

Selected Solutions

- 1 (b) The sequent $\vdash \forall x \forall y (P(x, y) \rightarrow \neg \forall z (P(x, z) \rightarrow \neg P(z, y)))$ is not valid. For instance, consider the model \mathcal{M} consisting of the set $\{a, b\}$ with interpretation $P^{\mathcal{M}} = \{(a, b)\}$ together with $l(x) = a$ and $l(y) = b$. We have $\mathcal{M} \models_l P(x, y)$ but not $\mathcal{M} \models_l \neg \forall z (P(x, z) \rightarrow \neg P(z, y))$. The latter can be seen as follows. If $l(z) = a$ then $\mathcal{M} \models_l P(x, z) \rightarrow \neg P(z, y)$ since $\mathcal{M} \not\models_l P(x, z)$. If $l(z) = b$ then $\mathcal{M} \models_l \neg P(z, y)$ and thus also $\mathcal{M} \models_l P(x, z) \rightarrow \neg P(z, y)$. Hence $\mathcal{M} \not\models_l \neg \forall z (P(x, z) \rightarrow \neg P(z, y))$.

- 3 (b) The following derivation shows that the given terms are not unifiable:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \underline{P(x, f(y, a)) \approx P(y, x)} \\
 \text{d} \Downarrow \\
 \underline{x \approx y, f(y, a) \approx x} \\
 \text{v} \Downarrow \{x \mapsto y\} \\
 f(y, a) \approx y \\
 \Downarrow \\
 \perp
 \end{array}$$

- (c) The given atoms are unifiable:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \underline{R(h(x, y, g(a, z))) \approx R(h(g(y, y), g(z, z), g(a, a)))} \\
 \text{d} \Downarrow \\
 \underline{h(x, y, g(a, z)) \approx h(g(y, y), g(z, z), g(a, a))} \\
 \text{d} \Downarrow \\
 \underline{x \approx g(y, y), y \approx g(z, z), g(a, z) \approx g(a, a)} \\
 \text{d} \Downarrow \\
 \underline{x \approx g(y, y), y \approx g(z, z), \underline{a \approx a}, z \approx a} \\
 \text{t} \Downarrow \\
 \underline{x \approx g(y, y), y \approx g(z, z), \underline{z \approx a}} \\
 \text{v} \Downarrow \{z \mapsto a\} \\
 \underline{x \approx g(y, y), \underline{y \approx g(a, a)}} \\
 \text{v} \Downarrow \{y \mapsto g(a, a)\} \\
 \underline{x \approx g(g(a, a), g(a, a))} \\
 \text{v} \Downarrow \{x \mapsto g(g(a, a), g(a, a))\} \\
 \square
 \end{array}$$

The resulting mgu is $\{x \mapsto g(g(a, a), g(a, a)), y \mapsto g(a, a), z \mapsto a\}$.

- 4 We first rename the variable x in the second argument of the disjunction and then transform the resulting formula into an equivalent prenex normal form:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \neg(\forall x \exists y P(f(x, y), y) \rightarrow \forall z Q(z)) \vee \forall x' R(x', x') \\
& \equiv \neg \exists x \forall y \forall z (P(f(x, y), y) \rightarrow Q(z)) \vee \forall x' R(x', x') \\
& \equiv \forall x \exists y \exists z \neg(P(f(x, y), y) \rightarrow Q(z)) \vee \forall x' R(x', x') \\
& \equiv \forall x \exists y \exists z \forall x' (\neg(P(f(x, y), y) \rightarrow Q(z)) \vee R(x', x'))
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we transform the quantifier-free part of the prenex normal form into CNF:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \equiv \forall x \exists y \exists z \forall x' (\neg(\neg P(f(x, y), y) \vee Q(z)) \vee R(x', x')) \\
& \equiv \forall x \exists y \exists z \forall x' ((P(f(x, y), y) \wedge \neg Q(z)) \vee R(x', x')) \\
& \equiv \forall x \exists y \exists z \forall x' ((P(f(x, y), y) \vee R(x', x')) \wedge (\neg Q(z) \vee R(x', x')))
\end{aligned}$$

We obtain an equisatisfiable Skolem normal form by replacing the existentially quantified variables y and z by fresh Skolem functions $g(x)$ and $h(x)$:

$$\approx \forall x \forall x' ((P(f(x, g(x)), g(x)) \vee R(x', x')) \wedge (\neg Q(h(x)) \vee R(x', x')))$$