Besik Dundua

International Black Sea University bdundua@gmail.com

Introduction

Syntax

Semantics

Introduction

Syntax

Semantics

What is a Propositional Logic?

- Propositional logic is a useful tool that allows us to reason about statements.
- Statements are propositions that is either true or false.
- Propositional logic has:
 - A syntax
 - A semantics
 - A proof theory.

Introduction

Syntax

Semantics

Alphabet

The alphabet of propositional logic consists:

- ▶ Propositional letters: *p*, *q*, *r*, . . . ,
- Logical connectives,:
 - nullary connectives ⊤ and ⊥,
 - unary connective ¬,
 - ▶ binary connectives \land, \lor, \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow .
- ► The punctuation symbols "(" and ")".

Propositional Formulas

The set of propositional formulas (shortly, formulas) \mathcal{P} is defined as follows:

- Any propositional letter is in P.
- ightharpoonup op and op are in \mathcal{P} .
- If P and Q are in P then ¬P, P ∧ Q, P ∨ Q, P → Q and P ↔ Q are also in P. Formulas generated by this item we sometime call compound formulas.
- ▶ Nothing else is in P.

Examples of Propositional Formulas

Propositional letters together with logical connectives (connectives) are used to to form new expressions.

- ▶ p
- ▼
- $\triangleright p \lor \bot$
- ightharpoonup $\top \lor (p \land q)$
- $ightharpoonup \neg p \lor q$
- $ightharpoonup p \wedge (q \rightarrow \neg r)$
- $\blacktriangleright \ (\neg p \lor q) \leftrightarrow (p \to q)$

Example of Problem Formulation

Suppose that stock prices go down if the prime interest rate goes up. Suppose also that most people are unhappy when stock prices go down. Assume that prime interest rate does go up. Are most people unhappy?

Example of Problem Formulation

Suppose that stock prices go down if the prime interest rate goes up. Suppose also that most people are unhappy when stock prices go down. Assume that prime interest rate does go up. Are most people unhappy?

Formalization:

- p : prime interest rate goes up.
- q : stock prices go down.
- r : most people are unhappy.
- ightharpoonup p
 ightarrow q : if the prime interest rate goes up, stock prices go down
- ▶ $q \rightarrow r$: if stock prices go down, most people are unhappy Can we show that if $p \rightarrow q$, $q \rightarrow r$, and p hold, then r holds?

Introduction

Syntax

Semantics

Interpretation of Propositional Letter and Constant

- ➤ An interpretation *I* assigns a truth value to each propositional letter
- ► The set of truth values is the set {true, false}

- $ightharpoonup \mathcal{I}(p) = true$
- $ightharpoonup \mathcal{I}(q) = false$
- $\mathcal{I}(r) = true$
- ► The logical constant ⊤ is interpreted as true.
- ▶ The logical constant \bot is interpreted as false.

Interpretation of Compound Formulas, Informally

- Interpretation of compound formulas is calculated by combining the truth values of propositional letters and constants according to the meaning of the connectives
- In the next slides we describe how connectives combine truth values to obtain a new truth value

Negation

- ▶ For any $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(\neg P) = true$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = false$.
- ▶ For any $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(\neg P) = false$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = true$.

P	$\neg P$
true	false
false	true

Conjunction

- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \land Q) = true$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = true$ and $\mathcal{I}(Q) = true$.
- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \land Q) = false$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = false$ or $\mathcal{I}(Q) = false$.

P	Q	$P \wedge Q$
true	true	true
false	true	false
true	false	false
false	false	false

- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}(p \land \neg r \land \top) =$
- $ightharpoonup \mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}(\neg p \wedge \neg r) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}(\neg$

Conjunction

- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \land Q) = true$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = true$ and $\mathcal{I}(Q) = true$.
- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \land Q) = false$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = false$ or $\mathcal{I}(Q) = false$.

P	Q	$P \wedge Q$
true	true	true
false	true	false
true	false	false
false	false	false

- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true$ and $\mathcal{I}(r) = false$ then $\mathcal{I}(p \land \neg r \land \top) = true$.
- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}(\neg p \land \neg r) = false.$



Disjunction

- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \lor Q) = true$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = true$ or $\mathcal{I}(Q) = true$
- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \vee Q) = false$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = false$ and $\mathcal{I}(Q) = false$

P	Q	$P \vee Q$
true	true	true
false	true	true
true	false	true
false	false	false

- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = true \text{ then } \mathcal{I}((\neg p \lor r) \land (\neg p \lor \neg r)) =$
- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = true \text{ then } \mathcal{I}((p \lor \neg r) \land (\neg p \lor r)) =$

Disjunction

- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \lor Q) = true$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = true$ or $\mathcal{I}(Q) = true$
- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \vee Q) = false$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = false$ and $\mathcal{I}(Q) = false$

P	Q	$P \vee Q$
true	true	true
false	true	true
true	false	true
false	false	false

- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = true \text{ then } \mathcal{I}((\neg p \lor r) \land (\neg p \lor \neg r)) = false$
- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true$ and $\mathcal{I}(r) = true$ then $\mathcal{I}((p \lor \neg r) \land (\neg p \lor r)) = true$

Implication

- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \to Q) = true$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = false$ or $\mathcal{I}(Q) = true$
- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \to Q) = \mathit{false}$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = \mathit{true}$ and $\mathcal{I}(Q) = \mathit{false}$

P	Q	P o Q
true	true	true
false	true	true
true	false	false
false	false	true

- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}((\neg p \to r) \land (p \to \neg r)) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ th$
- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}((\neg r \to \neg p) \lor (p \to r)) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ th$



Implication

- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \to Q) = true$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = false$ or $\mathcal{I}(Q) = true$
- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \to Q) = false$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = true$ and $\mathcal{I}(Q) = false$

P	Q	P o Q
true	true	true
false	true	true
true	false	false
false	false	true

- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true$ and $\mathcal{I}(r) = false$ then $\mathcal{I}((\neg p \rightarrow r) \land (p \rightarrow \neg r)) = true$
- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}((\neg r \rightarrow \neg p) \lor (p \rightarrow r)) = false$

Equivalence

- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \leftrightarrow Q) = true$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = \mathcal{I}(Q)$
- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \leftrightarrow Q) = false$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) \neq \mathcal{I}(Q)$.

P	Q	$P \leftrightarrow Q$
true	true	true
false	true	false
true	false	false
false	false	true

- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}((p \leftrightarrow \neg r) \leftrightarrow (\neg p \lor r)) =$
- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}((p \leftrightarrow r) \leftrightarrow (p \land r)) =$

Equivalence

- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \leftrightarrow Q) = true$ if $\mathcal{I}(P) = \mathcal{I}(Q)$
- ▶ For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(P \leftrightarrow Q) = false \text{ if } \mathcal{I}(P) \neq \mathcal{I}(Q)$.

P	Q	$P \leftrightarrow Q$
true	true	true
false	true	false
true	false	false
false	false	true

- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(r) = false \text{ then } \mathcal{I}((p \leftrightarrow \neg r) \leftrightarrow (\neg p \lor r)) = false$
- ▶ $\mathcal{I}(p) = true$ and $\mathcal{I}(r) = false$ then $\mathcal{I}((p \leftrightarrow r) \leftrightarrow (p \land r)) = true$

A More Complex Truth Table

p	q	r	$p \rightarrow q$	$\mid q ightarrow r$	$ \mid ((p \to q) \land (q \to r) \land p) \to r $
true	true	true	true	true	true
true	true	false	true	false	true
true	false	true	false	true	true
true	false	false	false	true	true
false	true	true	true	true	true
false	false	true	true	true	true
false	true	false	true	false	true
false	false	false	true	true	true

The table displays the truth values of a formula $((p \to q) \land (q \to r) \land p) \to r$ for all possible assignments of truth values to atoms occurring in it.

Interpretation of Formulas, Formally

- Lets S be a propositional formula and p_1, \ldots, p_n be atoms occurring in S. Then an interpretation of S is an assignment of truth values to p_1, \ldots, p_n in which every p_i is assigned either true or false, but not both.
- ▶ If there are n distinct propositional letters and constants in a formula, then there will be 2ⁿ distinct interpretations for the formula.
- A formula S is said to be true under an interpretation if and only if S is evaluated to *true* in the interpretation.
 Otherwise, S is said to be false under the interpretation.

Valid Formulas

A formula is said to be valid if and only if it is true under all its interpretations.

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$(p \rightarrow q) \land p$	$((p \to q) \land p) \to q$
true	true	true	true	true
true	false	false	false	true
false	true	true	false	true
false	false	true	false	true

Inconsistent Formulas

A formula is said to be inconsistent if and only if it is false under all its interpretations.

p	q	$\neg q$	$p \rightarrow q$	$p \land \neg q$	$(p \to q) \land (p \land \neg q)$
true	true	false	true	false	false
true	false	true	false	true	false
false	true	false	true	false	false
false	false	true	true	false	false

Invalid and Consistent Formulas

- ► A formula is invalid if and only if there is at least one interpretation under which the formula is false.
- ► A formula is consistent if and only if there is at least one interpretation under which the formula is true.

p	p o eg p
true	false
false	true

Logical Equivalences

- ▶ Two formulas P and Q are said to be logically equivalent denoted $P \Leftrightarrow Q$, if and only if the truth values of P and Q are the same under every interpretation of P and Q.
- ▶ Notice that, $P \Leftrightarrow Q$ if and only if $P \leftrightarrow Q$ is valid.

Example

We show $p \to q \Leftrightarrow \neg p \lor q$:

p	q	p o q	$\neg p \lor q$
true	true	true	true
true	false	false	false
false	true	true	true
false	false	true	true

Some Useful Logical Equivalences

$P \lor \top \Leftrightarrow \top$	(1)
$P \lor \bot \Leftrightarrow P$	(2)
$P \wedge \top \Leftrightarrow P$	(3)
$P \wedge \bot \Leftrightarrow \bot$	(4)
$P \wedge P \Leftrightarrow P$	(5)
$P \lor \neg P \Leftrightarrow \top$	(6)
$P \land \neg P \Leftrightarrow \bot$	(7)
$\neg(\neg P) \Leftrightarrow P$	(8)
$\neg\top\Leftrightarrow\bot$	(9)
$\neg\bot\Leftrightarrow\top$	(10)

Some Useful Logical Equivalences. Cont.

$$P \leftrightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow (P \to Q) \land (Q \to P) \tag{11}$$

$$P \to Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \lor Q \tag{12}$$

$$(P \lor Q) \lor R \Leftrightarrow P \lor (Q \lor R) \tag{13}$$

$$(P \land Q) \land R \Leftrightarrow P \land (Q \land R) \tag{14}$$

$$P \lor (Q \land R) \Leftrightarrow (P \lor Q) \land (P \lor R) \tag{15}$$

$$P \land (Q \lor R) \Leftrightarrow (P \land Q) \lor (P \land R) \tag{16}$$

$$\neg (P \lor Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \land \neg Q \tag{17}$$

$$\neg (P \land Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \lor \neg Q \tag{18}$$

$$P \lor Q \Leftrightarrow Q \lor P \tag{19}$$

$$P \land Q \Leftrightarrow Q \land P \tag{20}$$

Logical Consequence

Definition

A formula P is a logical consequence of formulas S_1, \ldots, S_n if and only if for any interpretation \mathcal{I} in which $S_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge S_n$ is true, P is also true.

Theorem

A formula P is a logical consequence of formulas S_1, \ldots, S_n if and only if the formula $(S_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge S_n) \rightarrow P$ is valid.

Example of Logical Consequence

Suppose that stock prices go down if the prime interest rate goes up. Suppose also that most people are unhappy when stock prices go down. Assume that prime interest rate does go up. Are most people unhappy?

- p : prime interest rate goes up.
- q : stock prices go down.
- r : most people are unhappy.
- ightharpoonup p
 ightarrow q : if the prime interest rate goes up, stock prices go down
- $q \rightarrow r$: if stock prices go down, most people are unhappy

We need to show r is logical consequence of $p \to q \land q \to r \land p$. That means, we have to prove $((p \to q) \land (q \to r) \land p) \to r$ is valid.

Literature

Chin-Liang Chang and Richard C. T. Lee. Symbolic logic and mechanical theorem proving. Computer science classics. Academic Press, 1973.

Melvin Fitting. First-order logic and automated theorem proving. Springer, 2nd edition, 1996.

Gallier, J.H.: Logic for Computer Science: Foundations of Automatic Theorem Proving. Wiley, 1987.