another set **A** of agents besides a usual set of propositional variables. The elements of **A** occur in a new operator K_i . The intuitive meaning of $K_i \varphi$ is that "agent *i* knows φ ."

This section is mostly based on the description of [7, Chapter 2].

Definition 2.1. We have two disjoint sets, **Prop** and **A**. A formula φ of the *epistemic logic* \mathscr{L}_{EL} is defined as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi} ::= p \mid \neg \boldsymbol{\varphi} \mid \boldsymbol{\varphi} \land \boldsymbol{\varphi} \mid K_i \boldsymbol{\varphi}$$

where $p \in \mathbf{Prop}$ and $i \in \mathbf{A}$.

We only use \neg and \land as primitives since other Boolean operators, such as \lor and \rightarrow , can be defined as compounds of the first two operators.

Definition 2.2. A *Kripke model for epistemic logic* (we call it *EL model*) \mathcal{M}_{EL} is a tuple $(W, (R_i)_{i \in \mathbf{A}}, V)$ where

- W is a non-empty set,
- For each $i \in \mathbf{A}$, R_i is a binary relation on W,
- $V : \operatorname{Prop} \to \mathscr{P}(W)$.

Definition 2.3. Given an EL model \mathscr{M}_{EL} , its point *w*, and a formula $\varphi \in \mathscr{L}_{EL}$, the *satisfaction relation* \mathscr{M}_{EL} , $w \models \varphi$ is defined inductively as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{EL}}, w \models p \iff w \in V(p) \text{ where } p \in \mathbf{Prop},$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{EL}}, w \models \neg \varphi \iff \text{Not } \mathcal{M}_{\text{EL}}, w \models \varphi (\mathcal{M}_{\text{EL}}, w \not\models \varphi),$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{EL}}, w \models \varphi \land \psi \iff \mathcal{M}_{\text{EL}}, w \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{M}_{\text{EL}}, w \models \psi,$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{EL}}, w \models K_i \varphi \iff \text{For all } v \in W, w R_i v \text{ implies } \mathcal{M}_{\text{EL}}, v \models \varphi.$$

As for epistemic logic, we define the validity of a formula. Later we discuss embedding epistemic logic into our new logic, so the formal definition is needed.

Definition 2.4. A formula φ is *valid* with respect to the class of EL models (written as $\models_{\text{EL}} \varphi$) if $\mathscr{M}_{\text{EL}}, w \models \varphi$ for every model \mathscr{M}_{EL} and its every world *w*.

2.2 Facebook Logic

This section gives a brief review of Facebook logic. If you want to study it deeper, Seligman et al. (2011) [14] and its sequel, Seligman et al. (2013) [15], will help.

The semantics of Facebook logic is called *epistemic social network model*. This is the tuple $(W, A, (\sim_a)_{a \in A}, (\simeq_w)_{w \in W}, V)$, where

- W is a set of epistemic alternatives,
- A is a set of agents,
- For each $a \in A$, \sim_a is an equivalence relation on W,
- For each $w \in W$, \asymp_w is an irreflexive and symmetric relation of friendship on *A*, and
- V is a valuation function assigning a subset of $W \times A$ to each propositional variable.

The reason that a relation \asymp_w over A is irreflexive and symmetric can be understood when we assume it as a friendship; no one is a friend to oneself, and if a person is your friend, then you are a friend of them.

Next, we define the truth of formulas.

First, we can find that we have two modal operators, K and F. We now have two kinds of possible worlds: agents and epistemic alternatives. The two modal operators correspond to each of them (acronyms for knowledge and friendship, respectively.)

Another addition is the introduction of a special propositional variable called *nominal*. Formally, nominal is defined as "a proposition such that the image by V is $W \times \{a\}$." In other words, one nominal n is a proposition corresponding to only one $a \in A$, which is a proposition for the *name* of the agent. In addition, we introduce the satisfaction operator @ used in hybrid logic. The intuitive meaning of $@_np$ is that "p holds for agent n."

Then, the truth of formulas in Facebook logic is defined inductively. Here, **Prop** is the set of propositional variables, and **Nom** is the set of nominals. Also, the boolean cases are omitted since they are the same as those in ordinary modal logic.

 $\mathcal{M}, w, a \models p \iff (w, a) \in V(p) \text{ where } p \in \mathbf{Prop},$ $\mathcal{M}, w, a \models n \iff n^{V} = a, \text{ where } n \in \mathbf{Nom}$ $\mathcal{M}, w, a \models K\varphi \iff \mathcal{M}, v, a \models \varphi \text{ for every } v \sim_{a} w,$ $\mathcal{M}, w, a \models F\varphi \iff \mathcal{M}, w, b \models \varphi \text{ for every } b \asymp_{w} a,$ $\mathcal{M}, w, a \models @_{n}\varphi \iff \mathcal{M}, w, n^{V} \models \varphi.$

As mentioned in Introduction, the truth of the propositional variable depends on both an epistemic alternative and an agent.

Example 2.5. The following formulas of Facebook logic can be translated as follows.

- *Kp*: I know that I am *p*.
- *KF p*: I know that all of my friends are *p*.
- *FKp*: Each of my friends know that they are *p*.
- $\langle F \rangle n$: I have a friend *n*.
- $@_n Kp$: The agent *n* knows that they are *p*.

2.3 Logic of Hide and Seek Game

The logic of hide and seek game (LHS), as the name implies, is a logic for describing a hide and seek game. There are two players, a hider and a seeker, and a set of propositional variables \mathbf{Prop}_H and \mathbf{Prop}_S for each player to describe their state. Moreover, there is a special propositional variable *I*. This is a proposition to describe that the hider and seeker are in the same place, i.e., that "I find you!"

The major difference from Facebook logic is that the model used has the same two-dimensional structure and the same (W, R, V) as in usual modal logic, which is appropriate considering that the hide and seek game is played by two players on the same board.

The truth value of LHS formulas is defined inductively as follows. Note that both *x* and *y* are elements of *W*.

$$\mathcal{M}, x, y \models p_H \iff x \in V(p_H) \text{ where } p_H \in \mathbf{Prop}_H,$$

$$\mathcal{M}, x, y \models p_S \iff y \in V(p_S) \text{ where } p_S \in \mathbf{Prop}_S,$$

$$\mathcal{M}, x, y \models I \iff x = y,$$

$$\mathcal{M}, x, y \models \Diamond_H \varphi \iff \text{ there is some } x' \text{ such that } xRx' \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, x', y \models \varphi,$$

$$\mathcal{M}, x, y \models \Diamond_S \varphi \iff \text{ there is some } y' \text{ such that } yRy' \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, x, y' \models \varphi.$$

Using this language, we can describe the hide and seek game. For example, $\Box_H \Diamond_S I$ means that no matter how the hider moves, the seeker has one move to catch the hider. This expression shows the existence of a winning strategy of the seeker.

In addition to the already mentioned Li et al. (2021) [10], Li et al. (2023) [11] is also useful if you want to know more about LHS.

3 Agent-Knowledge Logic

Here, we introduce a new logic, called *agent-knowledge logic*. As you read in Section 1, this logic is a mixture of Facebook logic and LHS. We have two dimensions, which correspond to agents and their knowledge, respectively. This structure and the intent behind it are very similar to that of Facebook logic. On the other hand, the idea that we use both \mathbf{Prop}_A and \mathbf{Prop}_K is unique in LHS.

Definition 3.1. We have four disjoint sets Prop_A , Prop_K , Nom_A , and Nom_K . A formula φ of the *agent-knowledge logic* \mathscr{L}_{AK} is defined as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi} ::= p_A \mid p_K \mid a \mid k \mid \neg \boldsymbol{\varphi} \mid \boldsymbol{\varphi} \land \boldsymbol{\varphi} \mid \Box_A \boldsymbol{\varphi} \mid \Box_K \boldsymbol{\varphi} \mid @_a \boldsymbol{\varphi} \mid @_k \boldsymbol{\varphi}$$

where $p_A \in \mathbf{Prop}_A$, $p_K \in \mathbf{Prop}_K$, $a \in \mathbf{Nom}_A$, and $k \in \mathbf{Nom}_K$.



Figure 1: An agent-knowledge model.

We call both an element of **Nom**_{*A*} or **Nom**_{*K*} *nominal*. As we mentioned in Section 2.2, they point to a specific agent and a specific epistemic alternative, respectively. As well as \lor and \rightarrow , if we need, we can define \Diamond_A and \Diamond_K in the usual way.

Definition 3.2. A *agent-knowledge model* (*AK model*) \mathcal{M}_{AK} is a tuple $(W_A, W_K, (R_y)_{y \in W_K}, (S_x)_{x \in W_A}, V_A, V_K)$ where

- W_A, W_K are non-empty sets,
- For each $y \in W_K$, R_y is a binary relation on W_A ,
- For each $x \in W_A$, S_x is a binary relation on W_K ,
- V_A : **Prop**_A \cup **Nom**_A $\rightarrow \mathscr{P}(W_A)$ where if $a \in Nom_A$, then $V_A(a) = \{x\}$ for some $x \in W_A$,
- V_K : **Prop**_K \cup **Nom**_K $\rightarrow \mathscr{P}(W_K)$ where if $k \in$ **Nom**_K, then $V_K(k) = \{y\}$ for some $y \in W_K$.

Note that the image of a nominal Nom_A by V_A is a singleton (the same fact holds for Nom_K and V_K .) Owing to this definition, nominal behaves as a *name* for each possible world.

We can illustrate an agent-knowledge model as if we write Cartesian coordinates in Figure 1. In this circumstance, a nominal is represented as a horizontal or vertical line. Likely, a propositional variable is depicted as a set of parallel lines.

We write *V* to express $V_A \cup V_K$. For instance, $V(p_A) = V_A(p_A)$. Moreover, we abbreviate $x \in W_A$ such that $V_A(a) = \{x\}$ by a^V . We do the same for k^V .

Definition 3.3. Given a model \mathscr{M}_{AK} , its points $(x, y) \in W_A \times W_K$, and a formula $\varphi \in \mathscr{L}_{AK}$, the *satisfaction relation* $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models \varphi$ is defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{split} \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) &\models p_A \iff x \in V(p_A) \text{ where } p_A \in \mathbf{Prop}_A, \\ \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) &\models p_K \iff y \in V(p_K) \text{ where } p_K \in \mathbf{Prop}_K, \\ \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) &\models a \iff x = a^V \text{ where } a \in \mathbf{Nom}_A, \\ \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) &\models k \iff y = k^V \text{ where } k \in \mathbf{Nom}_K, \\ \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) &\models \neg \varphi \iff \mathrm{Not} \, \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models \varphi \, (\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \not\models \varphi), \\ \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) &\models \neg \varphi \iff \mathrm{Not} \, \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \not\models \psi, \\ \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) &\models \Box_A \varphi \iff \mathrm{For all} \, x' \in W_A, xR_yx' \text{ implies } \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y') \models \varphi, \\ \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) &\models \Box_K \varphi \iff \mathrm{For all} \, y' \in W_K, yS_xy' \text{ implies } \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y') \models \varphi, \\ \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) &\models @_a \varphi \iff \mathscr{M}_{AK}, (a^V, y) \models \varphi. \end{split}$$

The truth of each propositional variable is determined by either $x \in W_A$ or $y \in W_K$. Especially whether p_K is true or false is independent of the element of W_A , so p_K can be assumed as an agent-free proposition.

The usage of the satisfaction operator @ should also be mentioned. It refers to a specific agent or epistemic alternative while ignoring the current one. For example, the meaning of $@_a \varphi$ is "for an agent whose name is *a*, φ holds." The current element of W_A is no longer necessary information to determine the truth of that formula.

Definition 3.4. A formula φ is *valid* with respect to the class of \mathscr{M}_{AK} (written as $\models_{AK} \varphi$) if \mathscr{M}_{AK} , $(x, y) \models \varphi$ for every model \mathscr{M}_{AK} and its every pair of worlds (x, y).

4 Embedding Epistemic Logic into Agent-Knowledge Logic

One of the aims of our new logic is to make it compatible with Facebook logic. In fact, any sentence we can express in basic epistemic logic can be rewritten in this agent-knowledge logic. In this section, we show that we can embed epistemic logic into agent-knowledge logic.

First of all, we identify the theorem we wish to prove. A proper translation of T exists, and the following theorem holds.

Theorem 4.1. For all $\varphi \in \mathscr{L}_{EL}$,

$$\models_{\mathrm{EL}} \varphi \iff \models_{\mathrm{AK}} T(\varphi).$$

To prove it, let us define how to translate a formula of epistemic logic.

Definition 4.2. We define a *translation* $T : \mathscr{L}_{EL} \to \mathscr{L}_{AK}$ as follows:

$$T : \mathbf{Prop} \ni p \mapsto p_K \in \mathbf{Prop}_K \text{ is a bijection,}$$
$$T : \mathbf{A} \ni i \mapsto a \in \mathbf{Nom}_A \text{ is a bijection,}$$
$$T(\neg \varphi) = \neg T(\varphi),$$
$$T(\varphi \land \psi) = T(\varphi) \land T(\psi),$$
$$T(K_i \varphi) = @_{T(i)} \Box_K T(\varphi).$$

Example 4.3. Here is one example of translation.

$$T(K_i(p \wedge K_j \neg q)) = @_{a_i} \Box_K (p_K \wedge @_{a_j} \Box_K \neg q_K).$$

We write a_i in the meaning of T(i) $(i \in \mathbf{A})$.

In fact, the idea of rewriting $K_i \varphi$ to $@_{T(i)} \Box_K T(\varphi)$ was presented in Sano's review in 2011 [13] for Japanese, which introduces Seligman et al. (2011) [14]. Unfortunately, this translation does not work for Facebook logic, but it does work when the translation is to agent-knowledge logic.

Definition 4.4. Given an EL model $\mathscr{M}_{EL} = (W, (R_i)_{i \in \mathbf{A}}, V)$, the induced AK model $\mathscr{M}_{AK}^{\alpha}$ is defined as follows:

- $\mathcal{M}_{AK}^{\alpha} = (\mathbf{A}, W, \emptyset, (R_i)_{i \in \mathbf{A}}, V^{\alpha}),$ where
- For any $p_A \in \mathbf{Prop}_A$, $V^{\alpha}(p_A) = \emptyset$,
- For any $p_K \in \mathbf{Prop}_K$, $V^{\alpha}(p_K) = V(T^{-1}(p_K))$,
- For any $a \in \mathbf{Nom}_A$, $V^{\alpha}(a) = V(T^{-1}(a))$,

• Take one $y_0 \in W$, and for any $k \in \mathbf{Nom}_K$, $V^{\alpha}(k) = \{y_0\}$.

Note that we do not care about the definitions of $(R_y)_{y \in A}, V^{\alpha}(p_A)$, and $V^{\alpha}(k)$. It is because the translated formula by *T* requires only **Prop**_{*K*}, **Nom**_{*A*}, boolean operators, \Box_K , and $@_a$.

Lemma 4.5. For any $\varphi \in \mathscr{L}_{EL}$ and for any $i \in \mathbf{A}$, we have:

$$\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{EL}}, w \models \varphi \iff \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{AK}}^{\alpha}, (i, w) \models T(\varphi).$$

Proof. By induction on the complexity of φ .

 $(\boldsymbol{\varphi} = p)$ For all $i \in \mathbf{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{EL}}, w &\models p \iff w \in V(p) \\ \iff w \in V^{\alpha}(T(p)) \\ \iff \mathscr{M}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{AK}}, (i, w) \models T(p). \end{aligned}$$

 $(\boldsymbol{\varphi} = \neg \boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\psi} \land \boldsymbol{\chi})$ Straightforward.

 $(\varphi = K_i \psi)$ First, we prove the left-to-right direction.

Suppose that $\mathscr{M}_{\text{EL}}, w \models K_j \psi$. Then, for all *v* such that $wR_j v$, we have $\mathscr{M}_{\text{EL}}, v \models \psi$. We divide the proof into two cases of whether we can take such a world $v \in W$.

- (i) If there is some $v \in W$, take one arbitrary. Then, we have $\mathscr{M}_{EL}, v \models \varphi$. By the induction hypothesis, especially $\mathscr{M}^{\alpha}_{AK}, (j, v) \models T(\varphi)$. Since we took v arbitrarily, it follows that $\mathscr{M}^{\alpha}_{AK}, (j, w) \models \Box_{K} T(\varphi)$. By the definition of V^{α} , we finally get that $\mathscr{M}^{\alpha}_{AK}, (i, w) \models @_{T(j)} \Box_{K} T(\varphi)$ for all $i \in A$.
- (ii) If there is no $v \in W$ such that $wR_j v$, we straightforwardly get that $\mathscr{M}^{\alpha}_{AK}, (j,w) \models \Box_K T(\varphi)$. In the same way as the former case, we have $\mathscr{M}^{\alpha}_{AK}, (i,w) \models @_{T(j)} \Box_K T(\varphi)$ for all $i \in \mathbf{A}$.

In both cases, we can reach the result that $\mathscr{M}^{\alpha}_{AK}(i,w) \models @_{T(j)} \square_K T(\varphi)$ for all $i \in \mathbf{A}$. Therefore, we have $\mathscr{M}^{\alpha}_{AK}(i,w) \models T(K_j \varphi)$.

Next, we prove the other direction. Take one $i \in A$ and suppose that $\mathscr{M}_{AK}^{\alpha}, (i, w) \models T(K_{j}\psi)$. It means that for all v such that $wR_{j}v, \mathscr{M}_{AK}^{\alpha}, (j, v) \models T(\psi)$ holds. Take one v such that $wR_{j}v$ (if we cannot, then $\mathscr{M}_{EL}, w \models K_{j}\psi$ is straightforward.) By the induction hypothesis, we have $\mathscr{M}_{EL}, v \models \psi$. Since we took v arbitrarily, it follows that $\mathscr{M}_{EL}, w \models K_{j}\psi$.

Definition 4.6. Given an AK model $\mathscr{M}_{AK} = (W_A, W_K, (R_y)_{y \in W_K}, (S_x)_{x \in W_A}, V)$, the induced EL model \mathscr{M}_{FL}^{β} is defined as follows:

 $\mathscr{M}^{\beta}_{\mathrm{EL}} = (W_K, (S^{\beta}_i)_{i \in \mathbf{A}}, V^{\beta}), \text{ where }$

- A is the set used in Definition 2.1,
- $yS_i^\beta z$ in \mathscr{M}_{EL}^β iff $yS_{T(i)^V}z$ in \mathscr{M}_{AK} ,
- $V^{\beta}(p) = V(T(p)).$

Let us consider a function $\beta_A : W_A \to \mathbf{A}$ such that $\beta(T(i)^V) = i$ for all $i \in \mathbf{A}$. It expresses the correspondence between an agent in W_A and an agent in \mathbf{A} . The illustration of this condition in Figure 2 may help your understanding.



Figure 2: The condition β_A satisfies (id_A is the identity on **A**).

Lemma 4.7. For any $\varphi \in \mathscr{L}_{EL}$ and for any $x \in W_A$,

$$\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{AK}}(x,y)\models T(\varphi)\iff \mathscr{M}^{\beta}_{\mathrm{EL}},y\models\varphi.$$

Proof. By induction on the complexity of φ .

 $(\boldsymbol{\varphi} = p)$ For all $x \in W^A$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{AK}},(x,y) &\models T(p) \iff y \in V(T(p)) \\ \iff y \in V^{\beta}(p) \\ \iff \mathscr{M}^{\beta}_{\mathrm{EL}}, y \models p. \end{aligned}$$

 $(\varphi = \neg \psi, \psi \land \chi)$ Straightforward.

 $(\varphi = K_j \psi)$ First, we prove the left-to-right direction.

Suppose that $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models T(K_j \psi)$. That is, we assume that $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models @_{T(j)} \Box_K T(\psi)$. Then, for all z such that $yS_{T(j)^V z}$, we have $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (T(j)^V, z) \models T(\psi)$. Bearing the definition of S_i^{β} , it suffices to pick up one $z \in W_K$ such that $yS_j^{\beta}z$ (if we cannot, it is straightforward that $\mathscr{M}_{EL}^{\beta}, y \models$ $K_j\psi$ holds.) By the assumption, we have $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (T(j)^V, z) \models T(\psi)$. By the induction hypothesis, $\mathscr{M}_{EL}^{\beta}, z \models \psi$. Since we picked up z arbitrary, we have $\mathscr{M}_{EL}^{\beta}, y \models K_j\psi$.

Next, we prove the other direction. Suppose that $\mathscr{M}_{EL}^{\beta}, y \models K_j \psi$. It means that for all $z \in W_K$ such that $yS_j^{\beta}z$, $\mathscr{M}_{EL}^{\beta}, z \models \psi$ holds. Now, pick $z \in W_A$ such that $yS_{T(j)}^{V}z$ arbitrarily (if we cannot, we have $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models T(K_j \psi)$ for all $x \in W_A$.), and we have $yS_j^{\beta}z$. Then, we have $\mathscr{M}_{AK}^{\beta}, z \models \psi$. By the induction hypothesis, $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (T(j)^V, z) \models T(\psi)$. Since we pick up *z* arbitrary, it follows that $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models @_{T(j)} \Box_K T(\psi)$ for any $x \in W_A$, which means $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models T(K_j \psi)$.

Now, we are ready to prove the main theorem, Theorem 4.1. Here is the proof.

Proof. We prove it by showing the contraposition. To prove the left-to-right direction, suppose that we have some φ such that $\not\models_{AK} T(\varphi)$. Then, there is a model \mathscr{M}_{AK} and its pair of points (x, y) such that $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models \neg T(\varphi)$, which means that $\mathscr{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models T(\neg \varphi)$. Then, by Lemma 4.7, we have $\mathscr{M}_{EL}^{\beta}, y \models \neg \varphi$, which leads us to the conclusion that $\not\models_{EL} \varphi$. The case of the other direction can be done by using Lemma 4.5.

We usually treat binary relations of EL models as equivalence relations. Moreover, once we want to deal with beliefs by means of a modal operator, we impose yet another condition on accessibility relations. The following corollary shows how embedding can reflect these restrictions.

Proposition 4.8. We have the following properties:

- (i) For every *i* ∈ A, if *R_i* in *M*_{EL} is reflexive (or serial, symmetric, transitive, euclidian), then so is *R_i* in *M*^α_{AK}.
- (ii) For every $x \in W_A$, if S_x in \mathcal{M}_{AK} is reflexive (or serial, symmetric, transitive, euclidian), then so is S_i^β in \mathcal{M}_{EI}^β .

Proof. The former is obvious, and the latter is straightforward from the definition of S_i^{β} .

5 Application

In this section, we seek to explore the extent to which this logic allows for representation. We take three approaches: first, Section 5.1 uses another yet unused modal operator to represent relations between agents; Section 5.2 introduces a representation utilizing universal operators, which are widely known in hybrid logic; in Section 5.3, we consider how to reproduce the operator used in epistemic logic.

5.1 All of my friends know...

In the previous section, we read $\Box_K \varphi$ as "I know φ ." Then, how should the other modal operator \Box_A be interpreted? Recall that the binary relation R_y , corresponding to \Box_A , connects two worlds of W_A . Since elements of W_A can be assumed as agents, the relation between agents can be interpreted as *friendship*.

As we do in Facebook logic, we can compound friendship and knowledge. For example, we can write some sentences as follows:

- $\Box_A \Box_K p_K$: All of my friends know p_K .
- $\Diamond_A \Box_K p_K$: Some of my friends know p_K .
- $\Box_K \Diamond_A \Box_K$: I know that some of my friends know p_K .

Note that p_K is a common proposition, not a property of individuals. Then, $\Box_A p_K$ (All of my friends are p_K) is equivalent to p_K unless they have no friend.

Moreover, we can designate an individual by calling their name owing to nominals. Consider this sentence:

Andy is my friend, and he knows that the Earth goes around the Sun. Therefore, one of my friends knows the heliocentric theory.

This inference can be symbolized in the agent-knowledge logic as follows:

$$\Diamond_A a \wedge @_a \Box_K p_K \rightarrow \Diamond_A \Box_K p_K,$$

where *a* shows "This is Andy" and p_K shows "the Earth goes around the Sun." In the previous section, we showed how to embed an epistemic logic into an agent-knowledge logic, and hybrid operators play important roles in that method. This is another advantage of using hybrid language instead of modal language.

In Facebook logic, the relationship between agents should be irreflexive and symmetric for two reasons: none of us is a friend of ourselves, and if someone is a friend of yours, then you are a friend of theirs. However, we can lift these restrictions. For example, we can read xR_yx' as "the agent x can see the post of x'" in X¹. Then, we can read $\Box_A \Box_K p_K$ as "all the people know p_K , as far as I know."

5.2 All the people know...

We are sometimes tempted to reference all agents, not just those who are our friends (for example, "all men are mortal," which is frequently used to explain the syllogism.) For these situations, agent-knowledge logic can respond — simply by introducing a universal operator in hybrid logic.

Let us introduce universal operators to the dimension of the agent. The definition of the operators A_A and E_A are as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models A_A \varphi \iff \mathcal{M}_{AK}, (z, y) \models \varphi \text{ for all } z \in W_A,$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{AK}, (x, y) \models E_A \varphi \iff \text{ there is some } z \in W_A \text{ such that } \mathcal{M}_{AK}, (z, y) \models \varphi$$

Owing to these operators, we can write some expressions as follows:

- $E_A \square_K p_K$: Someone knows p_K .
- $\Box_K A_A \Box_K p_K$: I know that all the people know p_K .
- $E_A \Box_A \Box_K p_K$: There is a person all of whose friends know p_K .

5.3 All people in the group know...

Let us change direction a little and consider how to mimic the operators in epistemic logic by the agentknowledge logic. Here, we consider the *everybody knows operator* used in epistemic logic.

Take one set G as a group of agents. That is, we take some $G \subseteq \mathbf{A}$. Then, the *everybody knows* operator E_G is defined as follows:

$$\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{EL}}, w \models E_G \varphi \iff \mathscr{M}, w \models K_i \varphi \text{ for all } i \in G.$$

Intuitively, this formula says that everyone in the group G knows φ .

Then, how do we mimic the operator in agent-knowledge logic? We make use of universal operators and the tool we have not used yet, the propositional variable in **Prop**_A. Recalling that the truth value of $p_A \in \mathbf{Prop}_A$ is determined only by the element of W_A , p_A can indicate the personal property or the group they belong to.

Let us read p_A as "they belong to the group G." Then, the sentence "all people in the group G." can be expressed by the following formula:

$$A_A(p_A \to \Box_K p_K)$$

Intuitively, this formula can be interpreted as "for all agents, if they is in group G, then they knows p_K ."

¹Most of the readers are familiar with the name once it had; twitter.

6 Prospected Future Work

One of the expected future research involving agent-knowledge logic will examine a greater variety of representations. The use of the tools presented in this paper would be just the tip of the iceberg. For example, Nom_A is the set of agents, and $Prop_K$ is an agent-independent proposition. In Section 5.3, we show a possible usage of $Prop_A$ to create a group of agents. However, it is difficult to say that sufficient utilization has been found for Nom_K .

It is also fruitful to imitate various operators of epistemic logic, such as the operator for *common* knowledge C_G and the operator for *distributed* knowledge D_G . This direction might reflect the fertile results accumulated in the study of epistemic logic.

Another challenge, and this one may be a bigger one, is to create a proof theory. Fortunately, there is already abundant previous research in the surrounding fields. In addition to the aforementioned Sano (2010) [12], Balbiani & Fernández González (2020) [1] has shown the Hilbert-style axiomatization of Facebook logic. In addition, if we look at the basic research on hybrid logic, the tableau calculus was developed by Bolander & Blackburn [5], and Blackburn et al. [3]. As shown in [7, Corollary 3.2.3], basic epistemic logic is decidable, so we want to expect determinism in agent-knowledge logic as well.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Prof. Ryo Kashima and Leonardo Pacheco for their invaluable advice in writing this paper. The research of the author was supported by JST SPRING, Grant Number JPMJSP2106.

References

- [1] Philippe Balbiani & Saúl Fernández González (2020): *Indexed Frames and Hybrid Logics*. In: Advances in Modal Logic.
- [2] Johan van Bentham (2006): *Epistemic Logic and Epistemology: The State of their Affairs*. Philosophical Studies 128, pp. 249–76.
- [3] Patrick Blackburn, Thomas Bolander, Torben Braüner & Klaus Frovin Jørgensen (2017): *Completeness and Termination for a Seligman-Style Tableau System*. Journal of Logic and Computation 27(1), pp. 81–107.
- [4] Patrick Blackburn & Balder ten Cate (2006): *Pure Extensions, Proof Rules, and Hybrid Axiomatics. Studia* Logica 84(2), pp. 277–322.
- [5] Thomas Bolander & Patrick Blackburn (2007): *Termination for Hybrid Tableaus*. Journal of Logic and Computation 17(3), pp. 517–554.
- [6] Torben Braüner (2011): Hybrid Logic and its Proof-Theory. 37, Springer Science & Business Media.
- [7] Ronald Fagin, Joseph Y. Halpern, Yoram Moses & Moshe Y. Vardi (1995): *Reasoning about knowledge*. MIT press.
- [8] Jaakko Hintikka (1962): *Knowledge and Belief: An Introduction to the Logic of the Two Notions*, second edition. Cornell University Press.
- [9] Andrzej Indrzejczak (2007): Modal Hybrid Logic. Logic and Logical Philosophy 16(2-3), pp. 147–257.
- [10] Dazhu Li, Sujata Ghosh, Fenrong Liu & Yaxin Tu (2021): On The Subtle Nature of a Simple Logic of The Hide and Seek Game. In: Logic, Language, Information, and Computation: 27th International Workshop, WoLLIC 2021, Virtual Event, October 5–8, 2021, Proceedings 27, Springer, pp. 201–218.
- [11] Dazhu Li, Sujata Ghosh, Fenrong Liu & Yaxin Tu (2023): A Simple Logic of The Hide and Seek Game. Studia Logica 111(5), pp. 821–853.

- [12] Katsuhiko Sano (2010): Axiomatizing Hybrid Products: How Can We Reason Many-Dimensionally in Hybrid Logic? Journal of Applied Logic 8(4), pp. 459–474.
- [13] Katsuhiko Sano (2011): *Paper Review: Logic in The Community.* Journals of The Japanese Society for Artificial Intelligence 26(6), pp. 703–707. (written in Japanese).
- [14] Jeremy Seligman, Fenrong Liu & Patrick Girard (2011): *Logic in the Community*. In: Proceedings of the 4th Indian Conference on Logic and Its Applications, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 178–188.
- [15] Jeremy Seligman, Fenrong Liu & Patrick Girard (2013): *Facebook and the Epistemic Logic of Friendship*. In: Proceedings of the 14th Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge, pp. 229–238.