## MATH 113: 4/11 WORKSHEET

Our next topic is another expansion to the expressiveness of our logic. But rather than someone at the front of the room telling you what it means, I want you to come up with what you think it should mean.

Our starting point will be truth-functional logic (so no quantifiers!). We will expand it by introducing a concept, which will need a new symbol. Since it can have multiple interpretations, we will write it as a blank box:  $\Box$ .

For the first interpretation, interpret  $\Box$  as "I know …". So  $\Box P$  means "I know P". For example, you might express "I know it will either rain or snow tomorrow" as  $\Box(R \lor S)$ . Given this interpretation, give the meaning of each of the following principles. Say whether you think it should be true or false, and why.

 $\bullet \ \Box P \to P$ 

• 
$$P \to \Box P$$

 $\bullet \ \Box P \to \Box \Box P$ 

- $\bullet \ \Box \Box P \to \Box P$
- $[\Box(P \to Q) \land \Box P] \to \Box Q$

For the second interpretation, interpret  $\Box$  as "I believe …". So  $\Box P$  means "I believe P". For example, you might express "if something is true then I believe it" as  $P \to \Box P$ . Given this interpretation, give the meaning of each of the following same principles. Say whether you think it should be true or false, and why.

 $\bullet \ \Box P \to P$ 

• 
$$P \to \Box P$$

 $\bullet \Box P \to \Box \Box P$ 

- $\bullet \Box \Box P \to \Box P$
- $[\Box(P \to Q) \land \Box P] \to \Box Q$

For the third interpretation, interpret  $\Box$  as "it is morally obligatory to …". So you might express "it is morally obligatory to not murder" as  $\Box \neg M$ . Given this interpretation, give the meaning of each of the following same principles. Say whether you think it should be true or false, and why.

 $\bullet \ \Box P \to P$ 

•  $P \to \Box P$ 

We might want to have two new concepts at once. We can't use a blank box for both of them, so let's rotate one of them by  $45^\circ$ :  $\diamond$ .

Interpret  $\Box$  as "it is morally obligatory to ..." and  $\diamondsuit$  as "it is morally permissible to ...". For example, you might express "it is not permissible to eat meat" as  $\neg \diamondsuit M$ . Given this interpretation, give the meaning of each of the following same principles. Say whether you think it should be true or false, and why.

•  $P \rightarrow \diamondsuit P$ 

•  $\diamondsuit P \to P$ 

- $\Box P \to \diamondsuit P$
- $\Box P \rightarrow \neg \Diamond \neg P$
- $\bullet \diamondsuit P \to \neg \Box \neg P$

Interpret  $\diamond$  as "it is possible that …" and  $\Box$  as "it is necessarily true that …". For example, you might express "2 + 2 is necessarily 4" as  $\Box T$  and you might express "it is possible that the global economy collapses within a year" as  $\diamond C$ . Given this interpretation, give the meaning of each of the following same principles. Say whether you think it should be true or false, and why.

- $\bullet \ P \to \diamondsuit P$
- $\bullet \diamondsuit P \to P$
- $\Box P \rightarrow \diamondsuit P$
- $\Box P \rightarrow \neg \Diamond \neg P$
- $\Diamond P \to \neg \Box \neg P$ •  $\Diamond P \to \Diamond \Diamond P$
- $\bullet \Diamond I \to \Diamond \Diamond I$  $\bullet \Diamond \Diamond P \to \Diamond P$
- $\bullet \Diamond \Box P \to \Box P$

There's different ways you might interpret "possible"—humanly possible, possible within the laws of physics, logically possible. Do your answers change based on which you chose?