

# Introduction to AI

François Jacquenet

Laboratoire Hubert Curien  
Université de Saint-Etienne  
[Francois.Jacquenet@univ-st-etienne.fr](mailto:Francois.Jacquenet@univ-st-etienne.fr)

September, 2019



# General idea

**Problem:** given a sentence  $S$ , say whether  $S$  is valid, unsatisfiable or contingent

Convert  $S$  to a clause  $\Phi$  in CNF

**if**  $\Phi \vdash \{\}$  **then**  $\Phi$  is unsatisfiable

**else if**  $\neg\Phi \vdash \{\}$  **then**  $\Phi$  is valid

**otherwise**  $\Phi$  is contingent

# Example 1

Given the sentence  $p \wedge (p \Rightarrow \neg q) \wedge q$

The clausal form is:  $\{p\}, \{\neg p, \neg q\}, \{q\}$

- |    |                      |         |
|----|----------------------|---------|
| 1. | $\{p\}$              | Premise |
| 2. | $\{\neg p, \neg q\}$ | Premise |
| 3. | $\{q\}$              | Premise |
| 4. | $\{\neg q\}$         | 1, 2    |
| 8. | $\{\}$               | 3, 4    |

Conclusion: the sentence  $p \wedge (p \Rightarrow \neg q) \wedge q$  is unsatisfiable

## Example 2

Given the sentence  $(p \Rightarrow q) \vee (q \Rightarrow p)$

The clausal form is:  $\{\neg p, q, \neg q, q\}$

We can not prove anything from that, so the sentence  $(p \Rightarrow q) \vee (q \Rightarrow p)$  is not unsatisfiable

Consider the negation of this sentence:  $\neg((p \Rightarrow q) \vee (q \Rightarrow p))$

The clausal form is:  $\{p\}, \{\neg q\}, \{q\}, \{\neg p\}$

- |    |              |         |
|----|--------------|---------|
| 1. | $\{p\}$      | Premise |
| 2. | $\{\neg q\}$ | Premise |
| 3. | $\{q\}$      | Premise |
| 4. | $\{\neg p\}$ | Premise |
| 8. | $\{\}$       | 1, 4    |

Conclusion: the sentence  $\neg((p \Rightarrow q) \vee (q \Rightarrow p))$  is unsatisfiable so the sentence  $(p \Rightarrow q) \vee (q \Rightarrow p)$  is valid

## Example 3

Given the sentence  $(p \Rightarrow q) \vee (p \Rightarrow \neg q)$

The clausal form is:  $\{\neg p, q\}, \{\neg p, \neg q\}$

We can not prove the empty clause from that, so the sentence  $(p \Rightarrow q) \vee (p \Rightarrow \neg q)$  is not unsatisfiable

Consider the negation of this sentence:  $\neg((p \Rightarrow q) \vee (p \Rightarrow \neg q))$

The clausal form is:  $\{p\}, \{p, q\}, \{\neg q, p\}, \{\neg q, q\}$

and here again we can not prove the empty clause from that, so the sentence  $(p \Rightarrow q) \vee (p \Rightarrow \neg q)$  is not valid

Conclusion: the sentence  $(p \Rightarrow q) \vee (p \Rightarrow \neg q)$  is contingent