

## Resolution Example and Exercises

### Solutions to Selected Problems

#### Example:

Consider the following axioms:

1. All hounds howl at night.
2. Anyone who has any cats will not have any mice.
3. Light sleepers do not have anything which howls at night.
4. John has either a cat or a hound.
5. (Conclusion) If John is a light sleeper, then John does not have any mice.

The conclusion can be proved using Resolution as shown below. The first step is to write each axiom as a well-formed formula in first-order predicate calculus. The clauses written for the above axioms are shown below, using LS(x) for 'light sleeper'.

1.  $\forall x (HOUND(x) \rightarrow HOWL(x))$
2.  $\forall x \forall y (HAVE(x,y) \wedge CAT(y) \rightarrow \neg \exists z (HAVE(x,z) \wedge MOUSE(z)))$
3.  $\forall x (LS(x) \rightarrow \neg \exists y (HAVE(x,y) \wedge HOWL(y)))$
4.  $\exists x (HAVE(John,x) \wedge (CAT(x) \vee HOUND(x)))$
5.  $LS(John) \rightarrow \neg \exists z (HAVE(John,z) \wedge MOUSE(z))$

The next step is to transform each wff into Prenex Normal Form, skolemize, and rewrite as clauses in conjunctive normal form; these transformations are shown below.

1.  $\forall x (HOUND(x) \rightarrow HOWL(x))$   
 $\neg HOUND(x) \vee HOWL(x)$
2.  $\forall x \forall y (HAVE(x,y) \wedge CAT(y) \rightarrow \neg \exists z (HAVE(x,z) \wedge MOUSE(z)))$   
 $\forall x \forall y (HAVE(x,y) \wedge CAT(y) \rightarrow \forall z \neg (HAVE(x,z) \wedge MOUSE(z)))$   
 $\forall x \forall y \forall z (\neg (HAVE(x,y) \wedge CAT(y)) \vee \neg (HAVE(x,z) \wedge MOUSE(z)))$   
 $\neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg CAT(y) \vee \neg HAVE(x,z) \vee \neg MOUSE(z)$
3.  $\forall x (LS(x) \rightarrow \neg \exists y (HAVE(x,y) \wedge HOWL(y)))$   
 $\forall x (LS(x) \rightarrow \forall y \neg (HAVE(x,y) \wedge HOWL(y)))$   
 $\forall x \forall y (LS(x) \rightarrow \neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg HOWL(y))$   
 $\forall x \forall y (\neg LS(x) \vee \neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg HOWL(y))$   
 $\neg LS(x) \vee \neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg HOWL(y)$
4.  $\exists x (HAVE(John,x) \wedge (CAT(x) \vee HOUND(x)))$   
 $HAVE(John,a) \wedge (CAT(a) \vee HOUND(a))$
5.  $\neg [LS(John) \rightarrow \neg \exists z (HAVE(John,z) \wedge MOUSE(z))]$  (negated conclusion)  
 $\neg [ \neg LS(John) \vee \neg \exists z (HAVE(John,z) \wedge MOUSE(z)) ]$   
 $LS(John) \wedge \exists z (HAVE(John,z) \wedge MOUSE(z))$   
 $LS(John) \wedge HAVE(John,b) \wedge MOUSE(b)$

The set of CNF clauses for this problem is thus as follows:

1.  $\neg HOUND(x) \vee HOWL(x)$
2.  $\neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg CAT(y) \vee \neg HAVE(x,z) \vee \neg MOUSE(z)$
3.  $\neg LS(x) \vee \neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg HOWL(y)$
4.
  1.  $HAVE(John,a)$
  2.  $CAT(a) \vee HOUND(a)$
5.
  1.  $LS(John)$
  2.  $HAVE(John,b)$
  3.  $MOUSE(b)$

Now we proceed to prove the conclusion by resolution using the above clauses. Each result clause is numbered; the numbers of its parent clauses are shown to its left.

```
[1..4.(b):] 6. CAT(a) ∨ HOWL(a)
[2..5.(c):] 7. ¬ HAVE(x,y) ∨ ¬ CAT(y) ∨ ¬ HAVE(x,z) ∨ ¬ MOUSE(z)
[7..5.(b):] 8. ¬ HAVE(John,y) ∨ ¬ CAT(y)
[6..8:] 9. ¬ HAVE(John,a) ∨ HOWL(a)
[4..9:] 10. HOWL(a)
[3..10:] 11. ¬ LS(x) ∨ ¬ HAVE(x,a)
[4..(a),11:] 12. ¬ LS(John)
[5..(a),12:] 13. □
```

#### Exercises:

1. Unify (if possible) the following pairs of predicates and give the resulting substitutions.  $b$  is a constant.

- a.  $P(x, f(x), z)$   
 $\neg P(g(y), f(f(g(b))), y)$
- b.  $P(x, f(x))$   
 $\neg P(f(f(y)), y)$
- c.  $P(x, f(z))$   
 $\neg P(f(f(y)), y)$

2. Consider the following axioms: