

305 Lecture 17 - Tautologies

Brian Weatherson

July 13, 2020

Plan

This lecture is about how we use truth tables to check for logical properties.

Associated Reading

Carnap Book, Chapter 10, section “Truth Values, Truth Tables, Tautologies”.

Tautologies

We are going to start with a particular kind of sentence, a **tautology**.

Definition

A tautology is a sentence that gets the value **T** in every row of its truth table.

Examples of Tautologies

What are some sentences that might fit the bill?

The Law of Excluded Middle

A	$A \vee \neg A$			
T	T	T	F	T
F	F	T	T	F

The Law of Non-Contradiction

A	$\neg (A \wedge \neg A)$				
T	T	T	F	F	T
F	T	F	F	T	F

Reflexive Conditionals

A	A \rightarrow A		
T	T	T	T
F	F	T	F

A Surprising One

A	B	$(A \rightarrow B) \vee (B \rightarrow A)$						
T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	F	T	F	F	T	F	T	T
F	T	F	T	T	T	T	F	F
F	F	F	T	F	T	F	T	F

Tautologies and Logical Truth

- All tautologies are logical truths.
- But the converse isn't true - some logical truths are not tautologies.
- E.g., If Brian is necessarily a human, then Brian is a human.

Validity

We can also use truth tables to check for properties of arguments, and in particular to check for validity.

Truth Tables and Validity

- An argument is (truth-functionally) valid if (and only if) every line on the truth table where all the premises are T, the conclusion is T as well.

Truth Tables and Validity

- An argument is (truth-functionally) valid if (and only if) every line on the truth table where all the premises are T, the conclusion is T as well.
- Equivalently, an argument is invalid if there is a line where the premises are T and the conclusion F, and valid otherwise.

Example of Invalidity

The argument A , therefore $A \wedge B$ is invalid because of the second line.

A	B	A	A	\wedge	B
T	T	T	T	T	T
T	F	T	T	F	F
F	T	F	F	F	T
F	F	F	F	F	F

Another Invalidity Example

Note that there are several lines with **T** premises and conclusion. But the argument $A \rightarrow B$, so $A \rightarrow C$ is invalid because of line 2.

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

Hypothetical Syllogism

On the other hand the argument from $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$ to $A \rightarrow C$ is valid.

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

For Next Time

We'll talk about how to build more complicated truth tables.