1. Show that $(\exists x)\, M(x)$ follows logically $(x)\,[H(x) \to M(x)],\ (\exists x)\, H(x)$

Step		Premises	Rule
	1.	$(x)\,[H(x) \to M(x)]$	P
{1}	2.	$H(y) \to M(y)$	US
	3.	$(\exists x)\, H(x)$	P
{3}	4.	$H(y)$	ES
{2,4}	5.	$M(y)$	T $P,\ P \to Q \Rightarrow Q$
	6.	$(\exists x)\, M(x)$	EG

2. All humans are mortal. Sachin is a human. Therefore he is mortal.

$H(x)$: x is a human
$M(x)$: x is Mortal
$H(S)$: Sachin is a human

The premises are.

$(\forall x)\,[H(x) \to M(x)],\ H(S)$

conclusion : $M(S)$

Step		Premises	Rule
	1.	$(\forall x)\,[H(x) \to M(x)]$	P
{1}	2	$H(S) \to M(S)$	US
	3.	$H(S)$	P
{2,3}	4.	$M(S)$	T $P,\ P \to Q \Rightarrow Q$

3. Show that the premises, "one student in this class knows how to write programs in JAVA" and "Everyone who knows how to write program in JAVA can get a high-paying job" imply the conclusion "someone in this class can get a high-paying job".

Let $A(x)$: x is in this class
$J(x)$: x knows how to write program in JAVA
$H(x)$: x can get a high paying job.

The premises are,
$(\exists x)(A(x) \wedge J(x))$, $(\forall x)(J(x) \rightarrow H(x))$

Conclusion: $\exists x (A(x) \wedge H(x))$

Step		Premises	Rule
	1.	$(\exists x)(A(x) \wedge J(x))$	P
{1}	2.	$A(y) \wedge J(y)$	ES
{2}	3.	$A(y)$	T $A(y) \wedge J(y) \Rightarrow A(y)$
{2}	4.	$J(y)$	T $A(y) \wedge J(y) \Rightarrow J(y)$
	5.	$(\forall x)(J(x) \rightarrow H(x))$	P
{5}	6.	$J(y) \rightarrow H(y)$	US
	7.	$H(y)$	T
{3,7}	8.	$A(y) \wedge H(y)$	T $A(y), H(y) \Rightarrow A(y) \wedge H(y)$
	9.	$(\exists x)(A(x) \wedge H(x))$	EG

4J. Verify the validity of the following argument.
"Every living thing is a plant or an animal"
"John's gold fish is alive and it is not a plant"
"All animals have hearts". Therefore, "John's gold fish has a heart".

$L(x)$: x is a living thing
$P(x)$: x is a plant
$A(x)$: x is an animal
$H(x)$: x is a heart
$L(j)$: j is alive
$P(j)$: j is not a plant
$H(j)$: j has a heart

Grn: $(\forall x)[L(x) \rightarrow P(x) \vee A(x)]$
$L(j) \wedge \neg P(j)$, $(\forall x)[A(x) \rightarrow H(x)]$

Conclusion : $H(j)$

Step	Premises	Rule
1.	$(\forall x)\,[L(x) \to P(x) \vee A(x)]$	P
{1} 2.	$L(j) \to P(j) \vee A(j)$	US
3.	$L(j) \wedge \neg P(j)$	P
{3} 4.	$L(j)$	T $P \wedge Q \Rightarrow P$
{2,4} 5.	$P(j) \vee A(j)$	T $P, P \to Q \Rightarrow Q$
{5} 6.	$\neg P(j) \to A(j)$	T $P \to Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$
7.	$(\forall x)\,[A(x) \to H(x)]$	P
{8} 8.	$A(j) \to H(j)$	US
9.	$\neg P(j) \to H(j)$	T
{3} 10.	$\neg P(j)$	T $P \wedge Q \Rightarrow P, Q$
11.	$H(j)$	T $P, P \to Q \Rightarrow Q$

5]. "All rock music is loud music", "Some rock music exist" Therefore "Some loud music exist"

$R(x)$: x is a rock music
$L(x)$: x is a loud music

Given. $(\forall x)\,[R(x) \to L(x)]$, $(\exists x)\,R(x)$

Conclusion : $(\exists x)\,L(x)$

1.	$(\forall x)\,(R(x) \to L(x))$	P
{1} 2.	$R(y) \to L(y)$	US
3.	$(\exists x)\,R(x)$	P
{3} 4.	$R(y)$	ES
{2,4} 5.	$L(y)$	T
6.	$(\exists x)\,L(x)$	EG

6] Establish the validity of argument.

i). All integers are rational nos.
ii) Some integers are power of three.
iii). Therefore some rational numbers are power of 3.

$I(x)$: x is an integer
$R(x)$: x is an rational number
$P(x)$: x is power of 3.

Sym. $(\forall x)(I(x) \to R(x)), (\exists x)(I(x) \wedge P(x))$

conclusion : $(\exists x)[R(x) \wedge P(x)]$

Step	Premises	Rule	
1.	$(\forall x)[I(x) \to R(x)]$	P	
{1} 2.	$I(y) \to R(y)$	US	
3	$(\exists x)[I(x) \wedge P(x)]$	P	
{3} 4.	$I(y) \wedge P(y)$	ES	
{4} 5.	$I(y)$	T	$P \wedge Q \Rightarrow P$
{2,5} 6.	$R(y)$	T	$P, P \to Q \Rightarrow Q$
{4} 7.	$P(y)$	T	$P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q$
{6,7} 8.	$R(y) \wedge P(y)$	T	$P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$
9.	$(\exists x)[R(x) \wedge P(x)]$	EG	

7]. Show that $(x)[P(x) \vee Q(x)] \Rightarrow (x)P(x) \vee (\exists x)Q(x)$ by indirect Proof.

Premises : $(x)[P(x) \vee Q(x)]$

Conclusion : $(x)P(x) \vee (\exists x)Q(x)$

Step	Premises	Rule
1.	$(x)[P(x) \vee Q(x)]$	P
{1} 2.	$P(y) \vee Q(y)$	US
3.	$\neg[(x) P(x) \vee (\exists x) Q(x)]$	negation of conclusion
{3} 4.	$(\exists x)\neg P(x) \wedge (x)\neg Q(x)$	T $\neg(P \wedge Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee \neg Q$
		T $P \wedge Q \Rightarrow P$
{4} 5.	$(\exists x)\neg P(x)$	ES
{5} 6.	$\neg P(y)$	T $P \wedge Q \Rightarrow Q$
7.	$(x) \neg Q(x)$	US
{7} 8.	$\neg Q(y)$	T $P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$
{6,8} 9.	$\neg P(y) \wedge \neg Q(y)$	T $\neg P \wedge \neg Q \Leftrightarrow \neg(P \vee$
{9} 10.	$\neg(P(y) \vee Q(y))$	T $P, Q \Rightarrow P \wedge Q$
{9,10} 11.	$[P(y) \vee Q(y)] \wedge \neg[P(y) \vee Q(y)]$	T $P \wedge \neg P \Leftrightarrow F$
{11} 12.	F	

8]. Using cp rule, obtain the following Implication

$(\forall x)[P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)], (\forall x)[R(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x)] \Rightarrow$ ~~$R(y) \rightarrow \neg P(y)(x)$~~ $(x)[R(x) \rightarrow \neg P(x)]$

Step	Premises	Rule
1.	$(\forall x)[P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)]$	P
2.	$(\forall x)[R(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x)]$	P
	$R(y) \rightarrow \neg Q(y)$	US
{2} 3		P (assumed)
4	$R(y)$	T $P, P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow Q$
	$\neg Q(y)$	
{3,4} 5.	$P(y) \rightarrow Q(y)$	US
{1} 6.		T $P \rightarrow Q, \neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P$
{5,6} 7.	$\neg P(y)$	

{4,7} 8. $R(y) \rightarrow \neg P(y)$ CP

{8} 9. $(\forall x)[R(x) \rightarrow \neg P(x)]$ UG