

# LOGIC FOR PHILOSOPHY

## 1 Chapter one

## 2 Chapter two

### 2.1 Disjunction and equivalence

(a) We need to show that for any wff  $\varphi$  and  $\chi$ , and any PL-interpretation  $\mathcal{I}$ ,  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi \vee \chi)=1$  iff either  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi)=1$  or  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\chi)=1$ . We must first notice that  $(\varphi \vee \chi)$  is just shorthand for  $(\sim \varphi \rightarrow \chi)$ , so that what we need to show is that for any wff  $\varphi$  and  $\chi$ , and any PL-interpretation  $\mathcal{I}$ ,  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\sim \varphi \rightarrow \chi)=1$  iff either  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi)=1$  or  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\chi)=1$ . This can be done by showing, first, that, if  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\sim \varphi \rightarrow \chi)=1$  then  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi)=1$  or  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\chi)=1$ , and subsequently that, if  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi)=1$  or  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\chi)=1$  then  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\sim \varphi \rightarrow \chi)=1$ .

Let us start by proving that if  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\sim \varphi \rightarrow \chi)=1$ , then either  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi)=1$  or  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\chi)=1$ . We first assume that  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\sim \varphi \rightarrow \chi)=1$ . Recall that we have defined the valuation function for  $\rightarrow$  as follows:  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\phi \rightarrow \psi)=1$  iff either  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\phi)=0$  or  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\psi)=1$ . Given our assumption, we can therefore say that either  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\sim \varphi)=0$  or  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\chi)=1$ . But then, given the definition for the valuation function for  $\sim$ , which is  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\sim \phi)=1$  iff  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\phi)=0$ , we can say that either  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi)=1$  or  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\chi)=1$ . This is what we wanted to show.

The second stage of the proof requires us to prove that if  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi)=1$  or  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\chi)=1$  then  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\sim \varphi \rightarrow \chi)=1$ . So, let us assume that either  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\varphi)=1$  or  $V_{\mathcal{I}}(\chi)=1$ . By the valuation function for  $\sim$ , we see how our assumption implies that ei-

ther  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim \varphi)=0$  or  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)=1$ . And so, subsequently, by the valuation function for  $\rightarrow$ , we can demonstrate that our assumption implies that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim \varphi \rightarrow \chi)=1$ .  $\square$

**(b)** We need to show that for any wff  $\varphi$  and  $\chi$ , and any PL-interpretation  $\mathcal{J}$ ,  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi \leftrightarrow \chi) = 1$  iff  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) = V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)$ . We begin by noting that  $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$  is shorthand for  $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge (\psi \rightarrow \varphi)$ , and that the latter in its turn is shorthand for  $(\sim (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow \sim (\psi \rightarrow \varphi))$ . This means that what we need to show is that, for any wff  $\varphi$  and  $\chi$ , and any PL-interpretation  $\mathcal{J}$ ,  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim ((\varphi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim (\chi \rightarrow \varphi))) = 1$  iff  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) = V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)$ . This can be done by showing, first that, if  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim ((\varphi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim (\chi \rightarrow \varphi))) = 1$  then  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) = V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)$ , and, subsequently, that if  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) = V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)$ , then  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim ((\varphi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim (\chi \rightarrow \varphi))) = 1$ .

Let us start by proving that if  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim ((\varphi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim (\chi \rightarrow \varphi))) = 1$  then  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) = V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)$ . We proceed by reductio, and so start by assuming that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) \neq V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)$ . This allows us to assume that, say,  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) = 1$  and that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi) = 0$ . Recall that we have defined the valuation function for  $\rightarrow$  as follows:  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) = 1$  iff either  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) = 0$  or  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\psi) = 1$ . The converse of this is that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) = 0$  iff  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) = 1$  and  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\psi) = 0$ . We see that our assumptions about the valuation interpretation for  $\psi$  and  $\chi$  imply that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi \rightarrow \chi) = 0$ . We now introduce the further assumption that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim ((\varphi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim (\chi \rightarrow \varphi))) = 1$ , which is just the antecedent of the conditional we are trying to prove. By the definition of the valuation function of  $\sim$ , we see that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}((\varphi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim (\chi \rightarrow \varphi)) = 0$ . But if we again rely on our definition of the valuation function of  $\rightarrow$ , we can demonstrate that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi \rightarrow \chi) = 1$  (and that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim (\chi \rightarrow \varphi)) = 0$ ). But we have already demonstrated that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi \rightarrow \chi) = 0$ , and so we have a contradiction. This allows us to reject the assumption that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) \neq V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)$ , and so we have shown that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim ((\varphi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim (\chi \rightarrow \varphi))) = 1$  then  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) = V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)$ .

Now we still need to prove that if  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi) = V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)$ , then

$V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim((\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim(\chi \rightarrow \phi))) = 1$ . We assume that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\phi) = V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi)$ , and so can assume that either  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\phi) = 1$  and that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi) = 1$ , or that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\phi) = 0$  and that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi) = 0$ . We proceed in two straightforward stages.

First, we demonstrate that if we assume  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\phi) = 1$  and that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi) = 1$ , it follows that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim((\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim(\chi \rightarrow \phi))) = 1$ . We assume that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\phi) = 1$  and that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi) = 1$ . Using our definitions for the valuation function of  $\rightarrow$  and  $\sim$ , we can say that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\phi \rightarrow \chi) = 1$  and that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim(\chi \rightarrow \phi)) = 0$ . But this implies that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}((\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim(\chi \rightarrow \phi)) = 0$ , which in turn implies that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim((\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim(\chi \rightarrow \phi))) = 1$ . This is the desired result.

Second, we demonstrate that if we assume  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\phi) = 0$  and that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\chi) = 0$ , it equally follows that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim((\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim(\chi \rightarrow \phi))) = 1$ . Again, the valuation function of  $\rightarrow$  and  $\sim$  allow us to say that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\phi \rightarrow \chi) = 1$  and that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim(\chi \rightarrow \phi)) = 0$ . As shown, this implies that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}((\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim(\chi \rightarrow \phi)) = 0$ , which in turn implies that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(\sim((\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \sim(\chi \rightarrow \phi))) = 1$ .  $\square$

### 3 Logical consequence

(a) We need to establish that  $\models [P \wedge (Q \vee R)] \rightarrow [(P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)]$ . We can prove this by reductio. So let  $\mathcal{J}$  be any PL-interpretation, and let us assume that  $V_{\mathcal{J}}((P \wedge (Q \vee R)) \rightarrow ((P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R))) = 0$ . Given our definition of the valuation function  $\rightarrow$ , we can say that (i)  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(P \wedge (Q \vee R)) = 1$ , and that (ii)  $V_{\mathcal{J}}((P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)) = 0$ . Given our definitions of the valuation function  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$ , we can say that (iii)  $\mathcal{J}(P) = 1$  (from (i)), and that (iv)  $V_{\mathcal{J}}(P \wedge Q) = 0$  (from (ii)), and so that (v)  $\mathcal{J}(P) = 0$  (from (ii)). We have now derived a contradiction from our assumption (iii & v), and so  $V_{\mathcal{J}}((P \wedge (Q \vee R)) \rightarrow ((P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R))) = 1$ .

■

---

**(b)** We need to establish that  $(P \leftrightarrow Q) \vee (R \leftrightarrow S) \not\models P \vee R$

**(c)**