

HW 3

1. Prove the following formally using a Natural Deduction proof that only uses the inference rules on the handout that are on the lecture notes page. (be sure not to use equivalence or Rosen inference rules)

a. $P \wedge Q \vdash P \vee R$

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. $P \wedge Q$ | Given |
| 2. P | by \wedge Elim-1 |
| 3. $P \vee R$ | by \vee Intro-2 |

b. $P \rightarrow \sim Q, Q \vdash \sim P$

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. $P \rightarrow Q$ | Given |
| 2. $[P]$ | Assume |
| 3. $\sim Q$ | by Implication Elim 1,2 |
| 4. False | by F Intro-3,5 |
| 5. $\sim P$ | by F Elim-4 |

c. $P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R) \vdash (P \wedge Q) \rightarrow R$

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. $P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R)$ | Given |
| 2. $[P]$ | Assume |
| 3. $Q \rightarrow R$ | by Implication Elim-1,2 |
| 4. $[Q]$ | Assume |
| 5. R | by Implication Elim-3,4 |
| 6. $P \wedge Q$ | by \wedge Intro-2,4 |
| 7. $P \wedge Q \rightarrow R$ | by Implication Intro-5,6 |
| 8. $(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow R$ | by Repeat 7 |

d. $\sim Q \vdash Q \rightarrow P$

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. $[Q]$ | Assume |
| 2. $\sim Q$ | Given |
| 3. False | by F Intro-1,2 |
| 4. $Q \rightarrow P$ | by F Elim-3 |
| 5. $Q \rightarrow P$ | by Repeat 4 |

e. $P \vee (Q \wedge R) \vdash P \vee Q$

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | [P] | Assume |
| 2. | $P \vee Q$ | by \vee Intro-1 |
| 3. | [Q \wedge R] | Assume |
| 4. | Q | by \wedge Elim-3 |
| 5. | $P \vee Q$ | by \vee Intro 4 |
| 6. | $P \vee Q$ | by \vee Elim-1-5 |

2. Give Natural Deduction proofs of the following (the proof are much more challenging)

a. $A \vee B, \sim B \vee C \vdash A \vee C$

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | [A] | Assume |
| 2. | $A \vee C$ | by \vee Intro-1 |
| 3. | [B] | Assume |
| 4. | $\sim B \vee C$ | Given |
| 5. | [$\sim B$] | Assume |
| 6. | False | by F Intro-3,5 |
| 7. | $A \vee C$ | by F Elim-6 |
| 8. | [C] | Assume |
| 9. | $A \vee C$ | by \vee Intro-8 |
| 10. | $A \vee C$ | by \vee Elim-5,7,8,9 |
| 11. | [$\sim B$] | Assume |
| 12. | $A \vee B$ | Given |
| 13. | [A] | Assume |
| 14. | $A \vee C$ | by \vee Intro-12 |
| 15. | [B] | Assume |
| 16. | False | by F Intro-10,14 |
| 17. | $A \vee C$ | by F Elim-15 |
| 18. | $A \vee C$ | by \vee Elim-13,14,15,17 |
| 19. | [C] | Assume |
| 20. | $A \vee C$ | by \vee Intro-8 |
| 21. | $A \vee C$ | by \vee Elim-1,2,3,10,11,18,19,20 |

b. $A \rightarrow B \vdash \sim B \rightarrow \sim C$

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | $A \rightarrow B$ | Given |
| 2. | [A] | Assume |
| 3. | B | by Implication Elim-1,2 |
| 4. | [$\sim B$] | Assume |
| 5. | False | by F Intro-3,6 |
| 6. | $\sim B \rightarrow \sim C$ | by F Elim-7 |
| 7. | $\sim B \rightarrow \sim C$ | by Repeat 6 |

8. $\sim B \rightarrow \sim C$

by Repeat 7

3. Section 1.4, Problems on pages 53-56

a. #10

Let $C(x)$ be the statement that “ x has a cat”, let $D(x)$ be the statement “ x has a dog”, and let $F(x)$ be the statement “ x has a ferret.” Express each of these statements in terms of $C(x)$, $D(x)$, $F(x)$, quantifiers, and logical connectives. Let the domain consist of all students in your class.

a. A student in your class has a cat, a dog, and a ferret

$$\exists x [C(x) \wedge D(x) \wedge F(x)]$$

b. All students in your class have a cat, a dog, or a ferret.

$\forall x [(C(x) \wedge \sim D(x) \wedge \sim F(x)) \vee (D(x) \wedge \sim C(x) \wedge \sim F(x)) \vee (F(x) \wedge \sim D(x) \wedge \sim C(x))]$ (if we assume that a student with one of the pets cannot have either of the others)

c. Some student in your class has a cat and a ferret, but not a dog.

$$\exists x [C(x) \wedge F(x) \wedge \sim D(x)]$$

d. No student in your class has a cat, a dog, and a ferret.

$$\forall x [\sim (C(x) \wedge F(x) \wedge D(x))]$$

e. For each of the three animals, cats, dogs, and ferrets, there is a student in your class who has this animal as a pet.

$$\exists x \exists y \exists z [C(x) \wedge D(y) \wedge F(z)]$$

b. #60 (omit [d])

Let $P(x)$, $Q(x)$, and $R(x)$ be the statements “ x is a clear explanation,” “ x is satisfactory,” and “ x is an excuse,” respectively. Suppose that the domain for x consists of all English text. Express each of these statements using quantifiers, logical connectives, and $P(x)$, $Q(x)$, and $R(x)$.

a. All clear explanations are satisfactory.

$$\forall x [P(x) \wedge Q(x)]$$

b. Some excuses are unsatisfactory.

$$\exists x [R(x) \wedge \sim Q(x)]$$

c. Some excuses are not clear explanations.

$$\exists x [R(x) \wedge \sim P(x)]$$

4. Section 1.5, problems on pages 65-67

a. #10

Let $F(x,y)$ be the statement “ x can fool y ”, where the domain consists of all people in the world. Use quantifiers to express each of these statements.

a. Everybody can fool Fred.

$$\forall x F(x, \text{Fred})$$

b. Evelyn can fool everybody.

- $\forall x F(\text{Evelyn}, x)$
- c. Everybody can fool somebody.
 $\forall x \exists y F(x, y)$
- d. There is no one who can fool everybody.
 $\forall x \forall y \neg F(x, y)$
- e. Everybody can be fooled by somebody.
 $\forall x \exists y F(y, x)$
- f. No one can fool both Fred and Jerry.
 $\forall x [\neg (F(x, \text{Fred}) \wedge F(x, \text{Jerry}))]$
- g. Nancy can fool exactly two people.
 $\exists x \exists y (F(\text{Nancy}, x) \wedge F(\text{Nancy}, y) \wedge x \neq y \wedge \forall z (F(\text{Nancy}, z) \rightarrow (z = x \vee z = y)))$
- h. There is exactly one person whom everybody can fool.
 $\exists x \forall y F(y, x) \wedge \forall z (\exists y F(y, z) \rightarrow z = x)$
- i. No one can fool himself or herself.
 $\forall x \neg F(x, x)$
- j. There is someone who can fool exactly one person besides himself or herself.
 $\exists x \exists y (F(x, y) \wedge \forall z (F(x, z) \rightarrow z = y) \wedge x \neq y)$

b. #28[a,c,e,i,j]

Determine the truth value of each of these statements if the domain of each variable consists of all real numbers.

- a. $\forall x \exists y [x^2 = y]$
True
- c. $\exists x \forall y [xy = 0]$
True
- e. $\forall x [x > 0 \rightarrow \exists y [xy = 1]]$
True
- i. $\forall x \exists y [x + y = 2 \wedge 2x - y = 1]$
False; (let $x = 2$ and show me a plausible y)
- j. $\forall x \forall y \exists z (z = (x + y) / 2)$
True