

# 301 PS1 Answers

## §1.2

3 (a) The truth table is

$P$	$Q$	$P + Q$
T	T	F
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	F	F

(b)  $P + Q$  is logically equivalent to  $(P \vee Q) \wedge \neg(P \wedge Q)$ , read as “(either  $P$  or  $Q$ ) and (not (both  $P$  and  $Q$ ))”. The truth table may be derived as

$P$	$Q$	$P \vee Q$	$\neg(P \wedge Q)$	$(P \vee Q) \wedge \neg(P \wedge Q)$
T	T	T	F	F
T	F	T	T	T
F	T	T	T	T
F	F	F	T	F

5(b)  $P \downarrow Q$  is logically equivalent to  $\neg(P \vee Q)$ , “not (either  $P$  or  $Q$ )”.

6(b)  $P | Q$  is logically equivalent to  $\neg(P \wedge Q)$ , “not (both  $P$  and  $Q$ )”.

12 (a) We first apply a DeMorgan Law and then Double Negation Elimination to the left term to find the logically equivalent  $\neg(\neg(P \vee Q)) \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} (\neg\neg P) \wedge \neg Q \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} P \wedge \neg Q$ . Thus  $\neg(\neg P \vee Q) \vee (P \wedge \neg R) \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee (P \wedge \neg R)$  which we recognise as the result of applying distributivity to  $P \wedge (\neg Q \vee \neg R)$ . The right conjunct is itself amenable to another DeMorgan Law so overall we have found the logically equivalent reduction  $P \wedge \neg(Q \wedge R)$ .

(b) A similar exercise.

(c) We begin by applying distributivity in the right disjunct, followed by associativity and commutativity

$$(P \wedge R) \vee (\neg R \wedge (P \vee Q)) \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} (P \wedge R) \vee ((\neg R \wedge P) \vee (\neg R \wedge Q)) \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} ((P \wedge R) \vee (P \wedge \neg R)) \vee (\neg R \wedge Q)$$

We then recognise  $(P \wedge R) \vee (P \wedge \neg R) \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} P \wedge (R \vee \neg R)$  by distributivity and further  $R \vee \neg R$  as true by the excluded middle. Thus we have reduced our expression to  $P \vee (\neg R \wedge Q)$ .

15. We will adopt the convention that a statement containing no letters has a single line in its truth table. For example, the statement “T” has the following truth table

T
T

Now suppose our statement had  $n$  letters in it and we added another letter to it; for example our statement was  $P \vee Q$  and we moved to  $(P \vee Q) \vee R$ . The addition of this letter doubles the amount of rows we had before, for every row must now be reconsidered in two new contexts: one in which the

new letter ( $R$ ) is true, and one in which it is false. We must still consider all the previous rows in the  $n$  letter table, and so the total number of rows for  $n + 1$  letters is precisely double that for  $n$ .

Starting with our base case of zero letters having one row, we see that 1 letter has  $2 = 2 * 1$  rows, 2 letters have  $4 = 2 * 2$  rows, 3 letters have  $8 = 2 * 4$  rows, and so on, so that  $n$  letters have  $2^n$  rows.

## Pierce's Law

- (a) We apply a DeMorgan Law to see that  $\neg(\neg P \vee Q) \vee P \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} (\neg\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \vee P$  and then a Double Negation Elimination to find  $(\neg\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \vee P \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee P$ .

(b) First the truth table,

$P$	$Q$	$P \wedge \neg Q$	$(P \wedge \neg Q) \vee P$
T	T	F	T
T	F	T	T
F	T	F	F
F	F	F	F

From this table we see that it doesn't seem to matter whether  $Q$  is true. Later on we will be able to understand this in terms of implications,  $(P \wedge \neg Q) \rightarrow P$  so that we have  $(P \wedge \neg Q) \vee P \rightarrow P \vee P \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} P$  and conversely  $P \rightarrow (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee P$  so that  $P \leftrightarrow (P \wedge \neg Q) \vee P$ .

## §1.3

1. (a) Let  $D(n, m)$  be the statement " $n$  divides  $m$ ", then our statement is  $D(3, 6) \wedge D(3, 9) \wedge D(3, 15)$ .  
 (b) Let  $D(n, m)$  be as above, then our statement is  $D(2, x) \wedge D(3, x) \wedge \neg D(4, x)$ .  
 (c) Let  $N(n)$  be the statement " $n$  is a natural number" and  $P(n)$  be " $n$  is prime". Then our statement is  $N(x) \wedge N(y) \wedge (P(x) + P(y))$  (where  $+$  is exclusive or).
4. (a)  $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \text{ is a square}\}$ .  
 (b)  $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \text{ is a power of 2}\}$ .  
 (c)  $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid 9 < n < 20\}$
8. (a)  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x^2 - 4x + 3 = 0\} = \{1, 3\}$ .  
 (b)  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x^2 - 2x + 3 = 0\} = \emptyset$  as there are no real solutions to this equation.  
 (c)  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x^2 < 25\} = (-5, 5)$  which we see by elaborating the constraint  $5 \in \{y \in \mathbb{R} \mid x^2 < 50 - y^2\}$ .

## 1. §1.4

7. (a) Let us write  $A(x)$  for the statement whose truth set has  $\{x \in X \mid A(x)\} = A$ , and similarly for  $B(x)$  and  $C(x)$ . Thus we see that  $(A \cup B) \setminus C = \{x \in X \mid (A(x) \vee B(x)) \wedge \neg C(x)\}$ . We may now leverage our knowledge of the calculus of logical statements to see that  $(A(x) \vee B(x)) \wedge \neg C(x) \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} (A(x) \wedge \neg C(x)) \vee (B(x) \wedge \neg C(x))$  via distributivity. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (A \cup B) \setminus C &= \{x \in X \mid (A(x) \vee B(x)) \wedge \neg C(x)\} \\
 &= \{x \in X \mid (A(x) \wedge \neg C(x)) \vee (B(x) \wedge \neg C(x))\} \\
 &= \{x \in X \mid A(x) \wedge \neg C(x)\} \cup \{x \in X \mid B(x) \wedge \neg C(x)\} \\
 &= (A \setminus C) \cup (B \setminus C).
 \end{aligned}$$

- (b) Adopting the same convention as above,  $\{x \in X \mid A(x)\} = A$ , we see that this time we are working with  $A \cup (B \setminus C) = \{x \in X \mid A(x) \vee (B(x) \wedge \neg C(x))\}$ . Once more we choose to concentrate on the statement in the elementhood test and reduce it. This time that means  $A(x) \vee (B(x) \wedge \neg C(x)) \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} (A(x) \vee B(x)) \wedge (A(x) \vee \neg C(x))$  via distributivity. But this is not quite the desired form of the answer, we are looking for  $(A \cup B) \setminus (C \setminus A)$ , and so we apply a DeMorgan Law and Double Negation Elimination to the right conjunct to rewrite this as  $(A(x) \vee B(x)) \wedge \neg(\neg A(x) \wedge \neg \neg C(x)) \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} (A(x) \vee B(x)) \wedge \neg(\neg A(x) \wedge C(x))$ . Here we apply commutativity to come up with our final statement,  $A(x) \vee (B(x) \wedge \neg C(x)) \stackrel{\text{l.e.}}{=} (A(x) \vee B(x)) \wedge \neg(C(x) \wedge \neg A(x))$ . Putting this together we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 A \cup (B \setminus C) &= \{x \in X \mid A(x) \vee (B(x) \wedge \neg C(x))\} \\
 &= \{x \in X \mid (A(x) \vee B(x)) \wedge \neg(C(x) \wedge \neg A(x))\} \\
 &= \{x \in X \mid A(x) \vee B(x)\} \setminus \{x \in X \mid C(x) \wedge \neg A(x)\} \\
 &= (A \cup B) \setminus (C \setminus A).
 \end{aligned}$$

8. We adopt the same convention as Q7, and begin by writing out the sets as truth sets.

- (a)  $(A \setminus B) \setminus C = \{x \in X \mid (A(x) \wedge \neg B(x)) \wedge \neg C(x)\}$
- (b)  $A \setminus (B \setminus C) = \{x \in X \mid A(x) \wedge \neg(B(x) \wedge \neg C(x))\}$
- (c)  $(A \setminus B) \cup (A \cap C) = \{x \in X \mid (A(x) \wedge \neg B(x)) \vee (A(x) \wedge C(x))\}$
- (d)  $(A \setminus B) \cap (A \setminus C) = \{x \in X \mid (A(x) \wedge \neg B(x)) \wedge (A(x) \wedge \neg C(x))\}$
- (e)  $A \setminus (B \cup C) = \{x \in X \mid A(x) \wedge \neg(B(x) \vee C(x))\}$

Now the question reduces to determining which of the statements are logically equivalent. In this case: (a),(d), and (e) are equal, and (b) and (c) are equal.