

Homework 2

Zachary Moring

September 19, 2024

I was not able to complete the code exercises this week.

Exercise 1. Use structural induction to prove the result in the slide.

For natural numbers, I cannot see the difference between structural induction and regular induction. To try to modify this, we can frame it as a recurrence relation.

Let s_1 be 1 and $s_n = s_{n-1} + \frac{1}{n^2}$. Then $s_n \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n}$.

For the base case, $(s_1 = 1) \leq 2 - 1$, so the proposition holds.

Assume that the proposition is true for s_{k-1} and consider s_k . By definition,

$$s_k = s_{k-1} + \frac{1}{k^2} \leq 2 - \frac{1}{(k-1)^2} + \frac{1}{k^2}$$

which we manipulate as:

$$\begin{aligned} s_k &= 2 - \frac{k^2}{k(k-1)^2} + \frac{(k-1)^2}{k(k-1)^2} \\ &= 2 - \frac{k^2 + (k-1)^2}{k(k-1)^2} \end{aligned}$$

Now we need to show that $s_k \leq 2 - \frac{1}{k^2}$, which we can rewrite with the denominator as

$$s_k = 2 - \frac{k^2 + (k-1)^2}{k(k-1)^2} \leq 2 - \frac{(k-1)^2}{k(k-1)^2}$$

which, by manipulation, is true if $k^2 + (k-1)^2 > (k-1)^2$, which it is.

Thus $s_k \leq 2 - \frac{1}{k^2}$.

Therefore, by structural induction on the recursion, $s_n \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n^2}$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Therefore, $s_n < 2$ for all $n \geq 1$.

[LCS] **Exercise 1.4.15.** Use induction on n to prove the theorem

$$(\varphi_1 \wedge (\varphi_2 \wedge (\cdots \wedge \varphi_n) \cdots) \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\varphi_1 \rightarrow (\varphi_2 \rightarrow (\cdots (\varphi_n \rightarrow \psi) \cdots)))$$

For the base case, consider $n = 1$ and thus $(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\varphi_1 \rightarrow \psi)$, which is trivially true. Thus, the theorem holds for the base case.

Now, let the inductive hypothesis IH be that

$$(\varphi_1 \wedge (\varphi_2 \wedge (\cdots \wedge \varphi_k) \cdots) \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow (\varphi_1 \rightarrow (\varphi_2 \rightarrow (\cdots (\varphi_k \rightarrow \chi) \cdots))).$$

Thus:

1	$(\varphi_1 \wedge (\cdots \wedge (\varphi_k \wedge \varphi_{k+1}) \cdots)) \rightarrow \psi$	premise
2	$(\varphi_1 \wedge (\cdots \wedge \varphi_k) \cdots)$	assume
3	φ_{k+1}	assume
4	$(\varphi_1 \wedge (\cdots \wedge (\varphi_k \wedge \varphi_{k+1})))$	$\wedge i \ 2 \ 3$
5	ψ	$\rightarrow e \ 4 \ 1$
6	$\varphi_{k+1} \rightarrow \psi$	$\rightarrow i \ 3 : 5$
7	$(\varphi_1 \rightarrow (\cdots (\varphi_k \rightarrow (\varphi_{k+1} \rightarrow \psi))))$	$\rightarrow e \ 6 \ IH \ (\chi = 6)$

Therefore, by induction, the theorem holds.

Problem 1. Show that any of the three rules LEM, PBC, and $\neg\neg$ E are interderivable.

Using the proof in the book on page 25, we know that PBC can be derived from $\neg\neg$ E.

Next, we demonstrate that LEM can be derived from PBC. No premises are needed.

1	$\neg(p \vee \neg p)$	assumption
2	p	assumption
3	$p \vee \neg p$	$\vee i_1$ 2
4	\perp	$\neg e$ 1 3
5	$\neg p$	$\neg i$ 2 : 4
6	$p \vee \neg p$	$\vee i_2$ 5
7	\perp	$\neg e$ 1 6
8	$\neg\neg(p \vee \neg p)$	PBC 1 : 7
9	$p \vee \neg p$	$\neg\neg e$ 8

Lastly, we demonstrate that $\neg\neg$ E is derivable from LEM.

1	$\neg\neg p$	premise
2	$p \vee \neg p$	LEM 1
3	$\neg p$	assumption
4	\perp	$\neg e$ 1 3
5	p	$\perp i$ 4
6	p	assumption
7	p	$\vee e$ 3 : 6

Therefore, LEM, PBC, and $\neg\neg$ E are interderivable.