

Calculating Truth Conditions

Scott Martin

January 30, 2012

- Truth tables let us determine the truth value of the propositions connected by a given connective.
- By repeatedly applying truth tables to connectives and the propositions they connect, we can calculate the truth conditions of an arbitrarily complex sentence of PL.

Example Calculation

Example 1

We start with a simple case of a binary connective between two atomic sentences of PL.

$$(\neg A) \wedge B \quad (1)$$

Example Calculation

Example 1

We start with a simple case of a binary connective between two atomic sentences of PL.

$$(\neg A) \wedge B \quad (1)$$

We use Table 1 to calculate the truth conditions of (1). The truth values for the main connective \wedge are in boldface.

$$\underline{\begin{array}{cc|cc} A & B & (\neg A) & \wedge & B \end{array}}$$

Example Calculation

Example 1

We start with a simple case of a binary connective between two atomic sentences of PL.

$$(\neg A) \wedge B \quad (1)$$

We use Table 1 to calculate the truth conditions of (1). The truth values for the main connective \wedge are in boldface.

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

Example Calculation

Example 1

We start with a simple case of a binary connective between two atomic sentences of PL.

$$(\neg A) \wedge B \quad (1)$$

We use Table 1 to calculate the truth conditions of (1). The truth values for the main connective \wedge are in boldface.

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

Example Calculation

Example 1

We start with a simple case of a binary connective between two atomic sentences of PL.

$$(\neg A) \wedge B \quad (1)$$

We use Table 1 to calculate the truth conditions of (1). The truth values for the main connective \wedge are in boldface.

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	$(\neg A)$	\wedge	<i>B</i>
T	T	F	F	
T	F	F	F	
F	T	T	T	

Example Calculation

Example 1

We start with a simple case of a binary connective between two atomic sentences of PL.

$$(\neg A) \wedge B \quad (1)$$

We use Table 1 to calculate the truth conditions of (1). The truth values for the main connective \wedge are in boldface.

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	$(\neg A)$	\wedge	<i>B</i>
T	T	F	F	
T	F	F	F	
F	T	T	T	
F	F	T	F	

Table 1: Truth condition calculation for (1).

Example Calculation Explained

- On the left side of the line are the truth assignments for all the atomic propositions contain within (1), namely A and B .

Example Calculation Explained

- On the left side of the line are the truth assignments for all the atomic propositions contain within (1), namely A and B .
- On the right side of the line, we write beneath each connected proposition (namely $\neg A$ and $(\neg A) \wedge B$) what its truth value would be given the calculated truth values of the propositions it connects.

Example Calculation Explained

- On the left side of the line are the truth assignments for all the atomic propositions contain within (1), namely A and B .
- On the right side of the line, we write beneath each connected proposition (namely $\neg A$ and $(\neg A) \wedge B$) what its truth value would be given the calculated truth values of the propositions it connects.
- For example, the second row beneath $\neg A$ contains an F because that's what the truth table for negation says the value of $\neg A$ is under a truth assignment that makes A true.

Example Calculation Explained

- On the left side of the line are the truth assignments for all the atomic propositions contain within (1), namely A and B .
- On the right side of the line, we write beneath each connected proposition (namely $\neg A$ and $(\neg A) \wedge B$) what its truth value would be given the calculated truth values of the propositions it connects.
- For example, the second row beneath $\neg A$ contains an F because that's what the truth table for negation says the value of $\neg A$ is under a truth assignment that makes A true.
- Similarly, the first row under \wedge contains an F because one of the conjuncts of $(\neg A) \wedge B$ (namely, $\neg A$) is false under the assignment on the first row, making $(\neg A) \wedge B$ false under that assignment as the truth table for \wedge says.

Some Things to Notice

- Notice that, in Example 1, the entire proposition $(\neg A) \wedge B$ is only true in the third row, the truth assignment with A false and B true.

Some Things to Notice

- Notice that, in Example 1, the entire proposition $(\neg A) \wedge B$ is only true in the third row, the truth assignment with A false and B true.
- Since (1) is sometimes false and sometimes true, depending on the truth assignment chosen, it is called a **contingent** proposition.

Some Things to Notice

- Notice that, in Example 1, the entire proposition $(\neg A) \wedge B$ is only true in the third row, the truth assignment with A false and B true.
- Since (1) is sometimes false and sometimes true, depending on the truth assignment chosen, it is called a **contingent** proposition.
- Some sentences (e.g. $A \vee \neg A$ and $A \rightarrow A$) are true under *every* truth assignment; such sentences are said to express a **tautology** or **logical truth**.

Some Things to Notice

- Notice that, in Example 1, the entire proposition $(\neg A) \wedge B$ is only true in the third row, the truth assignment with A false and B true.
- Since (1) is sometimes false and sometimes true, depending on the truth assignment chosen, it is called a **contingent** proposition.
- Some sentences (e.g. $A \vee \neg A$ and $A \rightarrow A$) are true under *every* truth assignment; such sentences are said to express a **tautology** or **logical truth**.
- Sentences that are false under every assignment are called **contradictions** or **logical falsehoods**, for example the negated tautology $\neg(A \vee \neg A)$.

Some Things to Notice

- Notice that, in Example 1, the entire proposition $(\neg A) \wedge B$ is only true in the third row, the truth assignment with A false and B true.
- Since (1) is sometimes false and sometimes true, depending on the truth assignment chosen, it is called a **contingent** proposition.
- Some sentences (e.g. $A \vee \neg A$ and $A \rightarrow A$) are true under *every* truth assignment; such sentences are said to express a **tautology** or **logical truth**.
- Sentences that are false under every assignment are called **contradictions** or **logical falsehoods**, for example the negated tautology $\neg(A \vee \neg A)$.
- If two or more sentences have the same interpretation on every truth assignment, they are said to be **equivalent**. For example, any two tautologies are equivalent to each other (but *not* equal!).

Some Things to Notice

- Notice that, in Example 1, the entire proposition $(\neg A) \wedge B$ is only true in the third row, the truth assignment with A false and B true.
- Since (1) is sometimes false and sometimes true, depending on the truth assignment chosen, it is called a **contingent** proposition.
- Some sentences (e.g. $A \vee \neg A$ and $A \rightarrow A$) are true under *every* truth assignment; such sentences are said to express a **tautology** or **logical truth**.
- Sentences that are false under every assignment are called **contradictions** or **logical falsehoods**, for example the negated tautology $\neg(A \vee \neg A)$.
- If two or more sentences have the same interpretation on every truth assignment, they are said to be **equivalent**. For example, any two tautologies are equivalent to each other (but *not* equal!).
- If an argument's premises are true in the actual world, we say that the argument is **sound**.

Another Example Calculation

Example 2

A slightly more complex example:

$$(A \wedge (A \rightarrow B)) \rightarrow B \quad (2)$$

Another Example Calculation

Example 2

A slightly more complex example:

$$(A \wedge (A \rightarrow B)) \rightarrow B \quad (2)$$

We proceed as before, using the truth tables for \wedge and \rightarrow :

$$\underline{A \quad B \quad | \quad (A \wedge (A \rightarrow B)) \quad \rightarrow \quad B}$$

Another Example Calculation

Example 2

A slightly more complex example:

$$(A \wedge (A \rightarrow B)) \rightarrow B \quad (2)$$

We proceed as before, using the truth tables for \wedge and \rightarrow :

A	B	$(A \wedge (A \rightarrow B))$	\rightarrow	B
T	T	T	T	T

Another Example Calculation

Example 2

A slightly more complex example:

$$(A \wedge (A \rightarrow B)) \rightarrow B \quad (2)$$

We proceed as before, using the truth tables for \wedge and \rightarrow :

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

Another Example Calculation

Example 2

A slightly more complex example:

$$(A \wedge (A \rightarrow B)) \rightarrow B \quad (2)$$

We proceed as before, using the truth tables for \wedge and \rightarrow :

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

Another Example Calculation

Example 2

A slightly more complex example:

$$(A \wedge (A \rightarrow B)) \rightarrow B \quad (2)$$

We proceed as before, using the truth tables for \wedge and \rightarrow :

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

Table 2: Truth condition calculation for (2).

Another Example Calculation

Example 2

A slightly more complex example:

$$(A \wedge (A \rightarrow B)) \rightarrow B \quad (2)$$

We proceed as before, using the truth tables for \wedge and \rightarrow :

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

Table 2: Truth condition calculation for (2).

What is another name for the class of sentences that (2) belongs to?

Exercises I

Problem 1

For each of the following sentences of PL, say what the main connective is:

- a $\neg(A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C)$
- b $(A \wedge B) \leftrightarrow C$
- c $\neg(\neg A \wedge \neg B)$
- d $(\neg A \wedge \neg B)$
- e $\neg(B \rightarrow (A \vee \neg C))$
- f $(\neg B \rightarrow (A \vee \neg C))$
- g $\neg A \rightarrow (B \wedge (\neg C \leftrightarrow D))$

Exercises II

Problem 2

Construct truth tables that show that de Morgan's laws are indeed tautologies:

a $\neg(A \wedge B) \leftrightarrow ((\neg A) \vee (\neg B))$

b $\neg(A \vee B) \leftrightarrow ((\neg A) \wedge (\neg B))$

Problem 3

Let φ and ψ be equivalent propositions. What do we know about the interpretation of the sentence $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$?

Exercises III

Problem 4

Construct truth tables for the following two sentences:

- a $A \rightarrow B$
- b $(\neg B) \rightarrow (\neg A)$

Given the truth tables you constructed, how are these sentences related?

Problem 5

Let S be a sound argument. What do we know about the truth value of the conclusion(s) of S ?