

Relational Argumentation Semantics

Ryuta Arisaka Takayuki Ito

Kyoto University
Kyoto, Japan

ryutaarisaka@gmail.com

ito@i.kyoto-u.ac.jp

In this paper, we propose a fresh perspective on argumentation semantics, to view them as a relational database. It offers encapsulation of the underlying argumentation graph, and allows us to understand argumentation semantics under a single, relational perspective, leading to the concept of relational argumentation semantics. This is a direction to understand argumentation semantics through a common formal language. We show that many existing semantics such as explanation semantics, multi-agent semantics, and more typical semantics, that have been proposed for specific purposes, are understood in the relational perspective.

1 Introduction

Relational database promotes knowledge management. Formal argumentation [12] (more traditionally belief revision [1, 18]) offers a machinery for conflict resolution. It is natural to try to integrate the two.

The relation of database and formal argumentation has been primarily for the latter to augment the former for dealing with inconsistent information present in it. There are a number of ideas proposed in this direction: inconsistent database management, e.g. [3, 4, 11, 17, 8, 16, 19, 22, 21, 7, 25, 29]), argumentation or dialectical databases [10, 26], argumentation-supported database queries [23, 15], schema matching [24], argumentation semantic web [27].

By contrast, the other direction of mingling, whereby formal argumentation is primary and relational database theory acts on it, has not been as well explored. The contrast could be in principle due to a lack of practical or theoretical significance in such matrimony. We shall demonstrate, however, that that is far from the case; that, in fact, it gives rise to a new means of encapsulation to facilitate a more general understanding of argumentation semantics; uniting, in particular, disparate argumentation semantics proposed for different purposes under a single relational perspective.

To explain what we specifically propose, a broad description of formal argumentation should be in place first and foremost. Given a representation of argumentation as a directed graph of: nodes representing information (typically arguments though can be anything) and edges representing certain directional relation (of attacks typically), formal argumentation typically identifies which nodes are accepted (, rejected, undecided-to-be-either, and so on). In a labelling-based approach, it amounts to finding labelling functions that assign a label corresponding to those acceptance statuses to each graph node in a way satisfying a given set of labelling constraints. Depending on chosen constraints, there could be more than one labelling function meeting the requirement, and there could be none.

On to our proposal, let us say that there is an argumentation graph and a set of constraints, and that we have obtained all labelling functions as satisfy them. Our proposal is *to view them as a relational database*, to be manipulated upon, just as any relational database. Encapsulation of the underlying graph structure is one of the key advantages of this viewpoint, allowing us to understand argumentation semantics more generally through the abstraction. We show that once some primary semantics are obtained and put in a database table form, many other semantics are its derivatives in the relational perspective.

We formalise our proposal by formulating a tuple relational calculus (see any standard text, e.g. [28], for database, but see [20] for an overview of theoretical relational database) for argumentation semantics. We then show that it serves to bring different argumentation semantics into a single relational

perspective. The novelty, significance and relevance of this work, from our vantage point, are as follows. **Novelty:** as far as our search on Google Scholar has permitted us, we did not find any previous work with a similar intent to understand argumentation semantics in tuple relational calculus. The perspective to view argumentation semantics as a relational database, and any query result as a relational argumentation semantics, is novel. **Significance:** as we show, the relational perspective brings argumentation semantics proposed for different purposes into a single relational perspective. The abstraction helps decouple primary components from derivatives, allowing us to understand argumentation semantics more generally. An argumentation semantics has been proposed for specific sets of constraints so far. Our proposal is a way of classifying argumentation semantics through a common formal language, in that sense assisting a more uniform understanding of argumentation semantics. Furthermore, it is practically significant, since any sensible query in the tuple relational calculus that we propose here can be directly handled in SQL; there is no need for any extra implementation. **Relevance:** the topic is of interest not only to argumentation communities and the theoretical database community, but also to those communities working on extraction and management of knowledge, where encapsulation is an asset.

2 Technical Preliminaries

Tuple relational calculus is the theoretical foundation of SQL. However, it is not an entirely familiar concept to formal argumentation practitioners taken as a whole. What may be obvious to the database community needs to be introduced with sufficient detail. To the database community, tuple relational calculus - even though to be adjusted for the benefit of argumentation semantics - is indeed a fairly standard formal machinery needing barely any new introduction. On the other hand, what of argumentation semantics, and first of all what exactly an argumentation semantics is, may need to be formally detailed before it becomes clear what contributions the relational calculus can make to formal argumentation.

These points weighed in, we choose to introduce formal argumentation semantics in this preliminary section in a way accessible to non-formal-argumentation communities, and treat adaptation of tuple relational calculus in Section 3 in a way accessible to the formal argumentation community.


2.1 Formal argumentation

Assume \mathcal{A} is the class of abstract entities we understand as arguments, and \mathcal{R} is the class of all binary relations over \mathcal{A} . We refer to a member of \mathcal{A} by A , that of \mathcal{R} by R , with or without a subscript. Assume \mathcal{R}^A denotes the subclass of \mathcal{R} containing every - but no other - $R \in \mathcal{R}$ that satisfies: if $(a_1, a_2) \in R$, then $a_1, a_2 \in A$. Then, a graph structure (A, R) with $R \in \mathcal{R}^A$ is an abstract representation of an argumentation. Far more often than not, A is finite, and we treat it as such in the rest. As for R , we assume for simplicity that every member indicates an attack relation, that is, $(a_1, a_2) \in R$ means a_1 attacks a_2 , and a_1 is the attacker of a_2 .

Example 1 (Warring countries, an example of an argumentation graph) *Suppose 7 warring countries, each having its own agenda as regards which countries to intrude into:*

a_A : Country A “We destroy Country C.”	a_D : Country D “We destroy Country C and Country E.”
a_B : Country B “We destroy Country A.”	a_E : Country E “We destroy Country D.”
a_C : Country C “We destroy Country B.”	a_F : Country F “We destroy Country G.”

Each country’s stance, as an argument, and the direction of aggression generate the following argumentation graph: $(\{a_A, \dots, a_G\}, \{(a_F, a_G), (a_E, a_D), (a_D, a_E), (a_D, a_C), (a_C, a_B), (a_B, a_A), (a_A, a_C)\})$. ♣



tbl ₁	a_G	a_F	a_E	a_D	a_C	a_B	a_A
λ_1	l_c	in	l_c	l_c	l_c	l_c	l_c
λ_2	l_c	in	in	l_c	l_c	l_c	l_c
λ_3	l_c	in	l_c	in	l_c	l_c	l_c
λ_4	l_c	in	l_c	in	l_c	in	l_c

tbl ₂	a_G	a_F	a_E	a_D	a_C	a_B	a_A
λ_5	out	in	und	und	und	und	und
λ_6	out	in	in	out	und	und	und
λ_7	out	in	out	in	out	in	out

tbl ₃	a_E	a_D	a_C	a_B	a_A
λ_8	l_c	in	l_c	in	l_c

tbl ₄	a_G	a_F	a_E
λ_9	out	in	und
λ_{10}	out	in	in
λ_{11}	out	in	out

tbl ₅	a_D	a_C	a_B	a_A
λ_{12}	in	out	in	out

Figure 1: (The table referred to by) tbl₁ lists admissible labellings ($\lambda_1(a_G) = l_c$, and so on). tbl₂ lists complete labellings with in, out, und. tbl₃ lists labellings that explain a_B . tbl₄ lists agent 1’s local complete labellings for a_G, a_F and a_E based on the knowledge of $(\{a_G, a_F, a_E, a_D\}, \{(a_F, a_G), (a_E, a_D), (a_D, a_E)\})$. tbl₅ lists agent 2’s local stable labellings for a_D, a_C, a_B and a_A based on the knowledge of $(\{a_D, a_C, a_B, a_A\}, \{(a_E, a_D), (a_D, a_E), (a_D, a_C), (a_C, a_B), (a_B, a_A), (a_A, a_C)\})$.

Assume L to be a set of labels, and assume Λ to be the class of all partial functions $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow L$. Each member of Λ is a labelling function, though, as per a permeated convention, we simply call it a labelling in the rest. We refer to each labelling by λ with(out) a subscript.

One of the main objectives of the abstract representation of an argumentation is to infer from it acceptance statuses of arguments, to be determined by a given set of constraints. In an equivalent term, it is to derive a set of labellings that satisfy labelling constraints. As for what constraints exist, there are many that have been - and are still being - proposed for specific purposes. Assume $dom(\lambda)$ is the domain of λ , and assume a label in $\in L$ indicating ‘accept’. Given (A, R) , there is the constraint of ‘conflict-freeness’: $\lambda \in \Lambda$ be such that $dom(\lambda) \subseteq A$ and that, for any $a_1, a_2 \in dom(\lambda)$, if $\lambda(a_1) = \lambda(a_2) = \text{in}$, then $(a_1, a_2) \notin R$. This condition enforces no simultaneous acceptance of an argument and its attacker (no destroyed country can destroy another country). The constraint of ‘ A_1 defending a ’ for some $A_1 \subseteq A$ and some $a \in A$ is: $\lambda \in \Lambda$ be such that $A_1 \subseteq dom(\lambda) \subseteq A$ and that if $\lambda(a_1) = \text{in}$ for every $a_1 \in A_1$, then for any $a_x \in A$ with $(a_x, a) \in R$, there exists some $a_2 \in A_1$ such that $(a_2, a_x) \in R$. More informally, regard any subset of arguments in A assigned in by λ as belong to the same group, it characterises the collective defence of a by the group A_1 : if a is attacked by an argument, there is at least one member in the group A_1 that offers a counter-attack to the attacker. Any labelling λ with $dom(\lambda) = A$ satisfying both conflict-freeness and the ‘ $dom(\lambda)$ defending a ’ for every $a \in dom(\lambda)$ is called admissible. Assume some label $l_c \in L$ as the complement of in (‘not accept’), and for a short-hand, assume ‘ $\lambda[a_1, \dots, a_n] = (l_1, \dots, l_n)$ ’ means both: $dom(\lambda) = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$; and $\lambda(a_i) = l_i$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then in our example above, $\lambda[a_G, a_F, a_E, a_D, a_C, a_B, a_A]$ can be any one of the following; see (the table referred to by) tbl₁ in Fig. 1:

- $(l_c, \text{in}, l_c, l_c, l_c, l_c, l_c)$.
- $(l_c, \text{in}, \text{in}, l_c, l_c, l_c, l_c)$.
- $(l_c, \text{in}, l_c, \text{in}, l_c, l_c, l_c)$.
- $(l_c, \text{in}, l_c, \text{in}, l_c, \text{in}, l_c)$.

Classic argumentation semantics. Any admissible labelling that also satisfies the ‘completeness’ constraint: λ be such that, for any $a_x \in A$, if $\{a \in A \mid \lambda(a) = \text{in}\}$ defends a_x , then $a_x \in dom(\lambda)$ and $\lambda(a_x) = \text{in}$, is called complete in a weaker sense (extension-based approach). As proved in [9], a stronger sense is possible with out (‘reject’) or else und (‘undecided’) following the three rules below: given (A, R) , for every $a \in A$, **(Rule 1)** $\lambda(a) \in \{\text{in}, \text{out}, \text{und}\}$, **(Rule 2)** $\lambda(a) = \text{in}$ if and only if, or iff, there is no attacker of a that is not assigned out by λ , and **(Rule 3)** $\lambda(a) = \text{out}$ iff there is some attacker of a that is assigned in by λ .

Labellings obtained by these are conservative over the weaker-sense labellings for in-labelled arguments, but give more information to the acceptance statuses of the other arguments. Set $L = \{\text{in}, \text{out}, \text{und}, l_c\}$

to express either of the senses. For the stronger one, as in tbl_2 in Fig. 1, $\lambda[a_G, a_F, a_E, a_D, a_C, a_B, a_A]$ can be: (out, in, und, und, und, und, und); (out, in, in, out, und, und, und); or (out, in, out, in, out, in, out).

Let $\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{\text{com}}$ be the set of all complete labellings of (A, R) in either of the senses, and assume $\lambda_1 \preceq \lambda_2$ holds just when firstly $\text{dom}(\lambda_1) = \text{dom}(\lambda_2)$ holds, secondly $\bigcup_{a \in \text{dom}(\lambda_1)} \lambda_1(a) = \bigcup_{a \in \text{dom}(\lambda_2)} \lambda_2(a)$ holds, and thirdly $\lambda_1(a) \notin \{\text{und}, l_c\}$ materially implies $\lambda_1(a) = \lambda_2(a)$. Then λ is called: preferred just when firstly it is complete and secondly, for any $\lambda_x \in \Lambda_{(A,R)}^{\text{com}}$, either $\lambda_x \preceq \lambda$ holds or else λ_x and λ are not comparable in $(\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{\text{com}}, \preceq)$; stable just when it is preferred and, for any $a_x \in A$, if $\lambda(a_x) \neq \text{in}$, then there is some $a \in A$ such that $\lambda(a) = \text{in}$ and that $(a, a_x) \in R$; and grounded iff λ is the greatest lower bound of $(\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{\text{com}}, \preceq)$. Classic argumentation semantics make use of them: X semantics of (A, R) is the set of all X labellings of (A, R) , where X is a member of {Complete, Preferred, Stable, Grounded}. Intuition for each semantics is: complete semantics is inclusive of all arguments that can be defended; preferred semantics is prejudiced for a maximally opinionated complete labelling by \preceq , grounded semantics is an impartial semantics preferring to judge ‘accept’ only those arguments that are judged ‘accept’ by all complete labellings; and stable semantics ensures that the ‘accept’ arguments attack every other arguments.

Explanation semantics. The defence constraint enforces certain causality in the labels of arguments; that, given λ , some argument assuming in is due specifically to other arguments assuming certain labels. Let us look back at our example, and consider one admissible labelling $\lambda[a_G, \dots, a_A] = (l_c, \text{in}, l_c, \text{in}, l_c, \text{in}, l_c)$. According to the reasoning in [14], $\lambda(a_B) = \text{in}$ is explained by a_D ’s in, since, if a_D is not assigned in, a_B also would not be. On the other hand, it is not explained by a_F ’s in, since the label of a_F exerts no influence over the label of a_B . Following the intuition, we may enforce the constraint of ‘relevance to a ’ for some $a \in A$: given (A, R) , let (A', R') be such that $A' = \bigcup_{(a_x, a) \in R^*} a_x$ and that $R' \in \mathcal{R}^{A'}$ (R^* is the reflexive-transitive closure of R), λ shall be such that $\text{dom}(\lambda) = A'$.

Then, for any $a \in A$, λ explains a iff: firstly λ satisfies relevance to a ; secondly, given $AF \equiv (\text{dom}(\lambda), R)$ with $R \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{dom}(\lambda)}$, λ is admissible in AF ; and finally $\lambda(a) = \text{in}$. We may say that the set of all labellings that explain a is the explanation semantics of (A, R) for a . In our example, the explanation semantics for a_B is a singleton set containing just $\lambda[a_E, \dots, a_A] = (l_c, \text{in}, l_c, \text{in}, l_c)$; see tbl_3 in Fig. 1.

Multi-agent semantics. Of many a number of existing multi-agent argumentation semantics, there are those that focus on derivation of a global argumentation semantics from agents’ local argumentation semantics. One typical idea that we touch upon in this paper is: given (A, R) , partition A into A_1, \dots, A_n ($\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} A_i = A$), each of which represents arguments put forward by an agent; each agent i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) knows some (A_x, R_x) such that $A_i \subseteq A_x \subseteq A$ and $R_x = R \cap (A_x \times A_x)$, and derives some semantics of (A_x, R_x) and keep the labels for arguments in A_i which form the agent’s local semantics Λ_i where $\lambda_i \in \Lambda_i$ satisfies $\text{dom}(\lambda_i) = A_i$ (a concrete example follows below). In the meantime, an external observer computes a semantics of the global argumentation graph Λ_g (where $\lambda_g \in \Lambda_g$ satisfies $\text{dom}(\lambda_g) = A$). A multi-agent labelling is then any $\lambda_g \in \Lambda_g$ such that, for each partition A_i , it assigns the same labels to A_i as some $\lambda_i \in \Lambda_i$. All multi-agent labellings form a multi-agent semantics. In our example, suppose agent 1: puts forward a_G, \dots, a_E ; and knows a_G, \dots, a_D and attacks among them. Suppose agent 2: puts forward a_D, \dots, a_A ; and knows a_E, \dots, a_A and attacks among them. Suppose agent 1 (resp. agent 2) uses complete semantics (stable semantics) with in, out and und. Then agent 1’s (resp. agent 2’s) local complete (resp. stable) semantics comprises 3 (resp. 1) labellings as shown in tbl_4 (resp. tbl_5) in Fig. 1. Suppose an observer uses complete semantics (tbl_2). Then the multi-agent semantics is a singleton set $\{\lambda_7\}$.

3 Relational Argumentation Semantics

To understand the different types of argumentation semantics in a single perspective, we present the viewpoint: ‘argumentation semantics as a relational database’ in this section, consolidating the bonding

and relational generalisation of argumentation semantics. We begin by formulating a tuple relational calculus for argumentation semantics.

Definition 1 (Arg-labelling table) We define an arg-labelling table to be a tuple (A, Λ_1) with $A \subseteq_{fin} \mathcal{A}$, called header of (A, Λ_1) , and $\Lambda_1 \subseteq \Lambda$ with any of its member λ satisfying $\text{dom}(\lambda) = A$ called body of (A, Λ_1) .

Example 2 (Arg-labelling table) We saw some examples of arg-labelling tables, literally expressed in tables, in Fig. 1. Putting the table referred to by tbl_1 in tuple form, we obtain $(\{a_G, \dots, a_A\}, \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4\})$ where λ_i , $1 \leq i \leq 4$, is such that $\text{dom}(\lambda_i) = \{a_G, \dots, a_A\}$, and that $\lambda_i(a_j) = x_{(i,j)}$, $j \in \{G, \dots, A\}$ ($x_{(i,j)}$ is the element in the table in the i -th row and j -th column, as usual of a matrix notation). ♣

It is obvious from the definition that there is no duplicate in the body. Now:

Definition 2 (Relational arg-labelling database) Let \mathcal{T} be a potentially uncountable set of table names, let tbl with(out) a subscript and a superscript denote its member, and let TBL with(out) a subscript its subset. We define a relational arg-labelling database schema to be a tuple (L, TBL, header) with $\text{header} : TBL \rightarrow 2^A$ associating a set of arguments to each table name. We denote the set of all relational arg-labelling database schemata by $SCHM$, and refer to its member by $schm$ with(out) a subscript.

We define a relational arg-labelling database for $schm \equiv (L, TBL, \text{header})$ to be $db : TBL \rightarrow 2^A$ satisfying the following condition¹: for every $tbl \in TBL$ and every $\lambda \in db(tbl)$, it holds that $\text{dom}(\lambda) = \text{header}(tbl)$.

Example 3 (Relational arg-labelling database) Let us refer to Fig. 1 and observe that there are 5 arg-labelling tables in total. The arg-labelling database holding them is expressed with the following relational arg-labelling database schema and relational arg-labelling database with respect to it. Assume $A_1 = A_2 = \{a_G, \dots, a_A\}$, $A_3 = \{a_E, \dots, a_A\}$, $A_4 = \{a_G, a_F, a_E\}$, $A_5 = \{a_D, \dots, a_A\}$, $\Lambda_1 = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4\}$, $\Lambda_2 = \{\lambda_5, \lambda_7\}$, $\Lambda_3 = \{\lambda_8\}$, $\Lambda_4 = \{\lambda_9, \lambda_{10}, \lambda_{11}\}$, and $\Lambda_5 = \{\lambda_{12}\}$.

Then: $schm$ is $(L, \{tbl_1, \dots, tbl_5\}, \text{header} \equiv \{tbl_1 \mapsto A_1, \dots, tbl_5 \mapsto A_5\})$; and db is $\{tbl_1 \mapsto \Lambda_1, \dots, tbl_5 \mapsto \Lambda_5\}$. It holds that $\text{dom}(\lambda_1) = A_1 = \text{header}(tbl_1)$, and similarly for all the others. (Note: the reason that we chose to have all the arg-labelling tables in the same - that is, in one - arg-labelling database is because we focus more on illustration of our relational calculus in sections 3.1 and 3.2. In practice, which tables should be grouped together varies by one's intention (e.g. Example 8 later).) ♣

3.1 Syntax and semantics of formal query language

Syntax of the query language is defined almost as tuple relational calculus, save we introduce a dyadic function count to count the number of a certain label assigned to the header arguments by a labelling. This additional function is appropriate for an arg-labelling table where any member in the body is a labelling, that is, the output of any member is in the same type L , which assures well-definedness of the counting function for every arg-labelling table. We introduce definitions (Definition 3 - 5) and illustrate them in an example.

Definition 3 (Atomic query formula) Let V be an uncountable set of variables. We define an atomic query formula with respect to $schm \equiv (L, TBL, \text{header})$ to be any of the following, so long as it satisfies the accompanying conditions.

- $v_1.a_1 \doteq v_2.a_2$ for $v_1, v_2 \in V$ and $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}$.
- $v_1.a_1 \doteq l$ for $v_1 \in V$, $a_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $l \in L$.
- $tbl[v_1]$ for $v_1 \in V$ and $tbl \in TBL$.
- $\text{count}(v_1, l_1) \leq \text{count}(v_2, l_2)$ for $l_1, l_2 \in L$.
- $\text{count}(v_1, l_1) \leq n$ for $l_1 \in L$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- $n \leq \text{count}(v_1, l_1)$ for $l_1 \in L$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

¹Readers are cautioned that this superscript is Λ and not A .

Definition 4 (Query formula) We define a query formula with respect to schm to be any of the following. We may refer to a query formula by \mathbf{F} with(out) a subscript.

- an atomic formula with respect to schm .
- $\neg \mathbf{F}_1$ if \mathbf{F}_1 is a formula.
- $\mathbf{F}_1 \wedge \mathbf{F}_2$ if \mathbf{F}_1 and \mathbf{F}_2 are formulas.
- $\mathbf{F}_1 \vee \mathbf{F}_2$ if \mathbf{F}_1 and \mathbf{F}_2 are formulas.
- $\exists v : A[\mathbf{F}_1]$ if A is a set of arguments and \mathbf{F}_1 is a formula.
- $\forall v : A[\mathbf{F}_1]$ if A is a set of arguments and \mathbf{F}_1 is a formula.

Following the predicate logic convention, we say that a variable v is: free in \mathbf{F} iff it is not quantified; bound in \mathbf{F} iff it is not free in \mathbf{F} .

The following semantics of the language is fairly standard to the database theory community; argumentation people may find the example to follow instrumental.

Definition 5 (Semantics) Let $\text{eval} : V \rightarrow \Lambda$ be an interpretation function such that $\text{eval}(v) \in \Lambda$, and let a ‘semantic structure’ be a tuple $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval})$ for schm and db for schm . We inductively define $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \mathbf{F}$ for some $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval})$ and some \mathbf{F} as follows.

- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models v_1.a_1 \doteq v_2.a_2$ iff $a_1 \in \text{dom}(\text{eval}(v_1))$ and $a_2 \in \text{dom}(\text{eval}(v_2))$ and $\text{eval}(v_1)(a_1) = \text{eval}(v_2)(a_2)$.
- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models v_1.a_1 \doteq l$ iff $a_1 \in \text{dom}(\text{eval}(v_1))$ and $\text{eval}(v_1)(a_1) = l$.
- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \text{tbl}[v_1]$ iff $\text{eval}(v_1) \in \text{db}(\text{tbl})$.
- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \text{count}(v_1, l_1) \leq \text{count}(v_2, l_2)$ iff $|\{a \in \text{dom}(\text{eval}(v_1)) \mid \text{eval}(v_1)(a) = l_1\}| \leq |\{a \in \text{dom}(\text{eval}(v_2)) \mid \text{eval}(v_2)(a) = l_2\}|$
- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \text{count}(v_1, l_1) \leq n$ iff $|\{a \in \text{dom}(\text{eval}(v_1)) \mid \text{eval}(v_1)(a) = l_1\}| \leq n$.
- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models n \leq \text{count}(v_1, l_1)$ iff $n \leq |\{a \in \text{dom}(\text{eval}(v_1)) \mid \text{eval}(v_1)(a) = l_1\}|$.
- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \neg \mathbf{F}$ iff $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \not\models \mathbf{F}$.
- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \mathbf{F}_1 \wedge \mathbf{F}_2$ iff $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \mathbf{F}_i$ for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \mathbf{F}_1 \vee \mathbf{F}_2$ iff $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \mathbf{F}_i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \exists v : A[\mathbf{F}]$ iff there is some λ such that $\text{dom}(\lambda) = A$ and that $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}') \models \mathbf{F}$ where eval' is almost exactly eval except $\text{eval}'(v) = \lambda$.
- $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \forall v : A[\mathbf{F}]$ iff, for every λ , if $\text{dom}(\lambda) = A$, then $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}') \models \mathbf{F}$ where eval' is almost exactly eval except $\text{eval}'(v) = \lambda$.

We say that $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval})$ models \mathbf{F} iff $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval}) \models \mathbf{F}$.

For atomic formulas, $v_1.a_1 \doteq v_2.a_2$ tests whether the label of a_1 assigned by $\lambda_x \equiv \text{eval}(v_1)$ and that of a_2 assigned by $\lambda_y \equiv \text{eval}(v_2)$ matches. The first two attached conditions force $a_1 \in \text{dom}(\lambda_x)$ and $a_2 \in \text{dom}(\lambda_y)$. $v_1.a_2 \doteq l$ tests whether the label of a_1 assigned by $\lambda_x \equiv \text{eval}(v_1)$ is l . $\text{tbl}[v_1]$ tests whether $\lambda_x \equiv \text{eval}(v_1)$ is in the body of the arg-labelling table $\text{db}(\text{tbl})$. $\text{count}(v_1, l_1) \leq \text{count}(v_2, l_2)$ compares the number of arguments assigned l_1 by $\lambda_1 \equiv \text{eval}(v_1)$ and that of arguments assigned l_2 by $\lambda_2 \equiv \text{eval}(v_2)$, and similarly for the other two atomic formulas involving count.

Example 4 (Formal language of queries) We assume the arg-labelling tables in our running example (see Fig. 1).

- $\text{tbl}_1[v_1] \wedge \text{tbl}_2[v_2] \wedge v_1.a_F \doteq v_2.a_B$ signifies firstly that $\lambda_x \equiv \text{eval}(v_1)$ is in the arg-labelling table tbl_1 , secondly that $\lambda_y \equiv \text{eval}(v_2)$ is in the arg-labelling table tbl_2 , and thirdly that $\lambda_x(a_F) = \lambda_y(a_B)$. Compare tbl_1 and tbl_2 ; for any labelling λ in tbl_1 , $\lambda(a_F) = \text{in}$, and for any labelling λ' in tbl_2 , $\lambda'(a_k) = \text{in}$ iff $\lambda' = \lambda_7$. This means that, for any eval , $(\text{schm}, \text{db}, \text{eval})$ models this query formula iff $(\lambda_x =) \text{eval}(v_1) \in \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4\}$ and $(\lambda_y =) \text{eval}(v_2) = \lambda_7$.

- $tbl_4[v_2] \wedge \exists v_1 : \{a_G, \dots, a_A\} [tbl_2[v_1] \wedge v_1.a_E \doteq v_1.a_A \wedge v_2.a_E \doteq v_1.a_F]$ signifies the following: for some $\lambda_x \equiv eval(v_1)$ in the body of tbl_2 with $\lambda_x(a_E) = \lambda_x(a_A)$, $\lambda_y \equiv eval(v_2)$ is such that firstly λ_y is in the body of tbl_4 and secondly $\lambda_y(a_E) = \lambda_x(a_F)$ (= in). There is only one labelling in tbl_4 , λ_{10} , to be the λ_y . This means that, for any eval, $(schm, db, eval)$ models this query formula iff $(\lambda_y =) eval(v_2) = \lambda_{10}$.
- $tbl_2[v_1] \wedge (3 \leq count(v, in) \vee 4 \leq count(v, und))$ signifies firstly that $\lambda_x \equiv eval(v_1)$ is in the arg-labelling table tbl_2 , and secondly that λ_x assigns in to at least 3 or und to at least 4 arguments in $dom(\lambda_x)$. This means that, for any eval, $(schm, db, eval)$ models this query formula iff $eval(v) \in \{\lambda_5, \lambda_7\}$.

In the above examples, take particular notice of the purpose of $tbl[v]$ atomic formulas acting to restrict the domain of a labelling to the header arguments of the referred arg-labelling table. ♣

3.2 Relational arg-labelling semantics

Definition 6 (Relational arg-labelling semantics) We define an arg-labelling query to be the following expression: $\{v : A \mid \mathbf{F}\}$, whereby the only free variable in \mathbf{F} is v .

We define the semantics of a query $\{v : A \mid \mathbf{F}\}$ with respect to some $schm$ and db to be the set of all λ satisfying $(schm, db, eval) \models \mathbf{F}$ with $eval(v) = \lambda$, and denote it by $\|\{v : A \mid \mathbf{F}\}\|$. We call any $\|\{v : A \mid \mathbf{F}\}\|$ with respect to $schm$ and db a relational arg-labelling semantics with respect to $schm$ and db .

Basic database queries such as selecting rows of a table, selecting columns of a table, and joining two tables, produce certain effects on arg-labelling database with associated arg-labelling tables.

Example 5 (Selecting columns of a single arg-labelling table) In Fig. 1, tbl_4 (more precisely the arg-labelling table referred to by tbl_4) is the result of selecting 3 columns a_G , a_F and a_E of tbl_2 . The corresponding relational arg-labelling semantics is $\|\{v : \{a_G, a_F, a_E\} \mid tbl_2[v]\}\|$ with respect to the same $schm$ and db in Example 3. To see to it, we firstly enumerate all λ with $(schm, db, eval) \models tbl_2[v]$ for $eval(v) = \lambda$, which are λ_1, \dots , and λ_4 ; for each of them, we force the domain to $\{a_G, a_F, a_E\}$, to obtain λ_9, λ_{10} and λ_{11} . We saw in Section 2 that both explanation and multi-agent semantics share the process of restricting attention to a subset of arguments. ♣

In the remaining, we let $\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n} v.a_i \doteq l_i$ abbreviate $v.a_1 \doteq l_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v.a_n \doteq l_n$.

Example 6 (Selecting rows of a single arg-labelling table) Classic argumentation semantics is defined with row selection from complete semantics. With tbl_2 , $\|\{v : \{a_G, \dots, a_A\} \mid tbl_2[v] \wedge -1 \leq count(v, und)\}\|$ with respect to the same $schm$ and db is the stable semantics. ♣

To put together multiple tables based on some constraints, there are joins.

Example 7 (Condition join) Let us say, we like to join tbl_4 and tbl_5 in such a way that λ with $dom(\lambda) = \{a_G, \dots, a_A\}$ is in the resultant table's body iff there are some $\lambda_x \in db(tbl_4)$ and some $\lambda_y \in db(tbl_5)$ such that $\lambda_x(a_i) = \lambda(a_i)$ and $\lambda_y(a_j) = \lambda(a_j)$ hold for every $i \in \{a_G, a_F, a_E\}$ and every $j \in \{a_D, \dots, a_A\}$ and that λ is in the body of tbl_2 . The relational arg-labelling semantics of this condition join is $\|\{v : \{a_G, \dots, a_A\} \mid tbl_2[v] \wedge \exists v_1 : \{a_G, a_F, a_E\} [tbl_4[v_1] \wedge (\bigwedge_{i \in \{G, \dots, E\}} v.a_i \doteq v_1.a_i) \wedge \exists v_2 : \{a_D, \dots, a_A\} [tbl_5[v_2] \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in \{D, \dots, A\}} v.a_i \doteq v_2.a_i]]]\}\|$. This, incidentally, forms the multi-agent semantics of Section 2. ♣

Though we do not highlight here for space, there are other types of joins, too, such as outer joins, as well as renaming, division and typical set-theoretic operations (union, intersection, difference). Readers are referred to [28, 20].

3.3 Consequence of the perspective of argumentation semantics as a relational database

We have provided a fresh perspective of: traditional argumentation semantics as a relational database. Since our relational calculus is tuple relational calculus plus a specific counting function, every sensible query (technically, domain independent queries [28, 20]) that is possible within the calculus can be queried in SQL that is readily available for use.

For theoretical implications, it offers a unifying relational point of view to argumentation semantics. For a start, weaker or stronger, whichever sense it is, we can uniformly define classic argumentation semantics.

Proposition 1 (Classic argumentation semantics as relational arg-labelling semantics) *Given (A, R) , assume $\text{schm} \equiv (L, \{tbl_{com}\}, \text{header})$ and db such that $\text{header}(tbl_{com}) = A$, and that $db(tbl_{com}) = \Lambda_{(A,R)}^{com}$. Then, complete / preferred / grounded / stable semantics of (A, R) is a relational arg-labelling semantics with respect to schm and db .*

Proof 1 *Vacuous for complete semantics; we need only select all members of the body of tbl_x . See Example 6 for row selection. For preferred semantics, we need only ensure to drop all rows that are not maximal in $(\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{com}, \preceq)$. The corresponding relational arg-labelling semantics is: $\|\{v : A \mid \exists v_1 : A[tbl_x[v_1] \wedge \bigwedge_{a_i \in A} v.a_i \doteq v_1.a_i] \wedge \forall v_2 : A[\neg tbl_x[v_2] \vee \bigwedge_{a_i \in A} ((\neg v_2.a_i \doteq in \wedge \neg v_2.a_i \doteq out) \vee v_2.a_i \doteq v.a_i)]\}\|$. For grounded semantics, we need to derive the meet of $\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{com}$ in \preceq , but this is precisely the relational arg-labelling semantics: $\|\{v : A \mid \bigwedge_{a_i \in A} (((\neg v.a_i \doteq in \wedge \neg v.a_i \doteq out) \vee \forall v_1 : A[\neg tbl_x[v_1] \vee v.a_i \doteq v_1.a_i]) \wedge ((\neg v.a_i \doteq und \wedge \neg v.a_i \doteq l_c) \vee \exists v_1 : A[tbl_x[v_1] \wedge (v_1.a_i \doteq und \vee v_1.a_i \doteq l_c \vee \exists v_2 : A[tbl_x[v_2] \wedge \neg v_1.a_i \doteq v_2.a_i)]))\}\|$. For stable semantics, $\|\{v : A \mid tbl_x[v] \wedge \neg 1 \preceq count(v, und) \wedge \neg 1 \preceq count(v, l_c)\}\|$. \square*

This serves to underscore how derivation of some semantics requires the underlying argumentation graph, and how, on the other hand, other semantics only require comparisons of labels with no further reference to the argumentation graph, for which it makes a perfect sense to adopt the relational perspective.

The relational perspective goes beyond reformulation, contributing to generalisation. As we saw in Section 2, some argumentation semantics (explanation, multi-agent) intend to derive a view covering only a part of an argumentation graph in order to compute the final result. We can understand it as:

Proposition 2 (Partial semantics) *Given (A, R) , assume some semantics of it: $\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$ such that $\lambda \in \Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$ satisfies $\text{dom}(\lambda) = A$. Let us say that Λ_1 is a partial semantics of $\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$ iff all the following conditions hold.*

1. *There is some $A_1 \subseteq A$ such that, for every $\lambda_x \in \Lambda_1$, $\text{dom}(\lambda_x) = A_1$ holds.*
2. *For every $\lambda_x \in \Lambda_1$ and for every $a_1 \in A_1$, there is some $\lambda \in \Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$ such that $\lambda_x(a_1) = \lambda(a_1)$.*
3. *For every $\lambda \in \Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$ and for every $a_1 \in A_1$, there is some $\lambda_x \in \Lambda_1$ such that $\lambda_x(a_1) = \lambda(a_1)$.*

Every partial semantics of $\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$ is a relational arg-labelling semantics with respect to $\text{schm} \equiv (L, \{tbl_{sem}\} \cup TBL, \text{header})$ and db such that $\text{header}(tbl_{sem}) = A$ and $db(tbl_{sem}) = \Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$. Assume TBL is some set of table names.

Proof 2 *The defined partial semantics is selection by column in the relational perspective; see Example 5. Indeed, assume an arbitrary $A_1 \subseteq A$ and assume that Λ_1 is a partial semantics of $\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$. Then $\Lambda_1 = \|\{v : A_1 \mid tbl_{sem}[v]\}\|$. \square*

In Fig. 1, tbl_4 is a partial semantics of tbl_2 which is a complete semantics of the argumentation graph of the example, and tbl_5 is a partial semantics of stable semantics of the argumentation graph. Together with the observation in Ex. 7, we see that multi-agent semantics is a relational arg-labelling semantics.

Proposition 3 (Dependent semantics) Given (A, R) , assume some semantics of it, say $\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$ where $dom(\lambda) = A$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$, and some Λ_x where for every $\lambda_x \in \Lambda_x$, there is some $A_1 \subseteq A$ such that $dom(\lambda_x) = A_1$. Let us say that Λ_y is a dependent semantics of $\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$ with respect to Λ_x iff $\Lambda_y \subseteq \Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$ holds and also, for any $\lambda_y \in \Lambda_y$, there is some $\lambda_x \in \Lambda_x$ such that $\lambda_x(a_1) = \lambda_y(a_1)$ for every $a_1 \in A_1$.

Every dependent semantics of $\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$ with respect to Λ_x is a relational arg-labelling semantics with respect to $schem \equiv (L, \{tbl, tbl_x\} \cup TBL, header)$ and db with: $header(tbl) = A$; $header(tbl_x) = A_1$; $db(tbl) = \Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$; and $db(tbl_x) = \Lambda_x$. Assume TBL is some set of table names.

Proof 3 Do the described selection of labellings in $\Lambda_{(A,R)}^{sem}$. □

Example 8 (Explanation semantics [14]) Let us look back at Fig. 1. Assume $schem \equiv (L, \{tbl_1\}, header)$ with $header(tbl_1) = \{a_G, \dots, a_A\}$ and $db \equiv \{tbl_1 \mapsto \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4\}\}$. Recall tbl_1 lists all the admissible labellings with in and l_c . For explanation semantics for a_B , firstly only those arguments a with $(a, a_B) \in R^*$ were focused. As we mentioned earlier, we can obtain this as a partial semantics $\Lambda_x \equiv \{\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_4\}$ of $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4\}$ where, for every $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and for every $a \in \{a_E, \dots, a_A\}$, $\lambda_i(a) = \lambda'_i(a)$. As the second step, we need to retain only those labelling λ in the body of the resultant arg-labelling table with $\lambda(a_B) = in$. But this is a dependent semantics of Λ_x with respect to $\{a_B \mapsto in\}$. ♣

4 Conclusion with Related Work

Among the existing papers, the idea to put an argumentation graph into database for queries is around, e.g. [10, 13, 15, 23, 26]; however, as far as we are aware, no previous work proposed the viewpoint: argumentation semantics as a relational database. We showed that it facilitates encapsulation of argumentation semantics in a single relational perspective, allowing for natural generalisation of argumentation semantics as was demonstrated in section 3.3. Given a plethora of argumentation semantics being proposed in various ways, there is always a question of how they may link in what way. Identification of common constraints among different argumentation formalisms is popular [12, 6, 2, 5]. The relational perspective, we believe, is a fruitful direction also for the unification research, given the following properties. (1) The tuple relational calculus we defined for formal argumentation semantics is a proper formal language (is a fragment of predicate logic) whose semantics is not only defined at some points (contrarily, the constraint identification research identifies a specific set of constraints), but for any expression allowed in the language. This accommodates an easier fine-tuning of some existing semantics to cater to some more specific situations. We saw a couple of examples in section 3.3; from partial semantics to multi-agent semantics with a join, and from dependent semantics to explanation semantics. (2) Still, the expressiveness of the relational calculus is sufficiently restricted, allowing processing in SQL: as is well-known, any domain independent query [28, 20] possible in tuple relational calculus can be handled in SQL; and the counting function we incorporated is also processable in SQL. (3) By posing argumentation semantics as a relational database, it becomes more accessible for database theory community to focus on database theory issues in formal argumentation, which we believe will aid furthering communication among relevant research communities for new theoretical and practical insights.

References

- [1] C. E. Alchourrón, P. Gärdenfors, and D. Makinson. On the Logic of Theory Change: Partial Meet Contraction and Revision Functions. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 50:510–530, 1985.
- [2] L. Amgoud and J. Ben-Naim. Weighted Bipolar Argumentation Graphs: Axioms and Semantics. In *IJCAI*, pages 5194–5198, 2018.
- [3] L. Amgoud and S. Kaci. An argumentation framework for merging conflicting knowledge bases. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 45:321–340, 2007.

- [4] A. Arioua, M. Croitoru, and S. Vesic. Logic-based argumentation with existential rules. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 90:76–106, 2017.
- [5] P. Baroni and M. Giacomin. On principle-based evaluation of extension-based argumentation semantics. *Artificial Intelligence*, 171(10-15):675–700, 2007.
- [6] P. Baroni, A. Rago, and F. Toni. How Many Properties Do We Need for Gradual Argumentation? In *AAAI*, pages 1736–1743, 2018.
- [7] L. E. Bertossi, A. Hunter, and T. Schaub. Introduction to Inconsistency Tolerance. In *Inconsistency Tolerance*, pages 1–14, 2005.
- [8] P. Besnard and A. Hunter. A logic-based theory of deductive arguments. *Artificial Intelligence*, 128(1-2):203–235, 2001.
- [9] M. Caminada. On the Issue of Reinstatement in Argumentation. In *JELIA*, pages 111–123, 2006.
- [10] M. Capobianco, C. I. Chesñevar, and G. R. Simari. Argumentation and the Dynamics of Warranted Beliefs in Changing Environments. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 11(2):127–151, 2005.
- [11] C. A. D. Deagustini, S. E. F. Dalibón, S. Gottifredi, M. A. Flappa, C. I. Chesñevar, and G. R. Simari. Relational databases as a massive information source for defeasible argumentation. *Knowledge Based Systems*, 51:93–109, 2013.
- [12] P. M. Dung. On the Acceptability of Arguments and Its Fundamental Role in Nonmonotonic Reasoning, Logic Programming, and n-Person Games. *Artificial Intelligence*, 77(2):321–357, 1995.
- [13] U. Egly, S. A. Gaggl, and S. Woltran. Answer-set programming encodings for argumentation frameworks. *Argument and Computation*, 1(2):147–177, 2010.
- [14] X. Fan and F. Toni. On Computing Explanations in Argumentation. In *AAAI*, pages 1496–1502, 2015.
- [15] T. F. Gordon. Hybrid Reasoning with Argumentation Schemes. In *JCKBSE*, pages 543–552, 2008.
- [16] Z. Hao, J. Wu, T. Liu, and X. Chen. Leveraging Cognitive Context Knowledge for Argumentation-Based Object Classification in Multi-Sensor Networks. *IEEE Access*, 7:71361–71373, 2019.
- [17] B. R. Jefferys, L. A. Kelley, M. J. Sergot, J. Fox, and M. J. E. Sternberg. Capturing expert knowledge with argumentation: a case study in bioinformatics. *Bioinformatics*, 22(8):924–933.
- [18] H. Katsuno and A. O. Mendelzon. On the Difference between Updating a Knowledge Base and Revising it. In *Belief Revision*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- [19] N. Kökciyan, I. Sassoon, A. P. Young, M. Chapman, T. Porat, M. Ashworth, V. Curcin, S. Modgil, S. Parsons, and E. Sklar. Towards an Argumentation System for Supporting Patients in Self-Managing Their Chronic Conditions. In *AAAI Workshops*, pages 455–462, 2018.
- [20] P. G. Kolaitis. Relational Databases, Logic, and Complexity
”<https://users.soe.ucsc.edu/~kolaitis/talks/gii09-final.pdf>. 2009.
- [21] M. V. Martinez, C. A. D. Deagustini, M. A. Falappa, and G. R. Simari. Inconsistency-Tolerant Reasoning in Datalog+- Ontologies via an Argumentative Semantics. In *IBERAMIA*, pages 15–27, 2014.
- [22] M. O. Moguillansky and N. D. R. nd Marcelo A. Falappa. Inconsistent-tolerant base revision through Argument Theory Change. *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 20(1):154–186, 2012.
- [23] J. Müller and A. Hunter. Deepflow: Using Argument Schemes to Query Relational Databases. In *COMMA*, pages 469–470, 2014.
- [24] H. Q. V. Nguyen, X. H. Luong, Z. Miklós, T. T. Quan, and K. Aberer. Collaborative Schema Matching Reconciliation. In *OTM*, pages 222–240, 2013.
- [25] P. Novák and C. Witteveen. Context-aware reconfiguration of large-scale surveillance systems: argumentative approach. *Argument and Computation*, 6(1):3–23, 2015.
- [26] S. Pradhan. Argumentation Databases. In *ICLP*, pages 178–193, 2003.
- [27] I. Rahwan, F. Zablith, and C. Reed. Laying the foundations for a World Wide Argument Web. *Artificial Intelligence*, 171(10-15):897–921, 2007.
- [28] R. Ramakrishnan and J. Gehrke. *Database Management Systems (3rd edition)*. McGraw-Hill, 2002.
- [29] E. Santos, J. P. Martins, and H. Galhardas. An Argumentation-based Approach to Database Repair. In *ECAI*, pages 125–130, 2010.