PROBLEM 1

$$\{x/A, y/B, z/B\}$$

B.
$$Q(y, G(A, B)), Q(G(x, x), y)$$

No unifier exists. y must bind to G(A,B) and x cannot bind to both A and B.

C. R(x,A,z), R(B,y,z)

{x/B, y/A} is the most general since z can bind to anything and be equivalent

D. Older (Father(y), y), Older (Father(x), John)

E. Knows(Father(y),y), Knows(x,x)

No unifier exists. x cannot bind to both Father(y) and y.

PROBLEM 2

A.

John likes all kinds of food.

1. Ax Food(x) => Like(John, x)

Apples are food.

2. Food(Apples)

Chicken is food.

3. Food(Chicken)

Anything anyone eats and isn't killed by is food.

4. Ex Ay Eats(x,y) $^{\sim}$ Killed(x,y) => Food(y)

If you are killed by something, you are not alive.

5. Ex Ay Killed(x,y) => Alive(x)

Bill eats peanuts and is still alive.*

6. Eat(Bill, Peanuts) & Alive(Bill)

Sue eats everything Bill eats.

7. Ax Eat(Bill,x) => Eat(Sue,x)

```
В.
Ax Food(x) => Like(John, x)
Ax \simFood(x) | Like(John, x)
1. ~Food(x) | Like(John,x)
2. Food(Apples)
3. Food(Chicken)
Ex Ay Eats(x,y) & \simKilled(x,y) => Food(y)
Ex Ay \sim (Eats(x,y) & \sim Killed(x,y)) | Food(y)
Ex Ay \simEats(x,y) | Killed(x,y) | Food(y)
Note: Standardize variables. In clause 1, x is the food, so we make x food and y the individual eating the
food from here on.
Ax Ey \simEats(y,x) | Killed(y,x) | Food(x)
Ax \simEats(F(y), x) | Killed(F(y), x) | Food(x)
4. \simEats(F(y), x) | Killed(F(y), x) | Food(x)
```

Ex Ay Killed(x, y) => Alive(x)

Ex Ay $^{\sim}$ Killed(x,y) | $^{\sim}$ Alive(x)

Note: Same as above, standardize variables.

Ax Ey ~Killed(y, x) | ~Alive(y)

Ax \sim Killed(F(y), x) | \sim Alive(F(y))

5. $^{\sim}$ Killed(F(y), x) | $^{\sim}$ Alive(F(y))

Eat(Bill, Peanuts) & Alive(Bill)

- 6. Eat(Bill, Peanuts)
- 7. Alive(Bill)

Ax Eats(Bill,x) => Eats(Sue,x)

Ax ~Eats(Bill,x) | Eats(Sue,x)

8. ~Eats(Bill,x) | Eats(Sue,x)

C.

Prove that John likes peanuts using resolution.

- 1. ~Food(x) | Like(John,x)
- 2. Food(Apples)
- 3. Food(Chicken)
- 4. \sim Eats(F(y), x) | Killed(F(y), x) | Food(x)
- 5. \sim Killed(F(y), x) | \sim Alive(F(y))
- 6. Eat(Bill, Peanuts)
- 7. Alive(Bill)
- 8. ~Eats(Bill,x) | Eats(Sue,x)
- 9. ~Like(John, Peanuts)

Negated assumption

10. ~Food(Peanuts)
11. ~Eats(F(y), Peanuts) | Killed(F(y), Peanuts)
12. Killed(Bill, Peanuts)
13. ~Alive(Bill)
14. Contradiction
15, 9; {x/Peanuts}
14, 10; {x/Peanuts}
15, 11; {F(y)/Bill}
17, 13

Therefore, we prove that John likes peanuts using resolution since there is a contradiction.

D.

Ex Food(x) ^ Eats(Sue,x) ~(Ex Food(x) ^ Eats(Sue,x)) Ax ~(Food(x) ^ Eats(Sue,x)) Ax ~Food(x) | ~Eats(Sue,x) ~Food(x) | ~Eats(Sue,x) 1. ~Food(x) | Like(John,x) 2. Food(Apples) 3. Food(Chicken) 4. \sim Eats(F(y), x) | Killed(F(y), x) | Food(x) 5. \sim Killed(F(y), x) | \sim Alive(F(y)) 6. Eat(Bill, Peanuts) 7. Alive(Bill) 8. ~Eats(Bill,x) | Eats(Sue,x) 9. ~Food(x) | ~Eats(Sue,x) **Negated Assumption** 10. ~Eats(Bill,x) | ~Food(x) 8,9 11. ~Food(Peanuts) 6,10; {x/Peanuts} 12. ~Eats(F(y), Peanuts) | Killed(F(y), Peanuts) 4,11; {x/Peanuts} 13. Killed(Bill,Peanuts) 6,12; {F(y)/Bill}

14. ~Alive(Bill) 5,13; {F(y)/Bill, x/Peanuts}

15. Contradiction 7,14

Therefore, we prove that Sue does not eat all foods, but we know that she eats some foods, including at least peanuts.

E.

If you don't eat, you die. Ax Ey ~Eat(y,x) => Die(y) Ax Ey Eat(y,x) | Die(y) Ax Eat(F(y), x) | Die(F(y)) Eat(F(y),x) | Die(F(y))

If you die, you are not alive.

Ey Die(y) => ~Alive(y) Ey ~Die(y) | ~Alive(y) ~Die(F(y)) | ~Alive(F(y))

Bill is alive.

Alive(Bill)

- 1. ~Food(x) | Like(John,x)
- 2. Food(Apples)
- 3. Food(Chicken)
- 4. \sim Eats(F(y), x) | Killed(F(y), x) | Food(x)
- 5. $^{\sim}$ Killed(F(y), x) | $^{\sim}$ Alive(F(y))
- 6. $Eat(F(y),x) \mid Die(F(y))$
- 7. ~Die(F(y)) | ~Alive(F(y))
- 8. Alive(Bill)
- 9. ~Eats(Bill,x) | Eats(Sue,x)
- 10. ~Food(x) | ~Eats(Sue,x) Same negation as part D
- 11. ~Eats(Bill,x) | ~Food(x) 9, 10
- 12. Die(Bill) | ~Food(x) 6, 11; {F(y)/Bill}
- 13. ~Alive(Bill) | ~Food(x) 7, 12; {F(y)/Bill}
- 14. ~Food(x) 8, 13; {F(y)/Bill)
- 15. ~Eats(Bill, x) | Killed(Bill, x) 4, 14; {F(y)/Bill}
- 16. ~Eats(Bill, x) | ~Alive(Bill) 5, 15; {F(y)/Bill}
- 17. ~Eats(Bill, x) 8, 16; {F(y)/Bill}
 18. Die(Bill) 6, 17; {F(y)/Bill}
- 19. ~Alive(Bill) 7, 18; {F(y)/Bill}
- 20. Contradiction 8, 20

By resolution, we know that Sue eats something that is food, but we do not have enough information to specify what kind of food she eats.