## Math 69

Winter 2009
Monday, January 5
Propositional Logic and Truth Tables

Here are some propositional connectives.
Not: $\neg$
And: $\wedge$
Or: V
If . . . then: $\rightarrow$
If and only if: $\leftrightarrow$
One way to give the meaning of a propositional connective is via a truth table, such as the following truth table for $\wedge$, which gives the truth value of $(P \wedge Q)$ depending on the truth values of $P$ and $Q$ :

| $P$ | $Q$ | $\\|$ | $(P \wedge Q)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $==$ | $==$ | $\\|$ | $=====$ |
| $T$ | $T$ | $\\|$ | $T$ |
| $T$ | $F$ | $\\|$ | $F$ |
| $F$ | $T$ | $\\|$ | $F$ |
| $F$ | $F$ | $\\|$ | $F$ |

Try writing down truth tables for $\vee$ and for $\rightarrow$.

A second way to give the meaning of a propositional connective is via a Boolean function, such as the following Boolean function $V a l_{\wedge}$ for $\wedge$, which takes the truth values of $P$ and $Q$ as arguments, and gives the truth value of $(P \wedge Q)$ as values:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\operatorname{Val}_{\wedge}(T, T)=T \\
\operatorname{Val}_{\wedge}(T, F)=\operatorname{Val}_{\wedge}(F, T)=\operatorname{Val}_{\wedge}(F, F)=F .
\end{gathered}
$$

Try writing down Boolean functions for $\neg$ and $\leftrightarrow$.

We can define a connective to be a Boolean function. How many possible binary (two-place) connectives are there:

- If we include all two-place Boolean functions?
- If we include only those two-place Boolean functions whose value depends on both arguments? For example, we would not include the Boolean function $G$ given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G(T, T)=G(T, F)=T \\
& G(F, T)=G(F, F)=F,
\end{aligned}
$$

as its value depends only on the first argument.

Translate the following sentences into the language of sentential logic. Begin by assigning sentence symbols to the simple declarative statements that are combined to produce these more complex sentences. This sometimes calls for exercising some judgment; the relevant simple declarative sentences may not appear word-for-word as parts of the English sentence, and the English may be ambiguous. For example:

English sentence: The exam will be on Monday or Tuesday.
Sentence components:
$M$ : The exam will be on Monday.
$T$ : The exam will be on Tuesday.
Sentence translation:
$((M \vee T) \wedge(\neg(M \wedge T)))$
Here I have assumed from context that the English "or" is to be interpreted as exclusive. Since the sentential logic " $\vee$ " is translated as inclusive or, I had to use a translation into sentential logic that does not exactly mirror the syntax of the English sentence.

An alternative translation, equivalent as far as truth value goes (see if you can convince yourself of this) but even farther from the original English syntax, is:

$$
(M \leftrightarrow(\neg T))
$$

Another, perhaps closer to the original English syntax, is: $((M \wedge(\neg T)) \vee(T \wedge(\neg M)))$

On the next page are sentences to translate. All use the same simple component sentences:
$x$ is prime.
$x$ is even.
$x$ equals 2 .
You can begin by assigning sentence symbols to these components.
$(1)$,$x is even but x$ is not equal to 2 .
(2.) If $x$ is prime then $x$ is not even.
(3.) $x$ is not even if $x$ is prime.
(4.) $x$ is prime only if $x$ is not even or $x$ is equal to 2 .
(5.) $x$ is an even prime exactly in case $x$ is equal to 2 .

A language $\mathcal{L}$ for propositional logic is defined as follows:
The symbols of the language are the following:
Infinitely many propositional symbols $A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}, \ldots$,
Connectives $\neg, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$, and $\leftrightarrow$
Punctuation symbols ( and ).
Any finite sequence of symbols is an expression.
The (well-formed) formulas, or wff's of the language are the expressions formed according to the following rules:

1. Any propositional symbol is a wff.
2. If $\alpha$ is a wff, so is $(\neg \alpha)$.
3. If $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are wffs, so is $(\alpha * \beta)$, where $*$ is any one of the binary connective symbols, $\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$, or $\leftrightarrow$.
Formally, there are two different ways of defining the set of well-formed formulas.
A. An expression $\alpha$ is a formula iff there is a finite sequence of expressions $\left(\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right)$ such that, for each $i$, one of:
4. $\alpha_{i}$ is a sentence symbol;
5. $\alpha_{i}=\left(\neg \alpha_{j}\right)$ for some $j<i$;
6. $\alpha_{i}=\left(\alpha_{j} * \alpha_{k}\right)$ for some $i, j<k$, where $*$ is any one of the binary connective symbols, $\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$, or $\leftrightarrow$;
and $\alpha_{n}=\alpha$.
B. An expression $\alpha$ is a formula iff $\alpha$ is in every set $X$ of expressions such that:
7. every sentence symbol is in $X$.;
8. whenever $\beta$ is in $X$, then $(\neg \beta)$ is in $X$;
9. whenever $\beta$ and $\gamma$ are in $X$, then $(\beta * \gamma)$ is in $X$, where $*$ is any one of the binary connective symbols, $\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$, or $\leftrightarrow$.

How could we show that A and B define exactly the same collections of well-formed formulas? (For any expression $\alpha$, we must show that $\alpha$ is a wff according to definition A if and only if $\alpha$ is a wff according to definition B.)

Finally, for future reference, here is the inductive method for proving that some proposition $\varphi(\alpha)$ holds for all wff's $\alpha$ :

1. (Base Step) Prove that $\varphi(A)$ holds for every sentence symbol $A$.
2. (Inductive Step for $\neg)$ Prove that if $\varphi(\alpha)$ holds then $\varphi((\neg \alpha))$ holds.
3. (Inductive Step for $\wedge)$ Prove that if $\varphi(\alpha)$ and $\varphi(\beta)$ hold, then $\varphi((\alpha \wedge \beta))$ holds.
4. (Inductive Step for $\vee$ ) Prove that if $\varphi(\alpha)$ and $\varphi(\beta)$ hold, then $\varphi((\alpha \vee \beta))$ holds.
5. (Inductive Step for $\rightarrow$ ) Prove that if $\varphi(\alpha)$ and $\varphi(\beta)$ hold, then $\varphi((\alpha \rightarrow$ $\beta$ ) holds.
6. (Inductive Step for $\leftrightarrow)$ Prove that if $\varphi(\alpha)$ and $\varphi(\beta)$ hold, then $\varphi((\alpha \leftrightarrow$ $\beta)$ ) holds.

For some purposes, the last four inductive steps can be combined into a single inductive step for binary connectives: Prove that if $\varphi(\alpha)$ and $\varphi(\beta)$ hold, then $\varphi((\alpha * \beta))$ holds, where $*$ is any binary connective.

Example: Prove that no wff has length 2. (The length of a wff is the number of symbols in it. See exercise 2 of Section 1.1; this proof is an ingredient in the solution.)

We show by induction that the length of every wff $\alpha$ is either equal to 1 or greater than or equal to 4 .

Base Step: If $\alpha$ is a sentence symbol $A$, then the length of $\alpha$ is 1 .
Inductive Step for $\neg$ : If $\alpha$ has length $n$, where $n=1$ or $n \geq 4$, then $(\neg \alpha)$ has length $n+3 \geq 4$.

Inductive Step for Binary Connectives: If $\alpha$ has length $n$, where $n=1$ or $n \geq 4$, and $\beta$ has length $m$, where $m=1$ or $m \geq 4$, then if $*$ is any binary connective, $(\alpha * \beta)$ has length $m+n+3 \geq 5$.

This completes the proof.

