

# Logic for AI — Master 1 IFI

## Class Assignment #1: Propositional Logic

Andrea G. B. Tettamanzi  
Université côte d'Azur  
andrea.tettamanzi@univ-cotedazur.fr

Academic Year 2018/2019

### 1 Formalization

Given the following symbols and sentences:

- $f$  = “John is fit”
- $l$  = “John is lucky”
- $w$  = “the weather is good”
- $c$  = “John succeeds in climbing mount Everest”

Formalize the following sentences in propositional logic:

1. John is fit and lucky
2. John is fit but not lucky, and the weather is not good.
3. If John is not fit and lucky, then he does not succeed in climbing mount Everest.
4. John succeeds in climbing mount Everest if he is fit and if the weather is good
5. If the weather is not good but John is lucky and fit, he succeeds in climbing mount Everest
6. If it is the case that the weather is good provided that John is lucky, then John succeeds in climbing mount Everest if he is fit and lucky.

### 2 Evaluation of Propositional Sentences

Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be defined as follows:

constant	$p$	$q$	$r$
truth value	$F$	$F$	$T$

Evaluate the following sentences:

1.  $p \Rightarrow q$
2.  $q \Rightarrow r$
3.  $r \Rightarrow p$
4.  $\neg(q \Leftrightarrow r) \vee p$
5.  $(p \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow r)) \Leftrightarrow ((p \wedge q) \Rightarrow r)$
6.  $(p \Rightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow (\neg q \Rightarrow \neg p)$
7.  $\neg q \wedge (p \vee q) \wedge (q \vee r) \wedge (p \Rightarrow \neg r)$

### 3 Truth Tables

For each of the following sentences, list their properties (i.e., are they valid, satisfiable, contingent, falsifiable, or unsatisfiable):

1.  $p \Rightarrow q$
2.  $q \Rightarrow r$
3.  $r \Rightarrow p$
4.  $\neg(q \Leftrightarrow r) \vee p$
5.  $(p \Rightarrow (q \Rightarrow r)) \Leftrightarrow ((p \wedge q) \Rightarrow r)$
6.  $(p \Rightarrow q) \Leftrightarrow (\neg q \Rightarrow \neg p)$
7.  $\neg q \wedge (p \vee q) \wedge (q \vee r) \wedge (p \Rightarrow \neg r)$

### 4 Entailment

Check whether

$$\{\neg p \Rightarrow q, q \Rightarrow p, p \Rightarrow (r \wedge s)\} \models p \wedge r \wedge s$$

1. With the truth table method.
2. By refutation, with the Davis-Putnam Algorithm
3. By refutation, with clausal resolution

Compare the three approaches.

Suggestion: you will need a CNF to prove the entailment by refutation; just construct a single sentence from the three premises, then transform that sentence into CNF.