

Charlie Griffin

# Problem Set #1: Propositions & Proofs

9/3/2015

1. A real number  $r$  is called sensible if  $\exists a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \sqrt{a/b} = r$ . Prove that  $\sqrt[3]{2}$  is not sensible.

Proof

Proof by contradiction, assume for purposes of contradiction that  $\sqrt[3]{2}$  is sensible.

Then  $\exists a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \sqrt[3]{2} = \sqrt{a/b}$  by the def of sensible

Squaring both sides  $\sqrt[3]{4} = a/b \Rightarrow \sqrt[3]{4}$  is rational

Then  $\exists m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \frac{m}{n} = a/b$  and  $m/n$  share no common factors

So  $4 = \frac{m^3}{n^3} \Rightarrow 4n^3 = m^3 \Rightarrow m^3$  is even

Suppose  $m$  is odd

then  $m^3$  would be odd since the product of any number of odd numbers is itself odd.

$\Rightarrow \Leftarrow$  since  $m^3$  is even, so  $m$  is even

Then  $\exists z \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow m = 2z$

So  $4n^3 = m^3 = (2z)^3 = 8z^3$

$\Rightarrow n^3 = 2z^3$  which implies  $n^3$ , and subsequently  $n$ , as shown above are even.

However this leads to a contradiction, since if  $m, n$  are even they share a common factor.  $\Rightarrow \Leftarrow$

So, by contradiction,  $\sqrt[3]{2}$  is not sensible. //

2. Translate the following into a predicate formula.

There is a student who has e-mailed exactly two other people in the class, besides possibly herself.

The domain of discourse should be the set of students in the class; in addition, the only predicates that you may use are equality and  $E(x,y)$  meaning that "x has sent e-mail to y."

Let  $S$  be the set of students in the class.

$$\exists x \in S \rightarrow \exists y_1, y_2 \in S \setminus \{x\} \rightarrow y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge E(x, y_1) \wedge E(x, y_2) \wedge \\ \forall z \in S \setminus \{x, y_1, y_2\}, \neg E(x, z)$$

3. Express each of the following predicates and propositions in formal logic notation. The domain of discourse is  $\mathbb{N}$ .

a.  $n$  is the sum of three perfect squares.

$$\exists x, y, z \exists x \cdot x + y \cdot y + z \cdot z = n$$

b.  $x > 1$ .

$$\exists w \exists (1 + w = x) \wedge (w \neq 0)$$

c.  $n$  is a prime number.

$$(n > 1) \wedge \neg (\exists x \exists y \exists xy = n \wedge x \neq 1 \wedge y \neq 1)$$

d.  $n$  is the product of two distinct primes

$$\exists x, y \exists (x \cdot y = n) \wedge \neg (x = y) \wedge (x \text{ is prime}) \wedge (y \text{ is prime})$$

e. There is no largest prime number.

$$\forall x, x \text{ is prime} \Rightarrow \exists y > x \exists y \text{ is prime}$$

f. (Goldbach Conjecture). Every <sup>natural</sup> even number  <sup>$n \geq 2$</sup>  can be expressed as the sum of two primes.

$$\forall n, (\exists m \exists (m + m = n) \wedge \exists y \exists y = 1 \wedge n > y + y) \Rightarrow (\exists x, y \exists x + y = n \wedge x \text{ is prime} \wedge y \text{ is prime})$$

9. (Bertrand's Postulate) If  $n > 1$ , then there is always at least one prime  $p$  such that  $n < p < 2n$ .

$$n > 1 \Rightarrow \exists p \geq p \text{ is prime} \wedge n < p \wedge p < n + n$$

4. If a set,  $A$ , is finite, then  $|A| < 2^{|A|} = |\mathcal{P}(A)|$ , and so there is no surjection from set  $A$  to its powerset. Show that this is still true if  $A$  is infinite.

Hint: Remember Russell's paradox and consider  $\{x \in A \mid x \notin f(x)\}$  where  $f$  is such a surjection

Proof Consider a set  $A$

Assume  $\exists$  a surjection  $f: A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$

Let  $B := \{x \in A \mid x \notin f(x)\} \Rightarrow x \in B \Leftrightarrow x \notin f(x), \forall x \in A$

Notice  $B \subseteq A \Rightarrow B \in \mathcal{P}(A)$

Since  $f$  is a surjection  $\exists b \in A \Rightarrow f(b) = B$

so  $x \in f(b) \Leftrightarrow x \in f(x)$  since  $f(b) = B, \forall x \in A$

However, if we let  $x = b$  this statement becomes  $b \in f(b) \Leftrightarrow b \notin f(b)$

$\Rightarrow \cdot \Leftrightarrow$  this is a contradiction, so no such surjection from  $A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$  exists //

5. a. Prove that  $\exists z. [P(z) \wedge Q(z)] \rightarrow [\exists x. P(x) \wedge \exists y. Q(y)]$  is valid

Proof

Assume  $\exists z. [P(z) \wedge Q(z)]$

So for some  $z_0$  in the domain we have  $P(z_0) \wedge Q(z_0)$

Then  $P(z_0)$  is true, so  $\exists x$ , namely  $x=z_0 \Rightarrow P(x)$

Similarly  $Q(z_0)$  is true  $\Rightarrow \exists y. Q(y)$

Then  $[\exists x. P(x) \wedge \exists y. Q(y)]$

Thus  $\exists z. [P(z) \wedge Q(z)] \rightarrow [\exists x. P(x) \wedge \exists y. Q(y)] //$

b. Prove the converse is not valid by describing a counter model

$[\exists x. P(x) \wedge \exists y. Q(y)] \not\Rightarrow \exists z. [P(z) \wedge Q(z)]$

Proof by counter example

Let the domain be  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $P(x)$  be  $x=1$  and  $Q(x)$  be  $x=2$ .

Then  $\exists x \in \mathbb{N}$ , namely  $x=1 \Rightarrow P(x)$  holds

Similarly  $\exists y \in \mathbb{N} \Rightarrow Q(y)$  holds ( $y=2$ )

So the antecedent is true in this scenario

Suppose  $\exists z. P(z) \wedge Q(z)$

Then  $z=1 \wedge z=2 \Rightarrow 1=2 \Rightarrow \text{contradiction}$

So the consequent is false

thus the statement is false //

6.a. Give an example where the following result fails:

False Theorem: For sets A, B, C, and D, let

$$L ::= (A \cup C) \times (B \cup D)$$

$$R ::= (A \times B) \cup (C \times D)$$

Then  $L = R$

Let  $A = \{0\}$ ,  $B = \{a\}$ ,  $C = \{9\}$ ,  $D = \{z\}$

Then  $L = \{0, 9\} \times \{a, z\}$

$$L = \{(0, a), (0, z), (9, a), (9, z)\}$$

and  $R = \{(0, a)\} \cup \{(9, z)\} = \{(0, a), (9, z)\} \neq L$

b. Identify the mistake in the following proof of the False Theorem

Bogus Proof: Since L and R are both sets of pairs it's sufficient

✓ to prove that  $(x, y) \in L \Leftrightarrow (x, y) \in R \quad \forall x, y$

The proof will be a chain of iff implications

✓  $(x, y) \in L$  iff

✓  $x \in A \cup C \wedge y \in B \cup D$  iff

✓  $(x \in A \vee x \in C) \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in D)$  iff

X  $(x \in A \text{ and } y \in B) \text{ or else } (x \in C \text{ and } y \in D)$  iff

↳  $x \in C \wedge y \in B$  and  $x \in A \wedge y \in D$  are also valid scenarios

c) Fix this proof to show  $R \subseteq L$

Proof

$$(x, y) \in L \quad \Leftrightarrow$$

$$x \in A \cup C \text{ and } y \in B \cup D \quad \Leftrightarrow$$

$$(x \in A \vee x \in C) \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in D) \quad \text{if}$$

$$(x \in A \wedge y \in B) \text{ or else } (x \in C \wedge y \in D) \quad \Leftrightarrow$$

$$(x, y) \in A \times B \vee (x, y) \in C \times D \quad \Leftrightarrow$$

$$(x, y) \in (A \times B) \cup (C \times D) = R$$

$$\text{so } R \subseteq L //$$