

Homework 2

Due: Jan 27, 2012

CS103, Winter 2011-2012

Correction (1/21/2012): specified non-negative integers in problem 8.

Correction (1/22/2012): Problem 11 is solved in Rosen Chapter 1. Don't bother doing it.

Correction (1/23/2012): Problem 9 should specify that x is non-zero.

For this homework, write all informal proofs according to the guidelines given in lectures up to lecture 5. In particular, when using a universal generalization, explicitly say “Let n be an arbitrary integer ...”, etc. Later, we will relax this rule, but please do it for now.

Problem 1 (Rosen, section 1.3, problem 36): Find a counterexample, if possible, to these universally quantified statements, where the domain for all variables consists of all real numbers.

- $\forall x (x^2 \neq x)$
- $\forall x (x^2 \neq 2)$
- $\forall x (|x| > 0)$

Problem 2 (Rosen, section 1.3, problem 50): Show that $\forall x P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x)$ and $\forall x (P(x) \vee Q(x))$ are not logically equivalent.

Problem 3 (Rosen, section 1.4, problem 40). Find a counterexample, if possible, to these universally quantified statements, where the domain for all variables consists of all integers.

- $\forall x \exists y (x = 1/y)$
- $\forall x \exists y (y^2 - x < 100)$
- $\forall x \forall y (x^2 \neq y^3)$

Problem 4 (Rosen, section 1.4, problem 50): A statement is in **prenex normal form (PNF)** if and only if it is of the form $Q_1 x_1 Q_2 x_2 \cdots Q_k x_k P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$. Put these statements in prenex normal form.

Hint: Use logical equivalences from Tables 6 and 7 in Section 1.2, Table 2 in Section 1.3, Example 19 in Rosen section 1.3, Exercises 45 and 46 in Section 1.3, and Exercises 48 and 49 in Rosen section 1.4.

- a. $\exists x P(x) \vee \exists x Q(x) \vee A$, where A is a proposition not involving any quantifiers.
- b. $\neg(\forall x P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x))$
- c. $\exists x P(x) \rightarrow \exists x Q(x)$

Problem 5 Write a proof in System F of following $\forall x (P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \leftrightarrow (\forall x P(x) \wedge \forall y Q(y))$

Problem 6 Here is a “proof” of the “theorem”:

$$\forall x \exists y R(x, y) \rightarrow \exists y \forall x R(x, y)$$

which is unfortunate, because the “theorem” is not actually valid.

1. $\forall x \exists y R(x, y)$	
2. \boxed{a}	
3. $\exists y R(a, y)$	\forall Elim: 1
4. $\boxed{b} R(a, b)$	
5. $R(a, b)$	Reit 4
6. $R(a, b)$	\exists Elim 4–5,3
7. $\forall x R(x, b)$	\forall Intro 3–6
8. $\exists y \forall x R(x, y)$	\exists Intro 7

- a. Describe a counter-example to the “theorem.”
- b. What rule was misapplied (based on the descriptions of the rules in the lecture)?

Problem 7 Consider the following statement: *There is a number between every pair of non-equal numbers.* (In this context, “between” two numbers also means not equal to either number).

- a. Write the statement in first order logic using standard symbols from arithmetic operations and relations (in addition to the usual logical symbols).

- b. Is it true for the integers? Prove it (show the existence of the “between” number by constructing it), or give a counterexample.
- c. Is it true for the rational numbers?
Prove it (show the existence of the “between” number by constructing it), or give a counterexample.

Rational numbers are numbers that can be written as p/q where p and q are both integers.

Problem 8 Write an informal proof by contradiction of the following theorem, following the guidelines in the lectures: The only consecutive non-negative integers satisfying $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ are $a = 3$, $b = 4$, and $c = 5$ (by “consecutive”, we mean $c = b + 1 = a + 2$).

Problem 9 Prove by contradiction that, for all real numbers x and y , if x is a non-zero rational number and y is irrational, the xy is also irrational.

Problem 10 Prove by cases that $\min(x, \min(y, z)) = \min(\min(x, y), z)$, for all real numbers x , y , and z .

Problem 11 *[I overlooked the fact that this is solved as an example in the reader. Don't do it.]* Prove that the square of every integer has a last digit of 0, 1, 4, 5, 6, or 9.