

Diskrete Mathematik

Solution 3

3.1 Expressing Relationship of Humans in Predicate Logic

- a) $m(x) \wedge \exists u \exists v (\text{par}(x, u) \wedge \text{par}(u, v) \wedge \text{par}(v, y))$
- b) $\exists u \exists v (\text{par}(u, x) \wedge \text{par}(u, y) \wedge \text{par}(v, x) \wedge \neg \text{par}(v, y))$

3.2 Quantifiers and Predicates

- a)
 - i) $\forall m \forall n (0 < m \cdot n \rightarrow (0 < m \vee 0 < n))$
This statement is false. For example, $(-2) \cdot (-2) = 4$.
 - ii) $\forall m (0 < m \rightarrow \exists n (0 < n \wedge m < n \wedge (\exists k n = 3 \cdot k)))$
This statement is true. For any n , one of the numbers $n + 1, n + 2, n + 3$ must be divisible by 3.
In the formula above, we assumed that 0 is not a natural number. An (equally good) solution for the case when 0 is a natural number would be $\forall m (-1 < m \rightarrow \exists n (-1 < n \wedge m < n \wedge (\exists k n = 3 \cdot k)))$
It is also allowed to drop the condition $0 < n$ (respectively, $-1 < n$), since it is implied by $m < n$.
 - iii) $\forall n (((\exists k n = 2 \cdot k) \wedge 2 < n) \rightarrow \exists p \exists q (\text{prime}(p) \wedge \text{prime}(q) \wedge n = p + q))$
This statement is known as the (strong) Goldbach conjecture. It is not known whether it is true.
- b) There are many equally good ways to describe given formulas using words. We only give examples:
 - i) "For every integer x , there exists an integer y , such that xy is equal to 1."
An alternative solution would be "Each integer has a multiplicative inverse."
This statement is false. For example, there is no integer that will give 1 when multiplied by 5.
 - ii) "There exists an integer x , such that for all integers y , the product xy is not equal to 1, and such that there exists an integer greater than 0."
This statement is true. For $x = 0$, we have that for any integer y , the product xy is not equal to 1, and that there exists a positive integer, namely 42.
Be careful, the following interpretation is *not* correct (Why?): "There exists an integer x , such that for all integers y , the product xy is not equal to 1 and y is positive."

3.3 Finding an Interpretation for a Formula

- a) $U = \mathbb{Z}$ and $P(x, y) = 1 \iff x < y$.
- b) $U = \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and $P(x, y) = 1 \iff (x < n-1 \wedge y = x+1) \vee (x = n-1 \wedge y = 0)$.

3.4 Order of Quantifiers

- a) Assume that the formula $\exists y \forall x P(x, y)$ is true. By the definition of \exists , there exists at least one y such that $\forall x P(x, y)$ is true. Let y^* be such a y . By the definition of \forall , we have that $P(x, y^*)$ is true for all x .
Therefore, we have that for all x there exists a y , namely y^* , for which $P(x, y)$ is true. This means exactly that $\forall x \exists y P(x, y)$ is true.
- b) Consider the following counterexample: the universe is the set \mathbb{Z} of all integers and P is the predicate less. In this interpretation, it is true that $\forall x \exists y x < y$, but the statement $\exists y \forall x x < y$ is false.

3.5 Winning Strategy

- a) The numbers announced by Alice cannot depend on Bob's choice for b_1 and b_2 . Therefore, the statement can be described by the following formula:

$$\exists a_1 \exists a_2 \forall b_1 \forall b_2 (a_1 + (a_2 + b_1)^{|b_2|+1} = 1).$$

The above statement is false, because for each tuple (a_1, a_2) , there exists a tuple $(b_1, b_2) := (2 - a_2 - a_1, 0)$ such that

$$a_1 + (a_2 + b_1)^{|b_2|+1} = a_1 + (a_2 + 2 - a_2 - a_1) = 2.$$

Therefore, Alice does not have a winning strategy.

- b) In this case, Alice's choice for a_2 can depend on b_1 . Therefore, the statement can be described by the following formula:

$$\exists a_1 \forall b_1 \exists a_2 \forall b_2 (a_1 + (a_2 + b_1)^{|b_2|+1} = 1).$$

This statement is true. A possible winning strategy for Alice is to choose $a_1 = 1$ and $a_2 = -b_1$. For such choice, we have

$$a_1 + (a_2 + b_1)^{|b_2|+1} = 1 + 0^{|b_2|+1} = 1.$$