

18F-0326 : Abdul Salam Wasti

18F-0137 : M. Tahe Raja ,

Q NO 1 :

- i) ~~Hassan~~ (Occupation(Jamal, surgeon) \vee Occupation(Jamal, lawyer)
- ii) Occupation(Hassam, actor) \wedge [Occupation(Hassam, surgeon) \vee Occupation(Hassam, Doctor) \vee Occupation(Hassam, lawyer)]
- iii) $\forall x$ [Occupation(x, Surgeon) \Rightarrow Occupation(x, Doctor)]
- iv) $\forall x$ [~~Customer~~ Occupation(x, lawyer) \Rightarrow \neg Customer(Hassam, x)]
- v) $\exists x$ [Boss(x, Jamal) \wedge Occupation(x, lawyer)]
- vi) $\exists x$ [Occupation(x, lawyer) \wedge ($\forall y$ (customer(y, x) \Rightarrow Occupation(y, doctor)))]
- vii) $\forall x$ (Occupation(x, surgeon) \Rightarrow [$\exists y$ (Occupation(y, lawyer) \wedge customer(x, y))])

Q No 2 :

i) $P(a, x)$ and $q(y, b)$

Sol Yes possible.

$$\Theta \{ x/b, y/a \}$$

ii)

$P(x, x)$ and $q(u, v)$

Sol

Yes Possible.

$$\Theta \{ u/x, v/x \}$$

iii)

$q(a, b, x)$ and $p(y, z, y)$

Sol

Yes, Possible

$$\Theta \{ y/x, x/a, z/b \}$$

iv) $P(c, y, d, y)$ and $P(u, u, v, v)$

Sol: No, unification is impossible

v) $P(g(a, x))$ and $P(g(u, b))$

Sol Yes, possible

$$\Theta \{ x/b, u/a \}$$

vi) $P(f(a, b), f(x, y))$ and $P(u, u)$

Sol. yes, Possible.

$$\Theta \{ x/a, y/b, u/f(a, b) \}$$

vii) $P(y, f(a, y))$ and $P(g(c, d), u)$

Sol yes, Possible.

$$\Theta \{ y/g(c, d), u/f(a, g(c, d)) \}$$

(viii) $P(g(x, y), h(z, z))$ and $P(u, h(u, a))$

Sol Not possible.

(ix) $P(g(x, y), g(y, z))$ and $P(u, u)$

Sol ~~not~~ yes, possible.

$$\Theta = \{ u/g(x, y), x/y, y/z \}$$

o ————— o

Q. No 3:

Part A:

(i) $S(j, e)$

(ii) $S(p, f)$

(iii) $\text{forall}(x, y, L) S(x, L) \wedge S(y, L) \Rightarrow L(x, y)$

(iv) $\text{forall}(w, x, y) C(w, x) \wedge L(w, x) \Rightarrow i(w, x, y)$

(v) $\text{forall}(L, M) \text{exist}(x) S(x, L) \wedge S(x, M)$

(vi) $i(S, j, p)$

Part B:

Combining eq(3) with eq(i) and eq(1) by substituting $x=m, y=j, L=e$

combining (3) with (6) and (1) substituting $x=m, y=p, L=f$

combining (4) with (8) and (9) substituting $w=m, x=y, y=p$

Now (vi) can be proven from (1)(2)(3)(5).

Goal $G_0: i(m, j, p)$ match with eq(4)
symbols $G_1: C(m, j), G_2: C(m, p)$

Goal G_1 : $c(m, j)$ match with eq (3)
symbols G_3 : $s(m, L_2)$. G_4 : $s(j, L_2)$

Goal G_3 : $s(m, L_2)$ match with eq (5)

G_3 succeed
Goal G_4 : $s(j, L_2)$ match eq (1)

G_4 succeed

G_1 succeed

Goal G_2 : $c(m, p)$ match eq (3)
symbols G_5 : $s(m, L_3)$ G_6 : $s(p, L_3)$

Goal G_5 : $s(m, L_3)$ match eq (5)

G_5 succeed

subgoal: G_6 : $s(p, L_3)$ No match
Return to G_5

Goal to G_5 : $s(m, L_3)$ match with eq (6)

G_5 succeed

subgoal: G_6 : $s(p, L_3)$ match eq (2)

G_6 succeed

G_2 succeed

G_0 succeed

Q. No 4:

Rule 1:

$$\text{Dog}(X) \wedge \text{Owns}(\text{Jack}, X)$$

Rule 2:

$$\forall x: (\neg \exists y \text{Dog}(y) \wedge \text{Owns}(x, y)) \vee \text{AnimalLover}(x)$$

$$\forall x: (\forall y \neg \text{Dog}(y) \vee \neg \text{Owns}(x, y)) \vee \text{AnimalLovers}(x)$$

To proof: Did curiosity killed the cat?

