1 Puzzle A

- 1. $\forall x Baby(x) \implies \neg Rational(x)$
- 2. $\forall x Manage An Alligator(x) \implies \neg Loathed(x)$
- 3. $\forall x \neg Rational(x) \implies Loathed(x)$
- 4. (conclusion) $Baby(Alex) \implies \neg ManageAnAlligator(Alex)$

Converting to clausal form:

- 1. $\neg Baby(x) \lor \neg Rational(x)$
- 2. $\neg ManageAnAlligator(x) \lor \neg Loathed(x)$
- 3. $Rational(x) \lor Loathed(x)$
- 4. (conclusion) $\neg Baby(Alex) \lor \neg ManageAnAlligator(Alex)$

Proof by resolution refutation:

Adding negative of **conclusion** to KB (i.e. sentences 1, 2, 3):

- $5. \ Baby(Alex) \land ManageAnAlligator(Alex) \\$
- 6. Baby(Alex) 5, And-Elimination
- 7. Manage An Alligator(Alex) 5, And-Elimination
- 8. $\neg Rational(Alex)$ {Alex/x} 1,6 Modus Ponens
- 9. Loathed(Alex) {Alex/x} 3,8 Modus Ponens
- 10. $\neg ManageAnAlligator(Alex)$ {Alex/x} 2,9 Modus Ponens
- 11. *NIL* 7,10 Modus Ponens

Therefore, the conclusion is **true**.

2 Puzzle B

Assumptions:

- $1. \ \forall x (\exists y (Eats(x,y) \land Pizza(y)) \implies Happy(x))$
- 2. $\forall x (Foodie(x) \implies \exists y ((Pizza(y) \lor Salad(y)) \land Eats(x,y))))$
- 3. $\forall x (\exists y (Eats(x, y) \land Salad(y)) \implies Healthy(x))$
- 4. $\forall x (Healthy(x) \implies Gyms(x))$
- 5. $\forall x (\forall y (Nice(x) \land Happy(y)) \implies \neg Dated(x,y))$
- 6. $Nice(Ann) \wedge Foodie(Peter)$

Goal:

```
\neg Gyms(Peter) \implies \neg Dated(Ann, Peter)
```

Input to Prover9:

```
formulas(assumptions).
all x (exists y (Eats(x, y) & Pizza(y)) -> Happy(x)).
all x (Foodie(x) -> exists y ((Salad(y) | Pizza(y)) & Eats(x, y))).
all x (exists y (Eats(x, y) & Salad(y)) -> Healthy(x)).
all x (Healthy(x) -> Gyms(x)).
all x (all y ((Nice(x) & Happy(y)) -> -Dated(x, y))).
Nice(Ann) & Foodie(Peter).
end_of_list.

formulas(goals).
-Gyms(Peter) -> -Dated(Ann, Peter).
end_of_list.
```

Output from Prover9:

```
formulas(goals).
-Gyms(Peter) -> -Dated(Ann,Peter).
end_of_list.
% Formulas that are not ordinary clauses:
1 (all x ((exists y (Eats(x,y) & Pizza(y))) -> Happy(x))) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
2 (all x (Foodie(x) -> (exists y ((Salad(y) | Pizza(y)) & Eats(x,y))))) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
3 (all x ((exists y (Eats(x,y) & Salad(y))) \rightarrow Healthy(x))) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
4 (all x (Healthy(x) -> Gyms(x))) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
5 (all x all y (Nice(x) & Happy(y) -> -Dated(x,y))) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
6 Nice(Ann) & Foodie(Peter) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
7 -Gyms(Peter) -> -Dated(Ann,Peter) # label(non_clause) # label(goal). [goal].
======= end of process non-clausal formulas ===
% Clauses before input processing:
formulas(usable).
end_of_list.
formulas(sos).
-Eats(x,y) | -Pizza(y) | Happy(x). [clausify(1)].
-Foodie(x) | Salad(f1(x)) | Pizza(f1(x)). [clausify(2)].
-Foodie(x) | Eats(x,f1(x)). [clausify(2)].
-Eats(x,y) | -Salad(y) | Healthy(x). [clausify(3)].
-Healthy(x) | Gyms(x). [clausify(4)].
-Nice(x) | -Happy(y) | -Dated(x,y). [clausify(5)].
Nice(Ann). [clausify(6)].
Foodie(Peter). [clausify(6)].
-Gyms(Peter). [deny(7)].
Dated(Ann,Peter). [deny(7)].
end_of_list.
formulas(demodulators).
end_of_list.
Eliminating Eats/2
8 -Foodie(x) | Eats(x,f1(x)). [clausify(2)].
9 -Eats(x,y) | -Pizza(y) | Happy(x). [clausify(1)].
Derived: -Foodie(x) \mid -Pizza(f1(x)) \mid Happy(x). [resolve(8,b,9,a)].
10 -Eats(x,y) | -Salad(y) | Healthy(x). [clausify(3)].
Derived: -Salad(f1(x)) \mid Healthy(x) \mid -Foodie(x). [resolve(10,a,8,b)].
Eliminating Foodie/1
11 Foodie(Peter). [clausify(6)].
12 -Foodie(x) | Salad(f1(x)) | Pizza(f1(x)). [clausify(2)].
Derived: Salad(f1(Peter)) | Pizza(f1(Peter)). [resolve(11,a,12,a)].
13 -Foodie(x) | -Pizza(f1(x)) | Happy(x). [resolve(8,b,9,a)].
Derived: -Pizza(f1(Peter)) | Happy(Peter). [resolve(13,a,11,a)].
14 -Salad(f1(x)) | Healthy(x) | -Foodie(x). [resolve(10,a,8,b)].
Derived: -Salad(f1(Peter)) | Healthy(Peter). [resolve(14,c,11,a)].
Eliminating Healthy/1
15 -Salad(f1(Peter)) | Healthy(Peter). [resolve(14,c,11,a)].
```

```
16 -Healthy(x) | Gyms(x). [clausify(4)].
Derived: -Salad(f1(Peter)) | Gyms(Peter). [resolve(15,b,16,a)].
Eliminating Nice/1
17 Nice(Ann). [clausify(6)].
18 -Nice(x) | -Happy(y) | -Dated(x,y). [clausify(5)].
Derived: -Happy(x) \mid -Dated(Ann,x). [resolve(17,a,18,a)].
Eliminating Gyms/1
19 -Salad(f1(Peter)) | Gyms(Peter). [resolve(15,b,16,a)].
20 -Gyms(Peter). [deny(7)].
Derived: -Salad(f1(Peter)). [resolve(19,b,20,a)].
Eliminating Dated/2
21 -Happy(x) | -Dated(Ann,x). [resolve(17,a,18,a)].
22 Dated(Ann, Peter). [deny(7)].
Derived: -Happy(Peter). [resolve(21,b,22,a)].
Eliminating Salad/1
23 -Salad(f1(Peter)). [resolve(19,b,20,a)].
24 Salad(f1(Peter)) | Pizza(f1(Peter)). [resolve(11,a,12,a)].
Derived: Pizza(f1(Peter)). [resolve(23,a,24,a)].
Eliminating Pizza/1
25 Pizza(f1(Peter)). [resolve(23,a,24,a)].
26 -Pizza(f1(Peter)) | Happy(Peter). [resolve(13,a,11,a)].
Derived: Happy(Peter). [resolve(25,a,26,a)].
Eliminating Happy/1
27 Happy(Peter). [resolve(25,a,26,a)].
28 -Happy(Peter). [resolve(21,b,22,a)].
Derived: $F. [resolve(27,a,28,a)].
Auto_denials: (no changes).
Term ordering decisions:
Predicate symbol precedence: predicate_order([]).
Function symbol precedence: function_order([]).
After inverse_order: (no changes).
Unfolding symbols: (none).
Auto_inference settings:
  % set(neg_binary_resolution). % (HNE depth_diff=0)
  % clear(ordered_res). % (HNE depth_diff=0) % set(ur_resolution). % (HNE depth_diff=0)
   % set(ur_resolution) -> set(pos_ur_resolution).
    % set(ur_resolution) -> set(neg_ur_resolution).
Auto_process settings: (no changes).
% Proof 1 at 0.01 (+ 0.00) seconds.
% Length of proof is 29.
% Level of proof is 8.
% Maximum clause weight is 0.000.
% Given clauses 0.
1 (all x ((exists y (Eats(x,y) & Pizza(y))) \rightarrow Happy(x))) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
2 (all x (Foodie(x) -> (exists y ((Salad(y) | Pizza(y)) & Eats(x,y))))) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
```

```
3 (all x ((exists y (Eats(x,y) & Salad(y))) \rightarrow Healthy(x))) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
4 (all x (Healthy(x) -> Gyms(x))) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
5 (all x all y (Nice(x) & Happy(y) -> -Dated(x,y))) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
6 Nice(Ann) & Foodie(Peter) # label(non_clause). [assumption].
7 -Gyms(Peter) -> -Dated(Ann,Peter) # label(non_clause) # label(goal). [goal].
8 -Foodie(x) | Eats(x,f1(x)). [clausify(2)].
9 -Eats(x,y) | -Pizza(y) | Happy(x). [clausify(1)].
10 -Eats(x,y) | -Salad(y) | Healthy(x). [clausify(3)].
11 Foodie(Peter). [clausify(6)].
12 -Foodie(x) | Salad(f1(x)) | Pizza(f1(x)). [clausify(2)].
13 -Foodie(x) | -Pizza(f1(x)) | Happy(x). [resolve(8,b,9,a)].
14 -Salad(f1(x)) | Healthy(x) | -Foodie(x). [resolve(10,a,8,b)].
15 -Salad(f1(Peter)) | Healthy(Peter). [resolve(14,c,11,a)].
16 -Healthy(x) | Gyms(x). [clausify(4)].
17 Nice(Ann). [clausify(6)].
18 -Nice(x) | -Happy(y) | -Dated(x,y). [clausify(5)].
19 -Salad(f1(Peter)) | Gyms(Peter). [resolve(15,b,16,a)].
20 -Gyms(Peter). [deny(7)].
21 -Happy(x) | -Dated(Ann,x). [resolve(17,a,18,a)].
22 Dated(Ann, Peter). [deny(7)].
23 -Salad(f1(Peter)). [resolve(19,b,20,a)].
24 Salad(f1(Peter)) | Pizza(f1(Peter)). [resolve(11,a,12,a)].
25 Pizza(f1(Peter)). [resolve(23,a,24,a)].
26 -Pizza(f1(Peter)) | Happy(Peter). [resolve(13,a,11,a)].
27 Happy(Peter). [resolve(25,a,26,a)].
28 -Happy(Peter). [resolve(21,b,22,a)].
29 $F. [resolve(27,a,28,a)].
----- end of proof -----
Given=0. Generated=1. Kept=0. proofs=1.
Usable=0. Sos=0. Demods=0. Limbo=0, Disabled=22. Hints=0.
Kept_by_rule=0, Deleted_by_rule=0.
Forward_subsumed=0. Back_subsumed=0.
Sos_limit_deleted=0. Sos_displaced=0. Sos_removed=0.
New_demodulators=0 (0 lex), Back_demodulated=0. Back_unit_deleted=0.
Demod_attempts=0. Demod_rewrites=0.
{\tt Res\_instance\_prunes=0.\ Para\_instance\_prunes=0.\ Basic\_paramod\_prunes=0.}
Nonunit_fsub_feature_tests=0. Nonunit_bsub_feature_tests=0.
Megabytes=0.04.
User_CPU=0.01, System_CPU=0.00, Wall_clock=0.
THEOREM PROVED
Exiting with 1 proof.
```

Therefore, the conclusion is **true**.

Process 39550 exit (max_proofs) Fri Mar 12 16:15:02 2021