

# CS3202: Logic, Specification and Verification

CS3202-LSV 2006-07

cs3202.lec@cs.st-andrews.ac.uk

Dr. James McKinna, Rм 1.03

Dr. Stéphane Lengrand, Rm. 1.02

## Lecture 1 (06/02/2007):

### **Review of logic, syntax and semantics**

#### **Review of propositional logic: syntax**

- propositional variables (atoms):  $P, Q, \ldots$
- connectives: and  $\land$ , or  $\lor$ , implies  $\Rightarrow$ , iff  $\Leftrightarrow$ , not,  $\neg$
- simple context-free grammar of well-formed formulae (wff)
- precedence and associativity (your mileage may vary)

#### **Review of propositional logic: semantics**

- yes, models of wffs
- valuations: finite maps from the propositional variables of a wff to the Booleans
- extend valuations to all wffs by structural recursion: need the truth tables
- a model  ${\mathcal M}$  of a wff  $\phi$  is a valuation in which  $\phi$  has value true
- tautologies: wffs with value true in *all* valuations

- finite maps  $\mathcal V$ , taking propositional variables P, etc. into Booleans
- lift to all wffs by *structural recursion*:

• where  $tt_{\wedge}(v, w)$ , etc. are the *truth-table* functions on truth values for the corresponding connective

 fundamental semantic relation (*consequence relation*) from hypotheses to conclusions

$$\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_n\models\phi$$

- in every valuation in which each of  $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$  has value true...
- . . . then so too does  $\phi$
- "entailment", "logical consequence", "semantic consequence" (for propositional logic)

- a *mechanical* process for checking entailments  $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n \models \phi$
- identify the propositional atoms P, Q ... in  $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$ ,  $\phi$
- consider all valuations  $\mathcal{V}$  on these atoms; (then extend to wffs)
- identify all such  $\mathcal V$  for which each of  $\mathcal V(\phi_i)$  = true
- check that for all such valuations  $\mathcal{V}(\phi)$  = true
- Problem: complexity lower bound of  $2^p$  in the number p of propositional atoms

• *syntactic* consequence relation, capturing "does the conclusion follow from the hypotheses?"

$$\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_n\vdash\phi$$

- defined by *inference rules*: introduction and elimination
- finite system, follows the *structure* of the grammar
- "natural": obviously correct inference from hypothesis to conclusion in each rule
- soundness: formalise this "obviously correct" idea
- completeness: the rules are, in fact enough to characterise semantic consequence (not at all "obvious")

### **Questions?**

JHM+SL: CS3202 Lecture 1 Slide 6