

### Truth table for $\rightarrow$

Assuming that the rules of Fitch are such that it is impossible to prove an argument which is not logically valid, the truth-table for  $\rightarrow$  is fixed if we accept  $\rightarrow$ Elim and  $\rightarrow$ Intro.

*How do the rules of proof for  $\rightarrow$  fix its truth table?*

A	B	$A \rightarrow B$
T	T	
T	F	
F	T	
F	F	

### 'If' and $\rightarrow$

$\neg A$	There is no cheese in my fridge
$A \rightarrow B$	If there is cheese in my fridge there is chocolate in my pocket.
$\neg A \vee B$	America does not exist $\vee$ Baudrillard is wrong
$A \rightarrow B$	If America exists, Baudrillard is wrong
$A \rightarrow B$	If you love logic, things will fall into place
$\neg(A \wedge \neg B)$	Not both: you take logic and things don't fall into place

### Quantifiers

Everything is broken:  $\forall x \text{ Broken}(x)$

Something is broken:  $\exists x \text{ Broken}(x)$

What does  $\exists$  mean? We give the meaning of  $\exists$  by specifying what it takes for a sentence containing  $\exists$  to be true:

1. Give every object a name.
2. For each name in turn, create a new sentence like this: delete the quantifier and replace all instances of the variable it binds with that name
3. If ANY OF the new sentences are true, so is the original.

### $\exists$ and $\wedge$ work together

Some object is F and G:  $\exists x ( F(x) \wedge G(x) )$

I met a philosopher:

Some object is a philosopher and I met it:

$\exists x ( \text{Philr}(x) \wedge \text{Met}(a,x) )$

Some square is blue:  $\exists x ( \text{Square}(x) \wedge \text{Blue}(x) )$

Rooney scored a goal:

$\exists x ( \text{Goal}(x) \wedge \text{Scored}(a,x) )$

Obama won an election:

$\exists x ( \text{Election}(x) \wedge \text{Won}(a,x) )$

### $\forall$ and $\rightarrow$ work together

All my things are broken:

$\forall x ( \text{Belongs}(a,x) \rightarrow \text{Broken}(x) )$

Everything I do turns bad:

$\forall x ( \text{Does}(a,x) \rightarrow \text{TurnsBad}(x) )$

All squares are blue:

$\forall x ( \text{Square}(x) \rightarrow \text{Blue}(x) )$

### Substitution of logical equivalents

Two sentences are *logically equivalent* when each is a logical consequence of the other.

$\varphi \dashv \vdash \psi$  means  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are logically equivalent.

Terminology: let  $\chi[\psi/\varphi]$  be the result of replacing  $\varphi$  with  $\psi$

E.g.  $(Q \neg \neg \vee P) [P/\neg \neg P] = Q \vee P$

Theorem: If  $\varphi \dashv \vdash \psi$  then  $\chi \dashv \vdash \chi[\psi/\varphi]$

## Exercises 05

*For your fifth seminar*

*Only for fast groups*

A. From the LPL textbook:

9.12–13

9.18–19 (trans.)

10.20, \*10.24–7

10.28–9

13.2–3, 13.8–9 (quantifier proofs)

13.11, 13.13, 13.15

NEVER USE TAUT CON.

B. For each of the following sentences of FOL, give a logically equivalent sentence of idiomatic English using the specified interpretation. Your English sentences should be as concise as possible.

Domain : people and actions

$D(x)$  :  $x$  is desirable

$V(x)$  :  $x$  is virtuous

$A(x)$  :  $x$  is an action

$H(x)$  :  $x$  is a person

$P(x,y)$ :  $x$  performed  $y$

i.  $\forall x [ D(x) \rightarrow V(x) ]$

ii.  $\forall x [ [A(x) \wedge D(x) ] \rightarrow V(x) ] ]$

iii.  $\exists x [ A(x) \wedge \neg [ D(x) \rightarrow V(x) ] ]$

\*iv.  $\exists x \forall y [ [ [H(x) \wedge A(y)] \wedge P(x,y) ] \rightarrow V(y) ]$

\*\*v.  $\neg \exists x [ \exists y [ H(x) \wedge P(x,y) \wedge A(y) \wedge \neg V(y) ] ]$   
 $\wedge \neg \exists z [ P(x,z) \wedge A(z) \wedge V(z) ] ]$