Satisfiability Checking

02 Propositional logic I

Prof. Dr. Erika Ábrahám

RWTH Aachen University
Informatik 2
LuFG Theory of Hybrid Systems

WS 23/24

02 Propositional logic I

1 Syntax of propositional logic

2 Semantics of propositional logic

3 Satisfiability and validity

Syntax of propositional logic

Abstract syntax of well-formed propositional formulae:

A proposition is a sentence like p→(p→q)

$$\varphi \;:=\; a \mid (\neg\varphi) \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi)$$

. An atomic proposition is like p

原子命题是最小的命题, 内部不包含更小的命题

where AP is a set of (atomic) propositions (Boolean variables) and $a \in AP$.
We write $PropForm$ for the set of all propositional logic formulae.

formulae由 ap构成

Syntactic sugar:

$$\bot \;:=\; (a \wedge \neg a)$$ unconditional false

$$\top \;:=\; (a \vee \neg a)$$ unconditional true

$$(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) := \neg((\neg\varphi_1) \wedge (\neg\varphi_2))$$

$$(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) := ((\neg\varphi_1) \vee \varphi_2)$$ ¬(Φ1^(¬Φ2))

$$(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) := ((\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge (\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi_1))$$

$$(\varphi_1 \oplus \varphi_2) := (\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow (\neg\varphi_2))$$

Formulae

- Examples of well-formed formulae:
  - $(\neg a)$
  - $(\neg(\neg a))$
  - $(a \wedge (b \wedge c))$
  - $(a \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c))$
- We omit parentheses whenever we may restore them through operator precedence:

  binds stronger

  $\longleftarrow$

  $\neg \quad \wedge \quad \vee \quad \rightarrow \quad \leftrightarrow$

- We will also use the "big" Boolean notation, e.g.



is defined as $x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge x_4 \wedge x_5$.

02 Propositional logic I

1 Syntax of propositional logic

2 Semantics of propositional logic

3 Satisfiability and validity

Semantics: Assignments

Structures for propositional logic:

- The domain is $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$.
- The interpretation assigns Boolean values to the variables:

$$\alpha : AP \to \{0, 1\}$$

We call these special interpretations assignments and use *Assign* to denote the set of all assignments.

Example: $AP = \{a, b\}, \alpha(a) = 0, \alpha(b) = 1$

即对atomic proposition赋值

Equivalently, we can see an assignment α as a set of variables ($\alpha \in 2^{AP}$), defining the variables from the set to be true and the others false.

Example: $AP = \{a, b\}, \alpha = \{b\}$

assignment可以定义为真值集合

An assignment can also be seen as being of type $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}^{AP}$, if we have an order on the propositions.

Example: $AP = \{a, b\}, \alpha = 01$

如果ap有顺序的话, assignment可以被视为ap的取值序列

Only the projected assignment matters...

- Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathit{Assign}$ and $\varphi \in \mathit{PropForm}$.
- Let $\mathit{AP}(\varphi)$ be the atomic propositions in φ.
- Clearly $\mathit{AP}(\varphi) \subseteq \mathit{AP}$.
- Lemma: if $\alpha_1|_{\mathit{AP}(\varphi)} = \alpha_2|_{\mathit{AP}(\varphi)}$, then

Projection

$$(\alpha_1 \textit{ satisfies } \varphi) \quad \text{iff} \quad (\alpha_2 \textit{ satisfies } \varphi)$$

- We will assume, for simplicity, that $\mathit{AP} = \mathit{AP}(\varphi)$.

Semantics I: Truth tables

- Truth tables define the semantics (=meaning) of the operators.
  They can be used to define the semantics of formulae inductively over their structure.
- Convention: 0= false, 1= true

p	q	$\neg p$	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \rightarrow q$	$p \leftrightarrow q$	$p \oplus q$
0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0

Each possible assignment is covered by a line of the truth table.

α satisfies φ iff in the line for α and the column for φ the entry is 1.

satisfy即assignment取值可使formulae为真

Q: How many binary operators can we define that have different semantics?

A: 16

因为binary operators的输入共有4种类可能: 00, 01, 10, 11

所以对应不同的semantics(即真值表的可能取值)为2^4

同理, three parameter operator 的semantics为2^8

Semantics I: Example

- Let φ be defined as $(a \vee (b \to c))$.
- Let $\alpha : \{a, b, c\} \to \{0, 1\}$ be an assignment with $\alpha(a) = 0$, $\alpha(b) = 0$, and $\alpha(c) = 1$.
- Q: Does α satisfy φ?
- A1: Compute with truth table:

a	b	c	$b \to c$	$a \vee (b \to c)$
0	0	0	1	1
0	0	1	1	1
0	1	0	0	0
0	1	1	1	1
1	0	0	1	1
1	0	1	1	1
1	1	0	0	1
1	1	1	1	1

Semantics II: Satisfaction relation

Satisfaction relation: $\models \subseteq \mathit{Assign} \times \mathit{PropForm}$ **Assignment|=PropForm**

Instead of $(\alpha, \varphi) \in \models$ we write $\alpha \models \varphi$ and say that

- α satisfies φ or
- φ holds for α or
- α is a model of φ.

$\models$ is defined recursively:

α	$\models p$	*iff*	$\alpha(p) = \mathit{true}$
α	$\models \neg\varphi$	*iff*	$\alpha \not\models \varphi$
α	$\models \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$	*iff*	$\alpha \models \varphi_1$ *and* $\alpha \models \varphi_2$
α	$\models \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$	*iff*	$\alpha \models \varphi_1$ *or* $\alpha \models \varphi_2$
α	$\models \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$	*iff*	$\alpha \models \varphi_1$ *implies* $\alpha \models \varphi_2$
α	$\models \varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2$	*iff*	$\alpha \models \varphi_1$ *iff* $\alpha \models \varphi_2$

Note: More elegant but semantically equivalent to truth tables.

Semantics II: Example

- Let φ be defined as $(a \vee (b \rightarrow c))$.
- Let $\alpha : \{a, b, c\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be an assignment with $\alpha(a) = 0$, $\alpha(b) = 0$, and $\alpha(c) = 1$.

- Q: Does α satisfy φ?

A2: Compute with the satisfaction relation:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
 & \alpha \models (a \vee (b \rightarrow c)) \\
\textit{iff} & \alpha \models a \textit{ or } \alpha \models (b \rightarrow c) \\
\textit{iff} & \alpha \models a \textit{ or } (\alpha \models b \textit{ implies } \alpha \models c) \\
\textit{iff} & 0 \textit{ or } (0 \textit{ implies } 1) \\
\textit{iff} & 0 \textit{ or } 1 \\
\textit{iff} & 1
\end{array}
$$

Semantics III: The algorithmic view

- Using the satisfaction relation we can define an algorithm for the problem to decide whether an assignment $\alpha : AP \to \{0, 1\}$ is a model of a propositional logic formula $\varphi \in \mathit{PropForm}$:

$$
\begin{array}{l}
\mathit{Eval}(\alpha, \varphi)\ \{ \\
\quad \textbf{if}\ \ \varphi \equiv a\ \ \textbf{return}\ \ \alpha(a)\,; \\
\quad \textbf{if}\ \ \varphi \equiv (\neg\varphi_1)\ \ \textbf{return not}\ \ \mathit{Eval}(\alpha, \varphi_1)\,; \\
\quad \textbf{if}\ \ \varphi \equiv (\varphi_1\ \mathrm{op}\ \varphi_2) \\
\qquad\qquad \textbf{return}\ \ \mathit{Eval}(\alpha, \varphi_1)\ [\![\mathrm{op}]\!]\ \mathit{Eval}(\alpha, \varphi_2)\,; \\
\}
\end{array}
$$

- Equivalent to the $\models$ relation, but from the algorithmic view.
- Q: Complexity? A: Polynomial (time and space).

Semantics III: Example

- Recall our example
  - $\varphi = (a \vee (b \rightarrow c))$
  - $\alpha : \{a, b, c\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with $\alpha(a) = 0$, $\alpha(b) = 0$, and $\alpha(c) = 1$.

- $\mathit{Eval}(\alpha, \varphi) = \mathit{Eval}(\alpha, a)$ *or* $\mathit{Eval}(\alpha, b \rightarrow c) =$
  0 *or* $(\mathrm{Eval}(\alpha, b)$ *implies* $\mathrm{Eval}(\alpha, c)) =$
  0 *or* $(0$ *implies* $1) =$
  0 *or* $1 =$
  1

- Hence, $\alpha \models \varphi$.

Satisfying assignments

寻找使得PropForm成立的assignment

- Intuition: each formula specifies a set of assignments satisfying it.
- Remember: *Assign* denotes the set of all assignments.
- Function $sat : PropForm \to 2^{Assign}$

  PropForm|=2^Assign (使PropForm成立的assignment的实际取值)

  (a formula $\to$ set of its satisfying assignments)
- Recursive definition:

  sat()即为使PropForm取值为真的assignment

$$
\begin{aligned}
sat(a) &= \{\alpha \mid \alpha(a) = 1\}, \quad a \in AP \\
sat(\neg\varphi_1) &= Assign \setminus sat(\varphi_1) \\
sat(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) &= sat(\varphi_1) \cap sat(\varphi_2) \\
sat(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) &= sat(\varphi_1) \cup sat(\varphi_2) \\
sat(\varphi_1 \to \varphi_2) &= (Assign \setminus sat(\varphi_1)) \cup sat(\varphi_2)
\end{aligned}
$$

- For $\varphi \in PropForm$ and $\alpha \in Assign$ it holds that

$$\alpha \models \varphi \quad \textit{iff} \quad \alpha \in sat(\varphi)$$

Satisfying assignments: Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& sat(a \vee (b \rightarrow c)) && = \\
& sat(a) \cup sat(b \rightarrow c) && = \\
& sat(a) \cup ((Assign \setminus sat(b)) \cup sat(c)) && = \\
& \{\alpha \in Assign \mid \alpha(a) = 1\} \cup \\
& \{\alpha \in Assign \mid \alpha(b) = 0\} \cup \\
& \{\alpha \in Assign \mid \alpha(c) = 1\} && = \\
& \{\alpha \in Assign \mid \alpha(a) = 1 \text{ or } \alpha(b) = 0 \text{ or } \alpha(c) = 1\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Extensions of $\models$

2^Assign: 使PropForm成立的assignment的实际取值情况

- We define $\models \subseteq 2^{Assign} \times PropForm$ by

  assignment的实际取值情况|=PropForm

  $$T \models \varphi \text{ iff } T \subseteq sat(\varphi)$$

  for formulae $\varphi \in PropForm$ and assignment sets $T \subseteq 2^{Assign}$.

  Examples: $\{\alpha \in Assign \mid \alpha(a) = \alpha(c) = 1\} \models a \vee (b \rightarrow c)$

  $\{\alpha \in Assign \mid \alpha(x_1) = 1\} \models x_1 \vee x_2$

- We define $\models \subseteq PropForm \times PropForm$ by

  PropForm |= PropForm

  $$\varphi_1 \models \varphi_2 \text{ iff } sat(\varphi_1) \subseteq sat(\varphi_2)$$

  for formulae $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in PropForm$.

  Examples: $a \wedge c \models a \vee (b \rightarrow c)$

  $x_1 \models x_1 \vee x_2$

Short summary for propositional logic syntax and semantics

- Syntax of propositional formulae $\varphi \in \mathit{PropForm}$:

$$\varphi \;:=\; \mathit{AP} \mid (\neg\varphi) \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi)$$

- Semantics:
  - Assignments $\alpha \in \mathit{Assign}$:

$$\alpha : \mathit{AP} \to \{0,1\}$$
$$\alpha \in 2^{\mathit{AP}}$$
$$\alpha \in \{0,1\}^{\mathit{AP}}$$

  - Satisfaction relation:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \models \subseteq \mathit{Assign} \times \mathit{PropForm} & , & (\text{e.g., } \alpha \models \varphi) \\ \models \subseteq 2^{\mathit{Assign}} \times \mathit{PropForm} & , & (\text{e.g., } \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \models \varphi) \\ \models \subseteq \mathit{PropForm} \times \mathit{PropForm}, & & (\text{e.g., } \varphi_1 \models \varphi_2) \\ \mathit{sat} : \mathit{PropForm} \to 2^{\mathit{Assign}} & , & (\text{e.g., } \mathit{sat}(\varphi)) \end{array}$$

02 Propositional logic I

1 Syntax of propositional logic

2 Semantics of propositional logic

3 Satisfiability and validity

Semantic classification of formulae

- A formula φ is called **valid** if $sat(\varphi) = Assign$. 永真式 (任何条件下都为真)
  (Also called a **tautology**).
- A formula φ is called **satisfiable** if $sat(\varphi) \neq \emptyset$.
- A formula φ is called **unsatisfiable** if $sat(\varphi) = \emptyset$.
  (Also called a **contradiction**). 矛盾式 (任何情况下都为假)



Some notations

- We can write:
  - $\models \varphi$ when φ is valid
  - $\not\models \varphi$ when φ is not valid 不是所有情况都能推出φ
  - $\not\models \neg\varphi$ when φ is satisfiable 不是所有情况都会推出非φ
  - $\models \neg\varphi$ when φ is unsatisfiable

Examples

- $(x_1 \wedge x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \vee x_2)$ is valid 永真式
- $(x_1 \vee x_2) \rightarrow x_1$ is satisfiable 有成立的情况, 是 satisfiable
- $(x_1 \wedge x_2) \wedge \neg x_1$ is unsatisfiable 没有成立的情况

Examples

- Here are some valid formulae:
  - $\models a \wedge 1 \leftrightarrow a$
  - $\models a \wedge 0 \leftrightarrow 0$
  - $\models \neg\neg a \leftrightarrow a$ (double-negation rule)
  - $\models a \wedge (b \vee c) \leftrightarrow (a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c)$
- Some more (De Morgan rules):
  - $\models \neg(a \wedge b) \leftrightarrow (\neg a \vee \neg b)$
  - $\models \neg(a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (\neg a \wedge \neg b)$

The satisfiability problem for propositional logic

- The satisfiability problem for propositional logic is as follows:

  Given an input propositional formula φ, decide whether φ is satisfiable.
- This problem is decidable but NP-complete.
- An algorithm that always terminates for each propositional logic formula with the correct answer is called a decision procedure for propositional logic.

Goal: Design and implement such a decision procedure:



Note: A formula φ is valid iff $\neg\varphi$ is unsatisfiable.

Learning target

- What are the rules to (syntactically) build propositional logic formulas?
- How to interpret propositional logic formulas...
  - ... using truth tables?
  - ... using the satisfaction relation?
  - ... algorithmically by the `Eval` function?
- How to compute the set of all satisfying assignments recursively by the `sat` function?
- When is a propositional logic formula valid, satisfiable or unsatisfiable?