## Logical statements

Notation:

- · Y means "for all" or "for every"

  (universal quantifier)
- · I means "there exists"

  (existential quantifier)
- "implies (conditional statement)
  - · X > Y means "X if and only if Y"

    (i.e. X > Y and Y > X) iff

    (biconditional statement)
  - · ~ X means "not X"

    (negation)

Exs:

Za) Consider the following statement:

YneI, IxeQ s.t. x-n=1.

It means "for every integer n,

there exists a rational number

x such that x-n=1."

This is a true statement, since, for  $n\in\mathbb{Z}$ , we may take x=n+1. Then  $x\in\mathbb{Q}$  and x-n=1.

Zb) Reversing the order of the quantified statements in the previous example gives:

3xe Q s.t. YneI, x-n=1.

This means "there exists a rational number x such that, for every integer n, we have x-n=1."

This is a false statement. To see why, note that for  $x \in Q$ , if we take n to be the smallest integer which is greater than or equal x, then  $x-n \le 0$ , so  $x-n \ne 1$ .

Helpful facts:

The statement  $X \Rightarrow Y$  is equivalent to the statement  $\sim Y \Rightarrow \sim X$ . (contrapositive) Exs:

." If nEN then nEQ."

Conditional statement:

nell => neQ

Centra positive:

n&Q > n & N

(both true)

. "If xEIR then xEQ."

Conditional statement:

XER => XEQ

Centra positive:

x & Q >> x & R

(both false)

2a) Negation of a universally quantified steatement:

~ (YxeA, X) (the negation of "for all xeA, statement X holds") is equivalent to

JXEA s.t.~X (there exists an XEA such that statement X does not hold)

b) Negation of an existentially quantified statement:

~ (JxEA s.t. X) (the negation of "there exists an xEA s.t. statement X holds") is equivalent to

YXEA, ~X (for every XEA,
statement X does not hold)

Exs:

Axe O , ~ X

Equivalently:

YxeQ, IneI s.t. x-n≠1. (true)

2) Prove or disprove: X
Yter, (3nez s.t. nt>t).

Scratch work / thought process:

First try some exs. and decide whether you think the statement is going to be true for every tER:

- · If t>0 we can take n= Z, then nt>t.
- · If t<0 we can take n=-1 then nt>t.
- · But ... what about if t=0? ...

Negation: 3+ER s.t. ~X

## Equivalently:

HER s.t. YneZ, ~ (n+>+).

FIER s.t. YneZ, nt=t. (true)

Pf. that this is true: Let t=0. Then \neT\_)

nt = 0 = t , so nt = t. @

Since the negation of the original statement is true, the original statement itself is false.