# Lecture 5

## Philosophy 109

Caley Howland

September 25, 2017

# Translation to TFL

- Sentences with no connectives are easy to translate or symbolize ($\mapsto$):
  - It is cold $\mapsto C$
  - It is rainy $\mapsto R$
  - It is sunny $\mapsto S$
- The trick when symbolizing an atomic sentence is to:
  - Use a different letter for each sentence
  - Use the same letter whenever the same sentence reappears.

# Translation to TFL

- Sentences with just one sentential connective are also pretty easy:
  - It is cold and rainy $\mapsto C \wedge R$ [Notice the two atomic letters]
  - If it is cold then it's rainy $\mapsto C \rightarrow R$
- Sentences with more than one connective can become trickier.
  - Either it is sunny or it is cold and rainy $\mapsto S \vee (C \wedge R)$.
  - Notice that $(S \vee C) \wedge R$ would be incorrect.

# Translation to TFL

- The goal is to give the most precise (and fine-grained) TFL rendering you can, and try to come as close as possible to the meaning of the original.
- This week we will focus on translations.
  - For this purpose we will only touch on the meanings of the terms.
- Then the following week we will learn more about the meaning, or semantics, of sentential logic.
- After that, we will be in a position to evaluate arguments for sentential validity.

# A Two Stage Process

- Sometimes, we will need to translate somewhat complicated sentences.
- It is useful to go through two separate stages:

Stage 1 Replace all basic sentences (explicit or implicit) with atomic letters. Result: a sentence of "Logish", halfway between the two.

Stage 2 Replace the remaining English connectives with their TFL symbols, and appropriately group them together with parentheses.

# Examples

| English | "Logish" | TFL |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | | |

# Examples

| English | "Logish" | TFL |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |

# Examples

| English | "Logish" | TFL |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | | |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | |

# Examples

| English | "Logish" | TFL |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | $S \rightarrow A$ |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | $S \rightarrow A$ |
| Snow is white, and the sky is blue | | |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | $S \rightarrow A$ |
| Snow is white, and the sky is blue | W and B | |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | $S \rightarrow A$ |
| Snow is white, and the sky is blue | W and B | $W \wedge B$ |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | $S \rightarrow A$ |
| Snow is white, and the sky is blue | W and B | $W \wedge B$ |
| It is not the case that Emily Bronte wrote Jane Eyre | | |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | $S \rightarrow A$ |
| Snow is white, and the sky is blue | W and B | $W \wedge B$ |
| It is not the case that Emily Bronte wrote Jane Eyre | It's not the case the E | |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | $S \rightarrow A$ |
| Snow is white, and the sky is blue | W and B | $W \wedge B$ |
| It is not the case that Emily Bronte wrote Jane Eyre | It's not the case the E | $\neg E$ |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | $S \rightarrow A$ |
| Snow is white, and the sky is blue | W and B | $W \wedge B$ |
| It is not the case that Emily Bronte wrote Jane Eyre | It's not the case the E | $\neg E$ |
| Juan is a bachelor if and only if he's unmarried | | |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | $S \rightarrow A$ |
| Snow is white, and the sky is blue | W and B | $W \wedge B$ |
| It is not the case that Emily Bronte wrote Jane Eyre | It's not the case the E | $\neg E$ |
| Juan is a bachelor if and only if he's unmarried | B if and only if not M | |

# Examples

| **English** | **"Logish"** | **TFL** |
|---|---|---|
| Either it's raining or it's snowing | Either R or S | $R \vee S$ |
| If Microsoft introduces a new tablet, then Apple will also. | If S then A | $S \rightarrow A$ |
| Snow is white, and the sky is blue | W and B | $W \wedge B$ |
| It is not the case that Emily Bronte wrote Jane Eyre | It's not the case the E | $\neg E$ |
| Juan is a bachelor if and only if he's unmarried | B if and only if not M | $B \leftrightarrow M$ |

# $\wedge$

- Use $\wedge$ to symbolize many different English Words

# $\wedge$

- Use $\wedge$ to symbolize many different English Words
  - *and, yet, but, however, moreover, furthermore, in addition, both, on the other hand, etc.*

# $\wedge$

- Use $\wedge$ to symbolize many different English Words
  - *and, yet, but, however, moreover, furthermore, in addition, both, on the other hand, etc.*
- Lots of these words have more to their meanings than simply *and*.

# $\wedge$

- Use $\wedge$ to symbolize many different English Words
  - *and, yet, but, however, moreover, furthermore, in addition, both, on the other hand, etc.*
- Lots of these words have more to their meanings than simply *and*.
  - For instance, "but" adds the idea that there is a contrast between the two conjuncts.

# $\wedge$

- Use $\wedge$ to symbolize many different English Words
  - *and, yet, but, however, moreover, furthermore, in addition, both, on the other hand, etc.*
- Lots of these words have more to their meanings than simply *and*.
  - For instance, "but" adds the idea that there is a contrast between the two conjuncts.
  - The following two sentences have different English meanings, but the same TFL translation.

# $\wedge$

- Use $\wedge$ to symbolize many different English Words
  - *and, yet, but, however, moreover, furthermore, in addition, both, on the other hand, etc.*
- Lots of these words have more to their meanings than simply *and*.
  - For instance, "but" adds the idea that there is a contrast between the two conjuncts.
  - The following two sentences have different English meanings, but the same TFL translation.
    - ★ "John is left handed **and** John is smart" $\mapsto L \wedge S$

# $\wedge$

- Use $\wedge$ to symbolize many different English Words
  - *and, yet, but, however, moreover, furthermore, in addition, both, on the other hand, etc.*
- Lots of these words have more to their meanings than simply *and*.
  - For instance, "but" adds the idea that there is a contrast between the two conjuncts.
  - The following two sentences have different English meanings, but the same TFL translation.
    - ★ "John is left handed **and** John is smart" $\mapsto L \wedge S$
    - ★ "John is left handed **but** John is smart"$\mapsto L \wedge S$

# $\wedge$

- Use $\wedge$ to symbolize many different English Words
  - *and, yet, but, however, moreover, furthermore, in addition, both, on the other hand, etc.*
- Lots of these words have more to their meanings than simply *and*.
  - For instance, "but" adds the idea that there is a contrast between the two conjuncts.
  - The following two sentences have different English meanings, but the same TFL translation.
    - ★ "John is left handed **and** John is smart" $\mapsto L \wedge S$
    - ★ "John is left handed **but** John is smart" $\mapsto L \wedge S$
  - Only one of them implies something insulting about left-handed people.

# Limitations of TFL

- TFL is limited in what aspects it captures of language.

# Limitations of TFL

- TFL is limited in what aspects it captures of language.
- When translating, we won't be trying to capture all of the meaning.

# Limitations of TFL

- TFL is limited in what aspects it captures of language.
- When translating, we won't be trying to capture all of the meaning.
- Just some of the most important and basic logical structure.

# Limitations of TFL

- TFL is limited in what aspects it captures of language.
- When translating, we won't be trying to capture all of the meaning.
- Just some of the most important and basic logical structure.
- More advanced logics capture more of the meaning.

# Limitations of TFL

- TFL is limited in what aspects it captures of language.
- When translating, we won't be trying to capture all of the meaning.
- Just some of the most important and basic logical structure.
- More advanced logics capture more of the meaning.
- But so far, no formal language has been successful in capturing all of the meaning of natural languages.

# Limitations of TFL

- TFL is limited in what aspects it captures of language.
- When translating, we won't be trying to capture all of the meaning.
- Just some of the most important and basic logical structure.
- More advanced logics capture more of the meaning.
- But so far, no formal language has been successful in capturing all of the meaning of natural languages.
- Which is good news! There is still work for research logicians!

# $\vee$

- Happily, $\vee$ is more straightforward

# $\vee$

- Happily, $\vee$ is more straightforward
- Generally, you will see "or", or "Either..., or" somewhere in the English sentence.

# $\vee$

- Happily, $\vee$ is more straightforward
- Generally, you will see "or", or "Either..., or" somewhere in the English sentence.
- The tricky word that can be translated into disjunction is *unless*

# $\vee$

- Happily, $\vee$ is more straightforward
- Generally, you will see "or", or "Either..., or" somewhere in the English sentence.
- The tricky word that can be translated into disjunction is *unless*
  - "$p$ unless $q$" means $\neg q \rightarrow p$. But, as we will prove later, this is equivalent (means the same) as $p \vee q$.

# $\rightarrow$

- All of the following are translated as $p \rightarrow q$

# $\rightarrow$

- All of the following are translated as $p \rightarrow q$
  - If $p$ then $q$.

# $\rightarrow$

- All of the following are translated as $p \rightarrow q$
  - If $p$ then $q$.
  - $p$ implies $q$.

# $\rightarrow$

- All of the following are translated as $p \rightarrow q$
  - If $p$ then $q$.
  - $p$ implies $q$.
  - $p$ only if $q$. [This one is tricky]

# $\rightarrow$

- All of the following are translated as $p \rightarrow q$
  - If $p$ then $q$.
  - $p$ implies $q$.
  - $p$ only if $q$. [This one is tricky]
  - $q$ if $p$.

# $\rightarrow$

- All of the following are translated as $p \rightarrow q$
  - If $p$ then $q$.
  - $p$ implies $q$.
  - $p$ only if $q$. [This one is tricky]
  - $q$ if $p$.
  - $p$ is sufficient for $q$.

# $\rightarrow$

- All of the following are translated as $p \rightarrow q$
  - If $p$ then $q$.
  - $p$ implies $q$.
  - $p$ only if $q$. [This one is tricky]
  - $q$ if $p$.
  - $p$ is sufficient for $q$.
  - $q$ is necessary for $p$.

# $\rightarrow$

- All of the following are translated as $p \rightarrow q$
  - If $p$ then $q$.
  - $p$ implies $q$.
  - $p$ only if $q$. [This one is tricky]
  - $q$ if $p$.
  - $p$ is sufficient for $q$.
  - $q$ is necessary for $p$.
  - $q$ provided $p$.

# $\rightarrow$

- All of the following are translated as $p \rightarrow q$
  - If $p$ then $q$.
  - $p$ implies $q$.
  - $p$ only if $q$. [This one is tricky]
  - $q$ if $p$.
  - $p$ is sufficient for $q$.
  - $q$ is necessary for $p$.
  - $q$ provided $p$.
  - $q$ whenever $p$.

# $\rightarrow$

- All of the following are translated as $p \rightarrow q$
  - If $p$ then $q$.
  - $p$ implies $q$.
  - $p$ only if $q$. [This one is tricky]
  - $q$ if $p$.
  - $p$ is sufficient for $q$.
  - $q$ is necessary for $p$.
  - $q$ provided $p$.
  - $q$ whenever $p$.
  - When $p$, $q$.

# $\rightarrow$

- "If $p$ then $q$", "$q$ if $p$", and "$p \rightarrow q$" are all ways of saying "$p$ is a *sufficient* condition for $q$"
  - This is equivalent to $q$ being a *necessary* condition for $p$.

# $\rightarrow$

- "If $p$ then $q$", "$q$ if $p$", and "$p \rightarrow q$" are all ways of saying "$p$ is a *sufficient* condition for $q$"
  - This is equivalent to $q$ being a *necessary* condition for $p$.
- "$q$ only if $p$", symbolized by $q \rightarrow p$, says that $p$ is a necessary condition for $q$.
  - Again, this is equivalent to $q$ being a *sufficient* condition for $p$.

$\rightarrow$

- Don't confuse necessary conditions for sufficient conditions.

# $\rightarrow$

- Don't confuse necessary conditions for sufficient conditions.
  - The antecedent of a conditional is always the sufficient condition for the consequent.

# $\rightarrow$

- Don't confuse necessary conditions for sufficient conditions.
  - The antecedent of a conditional is always the sufficient condition for the consequent.
  - the consequent is always a necessary condition for the antecedent.

# $\rightarrow$

- Don't confuse necessary conditions for sufficient conditions.
  - The antecedent of a conditional is always the sufficient condition for the consequent.
  - the consequent is always a necessary condition for the antecedent.
  - Remember: $S \rightarrow N$.

# $\rightarrow$

- Don't confuse necessary conditions for sufficient conditions.
  - The antecedent of a conditional is always the sufficient condition for the consequent.
  - the consequent is always a necessary condition for the antecedent.
  - Remember: $S \rightarrow N$.
- Your tv will work *only if* it is plugged in (True)

# $\rightarrow$

- Don't confuse necessary conditions for sufficient conditions.
  - The antecedent of a conditional is always the sufficient condition for the consequent.
  - the consequent is always a necessary condition for the antecedent.
  - Remember: $S \rightarrow N$.
- Your tv will work *only if* it is plugged in (True)
- Your tv will work *if* it is plugged in (False, might be broken)

# $\rightarrow$

- Don't confuse necessary conditions for sufficient conditions.
  - The antecedent of a conditional is always the sufficient condition for the consequent.
  - the consequent is always a necessary condition for the antecedent.
  - Remember: $S \rightarrow N$.
- Your tv will work *only if* it is plugged in (True)
- Your tv will work *if* it is plugged in (False, might be broken)
- Practice is necessary for becoming a great athlete, but it's not sufficient.

# $\leftrightarrow$

- $p \leftrightarrow q$ is equivalent to $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$
  - So $p$ is a necessary and sufficient condition for $q$, and vice versa.
- Translated as $p \leftrightarrow q$
  - $p$ if and only if $q$
  - $p$ just in case $q$
  - $p$ just when $q$
  - $p$ is necessary and sufficient $q$
  - $p$ when and only when $q$

# Connectives of TFL

| **Symbol** | Sentence | **Name/Function** | **Translation** |
|---|---|---|---|
| $\neg$ | $\neg p$ | negation | not |
| $\wedge$ | $p \wedge q$ | conjunction | and |
| $\vee$ | $p \vee q$ | disjunction | or |
| $\rightarrow$ | $p \rightarrow q$ | conditional | If..., then... |
| $\leftrightarrow$ | $p \leftrightarrow q$ | biconditional | if and only if |

# Grouping Connectives

## Scope

Whenever three or more TFL sentence letters appear in an TFL sentence, parentheses must be used to indicate the *scope* of The connectives.

## Scope: Definition

Scope of a connective: Which sentences are connected by the connective.

- The scope of two place connectives will always be two sentences.
- The scope of negation is always the unit to the right.

# Scope

- $A \wedge B \vee C$ is not an TFL sentence.

# Scope

- $A \wedge B \vee C$ is not an TFL sentence.
- $(A \wedge B) \vee C$ and $A \wedge (B \vee C)$ are different sentences with different meanings.

# Scope

- $A \wedge B \vee C$ is not an TFL sentence.
- $(A \wedge B) \vee C$ and $A \wedge (B \vee C)$ are different sentences with different meanings.
- But we must always group expressions with 3 or more sentence letters even when the meaning is the same:

# Scope

- $A \wedge B \vee C$ is not an TFL sentence.
- $(A \wedge B) \vee C$ and $A \wedge (B \vee C)$ are different sentences with different meanings.
- But we must always group expressions with 3 or more sentence letters even when the meaning is the same:
  - $(A \vee B) \vee C$ and $A \vee (B \vee C)$ mean the same thing, but we have to choose one (doesn't matter which).

# Scope

- $A \wedge B \vee C$ is not an TFL sentence.
- $(A \wedge B) \vee C$ and $A \wedge (B \vee C)$ are different sentences with different meanings.
- But we must always group expressions with 3 or more sentence letters even when the meaning is the same:
  - $(A \vee B) \vee C$ and $A \vee (B \vee C)$ mean the same thing, but we have to choose one (doesn't matter which).
  - Similarly for $(A \wedge B) \wedge C$ and $A \wedge (B \wedge C)$

# Negation

- "$\neg p$" just means *not* $p$, or *it's not the case that* $p$.

# Negation

- "$\neg p$" just means *not p*, or *it's not the case that p*.
- The $\neg$ operates only on the *unit* immediately following it.

# Negation

- "$\neg p$" just means *not* $p$, or *it's not the case that* $p$.
- The $\neg$ operates only on the *unit* immediately following it.
  - $\neg K \vee M$, $\neg$ only affects $K$.

# Negation

- "$\neg p$" just means *not* $p$, or *it's not the case that* $p$.
- The $\neg$ operates only on the *unit* immediately following it.
  - $\neg K \vee M$, $\neg$ only affects $K$.
  - $\neg(K \vee M)$, $\neg$ affects the entire disjunction $K \vee M$

# Negation

- "$\neg p$" just means *not* $p$, or *it's not the case that* $p$.
- The $\neg$ operates only on the *unit* immediately following it.
  - $\neg K \vee M$, $\neg$ only affects $K$.
  - $\neg(K \vee M)$, $\neg$ affects the entire disjunction $K \vee M$
- The Logish sentence "It's not the case that $K$ or $M$" is ambiguous between the last two.

# Negation

- "$\neg p$" just means *not* $p$, or *it's not the case that* $p$.
- The $\neg$ operates only on the *unit* immediately following it.
  - $\neg K \vee M$, $\neg$ only affects $K$.
  - $\neg(K \vee M)$, $\neg$ affects the entire disjunction $K \vee M$
- The Logish sentence "It's not the case that $K$ or $M$" is ambiguous between the last two.
  - Usually, we will use it to mean the former, so default to that.

# Negation

- Translate *Not both S and T as*:

# Negation

- Translate *Not both S and T as*:
  - $\neg(S \wedge T)$.

# Negation

- Translate *Not both S and T as*:
  - $\neg(S \wedge T)$.
    - ⋆ Means the same as $\neg S \vee \neg T$, not $\neg S \wedge \neg T$

# Negation

- Translate *Not both S and T as*:
  - $\neg(S \wedge T)$.
    - ⋆ Means the same as $\neg S \vee \neg T$, not $\neg S \wedge \neg T$
- Translate *Not either S or T as*:

# Negation

- Translate *Not both S and T as*:
  - $\neg(S \wedge T)$.
    - ⋆ Means the same as $\neg S \vee \neg T$, not $\neg S \wedge \neg T$
- Translate *Not either S or T as*:
  - $\neg(S \vee T)$.

# Negation

- Translate *Not both S and T as*:
  - $\neg(S \wedge T)$.
    - ⋆ Means the same as $\neg S \vee \neg T$, not $\neg S \wedge \neg T$
- Translate *Not either S or T as*:
  - $\neg(S \vee T)$.
    - ⋆ Means the same as $\neg S \wedge \neg T$, not $\neg S \vee \neg T$

# In Class Assignment

Translate these

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.
- Both Shell and Exxon are not polluters.
- Not either Shell or Exxon is a polluter.
- Neither Shell nor Exxon is a polluter.
- Either Shell or Exxon is not a polluter.

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.
  - $\neg(S \wedge E)$

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.
  - $\neg(S \wedge E)$
- Both Shell and Exxon are not polluters.

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.
  - $\neg(S \wedge E)$
- Both Shell and Exxon are not polluters.
  - $\neg S \wedge \neg E$

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.
  - $\neg(S \wedge E)$
- Both Shell and Exxon are not polluters.
  - $\neg S \wedge \neg E$
- Not either Shell or Exxon is a polluter.

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.
  - $\neg(S \wedge E)$
- Both Shell and Exxon are not polluters.
  - $\neg S \wedge \neg E$
- Not either Shell or Exxon is a polluter.
  - $\neg(S \vee E)$

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.
  - $\neg(S \wedge E)$
- Both Shell and Exxon are not polluters.
  - $\neg S \wedge \neg E$
- Not either Shell or Exxon is a polluter.
  - $\neg(S \vee E)$
- Neither Shell nor Exxon is a polluter.

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.
  - $\neg(S \wedge E)$
- Both Shell and Exxon are not polluters.
  - $\neg S \wedge \neg E$
- Not either Shell or Exxon is a polluter.
  - $\neg(S \vee E)$
- Neither Shell nor Exxon is a polluter.
  - $\neg S \wedge \neg E$

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.
  - $\neg(S \wedge E)$
- Both Shell and Exxon are not polluters.
  - $\neg S \wedge \neg E$
- Not either Shell or Exxon is a polluter.
  - $\neg(S \vee E)$
- Neither Shell nor Exxon is a polluter.
  - $\neg S \wedge \neg E$
- Either Shell or Exxon is not a polluter.

- Shell is not a polluter, but Exxon is.
  - $\neg S \wedge E$
- Not both Shell and Exxon are polluters.
  - $\neg(S \wedge E)$
- Both Shell and Exxon are not polluters.
  - $\neg S \wedge \neg E$
- Not either Shell or Exxon is a polluter.
  - $\neg(S \vee E)$
- Neither Shell nor Exxon is a polluter.
  - $\neg S \wedge \neg E$
- Either Shell or Exxon is not a polluter.
  - $\neg S \vee \neg E$