

Homework 4

Page 78, #4

- a) Simplification
- b) Disjunctive syllogism
- c) Modus ponens
- d) Addition
- e) Hypothetical syllogism

Page 80

20.

- a) Statement is invalid. $a = -1$ serves as a counterexample.
- b) Valid by modus ponens

24.

There is an error at step 3. It is not possible to use the simplification rule since you would need $P(c) \wedge Q(c)$ not $P(c) \vee Q(c)$. A similar error is made on step 5. Another error exists on step 7. Using the conjunction rule would result in $\forall x (P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ not $\forall x (P(x) \vee Q(x))$.