


Artificial Intelligence



Propositional Logic

CS 444 – Spring 2021

Dr. Kevin Molloy


Department of Computer Science

James Madison University

Announcements

- HW 7 is coming due.
- First quiz on RL will be released tomorrow (Friday).

Knowledge Bases



Knowledge base = set of sentences in a **formal** language

Declarative approach to build an agent (or other system):

- Tell it what it needs to know
- Then it can Ask itself what to do, answers should follow from the KB

Agents can be viewed at the knowledge level.

i.e., **what they know**, regardless of how implemented

Or at the **implementation level**

i.e., data structures in KB and algorithms that manipulate them

Simple Knowledge-based Agent

function KB-Agent(percept) **returns** an action

Static: *KB, a knowledge base*

t, a counter, initially 0, that indicates time

Tell(KB, Make-Percept-Sentence(percept, t))

action \leftarrow *Ask(KB, Make-Action-Query(t))*

Tell(KB, Make-Percept-Sentence(action, t))

t \leftarrow *t + 1*

return *action*

The agent must be able to:

- Represent states, actions, etc.
- Incorporate new percepts
- Update internal representations of the world
- Deduce hidden properties of the world
- Deduce appropriate actions

Wumpus World – PEAS Description


Performance measure

gold + 1000, death – 1000

-1 per step, -10 for using the arrow

Environment

- Squares adjacent to Wumpus are smelly
- Squares adjacent to pit are breezy
- glitter iff gold is in the same square
- Shooting kills Wumpus if you are facing it
- Shooting uses up the only arrow
- Grabbing picks up gold if in same square
- Releasing drops the gold in same square
- Squeal sound means Wumpus was killed



Actuators


Left turn, right turn, forward, grab, release, shoot

Sensors

Breeze, glitter, smell

Wumpus World Characterizations


Observable?	Partially observable – only local perception
Deterministic?	Yes – outcomes exactly specified
Episodic?	No – sequential at the level of actions
Static ?	Yes – Wumpus and pits do not move
Discrete?	Yes
Single Agent?	Yes (Wumpus is essentially a natural feature)




Exploring A Wumpus World

OK			
OK A	OK		


Exploring a Wumpus World




Exploring a Wumpus World




Exploring a Wumpus World




Exploring a Wumpus World




Exploring a Wumpus World




Exploring a Wumpus World



Exploring a Wumpus World




Sometimes No Safe Move Exists



Breeze in (1,2) and (2, 1)

⇒ no safe actions

Assuming pits uniformly distributed, (2,2) has a pit with higher probability. How much?



Smell in (1, 1)

⇒ cannot move

Can use strategy of coercion:

shoot straight ahead

Wumpus was there ⇒ dead ⇒ safe

Wumpus wasn't there ⇒ safe

Logic In General

- **Logics** are formal languages for representing information such that conclusions can be drawn.
- **Syntax** determines how sentences are expressed in a particular logic/language
- **Semantics** define the “meaning of sentences”;
 - i.e., define **truth** of a sentence in a world
- e.g., the language of arithmetic:
 - $x + 2 \geq y$ is a sentence; $x^2 + y >$ is not a sentence
 - $x + 2 \geq y$ is true iff the number $x + 2$ is no less than the number y
 - $x + 2 \geq y$ is true in a world where $x = 7, y = 1$
 - $x + 2 \geq y$ is false in a world where $x = 0, y = 6$

Types of Logic

- **Logics** are characterized by what they commit to as primitives
- Ontological commitment: what exists – facts? Objects? Time? Beliefs?
- Epistemological commitment: what states of knowledge?

Language	Ontological Commitment	Epistemological Commitment
Propositional logic	Facts	true/false/unknown
First-order logic	Facts, objects, relations	true/false/unknown
Temporal logic	Facts, objects, relations, time	true/false/unknown
Probability theory	Facts	Degree of belief
Fuzzy logic	Facts + degree of truth	Known internal value

Reasoning with Logic

- First order of business: fundamental concepts of logic representation and reasoning
 - independent of any logic's particular form/type
 - **Entailment**
- Second order of business: Introduction to **propositional logic**
Wumpus KB via propositional logic
- Third order of business: Drawing conclusions
 - **Inference** and theorem proving

Models

- Can use the term **model** in place of possible world
- Logicians typically think in terms of **models**, which are formally-structured worlds with respect to which truth can be evaluated
- Model = mathematical abstraction that fixes the truth/falsehood of every relevant sentence
- Possible models are just all possible assignments of variables in the environment
- We say that a model **m** “satisfies” sentence **α** if **α** “is true in” **m**
Or: “ **m** is a model of **α** ”
 $M(\alpha)$ is the set of all models of **α**

Models and Entailment

Entailment means that one thing follows from another:

$$KB \models \alpha$$

Knowledge base **KB** entails sentence α

iff α is true in all worlds/models where **KB** is true

$$KB \models \alpha \text{ iff } M(KB) \subseteq M(\alpha)$$

e.g., KB contains “Giants won” and “Red won” entails “Giants or Reds won”

$$x + y = 4 \text{ entails } 4 = x + y$$

Entailment is a relationship between sentences (i.e., **syntax**) that is based on **semantics**.

Note: brains process **syntax** (or some sort).

Quick Quiz

Given two sentences α and β , what does this mean:


$$\alpha \models \beta$$

- α entails β
- $M(\alpha) \subseteq M(\beta)$
- β is satisfied in all models of α .
- β may be satisfied in other models (as well).
- α is stronger assertion than β .


Hands on: Entailment in the Wumpus World

Situation after detecting nothing in [1, 1], moving right, breeze in [2,1]


Consider possible models for ?s assuming only pits



3 Boolean choices \Rightarrow 8 possible models




Wumpus Models



KB = Wumpus-world rules + observations


Wumpus Models



$KB = \text{Wumpus-world rules} + \text{observations}$, $\alpha_1 = \text{“}[1,2] \text{ is safe”}$

$KB \models \alpha_1$, proved by **model checking**

Wumpus Models



KB = Wumpus-world rules + observations, α_2 = “[2,2] is safe”,

KB \neq α_2

Entailment to Logical Inference

Entailment can be used to derive logical conclusions

i.e., **carry out logical inference**

A straightforward algorithm to carry out inference:

Model Checking

Model checking enumerates all possible models to check that α is true in all models where **KB** is true. i.e., $M(\mathbf{KB}) \subseteq M(\alpha)$

To understand entailment and inference: haystack and needle analogy

Consequences of **KB** are a haystack, α is a needle.

Entailment = needle in haystack

Inference = finding it

We need inference procedures to derive α from a given **KB**.

Inference

$KB \vdash_i \alpha$ = sentence α can be derived from KB by procedure i

Soundness: inference procedure i is sound if

whenever $KB \vdash_i \alpha$, it is also true that $KB \models \alpha$ (does not make stuff up)

Completeness: inference procedure i is complete if

whenever $KB \models \alpha$, it is also true that $KB \vdash_i \alpha$ (finds the needle in haystack)

Preview: we will define a logic (first-order logic) which is expressive enough to say almost anything of interest, and for which there exists a sound and complete inference procedure.

That is, the procedure will answer any question whose answer follows from what is known by the **KB**.

First step, propositional logic.

Propositional Logic: Syntax

Propositional logic is the simplest logic – illustrates basic ideas

Atomic sentences consist of a single propositional symbol

e.g., Propositional symbols P_1 , P_2 , etc. are atomic sentences

Each such symbol stands for a proposition that can be true or false.

e.g., $W_{1,3}$ stands for proposition that Wumpus is in $[1,3]$

Two propositions with fixed meaning: *True* and *False*

Complex sentences build over atomic ones via connectives:

negation, conjunction, disjunction, implication, biconditional

Propositional Logic: Syntax

If S is a sentence, $\neg S$ is a sentence (negation)

A (**positive**) literal is an atomic sentence; a (**negative**) literal is a negated atomic sentence

If S_1 and S_2 are sentences $S_1 \wedge S_2$ is a sentence (**conjunction**)

S_1 and S_2 are called conjuncts

If S_1 and S_2 are sentences $S_1 \vee S_2$ is a sentence (**disjunction**)

S_1 and S_2 are called disjuncts

If S_1 and S_2 are sentences, $S_1 \implies S_2$ is a sentence (**implication/ conditional**)

S_1 is called premise/antecedent; S_2 is called conclusion or consequent

Implication also known as **rule** or **if-then** statement

If S_1 and S_2 are sentences, $S_1 \iff S_2$ is a sentence (**biconditional**)

Propositional Logic: Semantics (Backus-Naur Form (BNF))

BNF is an ambiguous formal grammar for propositional logic

Sentence \rightarrow AtomicSentence | ComplexSentence

AtomicSentence \rightarrow True | False | P | Q | ...

ComplexSentence \rightarrow (Sentence) | [Sentence] | \neg Sentence | Sentence \wedge Sentence ...

We add operator precedence to disambiguate

Operator precedence (from highest to lowest): \neg , \wedge , \vee , \implies , \iff

Propositional Logic: Semantics

Each model specifies true/false for each propositional symbol

e.g., $P_{1,2}$ $P_{2,2}$ $P_{3,1}$
 true true false

This specific model: $m_1 = \{P_{1,2} = \text{true}, P_{2,2} = \text{true}, P_{3,1} = \text{false}\}$

$2^3 = 8$ possible models, feasible to enumerate

Rules for evaluating truth with respect to a model m :

$\neg S$	is true iff	S	S is false
$S_1 \wedge S_2$	is true iff	S_1	is true and S_2 is true
$S_1 \vee S_2$	is true iff	S_1	is true or S_2 is true
$S_1 \implies S_2$	is true iff	S_1	is false or S_2 is true
i.e.	is false iff	S_1	is true and S_2 is false
$S_1 \iff S_2$	is true iff	$S_1 \implies S_2$	is true and $S_2 \implies S_1$ is true

$$\neg P_{1,2} \wedge (P_{2,2} \vee p_{3,1}) = \text{true} \wedge (\text{false} \vee \text{true}) = \text{true} \wedge \text{true} = \text{true}$$

Truth Table for Connectives

P	Q		$\neg P$	$P \wedge Q$	$P \vee Q$	$P \Rightarrow Q$	$P \Leftrightarrow Q$
false	false		true	false	false	true	true
false	true		true	false	true	true	false
true	false		false	false	true	false	false
true	true		false	true	true	true	true

Wumpus World Sentences in Propositional Logic

Let $P_{i,j}$ be true if there is a pit in $[i, j]$

Let $B_{i,j}$ be true if agent is in $[i, j]$ and perceives a breeze

Let $W_{i,j}$ be true if there is a Wumpus in $[i, j]$

Let $S_{i,j}$ be true if agent is in $[i, j]$ and perceives a stench

... you can define other atomic sentences

Percept sentences part of KB:

No pit, no breeze in $[1, 1]$, but breeze perceived when in $[2, 1]$

$$R_1 : \neg P_{1,1}; \quad R_4 : \neg B_{1,1} \qquad R_5 : B_{2,1}$$

Rules in KB: “Put cause breezes in adjacent squares” eqv. to “Square is breeze **iff** adjacent pit”.

$$R_2 : B_{1,1} \Leftrightarrow (P_{1,2} \vee P_{2,1})$$

$$R_3 : B_{2,1} \Leftrightarrow (P_{1,1} \vee P_{2,2} \vee P_{3,1})$$

Truth Tables for Inference: Model Checking by Enumeration

B _{1,1}	B _{2,1}	P _{1,1}	P _{1,2}	P _{2,1}	P _{2,2}	P _{3,1}	R ₁	R ₂	R ₃	R ₄	R ₅	KB
false	true	True	true	true	false	False						
false	false	False	False	False	False	True	True	True	False	True	False	False
...
false	true	false	false	false	false	false	true	true	false	true	true	false
False	true	False	False	False	False	True	True	True	True	True	True	True
False	True	False	False	False	True	False	True	True	True	True	True	True
False	true	False	false	false	true	true	true	true	true	true	true	true
False	True	False	False	True	False	False	True	False	False	True	True	False
...
true	false	true	true	false	true	false						

Enumerate rows (different assignments to symbols); rows are possible models

If KB is true in a row/model, check that α is true, if not, entailment does not hold

If entailment not broken over all rows where **KB** is true, then α is entailed

Inference by Enumeration

function TT-Entails?(KB, α) **returns** true/false

Inputs: KB (the knowledge base), a sentence in proposition logic
 α , the query, a sentence in propositional logic

symbols \leftarrow a list of the propositional symbols in KB and α

Return TT-Check-All(KB, α , symbols, [])

function TT-Check-All(KB, α , symbols, []) **returns** true/false

if Empty?(symbols) *then*

if PL-TRUE?(KB, model) *then return* PL-TRUE(α , model)

else return true;

else do

P \leftarrow First(symbols); rest \leftarrow Rest(symbols)

return TT-Check-All(KB, α , rest, Extend(P, true, model)) and

TT-Check-All(KB, α , rest, Extend(P, false, model))

$O(2^n)$ for n symbols, problem is **co-NP-complete**.

Proof Methods

Proof methods divide into (roughly) two kinds:

Model checking:

- Truth table enumeration (always exponential in n)
- Improved backtracking, e.g., Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland
- Backtracking with constraint propagation, backjumping
- Heuristic search in model space (sound but incomplete) e.g., min-conflicts, etc.

Theorem Proving/Deductive Systems: Application of inference rules

- Legitimate (sound) generation of new sentences from old
- Proof = a sequence of inference rule applications
- Typically requires translation of sentence into a **normal form**