

M.A. 1st Semester Examination, 2012

PHILOSOPHY

COURSE NO. — PHI-103

Full Marks : 40

Time : 2 hours

Answer any **two** questions from Group — A and
one question from Group — B

The figures in the right-hand margin indicate marks

*Candidates are required to give their answers in their
own words as far as practicable*

Illustrate the answers wherever necessary

GROUP — A

1. Symbolize each of the following propositions. In each case use the suggested notation. 2 × 8
- (a) If any officer is present, then either no majors are present or he is a major. (Ox : x is an officer, Px : x is present, Mx : x is a major.)

- (b) If any survivors are women, then if all women are fortunate, they are fortunate. (Sx : x is a survivor, Wx : x is a woman, Fx : x is fortunate)
- (c) If any technician is absent-minded, then if some germicides are contaminated, then he is a scoundrel. (Tx : x is a technician, Ax : x is absent-minded, Gx : x is a germicide, Cx : x is contaminated, Sx : x is a scoundrel.)
- (d) If any husband is unsuccessful, then if all wives are ambitious, then some wives will be disappointed. (Hx : x is a husband, Sx : x is successful, Wx : x is wife, Ax : x is ambitious, Dx : x will be disappointed.)
- (e) If any employees are lazy and some positions have no future, then some employees will not be successful. (Ex : x is an employee, Lx : x is lazy, Px : x is a position, Fx : x has a future, Sx : x will be successful.)
- (f) If anything is damaged, some one will be blamed. (Dx : x is damaged, Px : x is a person, Bx : x will be blamed.)

(g) If every teacher is conservative and no student is intelligent then some student will fail in the examination. ($Tx : x$ is a teacher, $Cx : x$ is conservative, $Sx : x$ is a student, $Ix : x$ is intelligent, $Fx : x$ will fail in the examination.)

(h) If all officers present are either captains or majors, then either some captains are present or some majors are present. ($Ox : x$ is an officer, $Px : x$ is present, $Cx : x$ is a captain, $Mx : x$ is a major.)

2. Construct a formal proof of validity for each of the following arguments : 4 x 4

(i) $(x) \{Ox \supset [(y) (Py \supset Qy) \supset Rx]\}$
 $(x) \{Rx \supset [(y) (Py \supset Sy) \supset Tx]\}$
 $\therefore (y) [Py \supset (Qy \cdot Sy)] \supset (x) (Ox \supset Tx)$

(ii) $(\exists x) Gx \vee (y) (Gy \supset Hy)$
 $(x) (Ix \supset \sim Gx)$
 $\therefore (x) (Gx \supset Ix) \supset (y) (Gy \supset Hy)$

(iii) Any businessman who is a poet must be a wealthy man. Wealthy men are all conservatives. If some conservative does not like poetry, then no

poets are conservatives. Therefore, if there is a wealthy man who does not like poetry, then no businessmen are poets. (Bx : x is a businessman, Px : x is a poet, Wx : x is a wealthy man, Cx : x is conservative, Lx : x likes poetry).

(iv) Any car with good brakes is safe to drive and safe to ride in. So, if a car is new, then if all new cars have good brakes, it is safe to drive. (Cx : x is a car, Bx : x has good brakes, Dx : x is safe to drive, Rx : x is safe to ride in, Nx : x is new.)

3. Prove the invalidity of the following arguments : 4 × 4

(i) $(x) (\exists y) (Fx \equiv Gy) / \therefore (\exists y) (x) (Fx \equiv Gy)$

(ii) $(x) (y) [Ax \supset (By \vee Cy)]$

$(z) \{[(y) By \vee (y) Cy] \supset Dz\} / \therefore (\exists x) (\exists z) (Ax \supset Dz)$

(iii) $(x) Nx \supset (\exists y) Oy$

$(y) Oy \supset (\exists z) Pz / \therefore (\exists x) Nx \supset (z) Pz$

(iv) $(\exists x) (Xx \cdot Yx)$

$(x) (Xx \supset Zx)$

$(\exists x) \cdot (Zx \cdot \sim Xx) / \therefore \exists x (Zx \cdot \sim Yx)$

4. Construct demonstration for each of the following : 4×4

(i) $(\exists y) [Fy \supset (x) Fx]$

(ii) $(\exists x) (Fx \supset Q) \equiv [(x) Fx \supset Q]$

(iii) $[(\exists x) Fx \supset (\exists y) Gy] \equiv (x) (\exists y)(Fx \supset Gy)$

(iv) $(x) (\exists y) (Fx \vee Gy) \equiv (\exists y) (x) (Fx \vee Gy)$

GROUP – B.

Answer any *one* of the following questions : 8×1

5. Answer the following questions :

(a) In what sense can a propositional function be said to follow validly from a proposition ? 2

(b) What is the more general definition of formal proof of validity ? 2

(c) What method do we follow at the time of considering invalidity of an argument involving quantifier ? 4

6. State, explain and illustrate the final version of Universal Generalization. 8

7. Identify and explain the mistakes in the following erroneous "proofs". 4 + 4

(i) 1. $(x)(\exists y)(Fx \equiv \sim Fy) / \therefore (\exists x)(Fx \equiv \sim Fx)$

2. $(\exists y)(Fx \equiv \sim Fy) \dots 1. UI$

→ 3. $Fx \equiv \sim Fx$

4. $(\exists x)(Fx \equiv \sim Fx) \dots 3. EG$

5. $(\exists x)(Fx \equiv \sim Fx) \dots 2, 3 - 4 EI.$

(ii) 1. $(y)(\exists x)(Fx \vee Gy) / \therefore (\exists x)(y)(Fx \vee Gy)$

2. $(\exists x)(Fx \vee Gy) \dots 1, UI.$

→ 3. $Fx \vee Gx$

4. $(y)(Fx \vee Gy) \dots 3. UG.$

5. $(\exists x)(y)(Fx \vee Gy) \dots 4. EG.$

6. $(\exists x)(y)(Fx \vee Gy) \dots 2, 3 - 5 EI.$