## Phi 270 F97 part of quiz 4 and all of quiz 5 (of 6)

(questions from these two tests addressed the part of the course your test is designed to

cover)

**4-4.** Identify individual terms and quantifier phrases in the following sentence and indicate links between pronouns and their antecedents. (You can do this by marking up an English sentence; you are *not* being asked to provide a symbolic analysis.)

Everyone who Carol lent the book to spoke to her at length about it.

## [answer]

Analyze the following generalizations in as much detail as possible. Provide a key to the non-logical vocabulary (upper and lower case letters) appearing in your answer *and restate the result using an unrestricted quantifier*.

- **4-5.** Bob called no one. [answer]
- **4-6.** Among contestants, only professionals were finalists. [answer]

Analyze the following sentences in as much detail as possible, providing a key to the non-logical vocabulary (upper and lower case letters) appearing in your answer.

- **5-1.** Bob doesn't own any map showing Dafter. [answer]
- **5-2.** Nothing anyone said bothered Dave. [answer]

Use derivations to establish the validity of the following arguments. You may use attachment rules.

**5-3.** 
$$\forall x (Fx \land Gx)$$

∀x Fx

[answer]

- **5-4.**  $(\forall x: Rxa) \forall y Rxy$  $(\forall x: \forall y Rxy) Rxb$ [answer]]
- **5-5.** Use a derivation to show that the following argument is not valid and describe a structure dividing one of the derivation's open gaps. (You will *not* need the rules UG+, RUG+, and ST of §7.8 that were designed to avoid unending derivations.)

$$\frac{(\forall x: Fx) Rax}{(\forall x: Fx) Rxa}$$

You will receive credit for *one* of the following (but you may attempt both):

5-6a. Synthesize an English sentence whose analysis would yield the

following form.

$$(\forall x: Dx) (Okx \rightarrow (\forall y: Dy) Oky)$$
  
[D:  $\lambda x (x \text{ is a door}); O: \lambda xy (x \text{ opens } y); k: the key][answer]]$ 

**5-6b.** Use derivations to establish the validity of the following argument. You may use attachment rules.

$$\forall x (\forall y: Rxy) \neg Fy \\ (\forall x: Fx) Rxx \\ \forall x \neg Fx \\ [answer]$$

Phi 270 F97 Answers to part of quiz 4 and all of quiz 5 4-4.

Т

Everyone who <u>Carol lent the book</u> to spoke to <u>her</u> at length about it

no one is such that (Bob called him or her)  $(\forall x: x \text{ is an person}) \neg \underline{Bob} \text{ called } x$   $(\forall x: Px) \neg Cbx$  $\forall x (Px \rightarrow \neg Cbx)$ 

[C: 
$$\lambda xy$$
 (x called y); P:  $\lambda x$  (x is person); b: Bob]

**4-6.** Among contestants, only professionals were finalists Among contestants, only professionals are such that (they were finalists)

 $(\forall x: x was a contestant \land \neg x was a professional) \neg x was a finalist$ 

 $(\forall x: Cx \land \neg Px) \neg Fx$  $\forall x ((Cx \land \neg Px) \rightarrow \neg Fx)$ 

[C:  $\lambda x$  (x was a contestant); F:  $\lambda x$  (x was a finalist); P:  $\lambda x$  (x was a professional)]

5-1. Bob doesn't own any map showing Dafter every map showing Dafter is such that (Bob doesn't own it) (∀x: x is a map showing Dafter) ¬ Bob owns x (∀x: x is a map ∧ x shows Dafter) ¬ Obx

$$(\forall x: Mx \land Sxd) \neg Obx$$

[M:  $\lambda x$  (x *is a map*); O:  $\lambda xy$  (x *owns* y); S:  $\lambda xy$  (x *shows* y); b: *Bob*; d: *Dafter*]

5-2. Nothing anyone said bothered Dave everyone is such that (nothing he or she said bothered Dave) (∀x: x is a person) nothing x said bothered Dave (∀x: Px) nothing x said is such that (it bothered Dave) (∀x: Px) (∀y: y is a thing x said) ¬ y bothered <u>Dave</u> (∀x: Px) (∀y: x said y) ¬ Byd

 $(\forall x: Px) (\forall y: Sxy) \neg Byd$ [B:  $\lambda xy$  (x bothered y); P:  $\lambda x$  (x is a person); S:  $\lambda xy$  (x said y); d: Dave] 5-3.  $\forall x (Fx \land Gx)$ a:2 (a) 2 UI Fa ^ Ga 3 3 Ext Fa (4) 3 Ext Ga • 4 QED Fa 1 1 UG ∀x Fx 5-4.  $(\forall x: Rxa) \forall y Ryx$  $(\forall x: Rxa) \forall y Rxy$ c:3  $(\mathbf{c})$  $(\mathbf{c})$ ∀y Rcy ∀y Rcy a:2 a:2 2 UI Rcb (3)2 UI Rca (3)3 SB ∀y Ryc b:4 • Rbc 4 UI (5) Rcb 3 QED 1 1 RUG | ( $\forall x: \forall y Rxy$ ) Rxb 5 QED Rbc 1 1 RUG | ( $\forall$ x:  $\forall$ y Rxy) Rbx

[The first premise is never used in the derivation for this question (shown at the left). This was a slip on my part in making up the question; at the right is the sort of example I apparently had in mind.]



**5-6a.** ( $\forall$ x: x is a door) (the key opens x  $\rightarrow$  ( $\forall$ y: y is a door) the key opens y)

 $(\forall x: x \text{ is a door})$  (the key opens  $x \rightarrow every$  door is such that (the key opens it))

(∀x: x is a door) (the key opens x → the key opens every door)
(∀x: x is a door) if the key opens x, then it opens every door every door is such that (if the key opens it, then it opens every door)

If the key opens any door, then it opens every door

5-6b.  $\forall x (\forall y:Rxy) \neg Fy$ a:2 (∀x:Fx) Rxx a:4 (a) 2 UI  $(\forall y:Ray) \neg Fy$ a:5 Fa (4), (6)4 SB 5 SB (5)(6)Raa ¬ Fa • 6 Nc  $\bot$ 3 3 RAA ¬ Fa 1 1 UG  $\forall x \neg Fx$