

Math 2150 Assignment 5 Solutions [each part of each problem is worth 5 pts]

(1) Negate so that negation symbols immediately precede propositional variables. Be careful to use correct syntax (1. - 5. of the June 28 notes will be of use here). Just giving the formulas is sufficient here; you do not need to show work.

(a) $((\neg q) \rightarrow (\neg p))$

Solution. The negation of “if a , then b ” is “ a and not b ”, and so the initial negation is “ $(\neg q)$ and not $(\neg p)$ ”, that is, “ $(\neg q)$ and p ”. Thus the final formula is $((\neg q) \wedge p)$. $\square$

(b) $(r \wedge (s \leftrightarrow t))$

Solution. By DeMorgan, the negation of “ a and b ” is “not a or not b ”. Thus the initial negation is “not r or not $(s \leftrightarrow t)$ ”. The first “not” immediately precedes a variable, but the second does not. Look at the notes: how do we negate a formula of the form $(a \leftrightarrow b)$? It is $((a \wedge (\neg b)) \vee ((\neg a) \wedge b))$. Thus the desired negation is $((\neg r) \vee ((s \wedge (\neg t)) \vee ((\neg s) \wedge t)))$. $\square$

(c) $(p \vee (\neg q))$

Solution. By Demorgan, the negation of “ a or b ” is “not a and not b ”. Thus the initial negation is “not p and not $(\neg q)$ ”, which becomes “not p and q ”. Thus the final formula is $((\neg p) \wedge q)$. $\square$

(d) $((p \vee q) \wedge r)$

Solution. Again, by Demorgan, the negation of “ a and b ” is “not a or not b ”. Thus the initial negation is “not $(p \vee q)$ or not r ”. Applying DeMorgan to negate $(p \vee q)$, we get $((\neg p) \wedge (\neg q))$. Thus the final negation is $((\neg p) \wedge (\neg q)) \vee (\neg r)$. $\square$

(2) Negate so that negation symbols immediately precede predicates (see 1. - 5. of June 28 notes along with Theorem 1). Again, you need not show work here (though doing so may help increase partial credit).

(a) $\forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x))$

Solution. From DeMorgan, the negation of $\forall x\alpha$ is $\exists x(\neg\alpha)$. So the initial negation is “exists x such that not $(P(x) \vee Q(x))$ ”. To negate the final formula, first note that there are no quantifiers after the “not”, and so we are back in propositional logic. So the negation from propositional DeMorgan is $((\neg P(x)) \wedge (\neg Q(x)))$. So the final negated formula is $\exists x((\neg P(x)) \wedge (\neg Q(x)))$. $\square$

$$(b) \exists x(P(x) \rightarrow (Q(x) \vee R(x)))$$

Solution. From DeMorgan, the negation of $\exists x\alpha$ is $\forall x(\neg\alpha)$. So the initial negation is “for all x , not $(P(x) \rightarrow (Q(x) \vee R(x)))$ ”. Again, we now find ourselves in propositional logic following the “not”. The negation of “if A , then B ” is (from above, and I’ve yelled about this MANY times as well as put this in all caps in the notes) “ A and not B ”, which becomes “ $P(x)$ and not $(Q(x) \vee R(x))$ ”; using DeMorgan again, “ $P(x)$ and not $(Q(x) \vee R(x))$ ” becomes “ $P(x)$ and (not $Q(x)$ and not $R(x)$)”. So the final answer is the following: $\forall x(P(x) \wedge ((\neg Q(x)) \wedge (\neg R(x))))$. $\square$

$$(c) \exists x(P(x) \rightarrow \forall y\forall zQ(y, z))$$

Solution. From Demorgan, the negation of $\exists x\alpha$ is $\forall x(\neg\alpha)$. Thus from above, the negation of $\exists x(A \rightarrow B)$ is $\forall x(A \wedge (\neg B))$. So our initial negation is “ $\forall x(P(x)$ and not $\forall y\forall zQ(y, z)$)”. Now apply Demorgan twice to negate $\forall y\forall zQ(y, z)$ to get $\exists y\exists z(\neg Q(y, z))$. Thus the final negation is $\forall x(P(x) \wedge \exists y\exists z(\neg Q(y, z)))$. $\square$

$$(d) \exists x\forall y\exists z(P(x, y) \wedge Q(z))$$

Solution. Putting the above ideas together (begin by using predicate DeMorgan three times), the negation is $\forall x\exists y\forall z((\neg P(x, y)) \vee (\neg Q(z)))$. $\square$

(3) Show that the following formulas are not logically equivalent:

$$(a) \exists x(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \text{ and } (\exists xP(x) \wedge \exists xQ(x))$$

Solution. Let the domain for x be the collection of all (U.S.) coins. Let $P(x)$ be “ x is a penny” and let $Q(x)$ be “ x is a quarter”. The first formula above translates to “There exists a coin x such that x is a penny and x is a quarter.” But no coin is both at the same time, so the first formula is false relative to this domain. But the second translates to “There exists a coin x such that x is a penny or there exists a coin x such that x is a quarter.” This formula is true. This proves that the two formulas are not logically equivalent. $\square$

$$(b) \forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x)) \text{ and } \forall x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$$

Solution. We can adjust the above domain just slightly but use the same predicates. Let the domain for x be the collection of all coins which are either pennies or quarters. Then the first formula is true but the second is clearly false. $\square$

$$(c) \forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \text{ and } \forall x(P(x) \leftrightarrow Q(x))$$

Solution. Let the domain for x be the collection of all real numbers. Let $P(x)$ be “ x is an odd integer” and let $Q(x)$ be “ x is an integer”. Then the first formula is true but the second is false, since there are integers which are not odd. $\square$

(4) Let $T(x)$ be “ x is tall”, let $F(x, y)$ be “ x and y are friends”, and let $S(x, z)$ be “ x plays z ”. Let the domains for x and y be the collection of all people and the domain for z be the collection of all sports. NOTE: there is nothing “magical” about the letters chosen above. For example (see previous hw), $S(a, b)$ is “ a plays b ”. As another example, “ $F(x, y) \wedge S(y, golf)$ ” is “ x and y are friends and y plays golf.”

(a)(i) Translate “Everyone has a friend that plays basketball” into a formula.

Solution. $\forall x \exists y (F(x, y) \wedge S(y, basketball))$.

□

(a)(ii) Negate your formula in (i) so that all negation symbols immediately precede predicates.

Solution. $\exists x \forall y ((\neg F(x, y)) \vee (\neg S(y, basketball)))$.

□

(a) (iii) Translate your formula from (ii) into English.

Solution. There exists a person x such that for every person y , x and y are not friends or y does not play basketball.

□

(b)(i) Translate “There exists a tall person that has no friends” into a formula.

Solution. $\exists x (T(x) \wedge \forall y (\neg F(x, y)))$.

□

(b)(ii) Negate your formula in (i) so that all negation symbols immediately precede predicates.

Solution. $\forall x ((\neg T(x)) \vee \exists y F(x, y))$.

□

(b)(iii) Translate your formula from (ii) into English.

Solution. For every person x , either x is not tall or there exists a person y such that x and y are friends.

□