

Homework 2B – solution

1. Consider the following formula of predicate logic:

$$[(\forall y (R(x, y) \wedge P(y))) \Rightarrow (\forall x \forall y Q(x, y))] \wedge (\forall x Q(x, a)).$$

Construct its negation and reformulate it in such a way that the sign \neg is in front of the “atomic” propositional functions only.

We use the fact that $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$ and $\neg(\alpha \Rightarrow \beta) = \alpha \wedge \neg\beta$. In addition, we need to exchange the quantifiers $\forall \leftrightarrow \exists$ when negating quantified formulas. In the following derivation, each line is equivalent to the preceding one:

$$\begin{aligned} & \neg\left([\forall y (R(x, y) \wedge P(y)) \Rightarrow (\forall x \forall y Q(x, y))] \wedge (\forall x Q(x, a))\right) \\ & \neg[\forall y (R(x, y) \wedge P(y)) \Rightarrow (\forall x \forall y Q(x, y))] \vee \neg(\forall x Q(x, a)) \\ & [(\forall y (R(x, y) \wedge P(y))) \wedge \neg(\forall x \forall y Q(x, y))] \vee \neg(\forall x Q(x, a)) \\ & [(\forall y (R(x, y) \wedge P(y))) \wedge (\exists x \exists y \neg Q(x, y))] \vee (\exists x \neg Q(x, a)) \end{aligned}$$

2. Write the negations of the following statements

- a) $(\forall \varepsilon > 0)(\forall \delta > 0)(\varepsilon < \delta)$
- b) $(\forall \varepsilon > 0)(\exists \delta > 0)(\varepsilon < \delta)$
- c) $(\exists \varepsilon > 0)(\forall \delta > 0)(\varepsilon < \delta)$
- d) $(\exists \varepsilon > 0)(\exists \delta > 0)(\varepsilon < \delta)$

Which of them are true? Try to prove or disprove by rigorous argumentation.

For (a), the negation says $(\exists \varepsilon > 0)(\exists \delta > 0)(\varepsilon \geq \delta)$. The negation is true and hence the original statement is false. Proof: Just take $\varepsilon = 2$, $\delta = 1$. Then it is indeed true that $\varepsilon \geq \delta$.

For (b), the negation says $(\exists \varepsilon > 0)(\forall \delta > 0)(\varepsilon \geq \delta)$. The original statement is true and hence the negation is false. Proof: Take arbitrary¹ $\varepsilon > 0$. We need to find $\delta > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < \delta$. Just take $\delta := \varepsilon + 1$. (Or $\delta := 2\varepsilon$ or whatever.) Then indeed $\varepsilon < \delta$.

For (c), the negation says $(\forall \varepsilon > 0)(\exists \delta > 0)(\varepsilon \geq \delta)$. The negation is true and hence the original statement is false. Proof: Take arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. We need to find $\delta > 0$ such that $\varepsilon \geq \delta$. Just take $\delta := \varepsilon/2$. Then indeed $\varepsilon < \delta$.

For (d), the negation says $(\forall \varepsilon > 0)(\forall \delta > 0)(\varepsilon \geq \delta)$. The original statement is true and hence the negation is false. Proof: Just take $\varepsilon = 1$, $\delta = 2$. Then it is indeed true that $\varepsilon < \delta$.

¹ The word *arbitrary* gets sometimes misinterpreted if you are not used to reading mathematical texts. If I say that I will prove something for arbitrary x (or if I ask you to do so), what I mean is not that one can choose x at their convenience and do the proof only for this particular instance. Quite the opposite: I am claiming that the argument should work for any x .