Phi 270 F03 test 4 in pdf format

Analyze the sentences below in as much detail as possible, providing a key to the non-logical vocabulary you use. *Restate 2 using an unrestricted quantifier*.

- 1. No one called the new number [answer]
- Sam asked everyone he could think of [Remember to restate this one using an unrestricted quantifier.]
 [answer]
- **3.** *If any door was opened, the alarm sounded* [answer]
- **4.** Only people who'd read everything the author had written were asked to review the book

[answer]

Use derivations to show that the following arguments are valid. You may use any rules.

5.
$$\frac{\forall x (Fx \land Gx)}{\forall x Gx}$$

6.
$$(\forall x: Fx) Gx$$

 $\forall x \forall y (Gy \rightarrow Rxy)$
 $\forall x (\forall y: Fy) Rxy$
[answer]

Use a derivation to show that the following argument is not valid and describe a structure (by using either a diagram or tables) that divides an open gap.

7. $(\forall x: Fx) Rxa$ $Fa \rightarrow \forall x Rxx$ [answer]

2.

Phi 270 F03 test 4 answers

 No one called the new number No one is such that (he or she called the new number) (∀x: x is a person) ¬ x called the new number)

 $(\forall x: Px) \neg Cxn$

[C: λxy (x called y); P: λx (x is a person); n: the new number] Sam asked everyone he could think of

everyone Sam could think of is such that (Sam asked him or her) (∀x: x is a person Sam could think of) Sam asked x (∀x: x is a person ∧ Sam could think of x) Asx (∀x: Px ∧ Tsx) Asx

 $\forall x ((Px \land Tsx) \rightarrow Asx)$

[A: λxy (x asked y); P: λx (x is a person); T: λxy (x could think of y); s: Sam]

If any door was opened, the alarm sounded every door is such that (if it was opened, the alarm sounded) (∀x: x is a door) if x was opened, the alarm sounded (∀x: Dx) (x was opened → the alarm sounded)

```
(\forall x: Dx) (Ox \rightarrow Sa)
```

[D: λx (x *is a door*); O: λx (x *was opened*); S: λx (x *sounded*); a: *the alarm*]

- **4.** Only people who'd read everything the author had written were asked to review the book
 - Only people who'd read everything the author had written are such that (they were asked to review the book)
 - (∀x: ¬ x is a person who'd read everything the author had written) ¬ x was asked to review the book
 - $(\forall x: \neg (x \text{ is a person } \land x \text{ had read everything the author had written})) \neg Axb$
 - (∀x: ¬ (x is a person ∧ everything the author had written is such that (x had read it))) ¬ Axb
 - $(\forall x: \neg (Px \land (\forall y: y is a thing the author had written) x had read y)) \neg Axb$

 $(\forall x: \neg (Px \land (\forall y: the author had written y) Rxy)) \neg Axb$ $(\forall x: \neg (Px \land (\forall y: Way) Rxy)) \neg Axb$

[A: λxy (x was asked to review y); P: λx (x is a person); R: λxy (x had read y); R: λxy (x had written y); a: the author; b: the book]

	$\forall x (Fx \land Gx)$	a: 2
2 UI 3 Ext 3 Ext	ⓐ Fa ∧ Ga Fa Ga ●	3 (4)
4 QED	Ga	1
1 UG	∀x Gx	

5.



Counterexample presented by tables

range: 1, 2
$$\frac{a b}{1 2}$$
 $\frac{\tau}{1} \frac{F\tau}{1}$ $\frac{R}{1} \frac{1}{2}$
2 F 2 T F

Counterexample presented by a diagram



(This interpretation divides both gaps; the value of F2 is needed only for the 1st and the value of R21 only for the 2nd.)