PROPOSITIONAL LOGIC

VL Logik: WS 2019/20

(Version 2019.1)



<u>Martina Seidl</u> (martina.seidl@jku.at), Armin Biere (biere@jku.at) Institut für Formale Modelle und Verifikation



Game Board:



Game Board:

• The game board consists of **boxes**.





Game Board:

- The game board consists of boxes.
- The boxes contain **symbols**.





Game Board:

- The game board consists of boxes.
- The boxes contain symbols.
- Some symbols are **underlined**.





Rules of the Game:





Rules of the Game:

- One color is the winning color, for example red.
- □ Then the non-winning color is blue.



Rules of the Game:

- One color is the winning color, for example red.
- □ Then the non-winning color is blue.
- Now we can play: assign the two colors to each symbol such that its underlined and non-underlined occurrences have a different color.





Rules of the Game:

- One color is the winning color, for example red.
- □ Then the non-winning color is blue.
- Now we can play: assign the two colors to each symbol such that its underlined and non-underlined occurrences have a different color.



Rules of the Game:

- One color is the winning color, for example red.
- □ Then the non-winning color is blue.
- Now we can play: assign the two colors to each symbol such that its underlined and non-underlined occurrences have a different color.



Rules of the Game:

- One color is the winning color, for example red.
- □ Then the non-winning color is blue.
- Now we can play: assign the two colors to each symbol such that its underlined and non-underlined occurrences have a different color.
- If each box contains at least one symbol in the winning color, you won.















Wrong!

J⊼∩



Wrong!



















Some Terminology

From now on, we call a box a **clause**.

- We call a clause with at least one red symbol **satisfied**.
- We call a clause with all symbols in blue **falsified**.
- We call a clause with blue and uncolored symbols **undecided**.

 \Rightarrow The game is won if all clauses are satisfied.



1 symbol, 2 possibilities

1. ♥ 2. ♥



- 1 symbol, 2 possibilities
 - 1. ♥ 2. ♥
- 2 symbols, 4 possibilities



1 symbol, 2 possibilities 1. 🛡 2. • 2 symbols, 4 possibilities 1. ♥, ♦ 2. ♥, ♦ 3. ♥, ♦ 4. 💘 🔶 3 symbols, 8 possibilities 1. ♥, ♦, ■ 2. ♥, ♦, ■ 3. ♥, ♦, ■ 4. ♥, ♦, ■ 5. ♥, ♦, ■ 6. ♥, ♦, ■ 7. ♥, ♦, ■ 8. 🔍 🔶 🔳





J⊼∩





| n symbols |
|---------------------|
| \Rightarrow |
| 2^n possibilities |

Guess & Check Problems

observation in our BOX game:

- finding a solution is hard
 - \square 2^{*n*} solution candidates have to be considered
 - a good oracle is needed for guessing
- verifying a given candidate solution is easy
 - check that each box contains a red symbol

Guess & Check Problems

observation in our BOX game:

finding a solution is hard

- \square 2^{*n*} solution candidates have to be considered
- a good oracle is needed for guessing

verifying a given candidate solution is easy

check that each box contains a red symbol

fundamental question in computer science:

The P = NP Question

Is searching for a solution harder than verifying a solution? (unfortunately, the answer is not known)



Famous Guess & Check Problem: SAT

SAT is the decision problem of propositional logic:

Given a Boolean formula, for example

 $(\neg x \lor \neg y) \land (x \lor \neg y) \land (\neg x \lor z) \land (y \lor \neg z).$

- Question: is the formula satisfiable?
 I.e., is there an assignment of truth values 1 (true), 0 (false) to the literals x, y, z, ¬x, ¬y, ¬z such that
 - □ for every variable $v \in \{x, y, z\}$ it holds that the truth value of v and the truth value of $\neg v$ are different
 - □ each clause (...) contains at least one true literal

Famous Guess & Check Problem: SAT

SAT is the decision problem of propositional logic:

Given a Boolean formula, for example

 $(\neg x \lor \neg y) \land (x \lor \neg y) \land (\neg x \lor z) \land (y \lor \neg z).$

- Question: is the formula satisfiable?
 I.e., is there an assignment of truth values 1 (true), 0 (false) to the literals x, y, z, ¬x, ¬y, ¬z such that
 - □ for every variable $v \in \{x, y, z\}$ it holds that the truth value of v and the truth value of $\neg v$ are different
 - □ each clause (...) contains at least one true literal

Cook-Levin Theorem [71]: SAT is NP-complete

Searching is as easy as checking if and only if it is for SAT.



There is a correspondence between BOX and SAT, e.g., between

and $(\neg x \lor \neg y) \land (x \lor \neg y) \land (\neg x \lor z) \land (y \lor \neg z)$:

There is a correspondence between BOX and SAT, e.g., between

$$\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline $\underline{\nabla}$ & \underline{\nabla}$ & $\underline{\nabla}$ & \underline{\nabla}$ & \underline{\nabla}$ &$$

and $(\neg x \lor \neg y) \land (x \lor \neg y) \land (\neg x \lor z) \land (y \lor \neg z)$:

- *x* corresponds to \heartsuit , $\neg x$ corresponds to \heartsuit
- y corresponds to \diamond , $\neg y$ corresponds to \diamond
- *z* corresponds to \Box , $\neg z$ corresponds to $\underline{\Box}$
- red/blue coloring corresponds to assignment of literals to true/false (1/0)



There is a correspondence between BOX and SAT, e.g., between

$$\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline $\underline{\nabla}$ & \underline{\nabla}$ & $\underline{\nabla}$ & \underline{\nabla}$ & \underline{\nabla}$ &$$

and $(\neg x \lor \neg y) \land (x \lor \neg y) \land (\neg x \lor z) \land (y \lor \neg z)$:

- *x* corresponds to \heartsuit , $\neg x$ corresponds to \heartsuit
- y corresponds to \diamond , $\neg y$ corresponds to \diamond
- *z* corresponds to \Box , $\neg z$ corresponds to $\underline{\Box}$
- red/blue coloring corresponds to assignment of literals to true/false (1/0)

Note:



There is a correspondence between BOX and SAT, e.g., between

$$\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline $\underline{\nabla}$ & \underline{\nabla}$ & $\underline{\nabla}$ & \underline{\nabla}$ & \underline{\nabla}$ &$$

and $(\neg x \lor \neg y) \land (x \lor \neg y) \land (\neg x \lor z) \land (y \lor \neg z)$:

- *x* corresponds to \heartsuit , $\neg x$ corresponds to \heartsuit
- y corresponds to \diamond , $\neg y$ corresponds to \diamond
- z corresponds to \Box , $\neg z$ corresponds to \Box
- red/blue coloring corresponds to assignment of literals to true/false (1/0)

Note:

assignment of variables gives values of all literals
 jf we can solve SAT, we can solve BOX (and vice versa)

Practical Applications of SAT Solving



from http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/marijn/talks/Ptn-Linz.pdf



Logics in this Lecture

In this lecture, we consider different logic-based languages:

propositional logic (SAT)

- □ simple language: only atoms and connectives
- low expressiveness, low complexity
- □ very successful in industry (e.g., verification)
- <u>first-order logic (predicate logic)</u>
 - □ rich language: predicates, functions, terms, quantifiers
 - great power of expressiveness, high complexity
 - many applications in mathematics and verification
- satisfiability modulo theories (SMT)
 - customizable language: user decides
 - as much expressiveness as required as much complexity as necessary
 - very popular and successful in industry

Logic-Based Languages (Logics)

A logic consists of

- □ a set of symbols (like $\lor, \land, \neg, \top, \bot, \forall, \exists ...$)
- \square a set of variables (like *x*, *y*, *z*, . . .)
- concise syntax: well-formedness of expressions
- concise semantics: meaning of expressions
- Logics support <u>reasoning</u> for
 - derivation of "new" knowledge
 - proving the truth/falsity of a statement (satisfiability checking)
- Different logics <u>differ</u> in their
 - truth values: binary (true, false), multi-valued (true, false, unknown), fuzzy (between 0 and 1, e.g., [0, 1] as subset of the real numbers)

expressiveness (what can be formulated in the logic?)

complexity (how expensive is reasoning?)