Puzzle

In a certain place, all the inhabitants are either Knights or Knaves. Knights always tell the truth and Knaves never tell the truth.

You meet two inhabitants, A and B. A says "Exactly one of us is a knight." B says "A is a knight." What, if anything, can you infer from this?

Conditionals

Wednesday, 29 January

Philosophy Spring 2014 Speaker Series

"Are Psychopaths Responsible?"

Walter Sinnott-Armstrong,
Chauncey Stillman Professor of Practical Ethics
Duke University
Thursday, January 30, 2014 at 7:00 PM
MCOM 353

Abstract: Psychopaths are less than 1% of the population but commit over 30% of the violent crime in our country. They are widely misunderstood, but new studies (including some brain scans) have taught us a lot about what makes them tick. This new information points towards innovative psychiatric treatments and raises question about whether they should be held legally responsible.

This program was made possible in part by grants from Humanities Texas, the state affiliate of the National Endowment for the Humanities as well as from the Ethics Center at Texas Tech University.

Humanities Texas

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
Ethics Center

Class Announcements

- No office hours Thursday
- Class website: http://joelvelasco.net/teaching/2310
- **MUST** have a new copy of the book/software
  - You are really paying for your own software license and registration ID

Translation Examples

Translation Examples

- Both ***a*** and ***b*** are in the same column as ***c***:

Translation Examples

- Both ***a*** and ***b*** are in the same column as ***c***:
    - SameCol(a,c) $\land$ SameCol(b,c)

Translation Examples

- Both ***a*** and ***b*** are in the same column as ***c***:
  - SameCol(a,c) $\wedge$ SameCol(b,c)
- ***a*** is behind ***b***, which is in turn behind either ***c*** or ***d***:

Translation Examples

- Both ***a*** and ***b*** are in the same column as ***c***:
  - SameCol(a,c) ∧ SameCol(b,c)
- ***a*** is behind ***b***, which is in turn behind either ***c*** or ***d***:
  - BackOf(a,b) ∧ (BackOf(b,c) ∨ BackOf(b,d))

Translation Examples

- Both ***a*** and ***b*** are in the same column as ***c***:
  - SameCol(a,c) ∧ SameCol(b,c)
- ***a*** is behind ***b***, which is in turn behind either ***c*** or ***d***:
  - BackOf(a,b) ∧ (BackOf(b,c) ∨ BackOf(b,d))
- Either ***a*** and ***b*** are both small or are both large:

Translation Examples

- Both ***a*** and ***b*** are in the same column as ***c***:
  - SameCol(a,c) ∧ SameCol(b,c)
- ***a*** is behind ***b***, which is in turn behind either ***c*** or ***d***:
  - BackOf(a,b) ∧ (BackOf(b,c) ∨ BackOf(b,d))
- Either ***a*** and ***b*** are both small or are both large:
  - (Small(a) ∧ Small(b)) ∨ (Large(a) ∧ Large(b))

TRANSLATION EXAMPLES

Translation examples

- For a translation to be acceptable, the sentences must be true in exactly the same circumstances.

Translation examples

- For a translation to be acceptable, the sentences must be true in exactly the same circumstances.
- Exactly one of Alice, Bill, and Charlie is at the party.

TRANSLATION EXAMPLES

- For a translation to be acceptable, the sentences must be true in exactly the same circumstances.
- Exactly one of Alice, Bill, and Charlie is at the party.
- Is $P(a) \vee P(b) \vee P(c)$ a good translation?

Translation examples

- For a translation to be acceptable, the sentences must be true in exactly the same circumstances.
- Exactly one of Alice, Bill, and Charlie is at the party.
- Is $P(a) \vee P(b) \vee P(c)$ a good translation?
- NO - this sentences it is true if Alice and Bill both go, but the English sentence would be false.

TRANSLATION EXAMPLES

- For a translation to be acceptable, the sentences must be true in exactly the same circumstances.
- Exactly one of Alice, Bill, and Charlie is at the party.
- Is $P(a) \vee P(b) \vee P(c)$ a good translation?
- NO - this sentences it is true if Alice and Bill both go, but the English sentence would be false.

The Conditional

The Conditional

- A connective is truth-functional if the truth or falsity of compound sentences is completely determined by the truth values of the constituents.

The Conditional

- A connective is truth-functional if the truth or falsity of compound sentences is completely determined by the truth values of the constituents.
- Today we will introduce two new truth-functional connectives to our formal language.

The Conditional

- A connective is truth-functional if the truth or falsity of compound sentences is completely determined by the truth values of the constituents.
- Today we will introduce two new truth-functional connectives to our formal language.
- The first is called the material conditional, designated with the symbol $\rightarrow$.

The Conditional

- A connective is truth-functional if the truth or falsity of compound sentences is completely determined by the truth values of the constituents.
- Today we will introduce two new truth-functional connectives to our formal language.
- The first is called the material conditional, designated with the symbol $\rightarrow$.
- If A and B are sentences, then A $\rightarrow$ B is a sentence.

The Conditional

The Conditional

- We can translate $A \rightarrow B$ into English as 'if A, then B'.

The Conditional

- We can translate A → B into English as ‘if A, then B’.
- A is called the antecedent, B is called the consequent.

The Conditional

- We can translate A → B into English as 'if A, then B'.
- A is called the antecedent, B is called the consequent.
- If Alice is tall then Bill is: A → B

The Conditional

- We can translate $A \rightarrow B$ into English as 'if A, then B'.
- A is called the antecedent, B is called the consequent.
- If Alice is tall then Bill is: $A \rightarrow B$
- Bill is tall if Alice is: $A \rightarrow B$

The Conditional

- We can translate A → B into English as 'if A, then B'.
- A is called the antecedent, B is called the consequent.
- If Alice is tall then Bill is: A → B
- Bill is tall if Alice is: A → B
- If Bill and Alice are both tall, then neither Charlie nor David are: (B ∧ A) → ¬(C ∨ D)

Other Conditionals

Other Conditionals

- Alice will go only if Tom does:

Other Conditionals

- Alice will go only if Tom does:
  - A → T

Other Conditionals

- Alice will go only if Tom does:
  - $A \rightarrow T$
  - $\neg T \rightarrow \neg A$

Other Conditionals

- Alice will go only if Tom does:
  - $A \rightarrow T$
  - $\neg T \rightarrow \neg A$
- Alice will go unless Tom does

Other Conditionals

- Alice will go only if Tom does:
  - $A \rightarrow T$
  - $\neg T \rightarrow \neg A$
- Alice will go unless Tom does
  - $\neg T \rightarrow A$

Other Conditionals

- Alice will go only if Tom does:
  - $A \rightarrow T$
  - $\neg T \rightarrow \neg A$
- Alice will go unless Tom does
  - $\neg T \rightarrow A$
  - $\neg A \rightarrow T$

Other Conditionals

- Alice will go only if Tom does:
  - $A \rightarrow T$
  - $\neg T \rightarrow \neg A$
- Alice will go unless Tom does
  - $\neg T \rightarrow A$
  - $\neg A \rightarrow T$
  - Think “Alice will go (IF NOT) Tom

The Conditional

The Conditional

- The sentence A → B is true iff whenever A is true, B is also true.

The Conditional

- The sentence A → B is true iff whenever A is true, B is also true.
- Truth table for the material conditional:

The Conditional

- The sentence A → B is true iff whenever A is true, B is also true.
- Truth table for the material conditional:

A	B	A → B
TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
FALSE	FALSE	TRUE

The Conditional

The Conditional

- In English, ‘if… then’ statements can imply causation. In FOL, they do not.

The Conditional

- In English, 'if… then' statements can imply causation. In FOL, they do not.
- In English, the truth of 'if… then' statements depend on both the antecedent and the consequent. In FOL, if the antecedent is false, then the conditional is always true.

The Conditional

- In English, 'if… then' statements can imply causation.
  In FOL, they do not.
- In English, the truth of 'if… then' statements depend on both the antecedent and the consequent.
  In FOL, if the antecedent is false, then the conditional is always true.

  In FOL, if the consequent is true, then the conditional is always true.

The Conditional

- In English, 'if… then' statements can imply causation. In FOL, they do not.
- In English, the truth of 'if… then' statements depend on both the antecedent and the consequent.
  In FOL, if the antecedent is false, then the conditional is always true.

  In FOL, if the consequent is true, then the conditional is always true.
- $A \to B$ just means either A is false or B is true

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- In English, the expression “only if” implies that we are introducing a necessary condition.

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- In English, the expression "only if" implies that we are introducing a <u>necessary</u> condition.
- "You can be a lawyer only if you have a J.D." This means that having a J.D. is <u>necessary</u> in order to be a lawyer.

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- In English, the expression "only if" implies that we are introducing a <u>necessary</u> condition.
- "You can be a lawyer only if you have a J.D." This means that having a J.D. is <u>necessary</u> in order to be a lawyer.
- You might still not be a lawyer, for example if you haven't passed the bar exam. Having a J.D. is no *guarantee* that you are a lawyer.

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- In English, the expression "only if" implies that we are introducing a <u>necessary</u> condition.
- "You can be a lawyer only if you have a J.D." This means that having a J.D. is <u>necessary</u> in order to be a lawyer.
- You might still not be a lawyer, for example if you haven't passed the bar exam. Having a J.D. is no *guarantee* that you are a lawyer.
- Only one situation is ruled out: it is false that you could *not* have a J.D. and yet be a lawyer anyway.

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- In English, the expression "only if" implies that we are introducing a <u>necessary</u> condition.
- "You can be a lawyer only if you have a J.D." This means that having a J.D. is <u>necessary</u> in order to be a lawyer.
- You might still not be a lawyer, for example if you haven't passed the bar exam. Having a J.D. is no *guarantee* that you are a lawyer.
- Only one situation is ruled out: it is false that you could *not* have a J.D. and yet be a lawyer anyway.
- 'A only if B' is roughly 'B is necessary for A': $A \rightarrow B$

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- A sufficient condition, on the other hand, does guarantee that something else will happen.

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- A sufficient condition, on the other hand, does guarantee that something else will happen.
- "You are rich if you are a millionaire."

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- A sufficient condition, on the other hand, does guarantee that something else will happen.
- "You are rich if you are a millionaire."
- Yet it might still be the case that you are rich even if you aren't a millionaire.

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- A sufficient condition, on the other hand, does guarantee that something else will happen.
- "You are rich if you are a millionaire."
- Yet it might still be the case that you are rich even if you aren't a millionaire.
- Only one situation is ruled out: it can't be the case that you are a millionaire and yet you aren't rich.

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- A sufficient condition, on the other hand, does guarantee that something else will happen.
- "You are rich if you are a millionaire."
- Yet it might still be the case that you are rich even if you aren't a millionaire.
- Only one situation is ruled out: it can't be the case that you are a millionaire and yet you aren't rich.
- 'A is sufficient for B' is roughly 'If A then B': $A \rightarrow B$

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- If P, then Q: $P \rightarrow Q$

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- If P, then Q: $P \rightarrow Q$
- A only if B: $A \rightarrow B$ or $\neg B \rightarrow \neg A$

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- If P, then Q: $P \rightarrow Q$
- A only if B: $A \rightarrow B$ or $\neg B \rightarrow \neg A$
- P if Q: $Q \rightarrow P$

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- If P, then Q: $P \rightarrow Q$
- A only if B: $A \rightarrow B$ or $\neg B \rightarrow \neg A$
- P if Q: $Q \rightarrow P$
- Unless B, A: $\neg B \rightarrow A$

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- If P, then Q: $P \rightarrow Q$
- A only if B: $A \rightarrow B$ or $\neg B \rightarrow \neg A$
- P if Q: $Q \rightarrow P$
- Unless B, A: $\neg B \rightarrow A$
- P if not Q: $\neg Q \rightarrow P$

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- If P, then Q: $P \rightarrow Q$
- A only if B: $A \rightarrow B$ or $\neg B \rightarrow \neg A$
- P if Q: $Q \rightarrow P$
- Unless B, A: $\neg B \rightarrow A$
- P if not Q: $\neg Q \rightarrow P$
- A is necessary for B: $B \rightarrow A$ or $\neg A \rightarrow \neg B$

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- If P, then Q: $P \to Q$
- A only if B: $A \to B$ or $\neg B \to \neg A$
- P if Q: $Q \to P$
- Unless B, A: $\neg B \to A$
- P if not Q: $\neg Q \to P$
- A is necessary for B: $B \to A$ or $\neg A \to \neg B$
- P is sufficient for Q: $P \to Q$

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- If P, then Q: $P \rightarrow Q$
- A only if B: $A \rightarrow B$ or $\neg B \rightarrow \neg A$
- P if Q: $Q \rightarrow P$
- Unless B, A: $\neg B \rightarrow A$
- P if not Q: $\neg Q \rightarrow P$
- A is necessary for B: $B \rightarrow A$ or $\neg A \rightarrow \neg B$
- P is sufficient for Q: $P \rightarrow Q$