

PHIL 112 Homework 4

Hardy Jones
999397426
Dr. Landry
Winter 2014

1. Define

(a) Theorem in PD

A sentence \mathbf{P} of PL is a theorem in PD if and only if \mathbf{P} is derivable in PD from the empty set.

(b) Equivalence in PD

Sentences \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} of PL are equivalent in PD if and only if \mathbf{Q} is derivable in PD from $\{\mathbf{P}\}$ and \mathbf{P} is derivable in PD from $\{\mathbf{Q}\}$.

2. Construct derivations that show each of the following:

(a) $\{\neg(\forall x)(\exists y)Lxy, (\exists y)(\forall x)Lxy\}$ is inconsistent in PD

1. $\neg(\forall x)(\exists y)Lxy$	Assum
2. $(\exists y)(\forall x)Lxy$	Assum
3. $(\exists x)\neg(\exists y)Lxy$	QN 1
4. $(\exists x)(\forall y)\neg Lxy$	QN 3
5. $(\forall y)\neg Lay$	Assum / \exists Elim
6. $(\forall y)\neg Lay$	Reit: 5
7. $(\forall y)\neg Lay$	\exists Elim: 5, 6
8. $(\forall x)Lxb$	Assum / \exists Elim
9. $(\forall x)Lxb$	Reit: 8
10. $(\forall x)Lxb$	\exists Elim: 8, 9
11. $\neg Lab$	\forall Elim: 7
12. Lab	\forall Elim: 10

From lines 11 and 12 we have $\neg Lab \wedge Lab$.

Thus $\{\neg(\forall x)(\exists y)Lxy, (\exists y)(\forall x)Lxy\}$ is inconsistent in PD .

(b) $\{((\exists x)Fx \vee (\exists x)Gx) \rightarrow (\exists x)(Fx \vee Gx)\}$ is a theorem in *PD*

	1. $(\exists x)Fx \vee (\exists x)Gx$	Assum				
		2. $(\exists x)Fx$				
		Assum				
			3. Fa			
			Assum			
				4. $Fa \vee Ga$		
				\vee Intro: 3		
				5. $(\exists x)(Fx \vee Gx)$		
				\exists Intro: 4		
				6. $(\exists x)(Fx \vee Gx)$		
				\exists Elim: 2, 3–5		
				7. $(\exists x)Gx$		
				Assum		
					8. Gb	
					Assum	
						9. $Fb \vee Gb$
						\vee Intro: 8
						10. $(\exists x)(Fx \vee Gx)$
						\exists Intro: 9
						11. $(\exists x)(Fx \vee Gx)$
						\exists Elim: 7, 8–10
						12. $(\exists x)(Fx \vee Gx)$
						\vee Elim: 1, 2–6, 7–11,
						13. $((\exists x)Fx \vee (\exists x)Gx) \rightarrow (\exists x)(Fx \vee Gx)$
						\rightarrow Intro: 1–12

3. Symbolize Casino Slim's reasoning and construct a derivation in $PD+$ showing that the symbolized argument is valid in $PD+$.

1. $(\forall x)(\forall y)[(Fx \wedge Sy) \rightarrow Bxy]$	Assum
2. $(Fh \vee Ff) \wedge Ss$	Assum
3. $Fh \vee Ff$	\wedge Elim: 2
4. Ss	\wedge Elim: 2
5. $(\forall y)[(Fx \wedge Sy) \rightarrow Bhy]$	\forall Elim: 1
6. $(Fh \wedge Ss) \rightarrow Bhs$	\forall Elim: 5
7. $\neg(Fh \wedge Ss) \vee Bhs$	Impl: 5
8. $Fh \vee Ff$	Assum
9. Fh	Assum
10. $(\exists x)Fx$	\exists Intro: 9
11. Ff	Assum
12. $(\exists x)Fx$	\exists Intro: 11
13. $(\exists x)Fx$	\vee Elim: 8, 9–10, 11–12
14. $(\exists x)Fx$	\exists Intro: 13
15. Fh	Assum
16. Fh	Reit: 15
17. Fh	\exists Elim: 14, 15–16
18. $Fh \wedge Ss$	\wedge Intro: 4, 17
19. Bhs	\rightarrow Elim: 6, 18
20. $Bhs \vee Bfs$	\vee Intro: 19
21. $(\exists x)(Bhx \vee Bfx)$	\exists Intro: 20

4. Show that the following argument is valid.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 (\forall x)[(\exists y)(Byb \wedge Lxyb) \rightarrow Fx] \\
 (\exists x)(Cxb \wedge Lxab) \\
 \hline
 (\forall x)(Cxb \rightarrow \neg Fx) \rightarrow \neg Bab
 \end{array}$$

1. $(\forall x)[(\exists y)(Byb \wedge Lxyb) \rightarrow Fx]$	Assum
2. $(\exists x)(Cxb \wedge Lxab)$	Assum
3. $(\forall x)(Cxb \rightarrow \neg Fx)$	Assum / \rightarrow Intro
4. $Ccb \wedge Lcab$	Assum / \exists Elim
5. Ccb	\wedgeElim 4
6. $Lcab$	\wedgeElim 4
7. $Ccb \rightarrow \neg Fc$	\forallElim: 3
8. $\neg Fc$	MP 5, 7
9. $(\exists y)(Byb \wedge Lcyb) \rightarrow Fc$	\forallElim: 1
10. $\neg(\exists y)(Byb \wedge Lcyb)$	MT 8, 9
11. $(\forall y)\neg(Byb \wedge Lcyb)$	QN 10
12. $\neg(Bab \wedge Lcab)$	\forallElim: 11
13. $\neg Bab \vee Lcab$	DeM 12
14. $\neg Bab$	DS 6, 13
15. $\neg Bab$	\existsElim: 4, 5, 14
16. $(\forall x)(Cxb \rightarrow \neg Fx) \rightarrow \neg Bab$	\rightarrow Intro 3, 4-15

Thus the argument is valid.

5. Suppose that a set is inconsistent in PD. Is an argument that has the sentences in the set as premises valid in PD?

Yes, the argument would still be valid. Validity only states that the conclusion must be derivable from the premises. Since a conclusion can still be derived, it can still be valid.

6. Show in PDE that $\{a = b, b = c\} \vdash c = a$

1. $a = b$	Assum
2. $b = c$	Assum
3. $a = c$	1, 2 =Elim
4. $c = b$	1, 3 =Elim
5. $c = a$	1, 4 =Elim

7. Complete the following definition in PDE:

$$(\forall x)[Rf(x)g(x) \equiv Rg(x)f(x)]$$

. $(\forall x)(\forall y)(Ryx \rightarrow Rxy)$	Assum
. $Rg(a)f(a)$	Assum / \equiv Intro
. $(\forall y)(Ryf(a) \rightarrow Rf(a)y)$	\forall Elim: 1
. $Rg(a)f(a) \rightarrow Rf(a)g(a)$	\forall Elim: 1
. $Rf(a)g(a)$	MP 2, 4
. $Rf(a)g(a)$	Assum / \equiv Intro
. $(\forall y)(Ryg(a) \rightarrow Rf(a)y)$	\forall Elim: 1
. $Rf(a)g(a) \rightarrow Rg(a)f(a)$	\forall Elim: 1
. $Rg(a)f(a)$	MP 6, 8
. $Rf(a)g(a) \equiv Rg(a)f(a)$	\equiv Intro
. $(\forall x)[Rf(x)g(x) \equiv Rg(x)f(x)]$	\forall Intro: 10