

A SIMPLIFICATION OF THE WHITEHEAD-HUNTINGTON SET OF POSTULATES FOR
BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS.

BY DR. B. A. BERNSTEIN.

(Read before the San Francisco Section of the American Mathematical Society, November 20, 1915.)

OF the various sets of postulates that have been given for Boolean logic the most elegant and natural is the set of Huntington's based on Whitehead's "formal laws."* This set may be simplified by reducing the number of its postulates without injuring, the writer feels, the elegance or the naturalness of the original. This reduction is effected by substituting for Huntington's Postulates II_a, II_b, and V the following single postulate:

POSTULATE X. *For any element b in the class there exists an element \bar{b} such that, whatever a is, $a \oplus (b \odot \bar{b}) = a$ and $a \odot (b \oplus \bar{b}) = a$.*

Evidently, Huntington's Postulates II_a, II_b, and V follow from Postulate X, with the help of I_a and I_b.

Evidently, also, Postulate X can be derived from II_a, II_b, and V, with the help of I_a, I_b, III_a, and III_b.

It is of course seen that by adopting Postulate X in place of II_a, II_b, and V, not only is the number of Huntington's postulates reduced from ten to eight, but also the number of postulated special elements is reduced from three ("zero," the "whole," and the "negative") to one (the "negative").

In establishing the independence of the modified set of postulates Huntington's systems for I_a, I_b, IV_a, IV_b, VI can serve for the same numbered postulates in the new set. For Postulate X we can take Huntington's system for V. For III_a and III_b, however, a class of more than two elements is, in each case, necessary. Proof-systems for these two postulates are, respectively, the following:

$\overline{\text{III}}_a$	\oplus	e_1	e_2	e_3		\odot	e_1	e_2	e_3
e_1	e_1	e_1	e_1	e_1		e_1	e_1	e_2	e_3
e_2	e_1	e_2	e_2	e_2		e_2	e_2	e_2	e_2
e_3	e_1	e_3	e_3	e_3		e_3	e_3	e_2	e_3

* See E. V. Huntington, "Sets of independent postulates for the algebra of logic," *Transactions Amer. Math. Society*, vol. 5 (1904), pp. 288-309. The set referred to is the first of the three sets treated by Huntington in his paper.