```
(a)
\forall x \ y \ horse(x) \land rabbit(y) \Rightarrow faster(x, y)
\forall x \, y \, dog(x) \land rabbit(y) \Rightarrow faster(x, y)
horse(F) \lor dog(F)
rabbit(B)
greyhound(A)
(b) CNF:
\neg horse(x), \neg rabbit(y), faster(x, y)
                                                  GOAL: \neg faster(F, B)
\neg dog(x), \neg rabbit(y), faster(x, y)
                                                  (c)
horse(F) \lor dog(F)
                                                  \forall x \ greyhound(x) \Rightarrow dog(x)
rabbit(B)
greyhound(A)
```

Given:

- 1. The textbooks of class CA are easy
- 2. The textbooks of class CB are difficult
- 3. Mary studies (all and only) easy books
- 4. Mary passes the exam of a class if she studies at least a textbook for that class
- 5. Russel&Norvig is a textbook for class CA
- 6. Tenenbaum is a textbook for class CB
- 1 Translate the sentences in FOL, in CNF and tell if it is Horn
- 2 Prove, using **Resolution**, that *Mary passes an exam*, by adding the appropriate knowledge (if needed)

A straightforward translation is:

- 1. $\forall x \ text(CA, x) \Rightarrow easy(x)$
- $2. \forall x \ text(CB, x) \Rightarrow \neg easy(x)$
- $3. \forall x \ study(Mary, x) \Leftrightarrow easy(x)$
- $4. \ \forall x \ [\exists y \ text(x,y) \land study(Mary,y)] \Rightarrow pass(Mary,x)$
- 5. text(CA, Russel & Norvig)
- 6. text(CB, Tenenbaum)

A straightforward translation in CNF is:

- $1. \neg text(CA, x) \lor easy(x)$
- $2. \neg text(CB, x) \lor \neg easy(x)$
- $3.1. \neg study(Mary, x) \lor easy(x)$
- $3.2. study(Mary, x) \lor \neg easy(x)$
 - $4. \neg text(x,y) \lor \neg study(Mary,y) \lor pass(Mary,x)$
 - 5. text(CA, Russel & Norvig)
 - 6. text(CB, Tenenbaum)

It is Horn (at most one positive atom).

Knowledge base for the **Resolution**:

```
\{\neg text(CA, x) \lor easy(x)\}_1,
              \{\neg text(CB, x) \lor \neg easy(x)\}_2,
            \{\neg study(Mary, x) \lor easy(x)\}_{3,1},
            \{study(Mary, x) \lor \neg easy(x)\}_{3,2}
\{\neg text(x,y) \lor \neg study(Mary,y) \lor pass(Mary,x)\}_4,
             \{text(CA, Russel\&Norvig)\}_{5}
               \{text(CB, Tenenbaum)\}_{6}
                    \{\neg pass(Mary, z)\}_7
```

```
From (4) and (7) with \sigma = \{z/x\}:
              \{\neg text(z,y) \lor \neg study(Mary,y)\}_{8}
From (5) and (8) with \sigma = \{z/CA; y/Russel\&Norvig\}:
             \{\neg study(Mary, Russel\&Norvig)\}_9
From (3.2) and (9) with \sigma = \{x/Russel\&Norvig\}:
                 \{\neg easy(Russel\&Norvig)\}_{10}
From (1) and (5) with \sigma = \{x/Russel\&Norvig\}:
                  \{easy(Russel\&Norvig)\}_{11}
From (10) and (11) \Rightarrow {}
```

Transform into normal form the original formulas plus the negation of the thesis (A, B, C) are Skolem constants:

```
1) Equal(x_1, x_1)
```

- 2) $Equal(x_2, x_3) \vee \neg Equal(x_3, x_2)$
- 3) $Equal(x_4, x_5) \vee \neg Equal(x_4, x_6) \vee \neg Equal(x_6, x_5)$
- 4) Equal(A, B)
- 5) $\neg Equal(B,C)$
- 6) Equal(A, C)

We can get the empty clause, for instance, as follows:

- 7) Equal(B, A) resolution from (2) and (4) (substitution $\{x_3/A, x_2/B\}$)
- 8) $\neg Equal(A, x_5) \lor Equal(B, x_5)$ resolution from(3) and (7) (substitution $\{x_6/A, x_4/B\}$)
- 9) Equal(B,C) resolution from (6) and (8) (substitution $\{x_5/C\}$)
- 10) {} resolution from (5) and (9)

9) {} Res. 4b,8

```
The three sentences can be expressed as:
1) \forall x (Rose(x) \rightarrow \exists y (Thorn(y) \land Has(x,y)))
2) \forall t (Thorn(t) \rightarrow Dangerous(t))
3) \forall x((\exists y(Has(x,y) \land Dangerous(y))) \rightarrow Dangerous(x))
while the last sentence as:
\forall r(Rose(r) \rightarrow Dangerous(r))
The transformation of the formulas of KB into clauses (where F() is a Skolem function) gives :
1a) \neg Rose(x) \lor Thorn(F(x))
1b) \neg Rose(x) \lor Has(x, F(x))
2) \neg Thorn(t) \lor Dangerous(t)
3)\neg Has(x,y) \lor \neg Dangerous(y) \lor Dangerous(x)
The negation of (4) ( where R is a Skolem constant) gives :
4a) Rose(R)
4b)\neg Dangerous(R)
The empty clause can be derived:
5) \neg Rose(x) \lor Dangerous(F(x)) Res. 1a,2 \langle t/F(x) \rangle
6) \neg Rose(x) \lor \neg Dangerous(F(x)) \lor Dangerous(x) Res. 1b,3 \langle y/F(x) \rangle
7) \neg Rose(x) \lor Dangerous(x) Res. 5,6
8) Dangerous(R) Res. 4a,7 (x R)
```

```
1. \forall x (HOUND(x) \rightarrow HOWL(x))
2. \forall x \forall y (HAVE(x,y) \land CAT(y) \rightarrow \neg \exists z (HAVE(x,z) \land MOUSE(z)))
3. \forall x (LS(x) \rightarrow \neg \exists y (HAVE(x,y) \land HOWL(y)))
4. \exists x (HAVE (John,x) \land (CAT(x) \lor HOUND(x)))
5. LS(John) \rightarrow \neg \exists z (HAVE(John,z) \land MOUSE(z))
1. \neg HOUND(x) \lor HOWL(x)
2. \neg HAVE(x,y) \lor \neg CAT(y) \lor \neg HAVE(x,z) \lor \neg MOUSE(z)
3. \neg LS(x) \lor \neg HAVE(x,y) \lor \neg HOWL(y)
      1. HAVE(John,a)
4.
      2. CAT(a) v HOUND(a)
5.
      1. LS(John)
      2. HAVE(John,b)
      3. MOUSE(b)
```

```
[1.,4.(b):] 6. CAT(a) v HOWL(a)

[2,5.(c):] 7. ¬ HAVE(x,y) v ¬ CAT(y) v ¬ HAVE(x,b)

[7,5.(b):] 8. ¬ HAVE(John,y) v ¬ CAT(y)

[6,8:] 9. ¬ HAVE(John,a) v HOWL(a)

[4.(a),9:] 10. HOWL(a)

[3,10:] 11. ¬ LS(x) v ¬ HAVE(x,a)

[4.(a),11:] 12. ¬ LS(John)

[5.(a),12:] 13. □
```