Problem Set 1 - Solution

January 12, 2015

---

1. Prove by contradiction. Suppose that $\sqrt[3]{2}$ is sensible. Then by definition, there exist positive integers a and b such that $\sqrt{a/b} = \sqrt[3]{2}$. Squaring both sides of the equation gives us $\sqrt{a/b} = \sqrt[3]{4}$, which implies that $\sqrt[3]{4}$ is rational.

   This means there exists positive integers x and y such that $x/y = \sqrt[3]{4}$ and x/y is in lowest term. Therefore, we have:

$$x/y = \sqrt[3]{4} \tag{1}$$
$$x^3/y^3 = 4 \tag{2}$$
$$x^3 = 4y^3 \tag{3}$$

   In the last equation, the right side is even, so is the left side. Since x^3 is even, x must be even. Therefore x^3 is a multiple of 8, this implies that y^3 is also a even number, thus y is even, too. x and y are both even, this contradicts the assumption that x/y is in lowest term.

   Thus $\sqrt[3]{4}$ is irrational, the original assumption must not be true.

2. **A Wrong Attempt:**

$$\exists x.\ (E(x,y) \wedge E(x,z) \wedge x \neq y \wedge x \neq z \wedge y \neq z) \tag{4}$$

   This doesn't say "x emailed exactly two other people in the class.". It also doesn't existentially quantify y and z.

   Right Attempt:
   First, we modify the above predicate to express that there exist students x, y and z such that x have emailed y and z.

$$\exists x \exists y \exists z.\ (E(x,y) \wedge E(x,z) \wedge x \neq y \wedge x \neq z \wedge y \neq z) \tag{5}$$

   The following predicate restricts that x emailed exactly y and y, besides herself.

$$\forall s,\ E(x,s) \implies s = x \vee s = y \vee s = z \tag{6}$$

   Combining these two predicates, we can say that there exists some student x who has emailed to exactly two other students y and z, besides possibly herself.

$$\exists x \exists y \exists z.\ (E(x,y) \wedge E(x,z) \wedge \tag{7}$$
$$x \neq y \wedge x \neq z \wedge y \neq z \wedge \tag{8}$$
$$\forall s,\ E(x,s) \implies s = x \vee s = y \vee s = z) \tag{9}$$

3. (a) $\exists a, b, c.\ (n = a \cdot a + b \cdot b + c \cdot c)$

(b) We can express $x = 1$ as: $\forall y.\ (xy = y)$. Further we can express $x > 1$ as: $\exists y.\ (y = 1 \wedge x > y)$. Replacing $y = 1$ with the previous predicate gives us: $\exists y.\ (\forall z.\ (yz = z) \wedge x > y)$.

(c)

$$\neg(\exists x.\ (x > 1 \wedge x < n \wedge \exists y.\ (y > 1 \wedge y < n \wedge xy = n))) \tag{10}$$

A better version:

$$IS - PRIME(n) \equiv (n > 1) \wedge \neg(\exists x \exists y.\ (x > 1 \wedge y > 1 \wedge x \cdot y = n)) \tag{11}$$

(d)

$$\exists n \exists p \exists q.\ \text{IS-PRIME}(p) \wedge\ \text{IS-PRIME}(q) \wedge (n = p \cdot q) \wedge (p \neq q) \tag{12}$$

(e) **My Attempt:**

$$\neg(\exists n.\ \text{IS-PRIME}(n) \wedge\ \text{IS-PRIME}(p) \wedge\ \forall p, n > p) \tag{13}$$

Right Solution:

$$\neg(\exists n.\ \text{IS-PRIME}(n) \wedge (\forall p,\ \text{IS-PRIME}(p) \implies n \geq p)) \tag{14}$$

(f) We can express $n > 2$ as:

$$\exists k.\ (k = 1) \wedge (n > k + k). \tag{15}$$

So the predicate is:

$$\forall (n), (n > 2 \wedge \exists k. n = k + k) \implies \exists p \exists q.\ \text{IS-PRIME}(p) \wedge\ \text{IS-PRIME}(q) \wedge (n = p + q) \tag{16}$$

(g)

$$\forall (n), (n > 1 \implies \exists p.\ \text{IS-PRIME}(p) \wedge (n < p) \wedge (p < n + n)) \tag{17}$$

4. *Proof.* We prove by contradiction. Assume that there is a surjection f from set A to its powerset for some A which is infinite. Let the set W be $W = \{x \in A | x \notin f(x)\}$. So by definition,

$$x \in W \iff x \notin f(x) \tag{18}$$

W is a member of $\mathcal{P}(A)$ since W is a subset of A. Because there is a surjection f from A to $\mathcal{P}(A)$, we know that there must exist an element $a \in A$ such that $W = f(a)$. So from the above equation, we have,

$$x \in f(a) \iff x \notin f(x) \tag{19}$$

for all $x \in A$. Substituting a for x yields a contradiction, proving that there cannot be such a f. $\square$

5. (a) *Proof.* Let D be the domain for the variables and P, Q be some binary predicates on D. We need to show that if $\exists z.[P(z) \wedge Q(z)]$ holds under this interpretation, then so does $[\exists x.P(x) \wedge \exists y.Q(y)]$. So suppose $\exists z.[P(z) \wedge Q(z)]$. So some element $z_0 \in D$ such that $P(z) \wedge Q(z)$ is true. So there exists some $x \in D$ and some $y \in D$ such that $P(z) \wedge Q(z)$ is true. Namely, $x = z_0$ and $y = z_0$. That is, $[\exists x.P(x) \wedge \exists y.Q(y)]$ holds under this interpretation, as required. $\square$

(b) *Proof.* We can prove by describing an counter model. Let the domain be the integers and $P(x)$ be $x > 100$, and $Q(y)$ be $y < 50$. $[\exists x.P(x) \wedge \exists y.Q(y)]$ would be true because we can let $x = 101$ and $y = 49$. But $\exists z.[P(z) \wedge Q(z)]$ asserts that there exists an integer z such that $z > 100$ while $z < 50$, which is certainly false. $\square$

6. (a) Let $A = 0$, $B = 1$, $C = 2$ and $D = 3$. Then $L = (A \cup C) \times (B \cup D) = \{(0,1), (0,3), (2,1), (2,3)\}$ and $R = (A \times B) \cup (C \times D) = \{(0,1), (2,3)\}$. Thus $L \neq R$.

(b) The mistake lies in the third iff. The claim:
"either $x \in A$ or $x \in C$, and either $y \in B$ and $y \in D$ **iff**
($x \in A$ and $y \in B$) or else ($x \in C$ and $y \in D$)"
is not true. There are 4 possible combinations in total. Two others are ($x \in A$ and $y \in D$) and ($x \in C$ and $y \in B$).

(c) Replacing the third "iff" with "which is true when" which yields a correct prove that $(x, y) \in L$ is true when $(x, y) \in R$, which implies that $R \subseteq L$.