

Foundations of Artificial Intelligence

E1. Propositional Logic: Syntax and Semantics

Malte Helmert

University of Basel

April 16, 2025

Foundations of Artificial Intelligence

April 16, 2025 — E1. Propositional Logic: Syntax and Semantics

E1.1 Motivation

E1.2 Syntax

E1.3 Semantics

E1.4 Properties of Formulas

E1.5 Summary

Propositional Logic: Overview

Chapter overview: propositional logic

- ▶ E1. Syntax and Semantics
- ▶ E2. Equivalence and Normal Forms
- ▶ E3. Reasoning and Resolution
- ▶ E4. DPLL Algorithm
- ▶ E5. Local Search and Outlook

Classification

classification:

Propositional Logic

environment:

- ▶ **static** vs. dynamic
- ▶ **deterministic** vs. non-deterministic vs. stochastic
- ▶ **fully** vs. partially vs. not **observable**
- ▶ **discrete** vs. continuous
- ▶ **single-agent** vs. multi-agent

problem solving method:

- ▶ problem-specific vs. **general** vs. learning

(applications also in more complex environments)

E1.1 Motivation

Propositional Logic: Motivation

propositional logic

- ▶ modeling and representing problems and knowledge
- ▶ basis for **general** problem descriptions and solving strategies
 \rightsquigarrow automated planning (Part F)
- ▶ allows for automated **reasoning**

German: Aussagenlogik, automatisches Schliessen

Relationship to CSPs

- ▶ **previous part:** constraint satisfaction problems
- ▶ satisfiability problem in propositional logic can be viewed as **non-binary CSP** over $\{\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{T}\}$
- ▶ formula encodes constraints
- ▶ solution: satisfying assignment of values to variables
- ▶ backtracking with inference \approx DPLL ([Chapter E4](#))

Propositional Logic: Description of State Spaces

propositional variables for missionaries and cannibals problem:

two-missionaries-are-on-left-shore

one-cannibal-is-on-left-shore

boat-is-on-left-shore

...

- ▶ problem description for general problem solvers
- ▶ states represented as truth values of atomic **propositions**

German: Aussagenvariablen

Propositional Logic: Intuition

propositions: atomic statements over the world
that cannot be divided further

Propositions with **logical connectives** like
“and”, “or” and “not” form the propositional formulas.

German: logische Verknüpfungen

Syntax and Semantics

Today, we define **syntax** and **semantics** of propositional logic.
 \rightsquigarrow **reminder** from Discrete Mathematics in Computer Science

syntax:

- ▶ defines which **symbols** are allowed in formulas
 $(,), \neg, \wedge, A, B, C, X, \vee, \rightarrow, \nearrow, \dots?$
- ▶ ... and which **sequences** of these symbols are correct formulas
 $(A \wedge B), ((A) \wedge B), \wedge)A(B, \dots?$

semantics:

- ▶ defines the **meaning** of formulas
- ▶ uses **interpretations** to describe a possible world
 $I = \{A \mapsto \mathbf{T}, B \mapsto \mathbf{F}\}$
- ▶ tells us which formulas are true in which worlds

E1.2 Syntax

Alphabet of Propositions

- ▶ Logical formulas use an **alphabet Σ of propositions**, for example $\Sigma = \{P, Q, R, S\}$ or $\Sigma = \{X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots\}$.
- ▶ We do not mention the alphabet in the following.
- ▶ More formally, all definitions are parameterized by Σ .

German: Alphabet

Syntax

Definition (propositional formula)

- ▶ \top and \perp are formulas (**constant true/constant false**).
- ▶ Every proposition in Σ is a formula (**atomic formula**).
- ▶ If φ is a formula, then $\neg\varphi$ is a formula (**negation**).
- ▶ If φ and ψ are formulas, then so are
 - ▶ $(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ (**conjunction**)
 - ▶ $(\varphi \vee \psi)$ (**disjunction**)
 - ▶ $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$ (**implication**)

German: aussagenlogische Formel, konstant wahr/falsch,
atomare Formel, Konjunktion, Disjunktion, Implikation

Note: minor differences to Discrete Mathematics course

Abbreviating Notations: Omitting Parenthesis

may omit redundant parentheses:

- ▶ outer parentheses of formula:
 - ▶ $(P \wedge Q) \vee R$ instead of $((P \wedge Q) \vee R)$
- ▶ multiple conjunctions/disjunctions:
 - ▶ $P \wedge Q \wedge \neg R \wedge S$ instead of $((((P \wedge Q) \wedge \neg R) \wedge S))$
- ▶ implicit **binding strength**: $(\neg) > (\wedge) > (\vee) > (\rightarrow)$:
 - ▶ $P \vee Q \wedge R$ instead of $P \vee (Q \wedge R)$
 - ▶ use responsibly

Abbreviating Notations: Prefix Notation

prefix notations used like \sum for sums:

▶ $\bigvee_{i=1}^4 X_i$ instead of $(X_1 \vee X_2 \vee X_3 \vee X_4)$

▶ $\bigwedge_{i=1}^3 Y_i$ instead of $(Y_1 \wedge Y_2 \wedge Y_3)$

E1.3 Semantics

Intuition for Semantics

A formula is **true** or **false**
depending on the **interpretation** of the propositions.

Semantics: Intuition

- ▶ A proposition P is either true or false.
The truth value of P is determined by an **interpretation**.
- ▶ The truth value of a formula follows from
the truth values of the propositions.

Example

example interpretations for $\varphi = (P \vee Q) \wedge R$:

- ▶ If P and Q are false and R is true, then φ is false.
- ▶ If P is false and Q and R are true, then φ is true.

Interpretations

Definition (interpretation)

An **interpretation** I is a function $I : \Sigma \rightarrow \{\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}\}$.

Interpretations are sometimes called **truth assignments**.

German: Interpretation/Belegung/Wahrheitsbelegung

The Semantics of Formulas

When is a formula φ true under interpretation I ?
symbolically: When does $I \models \varphi$ hold?

Definition (Models and the \models Relation)

The relation “ \models ” is a relation between interpretations and formulas and is defined as follows:

- ▶ $I \models \top$ and $I \not\models \perp$
- ▶ $I \models P$ if $I(P) = \mathbf{T}$ for $P \in \Sigma$
- ▶ $I \models \neg\varphi$ if $I \not\models \varphi$
- ▶ $I \models (\varphi \wedge \psi)$ if $I \models \varphi$ and $I \models \psi$
- ▶ $I \models (\varphi \vee \psi)$ if $I \models \varphi$ or $I \models \psi$
- ▶ $I \models (\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$ if $I \not\models \varphi$ or $I \models \psi$

If $I \models \varphi$ ($I \not\models \varphi$), we say φ is **true (false)** under I .

Examples

Example (Interpretation I)

$I = \{P \mapsto \mathbf{T}, Q \mapsto \mathbf{T}, R \mapsto \mathbf{F}, S \mapsto \mathbf{F}\}$

Which formulas are true under I ?

- ▶ $\varphi_1 = \neg(P \wedge Q) \wedge (R \wedge \neg S)$. Does $I \models \varphi_1$ hold?
- ▶ $\varphi_2 = (P \wedge Q) \wedge \neg(R \wedge \neg S)$. Does $I \models \varphi_2$ hold?
- ▶ $\varphi_3 = (R \rightarrow P)$. Does $I \models \varphi_3$ hold?

E1.4 Properties of Formulas

Models of Formulas and Sets of Formulas

Definition (model)

An interpretation I is called a **model** of φ if $I \models \varphi$.

Definition ($I \models \Phi$)

Let Φ be a set of propositional formulas.

We write $I \models \Phi$ if $I \models \varphi$ for all $\varphi \in \Phi$.

Such an interpretation I is called a **model** of Φ .

If I is a model of formula φ , we also say “ I satisfies φ ” or “ φ holds under I ” (similarly for sets of formulas Φ).

German: Modell, erfüllt, gilt unter

Satisfiable, Unsatisfiable, Falsifiable, Valid

Definition (satisfiable etc.)

A formula φ is called

- ▶ **satisfiable** if there exists a model for φ
- ▶ **unsatisfiable** if there exists no model for φ
- ▶ **valid** (= a **tautology**) if all interpretations are models of φ
- ▶ **falsifiable** if not all interpretations are models of φ

German: erfüllbar, unerfüllbar, allgemeingültig (gültig, Tautologie), falsifizierbar

Truth Tables

Truth Tables

How to determine automatically if a given formula is (un)satisfiable, valid, falsifiable?

\leadsto simple method: **truth tables**

example: Is $\varphi = ((P \vee H) \wedge \neg H) \rightarrow P$ valid?

P	H	$P \vee H$	$((P \vee H) \wedge \neg H)$	$((P \vee H) \wedge \neg H) \rightarrow P$
F	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	F	T
T	F	T	T	T
T	T	T	F	T

$I \models \varphi$ for all interpretations I , hence φ is valid.

► Is it satisfiable/unsatisfiable/falsifiable?

Terminology (Side Note)

What does “ φ is true” mean?

- ▶ not formally defined
- ▶ the statement misses an interpretation
 - ▶ could be meant as “in the obvious interpretation”
in some cases
 - ▶ or as “in all possible interpretations” (tautology)
- ▶ imprecise language \rightsquigarrow avoid

E1.5 Summary

Summary

- ▶ **Propositional logic** forms the basis for a general representation of problems and knowledge.
- ▶ **Propositions** (atomic formulas) are statements over the world that cannot be divided further.
- ▶ **Propositional formulas** combine constant and atomic formulas with \neg , \wedge , \vee , \rightarrow to more complex statements.
- ▶ **Interpretations** determine which atomic formulas are true and which ones are false.
- ▶ Interpretations making a formula true are called **models**.
- ▶ important properties a formula may have:
satisfiable, unsatisfiable, valid, falsifiable