

We discussed in class on Tuesday October 19 the apparent property of First-Order Tableau proof attempts (searches) that they cannot find a simple two element *counter model* for the following proposition:

$$(\forall x)(\exists y). Axy \rightarrow (\exists y)(\forall x). Axy$$

The counter model M_2 we found in class by *model checking* consists of two elements, a_1, a_2 where Aa_1a_1 and Aa_2a_2 are both true, the two other combinations Aa_1a_2 and Aa_2a_1 are both false. Call the counter model with the opposite assignments M_2' .

It seems impossible to find either simple model M_2 or M_2' using Tableau because the restrictions on Rule D, the rule for δ formulas, prevent us from introducing the parameter a_1 to witness $\exists y.Aa_1y$. Even the Liberal rule D does not allow a_1 as a parameter in this subgoal, see Smullyan page 54. We can however find an *infinite* counter model M_ω by applying the rules, and the systematic procedure generates such a model (very slowly indeed).

Consider these questions and do your best to contribute in writing ideas for solving them.

Question 1: Is there a legal Tableau search (proof attempt) to find a finite counter model M_2 or M_2' ? Try to prove or disprove the conjecture that *there is no such search (proof attempt)*.

Question 2: Is there a further liberalization of Rule D on page 54 that is sound and allows generating M_2 ? Try to find such a rule that is in the spirit of Tableau. Recall that Liberal Rule D applied to a δ -formula has these *three restrictions* from page 54 (my labeling of them): D1: parameter a has not been previously introduced by a D rule, and D2: a does not already occur in the δ -formula as a parameter, and D3: no parameter of the δ -formula has been previously introduced by a D rule.

Can we safely remove condition D2? If not, why not? Recall that in class we found a model if we violated the D2 restriction. Does this example illustrate why each of D1, D2, and D3 is necessary?

Question 3: Is there another example of a formula with a finite counter model for which you can prove that Tableau search will not find it.

Question 4: The example at the bottom of page 62 finds a finite counter model for a simple formula. Does this example help us understand our problem? Does it reveal general conditions under which proof attempts find finite counter models?