

## 1 Propositional Logic Language

For each of the following sentences, use the notation introduced in class to convert the sentence into propositional logic. Then write the statement's negation in propositional logic.

- (a) The cube of a negative integer is negative.
- (b) There are no integer solutions to the equation  $x^2 - y^2 = 10$ .
- (c) There is one and only one real solution to the equation  $x^3 + x + 1 = 0$ .
- (d) For any two distinct real numbers, we can find a rational number in between them.

### Solution:

- (a) We can rephrase the sentence as “if  $n < 0$ , then  $n^3 < 0$ ”, which can be written as

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{Z})((n < 0) \implies (n^3 < 0))$$

or equivalently as

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{Z})((n \geq 0) \vee (n^3 < 0)).$$

The latter is easier to negate, and its negation is given by

$$(\exists n \in \mathbb{Z})((n < 0) \wedge (n^3 \geq 0))$$

- (b) The sentence is

$$(\forall x, y \in \mathbb{Z})(x^2 - y^2 \neq 10).$$

The negation is

$$(\exists x, y \in \mathbb{Z})(x^2 - y^2 = 10)$$

- (c) Let  $p(x) = x^3 + x + 1$ . The sentence can be read “there is a solution  $x$  to the equation  $p(x) = 0$ , and any other solution  $y$  is equal to  $x$ ”. Or,

$$(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})((p(x) = 0) \wedge ((\forall y \in \mathbb{R})(p(y) = 0) \implies (x = y))).$$

Its negation is given by

$$(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})((p(x) \neq 0) \vee ((\exists y \in \mathbb{R})(p(y) = 0) \wedge (x \neq y))).$$

This can be equivalently expressed as

$$(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})((p(x) = 0) \implies ((\exists y \in \mathbb{R})(p(y) = 0) \wedge (x \neq y))).$$

- (d) The sentence can be read “if  $x$  and  $y$  are distinct real numbers, then there is a rational number  $z$  between  $x$  and  $y$ .” Or,

$$(\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R})(x \neq y) \implies ((\exists z \in \mathbb{Q})(x < z < y \vee y < z < x)).$$

Equivalently,

$$(\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R})(x = y) \vee ((\exists z \in \mathbb{Q})(x < z < y \vee y < z < x)).$$

Note that  $x < z < y$  is mathematical shorthand for  $(x < z) \wedge (z < y)$ , so the above statement is equivalent to

$$(\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R})(x = y) \vee ((\exists z \in \mathbb{Q})((x < z) \wedge (z < y)) \vee ((y < z) \wedge (z < x))).$$

Then the negation is

$$(\exists x, y \in \mathbb{R})(x \neq y) \wedge ((\forall z \in \mathbb{Q})((z \leq x) \vee (z \geq y)) \wedge ((y \geq z) \vee (x \leq z))).$$

## 2 Implication

Which of the following implications are always true, regardless of  $P$ ? Give a counterexample for each false assertion (i.e. come up with a statement  $P(x, y)$  that would make the implication false).

- (a)  $\forall x \forall y P(x, y) \implies \forall y \forall x P(x, y)$ .
- (b)  $\exists x \exists y P(x, y) \implies \exists y \exists x P(x, y)$ .
- (c)  $\forall x \exists y P(x, y) \implies \exists y \forall x P(x, y)$ .
- (d)  $\exists x \forall y P(x, y) \implies \forall y \exists x P(x, y)$ .

### Solution:

- (a) True. For all can be switched if they are adjacent; since  $\forall x, \forall y$  and  $\forall y, \forall x$  means for all  $x$  and  $y$  in our universe.
- (b) True. There exists can be switched if they are adjacent;  $\exists x, \exists y$  and  $\exists y, \exists x$  means there exists  $x$  and  $y$  in our universe.
- (c) False. Let  $P(x, y)$  be  $x < y$ , and the universe for  $x$  and  $y$  be the integers. Or let  $P(x, y)$  be  $x = y$  and the universe be any set with at least two elements. In both cases, the antecedent is true and the consequence is false, thus the entire implication statement is false.
- (d) True. The first statement says that there is an  $x$ , say  $x'$  where for every  $y$ ,  $P(x, y)$  is true. Thus, one can choose  $x = x'$  for the second statement and that statement will be true again for every  $y$ . Note that the two statements are not equivalent as the converse of this is statement c, which is false.

### 3 Logic

Decide whether each of the following is true or false and justify your answer:

(a)  $\forall x (P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \equiv \forall x P(x) \wedge \forall x Q(x)$

(b)  $\forall x (P(x) \vee Q(x)) \equiv \forall x P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x)$

(c)  $\exists x (P(x) \vee Q(x)) \equiv \exists x P(x) \vee \exists x Q(x)$

(d)  $\exists x (P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \equiv \exists x P(x) \wedge \exists x Q(x)$

#### **Solution:**

(a) **True.**

Assume that the LHS is true. Then we know for an arbitrary  $x$   $P(x) \wedge Q(x)$  is true. This means that both  $\forall x P(x)$  and  $\forall x Q(x)$ . Therefore the RHS is true. Now assume the RHS. Since for any  $x$   $P(x)$  and for any  $y$   $Q(y)$  holds, then for an arbitrary  $x$  both  $P(x)$  and  $Q(x)$  must be true. Thus the LHS is true.

(b) **False.** If  $P(1)$  is true,  $Q(1)$  is false,  $P(2)$  is false and  $Q(2)$  is true, the left-hand side will be true, but the right-hand side will be false.

(c) **True**

Assuming that the LHS is true, we know there exists some  $x$  such that one of  $P(x)$  and  $Q(x)$  is true. Thus  $\exists x P(x)$  or  $\exists x Q(x)$  and the RHS is true. To prove the other direction, assume the LHS is false. Then there does not exist an  $x$  for which  $P(x) \vee Q(x)$  is true, which means there is no  $x$  for which  $P(x)$  or  $Q(x)$  is true. Therefore the RHS is false.

(d) **False.** If  $P(1)$  is true and  $P(x)$  is false for all other  $x$ , and  $Q(2)$  is true and  $Q(x)$  is false for all other  $x$ , the right hand side would be true. However, there would be no value of  $x$  at which both  $P(x)$  and  $Q(x)$  would be simultaneously true.