

1.1.7. What are the contrapositive, the converse, and the inverse of the implication

“The home team wins whenever it is raining.”?

*Solution:* First, it is best to rewrite the implication for clarity.

If it is raining, then the home team wins.

**Converse:** If the home team wins, then it is raining.

**Contrapositive:** If the home team does not win, then it is not raining.

**Inverse:** If it is not raining, then the home team does not win.

1.1.10. How can this English sentence be translated into a logical expression?

“You cannot ride the roller coaster if you are under four feet tall unless you are older than 16 years old.”

*Solution:* The first thing that must be done is to use propositional variables to represent each of the sentence parts. Let

- $q$  be “You cannot ride the roller coaster,”
- $r$  be “You are under four feet tall,” and
- $s$  be “You are older than 16 years old.”

Then the sentence can be translated into

$$(r \wedge \neg s) \rightarrow \neg q.$$

1.1.12. Determine whether the following system specifications are consistent:

“The diagnostic message is stored in the buffer or it is retransmitted.”

“The diagnostic message is not stored in the buffer.”

“If the diagnostic message is stored in the buffer, then it is retransmitted.”

*Solution:* First, translate the sentence parts into propositional variables:

- $p$  is “The diagnostic message is stored in the buffer” and
- $q$  is “The diagnostic message is retransmitted.”

Then the specification can be rewritten as

$$p \vee q,$$

$$\neg p,$$

$$p \rightarrow q.$$

Now, for the system specification to be consistent, we must be able to assign truth values to the variables to make all specifications true. So,  $p$  must be false to make  $\neg p$  true. Since  $p \vee q$  must be true, but  $p$  is false, then  $q$  must be true. Then  $p \rightarrow q$  is also true as  $p$  is false and  $q$  is true. Therefore, the system specification is consistent.

1.2.6. Show that  $(p \wedge q) \rightarrow (p \vee q)$  is a tautology.

*Solution:* It is necessary to use logical equivalences to show that the statement above is a tautology.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (p \wedge q) \rightarrow (p \vee q) &\equiv \neg(p \wedge q) \vee (p \vee q) && \text{(by implication)} \\
 &\equiv (\neg p \vee \neg q) \vee (p \vee q) && \text{(by De Morgan)} \\
 &\equiv (\neg p \vee p) \vee (\neg q \vee q) && \text{(by associative and commutative)} \\
 &\equiv \mathbf{T} \vee \mathbf{T} && \text{(by negation)} \\
 &\equiv \mathbf{T}
 \end{aligned}$$