### M1C03 Lecture 13

### Proof by Counterexample, Mixed Quantifiers, Limits

Jeremy Lane

Oct 7, 2021

## Announcement(s)

- Test 1 is October 29. See the Avenue announcement about time/location.
- To prepare for Test 1 you should be doing exercises.
- Quiz 4 is due Friday.
- Assignment 2 will be posted tomorrow (due October 22).

### Overview

- Proof by Counterexample
- Mixed quantifiers
- The limit definition

Reference: Lakins, Chapter 2.

## Basic Properties of Integers

For all integers a, b, and c,

```
(Closure under + and \cdot)
                             a+b and ab are integers.
           (Associativity) (a+b)+c=a+(b+c) and (ab)c=a(bc).
         (Commutativity) a+b=b+a and ab=ba.
           (Distributivity) a(b+c) = ab + ac.
               (Identities)
                             0 \neq 1, a + 0 = a, a \cdot 1 = a, and a \cdot 0 = 0.
                             There is a unique integer -a = (-1) \cdot a
       (Additive inverses)
                             such that a + (-a) = 0.
                             a-b is defined to be a+(-b).
            (Subtraction)
        (No divisors of 0)
                             If ab = 0, then a = 0 or b = 0.
            (Cancellation)
                             If ab = ac and a \neq 0, then b = c.
(Transitive property of <)
                             If a < b and b < c, then a < c.
             (Trichotomy)
                             Exactly one of a < b, a = b, or a > b holds.
       (Order property 1)
                             If a < b, then a + c < b + c.
       (Order property 2)
                             If c > 0, then a < b iff ac < bc.
       (Order property 3)
                             If c < 0, then a < b iff ac > bc.
```

### Basic Properties of Real Numbers

For all real numbers a, b, and c,

```
(Closure under + and \cdot)
                               a+b and ab are real numbers.
            (Associativity) (a+b)+c=a+(b+c) and (ab)c=a(bc).
          (Commutativity) a+b=b+a and ab=ba.
            (Distributivity) a(b+c) = ab + ac.
                (Identities)
                               0 \neq 1, a + 0 = a, a \cdot 1 = a, and a \cdot 0 = 0.
                               There is a unique real number -a = (-1) \cdot a
        (Additive inverses)
                               such that a + (-a) = 0.
             (Subtraction)
                               a-b is defined to be a+(-b).
                               If a \neq 0, then there is a unique real number
  (Multiplicative inverses)
                               a^{-1} = \frac{1}{a} such that a \cdot a^{-1} = 1.
                               When a \neq 0, \frac{b}{a} is defined to be b \cdot a^{-1}.
                 (Division)
         (No divisors of 0)
                               If ab = 0, then a = 0 or b = 0.
             (Cancellation)
                               If ab = ac and a \neq 0, then b = c.
(Transitive property of <)
                               If a < b and b < c, then a < c.
             (Trichotomy)
                               Exactly one of a < b, a = b, or a > b holds.
        (Order property 1)
                               If a < b, then a + c < b + c.
        (Order property 2)
                               If c > 0, then a < b iff ac < bc.
        (Order property 3)
                               If c < 0, then a < b iff ac > bc.
```

# Basic properties of absolute value

For all real numbers a, b,

- ② If  $a \ge 0$ , |b| = a if and only if b = a or b = -a.
- $|a|^2 = a^2$ .
- $|a| = \sqrt{a^2}.$
- $|a \cdot b| = |a||b|.$
- **1** If |a| = |b|, then a = b or a = -b.
- (Triangle inequality)  $|a+b| \le |a| + |b|$ .
- |a+b|=|a|+|b| if and only if a and b have the same sign.
- $\textbf{ (Reverse triangle inequality) } ||a|-|b|| \leq |a-b|$

### Proof by Counterexample

**Definition:** An integer n is *divisible* by a non-zero integer m if there exists an integer k such that n=km. We write  $m\mid n$  and say that m is a *divisor* of n.

Show that the following statement is false.

For all positive integers p, n, and m, if  $p \mid nm$ , then  $p \mid n$  or  $p \mid m$ .

# Proof by Counterexample

## Mixed Quantifiers

For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  such that x < y.

There exists  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , x < y.

#### Limits

**Definition:** Let f(x) be a function defined on an open interval containing a, except possibly at a itself.

The *limit of f at a equals L* if for all  $\epsilon>0$ , there exists  $\delta>0$  such that: for all x, if  $0<|x-a|<\delta$ , then  $|f(x)-L|<\epsilon$ .

In notation we write  $\lim_{x\to a} f(x) = L$ .

# Example

The limit of f(x) = 2x + 1 at a = 3 is 7.

# Example

The limit of f(x) = 2x + 1 at a = 3 is 7.

# Negating mixed quantifiers

$$\lim_{x\to 3} 2x + 1 \neq 8.$$

# Negating mixed quantifiers

$$\lim_{x\to 3} 2x + 1 \neq 8.$$

## Negating mixed quantifiers

In every intro to proofs course C, there exists a student S such that S can negate mixed quantifiers faster than every other student in C.

The limit of f(x) at a exists.

The limit of f(x) at a does not exist.