


# Assignments 3.3-Solution

## 一、阅读 (Reading)

1. 阅读教材.
2. 课外阅读:

 Predicate Logic (3) -by Gerard O'Regan.pdf.pdf

## 二、问题解答 (Problems)

1. 教材 P53: 题 14.

设个体域为全总个体域。令  $a$ : 小王;  $Y(x)$ :  $x$  是一年级生;  $L(x)$ :  $x$  是理科生;

$W(x)$ :  $x$  是文科生;  $F(x,y)$ :  $y$  是  $x$  的辅导员, 则推理可以形式化为

前提:

$$\forall x(Y(x) \wedge \neg W(x) \rightarrow \exists y F(x,y)),$$

$$Y(a), E(a),$$

$$\forall x(F(a, x) \rightarrow L(x)),$$

$$\forall x(L(x) \rightarrow \neg W(x))$$

结论:

$$\exists x \exists y (\neg W(x) \wedge F(x, y))$$

2. 教材 P53: 题 15 (5, 6) .

(5) 设个体域为全总个体域。令  $M(x)$ :  $x$  是人;  $C(x)$ :  $x$  长期吸烟;  $K(x)$ :  $x$  长期酗酒;  $J(x)$ :  $x$  身体健康;  $P(x)$ :  $x$  能参加体育比赛, 则推理可以形式化为:

$$\forall x((M(x) \wedge (C(x) \vee K(x))) \rightarrow \neg J(x)), \forall x((M(x) \wedge \neg J(x)) \rightarrow \neg P(x)), \exists x(M(x) \wedge P(x))$$

$$\Rightarrow \exists x(M(x) \wedge \neg K(x))$$

(6) 设个体域为全总个体域。

令  $M(x)$ :  $x$  是人;  $K(x)$ :  $x$  是科学工作者;  $Q(x)$ :  $x$  勤奋;  $T(x)$ :  $x$  聪明;  $S(x)$ :  $x$  将获得成功;  $a$ : 王大志, 则推理可以形式化为:

$$\forall x((M(x) \wedge K(x)) \rightarrow Q(x)), \forall x((M(x) \wedge Q(x) \wedge T(x)) \rightarrow S(x)), M(a) \wedge K(a) \wedge T(a) \Rightarrow S(a)$$

3. Formalize and prove the following three statements(the domain of discourse is universe, 论域为全总域).

(1) Every computer science major is a logical thinker.

John is a computer science major.

Therefore, there is some logical thinker.

Let  $C(x)$  mean "x is a computer science major," let  $L(x)$  mean "x is a logical thinker," and let the constant  $b$  mean "John."

$$\forall x (C(x) \rightarrow L(x)) \wedge C(b) \rightarrow \exists x L(x).$$

(2) All computer science majors are people.

Some computer science majors are logical thinkers.

Therefore, some people are logical thinkers.

$$\forall x (C(x) \rightarrow P(x)) \wedge \exists x (C(x) \wedge L(x)) \rightarrow \exists x (P(x) \wedge L(x)).$$

(3) Socrates is a philosopher.

All philosophers are human.

All humans are mortal.

Therefore Socrates is mortal.

$$\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow H(x)) \wedge \forall x(H(x) \rightarrow M(x)) \wedge P(s) \rightarrow M(s).$$

4. Consider the following problem. We know that horses are faster than dogs and that there is a greyhound that is faster than every rabbit. We know that Harry is a horse and that Ralph is a rabbit. Our job is to derive the fact that Harry is faster than Ralph.

**Problem translated in FOPL:**

$\forall x \forall y ((\text{Horse}(x) \wedge \text{Dog}(y)) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(x,y))$

$\exists y (\text{Greyhound}(y) \wedge (\forall z \text{Rabbit}(z) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(y,z)))$

$\text{Horse}(\text{Harry})$

$\text{Rabbit}(\text{Ralph})$

**Derive the following fact:**

$\text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, \text{Ralph})$

**Added axioms to represent commonsense knowledge:**

$\forall y (\text{Greyhound}(y) \rightarrow \text{Dog}(y))$

$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((\text{Faster}(x,y) \wedge \text{Faster}(y,z)) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(x,z))$

**Proving using Proof Theory and a set of inference rules**

- |    |  |         |
|----|--|---------|
| 1. | $\forall x \forall y \text{Horse}(x) \wedge \text{Dog}(y) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(x,y)$                    | Premise |
| 2. | $\exists y \text{Greyhound}(y) \wedge (\forall z \text{Rabbit}(z) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(y,z))$           | Premise |
| 3. | $\forall y \text{Greyhound}(y) \rightarrow \text{Dog}(y)$  | Premise |
| 4. | $\forall x \forall y \forall z \text{Faster}(x,y) \wedge \text{Faster}(y,z) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(x,z)$  | Premise |
| 5. | $\text{Horse}(\text{Harry})$   | Premise |
| 6. | $\text{Rabbit}(\text{Ralph})$  | Premise |
| 7. | $\text{Greyhound}(\text{Greg}) \wedge (\forall z \text{Rabbit}(z) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(\text{Greg},z))$ | ES (2)  |
| 8. | $\text{Greyhound}(\text{Greg})$  | T,I (7) |
| 9. | $\forall z \text{Rabbit}(z) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(\text{Greg},z)$  | T,I (7) |

10. $\text{Rabbit}(\text{Ralph}) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(\text{Greg}, \text{Ralph})$	US (9)
11. $\text{Faster}(\text{Greg}, \text{Ralph})$	T,I (6), (10)
12. $\text{Greyhound}(\text{Greg}) \rightarrow \text{Dog}(\text{Greg})$	US (3)
13. $\text{Dog}(\text{Greg})$	T,I (12), (8)
14. $\text{Horse}(\text{Harry}) \wedge \text{Dog}(\text{Greg}) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, \text{Greg})$	US (1)
15. $\text{Horse}(\text{Harry}) \wedge \text{Dog}(\text{Greg})$	T,I (5), (13)
16. $\text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, \text{Greg})$	T,I (14), (15)
17. $\text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, \text{Greg}) \wedge \text{Faster}(\text{Greg}, \text{Ralph}) \rightarrow \text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, \text{Ralph})$	US (4)
18. $\text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, \text{Greg}) \wedge \text{Faster}(\text{Greg}, \text{Ralph})$	T,I (11), (16)
19. $\text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, \text{Ralph})$	T,I (17), (19)

### Using Resolution to determine logical entailment

1. $\{\neg \text{Horse}(x), \neg \text{Dog}(y), \text{Faster}(x, y)\}$	Premise
2. $\{\text{Greyhound}(\text{Greg})\}$	Premise
3. $\{\neg \text{Rabbit}(z), \text{Faster}(\text{Greg}, z)\}$	Premise
4. $\{\neg \text{Greyhound}(y), \text{Dog}(y)\}$	Premise
5. $\{\neg \text{Faster}(x, y), \neg \text{Faster}(y, z), \text{Faster}(x, z)\}$	Premise
6. $\{\text{Horse}(\text{Harry})\}$	Premise
7. $\{\text{Rabbit}(\text{Ralph})\}$	Premise
8. $\{\neg \text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, \text{Ralph})\}$	Negated Goal
9. $\{\text{Dog}(\text{Greg})\}$	2, 4
10. $\{\neg \text{Dog}(y), \text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, y)\}$	6, 1
11. $\{\text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, \text{Greg})\}$	9, 10
12. $\{\text{Faster}(\text{Greg}, \text{Ralph})\}$	7, 3
13. $\{\neg \text{Faster}(\text{Greg}, z), \text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, z)\}$	11, 5
14. $\{\text{Faster}(\text{Harry}, \text{Ralph})\}$	12, 13
15. $\{\}$	14, 8