

3.

- a) addition
- b) simplification
- c) modus ponens
- d) modus tollens
- e) hypothetical syllogism

4.

- a) simplification
- b) disjunctive syllogism
- c) hypothetical syllogism
- d) addition
- e) hypothetical syllogism

13.

a)

$S(x)$: "x is a student at the class"

$J(x)$: "x knows how to write programs in JAVA"

$H(x)$: "get a high-paying job"

$S(\text{Doug})$

$J(\text{Doug})$

$\forall x (J(x) \rightarrow H(x))$

conclusion : $\exists x (S(x) \wedge J(x))$

- 1. $\forall x (J(x) \rightarrow H(x))$
- 2. $J(\text{Doug})$ using modus ponens
- 3. $H(\text{Doug})$
- 4. $S(\text{Doug}) \wedge H(\text{Doug})$ conjunction 4 and given
- 5. $\exists x (S(x) \wedge H(x))$ using existential generalization

b)

$C(x)$: "x in the class"

$W(x)$: "enjoys whale watching"

$P(x)$: "cares about ocean pollution"

$\exists x (C(x) \wedge W(x))$

$\forall x (W(x) \rightarrow P(x))$

conclusion : $\exists x (C(x) \wedge P(x))$

- 1. $\exists x (C(x) \wedge W(x))$
- 2. $C(a) \wedge W(a)$ existential instantiation
- 3. $C(a)$ simplification
- 4. $\forall x (W(x) \rightarrow P(x))$
- 5. $W(a) \rightarrow P(a)$ existential instantiation
- 6. $W(a)$
- 7. $P(a)$ simplification
- 8. $C(a) \wedge P(a)$ conjunction from 3 and 7
- 9. $\exists x (C(x) \wedge P(x))$ existential generalization

c)

$S(x)$: "x student in the class"
 $C(x)$: "x owns a personal computer"
 $W(x)$: "x use a word processing program"

$\forall x (S(x) \rightarrow C(x))$
 $\forall x (C(x) \rightarrow W(x))$

conclusion : $S(zake) \rightarrow W(zake)$

1. $\forall x (S(x) \rightarrow C(x))$
2. $S(zake) \rightarrow C(zake)$ using universal instantiation
3. $S(zake)$ given
4. $C(zake)$ modus ponens
5. $\forall x (C(x) \rightarrow W(x))$
6. $C(zake) \rightarrow W(zake)$ using universal instantiation
7. $C(zake)$ modus ponens
8. $W(zake)$ from 4
9. $S(zake) \rightarrow W(zake)$ hypothetical syllogism

d)

$J(x)$: "x lives in New Jersey"
 $O(x)$: "x lives within 50 miles of the ocean"
 $N(x)$: "x have seen the ocean"

$\forall x (J(x) \rightarrow O(x))$
 $\exists x (J(x) \wedge \neg N(x))$

conclusion : $\exists x (O(x) \wedge \neg N(x))$

1. $\forall x (J(x) \rightarrow O(x))$
2. $J(a) \rightarrow O(a)$ using universal instantiation
3. $J(a)$
4. $O(a)$ modus ponens
5. $\exists x (J(x) \wedge \neg N(x))$
6. $J(a) \wedge \neg N(a)$ using existential instantiation
7. $\neg N(a)$ simplification
8. $O(a) \wedge \neg N(a)$ using conjunction
9. $\exists x (O(x) \wedge \neg N(x))$ existential generalization

13.

a)

$S(x)$: "x is a student in the class"
 $R(x)$: "x owns a red convertible"
 $T(x)$: "x has gotten a speeding ticket"

$s(x) \wedge R(x)$
 $\forall x (R(x) \rightarrow T(x))$
 $R(Linda)$

conclusion : $\exists x(s(x) \wedge T(x))$

1. $S(\text{Linda}) \wedge R(\text{Linda})$
2. $S(\text{Linda})$ simplification
3. $\forall x (R(x) \rightarrow T(x))$
4. $R(\text{Linda}) \rightarrow T(\text{Linda})$ universal instantiation
5. $R(\text{Linda})$ given
6. $T(\text{Linda})$ modus ponens
7. $T(\text{Linda}) \wedge S(\text{Linda})$ from 2 using conjunction
8. $\exists x (T(x) \wedge S(x))$ existential generalization

b)

$R(x)$: "x is a roommate"

$S(x)$: "x is a student"

$D(x)$: "x has taken a course in discrete mathematics"

$A(x)$: "x can take a course in algorithms"

$\forall x (S(x) \wedge D(x))$

$\forall x (D(x) \rightarrow A(x))$

$R(x) \rightarrow S(x)$

conclusion : $\forall x (R(x) \rightarrow A(x))$

1. $R(\text{Aaron}) \rightarrow S(\text{Aaron})$
2. $R(\text{Aaron})$
3. $S(\text{Aaron})$ modus ponens
4. $\forall x (S(x) \wedge D(x))$
5. $S(\text{Aaron}) \wedge D(\text{Aaron})$ universal instantiation
6. $D(\text{Aaron})$ simplification
7. $\forall x (D(x) \rightarrow A(x))$
8. $D(\text{Aaron}) \rightarrow A(\text{Aaron})$ universal instantiation
9. $R(\text{Aaron}) \rightarrow A(\text{Aaron})$ from 1 and 8 using hypothetical syllogism
10. $\forall x (R(x) \rightarrow A(x))$ universal generalization

c)

$M(x)$: "x is a movies produced by John Sayles"

$W(x)$: "x is a wonderful movie"

$C(x)$: "x is a movie about coal miners"

$\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow W(x))$

$\exists x(M(x) \wedge C(x))$

conclusion : $\exists x(W(x) \wedge C(x))$

1. $\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow W(x))$
2. $M(c) \rightarrow W(c)$ universal instantiation
3. $\exists x(M(x) \wedge C(x))$
4. $M(c) \wedge C(c)$ existential instantiation
5. $M(c)$ simplification
6. $M(c) \rightarrow W(c)$

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 7. $W(c)$ | modus ponens |
| 8. $W(c) \wedge C(c)$ | conjunction from 7 and 4 by simplification |
| 9. $\exists x(W(x) \wedge C(x))$ | existential generalization |

d)

$S(x)$: "x in the class"

$F(x)$: "x has been to France"

$L(x)$: "x had visited the Louvre"

$\exists x(S(x) \wedge F(x))$

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

conclusion : $\exists x(S(x) \wedge L(x))$

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. $(S(x) \wedge F(x))$ | |
| 2. $S(a) \wedge F(a)$ | existential instantiation |
| 3. $S(a)$ | simplification |
| 4. $\forall x(F(x) \rightarrow L(x))$ | |
| 5. $F(a) \rightarrow L(a)$ | universal instantiation |
| 6. $F(a)$ | from 2 by simplification |
| 7. $L(a)$ | modus ponens |
| 8. $S(a) \wedge L(a)$ | conjunction 7 and 3 |
| 9. $\exists x (S(x) \wedge L(x))$ | existential generalization |

19.

a) NOT a valid argument $p \rightarrow q$ doesn't mean that I can say $q \rightarrow p$ (misusing of the converse)

b) valid argument using modus tollens

c) NOT a valid argument $p \rightarrow q$ doesn't mean that I can say $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$ (misusing of the inverse)

20.

a) not a valid argument (misusing of converse)

b) Valid argument (universal instantiation)

23.

error in step 5, we are assuming that the same c can be true for both $P(x)$ and $Q(x)$ which maybe NOT! We can rewrite the argument as follows:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 5. $Q(a)$ | Existential instantiation |
| 6. $P(c) \wedge Q(a)$ | Conjunction |
| 7. $\exists x \exists y (P(x) \wedge Q(y))$ | Existential generalization |

24.

in step 2 c should be referring to an arbitrary value from the domain not a specific value.

error in step 3, we can simplify only from statement having \wedge , same for step 5.

another error in step 7, using conjunction is using the AND operator as follows :

$\forall x P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x)$.

26.

$\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$

$\forall x (Q(x) \rightarrow R(x))$

conclusion : $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow R(x))$

1. $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$

2. $P(a) \rightarrow Q(a)$

universal instantiation (a is an arbitrary value)

3. $\forall x (Q(x) \rightarrow R(x))$

4. $Q(a) \rightarrow R(a)$

universal instantiation (a is an arbitrary value)

5. $P(a) \rightarrow R(a)$

Hypothetical syllogism from 2 and 4

6. $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow R(x))$

universal generalization

27.

if $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow (Q(x) \wedge S(x)))$ and $\forall x(P(x) \wedge R(x))$ then $\forall x(R(x) \wedge S(x))$

1. $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow (Q(x) \wedge S(x)))$

2. $P(a) \rightarrow (Q(a) \wedge S(a))$

universal instantiation (a is arbitrary value)

3. $\forall x(P(x) \wedge R(x))$

4. $P(a) \wedge R(a)$

universal instantiation (a is arbitrary value)

5. $P(a)$

simplification

6. $Q(a) \wedge S(a)$

modus ponens from 5 and 2

7. $S(a)$

simplification

8. $S(a) \wedge R(a)$

conjunction and simplification from 4

9. $\forall x(R(x) \wedge S(x))$

universal generalization