

# Philosophy 220

Truth Functional Properties Expressed in terms of  
Consistency

# The semantic concepts of truth-functional logic:

- \* Tautology
- \* Contradiction
- \* Contingency
- \* Entailment
- \* Validity
- \* Equivalence
- \* Consistency

# The concepts of truth-functional logic:

- \* The section of the text pp. 110-113 aims to demonstrate that all of the semantic concepts of truth-functional logic can be explained in terms of consistency.
- \* As it happens, all of the semantic concepts of truth-functional logic can be explained in terms of any of the other semantic concepts of truth-functional logic listed previously.

# Why Consistency?

- \* If all of the other semantic concepts of truth-functional logic can be explained via consistency, then a system that tests for consistency can test for all of the other concepts as well.
- \* We will be replacing truth-tables with a system based on testing for consistency (but that is much easier to learn if you already are very familiar with truth-tables).
- \* This new system, called the ‘semantic tree system’ will be our primary system for determining validity, entailment, equivalency, etc. for the remainder of the course.

# Consistency (Review)

- \* A set of sentences of SL is consistent if and only if there is at least one truth value assignment [of the constituents of the set of sentences] on which all the members of the set are true.

# Contradiction

## Definition

- \* A sentence of SL is a contradiction if and only if it is false on every possible truth-value assignment of its constituents.

## Explained via consistency

- \* A sentence **P** is truth-functionally false if and only if  $\{\mathbf{P}\}$  is truth-functionally inconsistent.
- \* Since inconsistent sets are sets that can never all be true at the same time, and since the unit set of **P** has only one member, it must always be false to be inconsistent.

# Tautology

## Definition

- \* A sentence of SL is a tautology if and only if it is true on every possible truth-value assignment of its constituents.

## Explained via Consistency

- \* A sentence  $P$  is a tautology if and only if  $\{\sim P\}$  is truth-functionally inconsistent.
- \* The only member of any inconsistent set is a contradiction, and the negation of a contradiction is a tautology, so if  $\sim P$  is a contradiction, then  $P$  is a tautology.

# Contingency

## Definition

- \* A sentence of SL is contingent if and only if it is neither a tautology nor a contradiction.

## Explained via consistency

- \* A sentence **P** is truth-functionally indeterminate if and only if both  $\{\sim\mathbf{P}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{P}\}$  are truth-functionally consistent.
- \* If the above are consistent, then **P** is neither a tautology nor a contradiction.



# Equivalence

## Definition

- \* Sentences  $P$  and  $Q$  of SL are equivalent if and only if there is no truth value assignment [for the components of  $P$  and  $Q$ ] on which  $P$  and  $Q$  have different truth-values.

## Explained via consistency

- \* Sentences  $P$  and  $Q$  of SL are equivalent if and only if  $\{\sim(P \equiv Q)\}$  is inconsistent
- \* If  $P$  and  $Q$  have the same truth values,  $P \equiv Q$  is a tautology. That would mean that  $\sim(P \equiv Q)$  would be a contradiction, and so would make for an inconsistent set.

# A new symbol:

- \* To define validity and entailment by means of consistency, it is useful to introduce a new symbol:
- \* '∪' is the union symbol.
- \* The union symbol is used to express the combination of two sets together.
- \* Example:  $\{A, B, C\} \cup \{D\}$  is  $\{A, B, C, D\}$

# Entailment

## Definition

- \* A set  $\Gamma$  of sentences of SL entails a sentence  $P$  if and only if there is no truth-value assignment on which every member of  $\Gamma$  is true and  $P$  is false.

## Explained via Consistency

- \*  $\Gamma \models P$  if and only if  $\Gamma \cup \{\sim P\}$  is truth-functionally inconsistent.
- \* Next slide contains a more detailed rationale...

$\Gamma \models \mathbf{P}$  if and only if  $\Gamma \cup \{\sim\mathbf{P}\}$  is inconsistent.

- \* If the set  $\Gamma$  entails  $\mathbf{P}$ , then there is no truth-value assignment that makes the members of  $\Gamma$  true while  $\mathbf{P}$  is false. That means that whenever the members of  $\Gamma$  are all true,  $\mathbf{P}$  is true also, so  $\Gamma \cup \{\sim\mathbf{P}\}$  would be inconsistent.
- \* Side note: If  $\Gamma$  is inconsistent to begin with, then  $\Gamma \cup \{\sim\mathbf{P}\}$  is still inconsistent, and  $\Gamma$  still entails  $\mathbf{P}$ , because inconsistent sets entail anything.

# Validity

- \* Since validity is simply a special case of entailment, the same procedure can demonstrate that validity, like entailment, can be described in terms of consistency.
- \* If an argument is valid, then the union of the set of its premises and the negation of its conclusion will form an inconsistent set.