Informatics 1
Computation and Logic
Lecture 17
The Big Ideas
A formal language, without the vagueness and ambiguity of natural language

Syntax: expressions are built up from atomic propositions using logical connectives

\[ \land \lor \neg \rightarrow \]

expressions are trees, with atomic propositions as leaf nodes and other nodes labelled with connectives

\[ A \land B \rightarrow \neg C \]
A formal language, without the vagueness and ambiguity of natural language

Semantics:
the truth value expressions is built up “compositionally” from the truth values of its atomic propositions using logical operators
Formal Inference

proofs are built from assumptions using sound rules

**proofs are trees**, with assumptions as leaves, and other nodes labelled with instances of rules

\[
\begin{align*}
A &\rightarrow B \\
B &\rightarrow \neg B
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\neg B \\
\rightarrow A
\end{align*}
\]

a deduction rule

an entailment

\[
A \rightarrow B, \neg B \vdash \neg A
\]
Formal Inference

proofs are built from assumptions using sound rules
proofs are trees, with assumptions as leaves, and
other nodes labelled with instances of rules

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A \rightarrow B, \ \neg B \vdash \neg A \\
B \rightarrow C, \ \neg C \vdash \neg B \\
A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C, \ \neg C \vdash \neg A
\end{array}
\]

\[(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C) \vdash A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C)\]
Natural Deduction

one natural way to prove $A \rightarrow B$ is to assume $A$ and prove $B$

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a proof} \\
A \rightarrow B, \neg B \quad & \quad \neg A \\
\hline
B \rightarrow C, \neg C \\
\hline
\neg A
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\rightarrow \text{ introduction} \\
a \text{ rule of inference} \\
\Gamma, X \vdash Y \\
\hline
\Gamma \vdash X \rightarrow Y
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a proof?} \\
A \rightarrow B, \neg B \vdash \neg A \\
\hline
B \rightarrow C, \neg C \\
\hline
\neg A \\
\hline
\neg C \rightarrow \neg A
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
A \rightarrow B, \neg B \vdash \neg A \\
B \rightarrow C, \neg C \vdash \neg B \\
\hline
A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C, \neg C \vdash \neg A \\
\hline
\neg C \rightarrow \neg A \\
\hline
A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C \vdash \neg C \rightarrow \neg A
\end{align*}
\]
Natural Deduction

one natural way to prove $X \rightarrow Y$ is to assume $X$ and prove $Y$
and if we can prove $X \rightarrow Y$ then from $X$ we can infer $Y$

→ introduction & elimination
a 2-way rule of inference
\[
\Gamma, X \vdash Y \\
\Gamma \vdash X \rightarrow Y
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A, B \vdash B \\
B \vdash A \rightarrow B \\
B, (A \rightarrow B) \vdash (A \rightarrow C) \\
(A \rightarrow B) \vdash (A \rightarrow C), A, B \vdash C \\
(A \rightarrow B) \vdash (A \rightarrow C), A \vdash B \rightarrow C \\
(A \rightarrow B) \vdash (A \rightarrow C) \vdash A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C)
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(A \rightarrow B) \vdash (A \rightarrow C), A \rightarrow B, (A \rightarrow B) \vdash (A \rightarrow C) \vdash A \rightarrow C \\
A \rightarrow C \vdash A \rightarrow C
\end{array}
\]

The proofs may be natural, but sometimes they are hard to find!
Gentzen’s idea

Instead of just entailments, \( \Gamma \vdash X \) (where \( X \) is an expression and \( \Gamma \) is a finite set of expressions)
allow sequents, \( \Gamma \vdash \Delta \) (where both \( \Gamma \) and \( \Delta \) are finite sets of expressions)

Of course, every entailment ‘is’ a sequent (where \( \Delta \) is a singleton)
but the sequent calculus is much simpler than natural deduction

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma, A, B & \vdash \Delta \quad (\wedge L) \quad \Gamma \vdash A \wedge B, \Delta \quad (\wedge R) \\
\Gamma, A \vdash \Delta, B & \vdash \Delta \quad (\vee L) \quad \Gamma \vdash A \vee B, \Delta \quad (\vee R) \\
\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B, \Delta & \vdash \Delta \quad (\rightarrow L) \quad \Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B, \Delta \quad (\rightarrow R) \\
\Gamma \vdash A, \Delta & \vdash \Delta \quad (\neg L) \quad \Gamma \vdash A, \neg A, \Delta \quad (\neg R)
\end{align*}
\]
The diagram shows a river, a road, an island, and two bridges that can open to let ships pass. Ships can pass from West to East only if at least one of the bridges is open. Cars can pass from North to South only if both bridges are closed.

How does this relate to de Morgan’s Law?
Draw a graph showing the paths across the bridges from North to South.

In each case, the bridges correspond to edges of the graph.

Draw a graph showing the paths under the bridges from West to East.

What is the logical relationship between the two graphs?
We can express many combinatorial problems in propositional logic

(eg Sudoku, but also more practical problems, such as circuit design)

We can use resolution to check whether a set of clauses is consistent.

If we can derive the empty clause the set is inconsistent, and we can invert the proof to produce a refutation tree.

If we cannot derive the empty clause we can construct a satisfying valuation from the failed attempt to prove a contradiction.

Generating all the resolvants takes space and time.
Davis Putnam

Take a collection $\mathcal{C}$ of clauses.

For each propositional letter, $A$
  For each pair $(X, Y) \mid X \in \mathcal{C} \land Y \in \mathcal{C} \land A \in X \land \neg A \in Y$
    if $R(X, Y, A) = \emptyset$ return UNSAT
    if $R(X, Y, A)$ is consistent $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C} \cup \{R(X, Y)\}$
    return SAT

Where $R(X, Y, A) = X \cup Y \setminus \{A, \neg A\}$

Heuristic: start with variables that occur seldom.
Naïve search

function SAT(Φ, V)

Φ|V = {}
||
{} ∉ Φ|V
&&
let A = chooseLiteral(Φ, V)
in
SAT(Φ, V ^ A)
||
SAT(Φ, V ^ ¬A)

Φ is a set of clauses

V is a partial valuation (a consistent set of literals)  
V^A = V u {A}

Φ | V is the result of simplifying Φ using V:
For each literal L ∈ V
• remove clauses containing L
• delete ¬L from remaining clauses

chooseLiteral(Φ, V) returns a literal occurring in Φ | V
We can express many combinatorial problems in propositional logic
(eg Sudoku, but also more practical problems)

We can search for solutions to a set of constraints expressed in propositional logic

We convert the problem to clausal form and check partial valuations $V$ against our constraints if $V$ contradicts any clauses our search must backtrack.

Checking these potential solutions costs time and space

We can narrow the search by **unit propagation**: identifying literals whose siblings are all falsified, and making them true

Keeping track of unit literals takes time
- **A Boolean Network Model:**
  - Nodes represent transcription factors
  - Edges represent regulatory input
  - Boolean gates (input functions) represent gene expression

\[
\begin{align*}
f_A(A,B,C) &= A \text{ OR } C \\
f_C(A,B,C) &= \text{NOT } A \text{ OR } B \\
f_B(A,B,C) &= A \text{ AND } C
\end{align*}
\]
Dynamics

- Network State: \( X=(A,B,C,...) \) is a Boolean vector

- State evolution: \( X(t+1)=f(X(t))=(f_A(X(t)), f_B(X(t)), \ldots) \)
  - E.g., \( X(t+1)=(A \text{ OR } C, A \text{ AND } C, (\text{NOT } A) \text{ OR } B) \)
  - \((0,1,1)=>(1,0,1)\)

- This is discrete time synchronous dynamics
  - State transitions occur through concurrent gates firings

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
X(t) & X(t+1) \\
000 & 001 \\
001 & 101 \\
010 & 001 \\
011 & 101 \\
100 & 100 \\
101 & 110 \\
110 & 101 \\
111 & 111 \\
\end{array}
\]

State-space dynamics

- Cycle
- Attractors

\( f_A(A,B,C)=A \text{ OR } C \)
\( f_B(A,B,C)=A \text{ AND } C \)
\( f_C(A,B,C)=(\text{NOT } A) \text{ OR } B \)
Let $A$ be a class of such strings. We call $A$ regular, if $A$ can be described by an expression built out of the following operations (chosen in analogy to the definition of regular events in Sect. 7.1.)

The empty set and the unit set consisting of just $a_i$ for any $i$ are regular. If $A$ and $B$ are regular, so is their sum which we write $A \lor B$. If $A$ and $B$ are regular, so is the set, written $AB$, of strings obtained by writing a string belonging to $A$ just left of a string belonging to $B$. If $A$ and $B$ are regular, so is $A^*B$ which abbreviates $A \cdots AB \ (n \geq 0)$, i.e., the sum of these classes for all $n \geq 0$. 

S. C. Kleene 1909–1994

Representation of events in nerve nets and finite automata 1951

https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_memoranda/2008/RM704.pdf
Finite State Machine concepts proved valuable in language parsing (compilers) and sequential circuit design.
SYNTHESIZING SEQUENTIAL CIRCUITS

Fig. 5

[Diagram of a sequential circuit with states 00, 01, 10, and 11, and transitions labeled with inputs and outputs.]
A nondeterministic automaton has, at each stage of its operation, several choices of possible actions. This versatility enables us to construct very powerful automata using only a small number of internal states.

Nondeterministic automata, however, turn out to be equivalent to the usual automata. This fact is utilized for showing quickly that certain sets are definable by automata.

Dana S. Scott 1934-…

Michael O. Rabin 1931-…

Finite Automata and their Decision Problems 1959
Parsers are responsible for translating unstructured, untrusted, opaque data to a structured, implicitly trusted, semantically meaningful format suitable for computing on. Parsers, therefore, are the components that facilitate the separation of data from computation and, hence, exist in nearly every conceivable useful computer system.

Parsers must be correct, so that only valid input is blessed with trust; and they must be efficient so that enormous documents and torrential datastreams don’t bring systems to their knees.

Fig. 2. DFA that recognizes HTTP headers, with the request on the first line, followed by arbitrary key-value pairs on subsequent lines, ending with two consecutive newlines. Solid edges represent any printable character, dotted lines represent a space, dashed lines represent a newline. The unlabeled states just eat spaces.
Abstract In this chapter, we introduce an important building block for efficient custom hardware design: the Finite State Machine with Datapath (FSMD). An FSMD combines a controller, modeled as a finite state machine (FSM) and a datapath. The datapath receives commands from the controller and performs operations as a result of executing those commands. The controller uses the results of data path operations to make decisions and to steer control flow. The FSMD model will be used throughout the remainder of the book as the reference model for the ‘hardware’ part of hardware/software codesign.
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