

Solutions of Question 3 in Homework 1

Only Question 3 will be solved and graded! Each part is worth approximately 9 points.

- (3) (a) Suppose that the universes for the variables x and y are the set of all cars. Let a denote my car. Translate the following quantified assertions into sentences in plain English where the open statements $L(x, y)$, $M(x, y)$, and $N(x, y)$ are given as follows:

$$L(x, y) = x \text{ is faster than } y; \quad M(x, y) = x \text{ is more expensive than } y; \quad N(x, y) = x \text{ is older than } y.$$

(i) $(\exists x)(\forall y)L(x, y)$

There is a car x such that, for all cars y , x is faster than y .

There is a car x such that x is faster than y for all cars y .

“There is a car which is faster than every car”

(ii) $(\forall x)(\exists y)M(x, y)$

For all cars x , there exists a car y such that x is more expensive than y .

For any car x , there is a car y such that y is cheaper than x .

“For each car there is a car which is cheaper”

(iii) $(\exists y)(\forall x)(L(x, y) \vee N(x, y))$

There is a car y such that, for all cars x , either x is faster than y or x is older than y .

There is a car y such that, either x is faster than y or x is older than y for all cars x .

There is a car y such that, either y is slower than x or y is newer than x for all cars x .

“There is a car which is either slower or newer than any car”

(iv) $(\forall y)(\exists x)(\neg M(x, y) \rightarrow L(x, y))$

For all cars y , there is a car x such that, if x is not more expensive than y then x is faster than y .

(To write the above sentence without variables x, y we may use equivalence $P \rightarrow Q \equiv \neg P \vee Q$)

For any car y , there is a car x such that, either x is more expensive than y or x is faster than y .

For any car y , there is a car x such that, either y is cheaper than x or y is slower than x .

“For any car there is car which is either cheaper or slower”

(v) $\forall x L(a, x)$

For all cars x , a is faster than x .

a is faster than x for all cars x .

“My car is faster than every car”

(vi) $\forall x((M(x, a) \wedge N(x, a)) \rightarrow \neg L(x, a))$

For all cars x , if x is more expensive than a and x is older than a , then x is not faster than a .

(To write the above sentence without variables x, y we may argue as follows: Let

$$A = \{x \mid M(x, a) \wedge N(x, a)\}$$

be the set of all cars x such that x is more expensive than a and x is older than a . Recalling the logical equivalence

$$(\forall z \in S)P(z) \equiv \forall z(z \in S \rightarrow P(z))$$

where S is a set and $P(z)$ is an open statement, we see that

$$\forall x \left((M(x, a) \wedge N(x, a)) \rightarrow \neg L(x, a) \right) \equiv (\forall x \in A) \neg L(x, a).$$

“Any car which is more expensive and older than my car is not faster than my car”

(b) Write a negation in plain English for each of the following quantified assertions.

(i) There is a place in the world such that everyone who enter the place goes blind.

Given sentence may be symbolized as

$$(\exists p)(\forall x)(xEp \rightarrow B(x))$$

where “ $xEp = x$ enters p ”, “ $B(x) = x$ goes blind”, the universe for p is the all places in the world and the universe for x is the all people. Its negation is

$$\neg ((\exists p)(\forall x)(xEp \rightarrow B(x))) \equiv (\forall p)(\exists x)\neg(xEp \rightarrow B(x)) \equiv (\forall p)(\exists x)(xEp \wedge \neg B(x))$$

where we used the equivalence $P \rightarrow Q \equiv \neg P \vee Q$. The negation can be translated as

“For each place in the world there is a person who enters the place and does not go blind”

(ii) At least one person in Istanbul owns every newspapers published yesterday.

Given sentence may be symbolized as

$$(\exists x)(\forall y)xOy$$

where “ $xOy = x$ owns y ”, the universe for x is the all people in Istanbul and the universe for y is the all published newspapers yesterday. Its negation is

$$\neg ((\exists x)(\forall y)xOy) \equiv (\forall x)(\exists y)\neg xOy$$

The negation can be translated as

“For each person in Istanbul there is a newspaper published yesterday which is not owned by the person”

(iii) Everyone has a secret that is not known by more than two people.

Given sentence may be symbolized as

$$(\forall x)(\exists s)(xHs \wedge \neg K(s))$$

where “ $xHs = x$ has s ”, “ $K(s) = s$ is known by more than two people”, the universe for x is the all people and the universe for s is the all secrets. Its negation is

$$\neg ((\forall x)(\exists s)(xHs \wedge \neg K(s))) \equiv (\exists x)(\forall s)(\neg xHs \vee K(s))$$

The negation can be translated as

“There is a person x such that, for all secrets s , either x does not have s or s is known by more than two people” To write the negation without variables x, s we may use the equivalences

$$P \rightarrow Q \equiv \neg P \vee Q \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall z \in A)R(z) \equiv \forall z(z \in A \rightarrow R(z))$$

where A is a set. So

$$(\exists x)(\forall s)(\neg xHs \vee K(s)) \equiv (\exists x)(\forall s)(xHs \rightarrow K(s)) \equiv (\exists x)(\forall s)(s \in A_x \rightarrow K(s)) \equiv (\exists x)(\forall s \in A_x)K(s)$$

where for any person x the set $A_x = \{t \mid xHt\}$ is the set of all secrets t such that x has t . Note that $t \in A_x$ if and only if xHt . Now the negation $(\exists x)(\forall s \in A_x)K(s)$ can be translated as

“There is a person x such that, for all secrets s that x has, s is known by more than two people”

“There is a person each of whose secrets is known by more than two people”

- (iv) Every integer is either odd or even, but not both.

Given sentence may be symbolized as

$$(\forall z \in \mathbb{Z}) [(z \in O \vee z \in E) \wedge \neg(z \in O \wedge z \in E)]$$

where O is the set of odd integers and E is the set of even integers. Its negation is

$$\neg((\forall z \in \mathbb{Z}) [(z \in O \vee z \in E) \wedge \neg(z \in O \wedge z \in E)]) \equiv (\exists z \in \mathbb{Z}) [(z \notin O \wedge z \notin E) \vee (z \in O \wedge z \in E)]$$

The negation can be translated as

“There is an integer z such that, either z is not odd and not even, or z is both odd and even”

To rewrite in a simpler form we may use the equivalence $P \rightarrow Q \equiv \neg P \vee Q$ to see that

$$(\exists z \in \mathbb{Z}) [(z \notin O \wedge z \notin E) \vee (z \in O \wedge z \in E)] \equiv (\exists z \in \mathbb{Z}) [(z \in O \vee z \in E) \rightarrow (z \in O \wedge z \in E)]$$

Now the negation can be translated as

“There is an integer such that if it is either odd or even, then it is both odd and even”

(Some symbols above may be simplified if we remember the definitions of the union and the intersection of the sets because

$$(z \in O \vee z \in E) \equiv z \in (O \cup E) \quad \text{and} \quad (z \in O \wedge z \in E) \equiv z \in (O \cap E)$$

- (v) There are real numbers
- a
- and
- b
- such that
- $a < s < b$
- for any element
- s
- of the set
- S
- .

Given sentence may be symbolized as

$$(\exists a \in \mathbb{R})(\exists b \in \mathbb{R})(\forall s \in S)(a < s < b)$$

Its negation is

$$\neg((\exists a \in \mathbb{R})(\exists b \in \mathbb{R})(\forall s \in S)(a < s < b)) \equiv (\forall a \in \mathbb{R})(\forall b \in \mathbb{R})(\exists s \in S)\neg(a < s < b)$$

The negation can be translated as

“For all real numbers a and b there is an element s of the set S such that it is not the case that $a < s < b$ ”

To rewrite it in a simpler form we may argue as follows: For this we should assume that S is a nonempty set! Note that for the condition $a < s < b$ to be satisfied for all $s \in S$, the condition $a < b$ must already be satisfied. So the given sentence may be written and symbolized as follows:

“There are real numbers a and b satisfying $a < b$ such that $a < s < b$ for any element s of the nonempty set S ”

$$(\exists a \in \mathbb{R})(\exists b \in \mathbb{R})((a < b) \wedge (\forall s \in S)(a < s < b))$$

Its negation is

$$(\forall a \in \mathbb{R})(\forall b \in \mathbb{R})\left(\neg(a < b) \vee \neg[(\forall s \in S)(a < s < b)]\right) \equiv (\forall a \in \mathbb{R})(\forall b \in \mathbb{R})\left((a < b) \rightarrow \neg[(\forall s \in S)(a < s < b)]\right)$$

The negation can be translated as

“For all real numbers a and b if $a < b$ then S is not a subset of the interval (a, b) ”

“ S is not a subset of the interval (a, b) for any real numbers a and b satisfying $a < b$ ”