

5.2.1. Names and Predicates: Construction and Translation Problems

A. For each of the strings of symbols below, decide whether it a **formal sentence** according to the rules of our revised construction rules listed here.

Revised Construction Rules (*First Draft*)

Atomic Sentences:

- A1. Sentence letters are atomic sentence
- A2. A predicate letter followed by a name letter is an atomic sentence.

Formal Sentences:

- 1. Atomic sentences are formal sentences.
- 2. If \bullet is a formal sentence, then $\sim\bullet$ is a formal sentence.
- 3. If \bullet and \blacktriangle are formal sentences, then $(\bullet \wedge \blacktriangle)$ is a formal sentence.
- 4. If \bullet and \blacktriangle are formal sentences, then $(\bullet \vee \blacktriangle)$ is a formal sentence.
- 5. If \bullet and \blacktriangle are formal sentences, then $(\bullet \rightarrow \blacktriangle)$ is a formal sentence.

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. $(Ga \vee Ha)$ | 4. Hab |
| 2. $\sim Ba$ | 5. $(P \rightarrow Mc)$ |
| 3. $(a \wedge P)$ | 6. $(G \vee H)a$ |

B. Using the translation key below, **translate** each of these English sentences into our (revised) formal language.

a: Trixie

b: Suki

c: Rex

d: Kitty

e: Jack

G: ___ gamble / is a gambler

H: ___ is a logician

I: ___ like logic

J: ___ plays poker

K: ___ surfs / is a surfer

1. Trixie is a gambler, but Rex isn't.
2. Suki is neither a gambler nor a logician.
3. If Rex is a logician, then he likes logic.
4. Although Kitty doesn't play poker, she is a gambler.

5a. Rex isn't a surfer, and he isn't a gambler.

5b. Rex isn't a surfer who gambles.

5c. If Rex neither surfs nor gambles, then he isn't a gambler who surfs.

(6)

1. Jack is either a surfer who gambles or one who doesn't.

∴ Jack is a surfer.

C. Translate the following English arguments into the formal language (showing the **translation key** used).

(1)

1. Neko is chubby and Neko is food-obsessed and Neko is an inventor.

\therefore Neko is a chubby, food-obsessed inventor.

(2)

1. Jack isn't both a coffee drinker and a tea drinker.

\therefore If Jack's a tea drinker, he's not one who also drinks coffee.

(3)

1. Jack is either a coffee-drinking surfer, or one that drinks tea.

\therefore Jack is a surfer, and is either a coffee drinker or a tea drinker.

(4)

1. Jack isn't a coffee-drinking logician.

\therefore Jack doesn't drink coffee.

(Q: Which, if any, of these arguments seem valid?)