

PHILOSOPHY TRIPOS Part IA

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION FOR PART IB OF THE PHILOSOPHY TRIPOS

Tuesday 30 May 2000

9 to 12

Paper 3

LOGIC

Answer **four** questions only.

Write the number of the question at the beginning of each answer. If you are answering an either/or question, indicate the letter as well.

- 1 **Either** (a) Are there any necessary truths that can only be known a posteriori?

 Or (b) How successful is Quine's assault on the analytic/synthetic distinction?
- 2 What is Russell's Theory of Descriptions? Does it solve the problems that it purports to solve?
- 3 Why does Frege hold that a proper name must have sense as well as reference? Is he right?
- 4 What are the paradoxes of material implication? Can they be resolved?
- 5 'Different sentences can express the same proposition.' So what are propositions?
- 6 Use the tableaux method (the tree test) to determine which of the following arguments are valid:
 - (a) $P, (P \rightarrow Q), (Q \rightarrow R)$ hence R
 - (b) $(\neg R \rightarrow (P \rightarrow S)), \neg (\neg P \& R)$ hence $\neg (R \rightarrow S)$
 - (c) $(\neg P \rightarrow R)$ hence $(\neg R \rightarrow \neg (P \& Q))$
 - (d) $\neg R, (P \rightarrow R), (\neg P \rightarrow S), \neg (S \& Q)$ hence $\neg (Q \rightarrow R)$
 - (e) $\neg (P \rightarrow (Q \& R)), (S \rightarrow R), \neg (Q \& \neg \neg R)$ hence $\neg (S \rightarrow P)$

[TURN OVER for continuation of question 6]

Also translate and test the following arguments:

- (f) If Jo goes to the party and Sam goes to the party, there will be a row. So either there will be a row if Jo goes, or there will be a row if Sam goes.
- (g) We won't buy a ticket. If our number comes up if we buy a ticket, then we will win the lottery. Hence we will win the lottery.

Comment on your last two verdicts.

- 7 Translate the following sentences into the language of the predicate calculus with identity, explaining the translation scheme that you use.
- (a) No student is a logician if Jo is not a logician.
 - (b) Some students who are logicians are not philosophers.
 - (c) Only if Jo is a philosopher is every student who is a logician a philosopher too.
 - (d) Some students like all logicians who like themselves.
 - (e) Whomever Jo likes likes some philosopher.
 - (f) Some logician other than Jo likes every student.
 - (g) Jo is a philosopher and likes only other philosophers.
 - (h) Only a student admires another student.
 - (i) The student Jo likes is not a philosopher who likes her.
 - (j) Exactly three students like Jo.
 - (k) The only logician who likes Jo likes the only student who is a philosopher.
- 8 Show the following arguments are valid by translating them into the language of the predicate calculus with identity and using predicate tableaux.
- (a) Some cricketers admire anyone who has played cricket for England. Fred is a cricketer with no admirers. So Fred has not played cricket for England.
 - (b) Angharad and Bethan, and they alone, love Caradoc. Someone who loves Caradoc kissed him. So either Angharad or Bethan kissed Caradoc.
 - (c) Any true philosopher admires some logician. Some students admire only existentialists. No existentialists are logicians. Hence not all students are true philosophers.
 - (d) All logicians are philosophers; hence any logician's car is a philosopher's car.
 - (e) The King of France is bald. Bald men are sexy. Hence the King of France is sexy.
- 9 Outline the semantics for a suitable language for Predicate Logic. What is it for an argument framed in this language to be semantically valid?
- 10 Show that a Sentential argument is valid according to the tableau method (i.e. by the 'tree test') if, and only if, it is tautologically valid.