

Ricardo Barbosa  
April 08, 2021

CST 329: Reasoning with Logic  
Dr. Shahidul Islam (Based on the materials from Dr. Bruns)

Work on the practice problems must be typed and submitted in pdf format only. Any other formats will not be accepted. Make your own copy (File > Make a copy) of the document. Edit your copy of the documents with your answers. Then, download a copy of your word doc as a PDF (File > Download > PDF) and submit it through the Canvas submission page.

**Note:** When asked to write proof, create the problems on proof-checker.org and paste the screenshots of your successful proofs in this document for your submission.

Consider working with others when needed on the following problems:

## Lab: Examples, first-order logic

1. Use the following translation key:

Fx: x is a female

Gx: x is male

Hx: x is human

Tx: x is from Texas

Sx: x is a computer scientist

Lx: x is a mammal

Mx: x is mortal

Translate the sentences below to logic:

- Nothing is a male computer scientist from Texas.

$\sim \text{Ex}(\text{Hx} \wedge \text{Sx} \wedge \text{Tx})$

- All male humans are mortal mammals.

$\text{Ax}(\text{Hx} \rightarrow (\text{Mx} \wedge \text{Lx}))$

- Some female humans are computer scientists who live in Texas.

$\text{Ex}(\text{Fx} \wedge \text{Hx} \wedge \text{Tx})$

- No male human is a computer scientist who lives in Texas.

$\sim \text{Ex}((\text{Mx} \wedge \text{Hx}) \wedge (\text{Sx} \wedge \text{Tx}))$

2. This is from Problem 2 at the end of Chapter 12 in our textbook. Provide a key and translate the following expressions into first-order logic. Assume the domain of discourse is terrestrial organisms. For example  $\forall x Fx$  would mean 'all terrestrial organisms are F'. Don't be concerned that some of these sentences are obviously false.

*Fx: x are horses*

*Gx: x are mammals*

*Sx: x lay eggs*

- Some egg-laying mammals are not horses.

**$\text{Ex}((Sx \wedge Gx) \wedge \sim Fx)$**

- There are no horses.

**$\sim \text{Ex}(Fx)$**

- There are some mammals.

**$\text{Ex}(Gx)$**

- Only horses are mammals.

**$\text{Ax}(Gx \rightarrow Fx)$**

- All and only horses are mammals.

**$\text{Ax}(Gx \leftrightarrow Fx)$**

## Lab: Universal instantiation

1. Prove the following argument with the proof checker

$$\frac{\forall x (Hxc \rightarrow Fx), Hbc}{Fb}$$

**Check Your Proof:**

**Proof:**

Construct a proof for the argument:  $\forall x(Hxc \rightarrow Fx), Hbc \therefore Fb$

1	$\forall x(Hxc \rightarrow Fx)$	
2	$Hbc$	
3	$Hbc \rightarrow Fb$	1 Universal instantiation
4	$Fb$	2, 3 Modus Ponens

new line

new subproof

😊 Congratulations! This proof is correct.

check proof

start over

Clear & Start a new Proof

2. Prove the following argument with the proof checker

$$\frac{\forall x (Fx \rightarrow Gx), Gc \rightarrow \neg Hc, Hc}{\neg Fc}$$

**Check Your Proof:**

**Proof:**

Construct a proof for the argument:  $\forall x(Fx \rightarrow Gx), Gc \rightarrow \neg Hc, Hc \therefore \neg Fc$

1	$\forall x(Fx \rightarrow Gx)$	
2	$Gc \rightarrow \neg Hc$	
3	$Hc$	
4	$Fc \rightarrow Gc$	1 Universal instantiation
5	$\neg \neg Hc$	3 Double Negation
6	$\neg Gc$	2, 5 Modus Tollens
7	$\neg Fc$	4, 6 Modus Tollens

new line

new subproof

😊 Congratulations! This proof is correct.

check proof

start over

Clear & Start a new Proof

## Lab: Existential generalization

1. Prove the following argument with the proof checker

$$\frac{\forall x (Fx \rightarrow Gx)}{\neg Ga \rightarrow \exists x (\neg Fx)}$$

**Check Your Proof:**

**Proof: Lab: Existential Gen #1**

Construct a proof for the argument:  $\forall x(Fx \rightarrow Gx) \therefore \neg Ga \rightarrow \exists x \neg Fx$

1	$\forall x(Fx \rightarrow Gx)$	
2	$Fa \rightarrow Ga$	1 Universal instantiation
3	$\neg Ga$	
4	$\neg Fa$	2, 3 Modus Tollens
5	$\exists x \neg Fx$	4 Existential generalization
6	$\neg Ga \rightarrow \exists x \neg Fx$	3-5 Conditional derivation

new line

new subproof

😊 Congratulations! This proof is correct.

check proof

start over

Clear & Start a new Proof

2. Is it true that if "Everything is F" then "Something is F"? Is this intuitively reasonable?  
Try to prove the following argument with the proof checker:

Yes. This is reasonable. If  $x$  is an element of a larger  $X$ , then there should exist a smaller  $y$  within  $x$ .

$$\frac{\forall x Fx}{\exists x Fx}$$


## Check Your Proof:

### Proof: EI Lab #2

Construct a proof for the argument:  $\forall x Fx \therefore \exists x Fx$

1	$\forall x Fx$	
2	$Fa$	1 Universal instantiation
3	$\exists x Fx$	2 Existential generalization

 new line

 new subproof

😊 Congratulations! This proof is correct.

check proof

start over

Clear & Start a new Proof

## Lab: Existential instantiation lab

1. Prove the following argument with the proof checker

$$\frac{\forall x (Wx \rightarrow Mx), \exists x (Wx \wedge Cx), \forall x (Cx \rightarrow Fx)}{\exists x (Mx \wedge Fx)}$$


### Check Your Proof:

#### Proof: Existential Inst #1

Construct a proof for the argument:  $Ax(Wx \rightarrow Mx), Ex(Wx \wedge Cx), Ax(Cx \rightarrow Fx) \therefore \exists x(Mx \wedge Fx)$

1	$\forall x(Wx \rightarrow Mx)$	
2	$\exists x(Wx \wedge Cx)$	
3	$\forall x(Cx \rightarrow Fx)$	
4	$Wa \wedge Ca$	
5	$Wa \rightarrow Ma$	1 Universal instantiation
6	$Ca \rightarrow Fa$	3 Universal instantiation
7	$Wa$	4 Simplification
8	$Ca$	4 Simplification
9	$Ma$	5, 7 Modus Ponens
10	$Fa$	6, 8 Modus Ponens
11	$Ma \wedge Fa$	9, 10 Adjunction
12	$\exists x(Mx \wedge Fx)$	11 Existential generalization
13	$\exists x(Mx \wedge Fx)$	2, 4-12 Existential instantiation

 new line

 new subproof

😊 Congratulations! This proof is correct.

check proof

start over

Clear & Start a new Proof

2. Prove the following argument with the proof checker

$$\frac{\exists x \exists y Fxy}{\exists y \exists x Fxy}$$


## Check Your Proof:


### Proof:

Construct a proof for the argument:  $\exists x \exists y Fxy \therefore \exists y \exists x Fxy$

1	$\exists x \exists y Fxy$	
2	$\exists y Fay$	
3	$Fab$	
4	$\exists x Fxb$	3 Existential generalization
5	$\exists y \exists x Fxy$	4 Existential generalization
6	$\exists y \exists x Fxy$	2, 3-5 Existential instantiation
7	$\exists y \exists x Fxy$	1, 2-6 Existential instantiation

 new line

 new subproof

 Congratulations! This proof is correct.

check proof

start over

Clear & Start a new Proof

## Lab: Universal derivation lab

1. Prove the following argument with the proof checker.

$$\frac{\forall x (Fx \rightarrow Gx), \forall x (Gx \rightarrow Hx), \forall x (Hx \rightarrow Mx)}{\forall x (Fx \rightarrow Mx)}$$


## Check Your Proof:


### Proof: Universal Derivation 1

Construct a proof for the argument:  $\forall x(Fx \rightarrow Gx), \forall x(Gx \rightarrow Hx), \forall x(Hx \rightarrow Mx) \therefore \forall x(Fx \rightarrow Mx)$

1	$\forall x(Fx \rightarrow Gx)$	
2	$\forall x(Gx \rightarrow Hx)$	
3	$\forall x(Hx \rightarrow Mx)$	
4	$Fa \rightarrow Ga$	1 Universal instantiation
5	$Ga \rightarrow Ha$	2 Universal instantiation
6	$Ha \rightarrow Ma$	3 Universal instantiation
7	$Fa$	
8	$Ga$	4, 7 Modus Ponens
9	$Ha$	5, 8 Modus Ponens
10	$Ma$	6, 9 Modus Ponens
11	$Fa \rightarrow Ma$	7–10 Conditional derivation
12	$\forall x(Fx \rightarrow Mx)$	11 Universal derivation

 new line

 new subproof

 Congratulations! This proof is correct.

[check proof](#)

[start over](#)

[Clear & Start a new Proof](#)

2. I want you to translate backwards from a logical argument to English. Here is a logical argument:

$$\frac{\forall x (Fx \leftrightarrow Gx), Gb}{\exists x (Gx \wedge Fx)}$$



Write a translation key, and using the translation key, translate the logic to English. Your English argument should be a paragraph, not an ordered list of sentences.

**Fx: x is a Fish**

**Gx: x has gills**

**All and only fish have gills and we know that fish have gills. So there must exist a fish with gills.**

3. Explain why the following "proof" is incorrect:

Construct a proof for the argument:  $\forall x Fxx \therefore \forall x \forall y Fxy$

1	$\forall x Fxx$	
2	$Faa$	1 Universal instantiation
3	$\forall y Fay$	2 Universal derivation
4	$\forall x \forall y Fxy$	3 Universal derivation

Note: Think about the restrictions on the use of the rules. Once you think you have an answer, use the proof checker and see what it says about it.

**The proof-checker says that this is not a proper application of the rule Universal Derivation. I believe this is wrong because there must be a subproof after Faa that assumed  $\forall y Fay$**

4. If you have time, finish the following proof by adding justification to every line that needs it.

1	$\forall x(J(x) \rightarrow K(x))$
2	$\exists x \forall y L(x, y)$
3	$\forall x J(x)$
4	$\forall y L(a, y)$
5	$L(a, a)$
6	$J(a)$
7	$J(a) \rightarrow K(a)$
8	$K(a)$
9	$K(a) \wedge L(a, a)$
10	$\exists x(K(x) \wedge L(x, x))$
11	$\exists x(K(x) \wedge L(x, x))$

### Check Your Proof:

#### Proof:

Construct a proof for the argument:  $Ax(Jx \rightarrow Kx), \exists x \forall y Lxy, Ax Jx \therefore \exists x(Kx \wedge Lxx)$

1	$\forall x(Jx \rightarrow Kx)$	
2	$\exists x \forall y Lxy$	
3	$\forall x Jx$	
4	$\forall y Lay$	
5	$Laa$	4 Universal instantiation
6	$Ja$	3 Universal instantiation
7	$Ja \rightarrow Ka$	1 Universal instantiation
8	$Ka$	6, 7 Modus Ponens
9	$Ka \wedge Laa$	5, 8 Adjunction
10	$\exists x(Kx \wedge Lxx)$	9 Existential generalization
11	$\exists x(Kx \wedge Lxx)$	2, 4-10 Existential instantiation

 new line

 new subproof

😊 Congratulations! This proof is correct.

[check proof](#)

[start over](#)

[Clear & Start a new Proof](#)