Theory of Computer Science
## B1. Propositional Logic I

Gabriele Röger

University of Basel

February 19, 2020

Motivation
○○○○○○○○○○○○
Syntax
○○○○○
Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○
Summary
○○

Logic: Overview

Motivation
○●○○○○○○○○○○○

Syntax
○○○○○

Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○○

Summary
○○

Motivation

Motivation
○●○○○○○○○○○○

Syntax
○○○○○

Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○

Summary
○○

Why Logic?

- formalizing mathematics
  - What is a true statement?
  - What is a valid proof?
- basis of many tools in computer science
  - design of digital circuits
  - semantics of databases; query optimization
  - meaning of programming languages
  - verification of safety-critical hardware/software
  - knowledge representation in artificial intelligence
  - logic-based programming languages (e.g. Prolog)
  - . . .

Application: Logic Programming I

Declarative approach: Describe what to accomplish
not how to accomplish it.

Application: Logic Programming I

Declarative approach: Describe what to accomplish
                      not how to accomplish it.

Example (Map Coloring)

Color each region in a map with a limited number of colors
so that no two adjacent regions have the same color.

This is a hard problem!

Application: Logic Programming II

Prolog program

```
color(red). color(blue). color(green). color(yellow).

neighbor(StateAColor, StateBColor) :-
    color(StateAColor), color(StateBColor),
    StateAColor \= StateBColor.

switzerland(AG, AI, AR, BE, BL, BS, FR, GE, GL, GR,
            JU, LU, NE, NW, OW, SG, SH, SO, SZ, TG,
            TI, UR, VD, VS, ZG, ZH) :-
    neighbor(AG, BE), neighbor(AG, BL), neighbor(AG, LU),
    ...
    neighbor(UR, VS), neighbor(VD, VS), neighbor(ZH, ZG).
```

What Logic is About

General Question:

- Given some knowledge about the world (a knowledge base)
- what can we derive from it?
- And on what basis may we argue?

⤳ logic

Goal: "mechanical" proofs

- formal "game with letters"
- detached from a concrete meaning

Motivation
○○○○○●○○○○○○

Syntax
○○○○○

Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○

Summary
○○

Logic: Overview

Motivation
○○○○○○●○○○○○
Syntax
○○○○○
Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○
Summary
○○

Task

What's the secret of your long life?

I am on a strict diet: If I don't drink beer to a meal, then I always eat fish. Whenever I have fish and beer with the same meal, I abstain from ice cream. When I eat ice cream or don't drink beer, then I never touch fish.

Simplify this advice!

Exercise from U. Schöning: Logik für Informatiker
Picture courtesy of graur razvan ionut / FreeDigitalPhotos.net

Propositional Logic

Propositional logic is a simple logic without numbers or objects.

Building blocks of propositional logic:

- propositions are statements that can be either true or false
- atomic propositions cannot be split into sub-propositions
- logical connectives connect propositions to form new ones

German: Aussagenlogik, Aussage, atomare Aussage, Junktoren

Examples for Building Blocks

> If I don't drink beer to a meal, then I always eat fish. Whenever I have fish and beer with the same meal, I abstain from ice cream. When I eat ice cream or don't drink beer, then I never touch fish.

- Every sentence is a proposition that consists of sub-propositions (e. g., "eat ice cream or don't drink beer").

Exercise from U. Schöning: Logik für Informatiker
Picture courtesy of graur razvan ionut / FreeDigitalPhotos.net

Examples for Building Blocks

If I don't drink beer to a meal, then I always eat fish. Whenever I have fish and beer with the same meal, I abstain from ice cream. When I eat ice cream or don't drink beer, then I never touch fish.

- Every sentence is a proposition that consists of sub-propositions (e. g., "eat ice cream or don't drink beer").
- atomic propositions "drink beer", "eat fish", "eat ice cream"

Motivation
○○○○○○○○○●○○○

Syntax
○○○○○

Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○○

Summary
○○

Examples for Building Blocks

If I don't drink beer to a meal, then I always eat fish. Whenever I have fish and beer with the same meal, I abstain from ice cream. When I eat ice cream or don't drink beer, then I never touch fish.

- Every sentence is a proposition that consists of sub-propositions (e.g., "eat ice cream or don't drink beer").
- atomic propositions "drink beer", "eat fish", "eat ice cream"
- logical connectives "and", "or", negation, "if, then"

Problems with Natural Language

If I don't drink beer to a meal, then I always eat fish.
Whenever I have fish and beer with the same meal, I abstain from ice cream.
When I eat ice cream or don't drink beer, then I never touch fish.

Exercise from U. Schöning: Logik für Informatiker
Picture courtesy of graur razvan ionut / FreeDigitalPhotos.net

Problems with Natural Language

If I don't drink beer to a meal, then I always eat fish.
Whenever I have fish and beer with the same meal, I abstain from ice cream.
When I eat ice cream or don't drink beer, then I never touch fish.

- "irrelevant" information

Exercise from U. Schöning: Logik für Informatiker
Picture courtesy of graur razvan ionut / FreeDigitalPhotos.net

Problems with Natural Language

If I don't drink beer, then I eat fish.
Whenever I have fish and beer, I abstain
from ice cream.
When I eat ice cream or don't drink
beer, then I never touch fish.

- "irrelevant" information

Problems with Natural Language

If I don't drink beer, then I eat fish.
Whenever I have fish and beer, I abstain
from ice cream.
When I eat ice cream or don't drink
beer, then I never touch fish.

- ■ "irrelevant" information
- ■ different formulations for the same connective/proposition

Exercise from U. Schöning: Logik für Informatiker
Picture courtesy of graur razvan ionut / FreeDigitalPhotos.net

Problems with Natural Language

If I don't drink beer, then I eat fish.
Whenever I have fish and beer, I abstain
from ice cream.
When I eat ice cream or don't drink
beer, then I never touch fish.

- "irrelevant" information
- different formulations for the same connective/proposition

Exercise from U. Schöning: Logik für Informatiker
Picture courtesy of graur razvan ionut / FreeDigitalPhotos.net

Motivation
○○○○○○○○○○●○○

Syntax
○○○○○

Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○

Summary
○○

Problems with Natural Language

If not DrinkBeer, then EatFish.
If EatFish and DrinkBeer,
then not EatIceCream.
If EatIceCream or not DrinkBeer,
then not EatFish.

- "irrelevant" information
- different formulations for the same connective/proposition

Exercise from U. Schöning: Logik für Informatiker
Picture courtesy of graur razvan ionut / FreeDigitalPhotos.net

What is Next?

- What are meaningful (well-defined) sequences of
  atomic propositions and connectives?
  "if then EatIceCream not or DrinkBeer and" not meaningful
  → syntax

- What does it mean if we say that a statement is true?
  Is "DrinkBeer and EatFish" true?
  → semantics

- When does a statement logically follow from another?
  Does "EatFish" follow from "if DrinkBeer, then EatFish"?
 → logical entailment

German: Syntax, Semantik, logische Folgerung

Motivation
○○○○○○○○○○○○●

Syntax
○○○○○

Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○○

Summary
○○

Questions

Questions?

Motivation
000000000000

Syntax
●0000

Semantics
00000000000

Summary
00

Syntax

Logic: Overview

Syntax of Propositional Logic

Definition (Syntax of Propositional Logic)

Let A be a set of atomic propositions. The set of propositional formulas (over A) is inductively defined as follows:

- Every atom $a \in A$ is a propositional formula over A.

- If φ is a propositional formula over A,
  then so is its negation $\neg\varphi$.

- If φ and ψ are propositional formulas over A,
  then so is the conjunction $(\varphi \land \psi)$.

- If φ and ψ are propositional formulas over A,
  then so is the disjunction $(\varphi \lor \psi)$.

The implication $(\varphi \to \psi)$ is an abbreviation for $(\neg\varphi \lor \psi)$.
The biconditional $(\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi)$ is an abbrev. for $((\varphi \to \psi) \land (\psi \to \varphi))$.
German: atomare Aussage, aussagenlogische Formel, Atom, Negation, Konjunktion, Disjunktion, Implikation, Bikonditional

Motivation
○○○○○○○○○○○○

Syntax
○○○●○

Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○

Summary
○○

Syntax: Examples

Which of the following sequences of symbols are propositional
formulas over the set of all possible letter sequences? Which kinds
of formula are they (atom, conjunction, . . .)?

- $(A \land (B \lor C))$
- $((\text{EatFish} \land \text{DrinkBeer}) \to \neg\text{EatIceCream})$
- $\neg(\land \text{Rain} \lor \text{StreetWet})$
- $\neg(\text{Rain} \lor \text{StreetWet})$
- $\neg(A = B)$
- $(A \land \neg(B \leftrightarrow)C)$
- $(A \lor \neg(B \leftrightarrow C))$
- $((A \leq B) \land C)$
- $((A_1 \land A_2) \lor \neg(A_3 \leftrightarrow A_2))$

Motivation
○○○○○○○○○○○○○

Syntax
○○○○●

Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○

Summary
○○

Questions

Questions?

Semantics

Motivation
○○○○○○○○○○○○○

Syntax
○○○○○

Semantics
○●○○○○○○○○○

Summary
○○

Logic: Overview

Motivation
0000000000000

Syntax
00000

Semantics
0000000000000

Summary
00

Meaning of Propositional Formulas?

So far propositional formulas are only symbol sequences
without any meaning.

For example, what does this mean:
((EatFish ∧ DrinkBeer) → ¬EatIceCream)?

▷ We need semantics!

Semantics of Propositional Logic

Definition (Semantics of Propositional Logic)

A truth assignment (or interpretation) for a set of atomic propositions A is a function $\mathcal{I} : A \to \{0, 1\}$.

A propositional formula φ (over A) holds under $\mathcal{I}$
(written as $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$) according to the following definition:

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\mathcal{I} \models a & \text{iff} & \mathcal{I}(a) = 1 & \text{(for } a \in A) \\
\mathcal{I} \models \neg\varphi & \text{iff} & \text{not } \mathcal{I} \models \varphi & \\
\mathcal{I} \models (\varphi \wedge \psi) & \text{iff} & \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{I} \models \psi & \\
\mathcal{I} \models (\varphi \vee \psi) & \text{iff} & \mathcal{I} \models \varphi \text{ or } \mathcal{I} \models \psi &
\end{array}
$$

Question: should we define semantics of $(\varphi \to \psi)$ and $(\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi)$?

German: Wahrheitsbelegung/Interpretation, φ gilt unter $\mathcal{I}$

Motivation
○○○○○○○○○○○○

Syntax
○○○○○

Semantics
○○○○○●○○○○○○○

Summary
○○

Semantics of Propositional Logic: Terminology

- For $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$ we also say $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of φ
  and that φ is true under $\mathcal{I}$.

- If φ does not hold under $\mathcal{I}$, we write this as $\mathcal{I} \not\models \varphi$
  and say that $\mathcal{I}$ is no model of φ
  and that φ is false under $\mathcal{I}$.

- Note: $\models$ is not part of the formula
  but part of the meta language (speaking about a formula).

German: $\mathcal{I}$ ist ein/kein Modell von φ; φ ist wahr/falsch unter $\mathcal{I}$; Metasprache

Motivation
000000000000

Syntax
00000

Semantics
00000●00000

Summary
00

Exercise

Consider set $A = \{X, Y, Z\}$ of atomic propositions
and formula $\varphi = (X \wedge \neg Y)$.

Specify an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ for A with $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$.

Motivation
000000000000

Syntax
00000

Semantics
0000000●0000

Summary
00

Semantics: Example (1)

$A = \{\text{DrinkBeer}, \text{EatFish}, \text{EatIceCream}\}$

$\mathcal{I} = \{\text{DrinkBeer} \mapsto 1, \text{EatFish} \mapsto 0, \text{EatIceCream} \mapsto 1\}$

$\varphi = (\neg\text{DrinkBeer} \rightarrow \text{EatFish})$

Do we have $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$?

Motivation
000000000000

Syntax
00000

Semantics
000000000000

Summary
00

Semantics: Example (2)

Goal: prove $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$.

Let us use the definitions we have seen:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I} \models \varphi &\text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models (\neg \text{DrinkBeer} \rightarrow \text{EatFish}) \\
&\text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models (\neg\neg \text{DrinkBeer} \vee \text{EatFish}) \\
&\text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \neg\neg \text{DrinkBeer or } \mathcal{I} \models \text{EatFish}
\end{aligned}$$

This means that if we want to prove $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$, it is sufficient to prove

$$\mathcal{I} \models \neg\neg \text{DrinkBeer}$$

or to prove

$$\mathcal{I} \models \text{EatFish}.$$

We attempt to prove the first of these statements.

Semantics: Example (3)

New goal: prove $\mathcal{I} \models \neg\neg\mathsf{DrinkBeer}$.

We again use the definitions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I} \models \neg\neg\mathsf{DrinkBeer} \ &\text{iff not } \mathcal{I} \models \neg\mathsf{DrinkBeer} \\
&\text{iff not not } \mathcal{I} \models \mathsf{DrinkBeer} \\
&\text{iff } \mathcal{I} \models \mathsf{DrinkBeer} \\
&\text{iff } \mathcal{I}(\mathsf{DrinkBeer}) = 1
\end{aligned}
$$

The last statement is true for our interpretation $\mathcal{I}$.

To write this up as a proof of $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi$,
we can go through this line of reasoning back-to-front,
starting from our assumptions and ending with the conclusion
we want to show.

Semantics: Example (4)

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{\text{DrinkBeer} \mapsto 1, \text{EatFish} \mapsto 0, \text{EatIceCream} \mapsto 1\}$.

Proof that $\mathcal{I} \models (\neg\text{DrinkBeer} \rightarrow \text{EatFish})$:

1. We have $\mathcal{I} \models \text{DrinkBeer}$
   (uses defn. of $\models$ for atomic props. and fact
   $\mathcal{I}(\text{DrinkBeer}) = 1$).

2. From (1), we get $\mathcal{I} \not\models \neg\text{DrinkBeer}$
   (uses defn. of $\models$ for negations).

3. From (2), we get $\mathcal{I} \models \neg\neg\text{DrinkBeer}$
   (uses defn. of $\models$ for negations).

4. From (3), we get $\mathcal{I} \models (\neg\neg\text{DrinkBeer} \vee \psi)$ for all formulas ψ,
   in particular $\mathcal{I} \models (\neg\neg\text{DrinkBeer} \vee \text{EatFish})$
   (uses defn. of $\models$ for disjunctions).

5. From (4), we get $\mathcal{I} \models (\neg\text{DrinkBeer} \rightarrow \text{EatFish})$
   (uses defn. of "$\rightarrow$"). $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

Motivation
○○○○○○○○○○○○○

Syntax
○○○○○

Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○●

Summary
○○

Questions

Questions?

Motivation
○○○○○○○○○○○○○

Syntax
○○○○○

Semantics
○○○○○○○○○○○

Summary
●○

Summary

Motivation
00000000000

Syntax
00000

Semantics
00000000000

Summary
○●

Summary

- propositional logic based on atomic propositions
- syntax defines what well-formed formulas are
- semantics defines when a formula is true
- interpretations are the basis of semantics