

Summary on Lecture 6, February 4, 2019

• **Two proofs.**

- (1) Show that
- $n^2 - 2$
- is not divisible by 5 for every
- $n \in \mathbf{Z}_+$
- .

Proof. We consider the cases: (a) $n = 5k$, (b) $n = 5k + 1$, (c) $n = 5k + 2$, (d) $n = 5k + 3$, (e) $n = 5k + 4$.

(a): We have $n^2 - 2 = 25k^2 - 2$ is not divisible by 5.

(b): We have $n^2 - 2 = 25k^2 + 10k + 1 - 2 = 5(5k^2 + 2k) - 1$ is not divisible by 5.

(c): We have $n^2 - 2 = 25k^2 + 20k + 4 - 2 = 5(5k^2 + 4k) + 2$ is not divisible by 5.

(d): We have $n^2 - 2 = 25k^2 + 30k + 9 - 2 = 5(5k^2 + 6k + 1) + 2$ is not divisible by 5.

(e): We have $n^2 - 2 = 25k^2 + 40k + 16 - 2 = 5(5k^2 + 8k + 3) + 1$ is not divisible by 5.

Thus $n^2 - 2$ is not divisible by 5 for every $n \in \mathbf{Z}_+$.

- (2) Show that
- $n^4 - n^2$
- is divisible by 3 for every
- $n \in \mathbf{Z}_+$
- .

Proof. We notice that $n^4 - n^2 = n^2(n^2 - 1) = n^2(n - 1)(n + 1)$. Then we consider the cases:

(a) $n = 3k$, (b) $n = 3k + 1$, (c) $n = 3k + 2$.

(a): Then n^2 is divisible by 3.

(b): Then $n - 1$ is divisible by 3.

(c): Then $n + 1$ is divisible by 3.

Thus $n^4 - n^2$ is divisible by 3 for every $n \in \mathbf{Z}_+$.

- (3) Show that
- $n^4 - n^2$
- is even for every
- $n \in \mathbf{Z}_+$
- .

- (4) Show that
- $n^4 - n^2$
- is divisible by 6 for every
- $n \in \mathbf{Z}_+$
- .

• **Quantifiers.** We introduce two important notations:

“ \forall ” “for all”

“ \exists ” “exists”

- (a) Let
- $p(n)$
- means “
- $n^2 = n$
- ”, where
- $n \in \mathbf{Z}$
- . Then we have the statements:

$$\forall n p(n) \iff \forall n (n^2 = n)$$

F

$$\exists n p(n) \iff \exists n (n^2 = n)$$

T

- (b) Let
- $p(n)$
- means “
- $n + 2$
- is even”, where
- $n \in \mathbf{Z}$
- . Then we have the statements:

$$\forall n p(n) \iff \forall n (n + 2 \text{ is even})$$

F

$$\exists n p(n) \iff \exists n (n + 2 \text{ is even})$$

T

$$\forall n \neg p(n) \iff \forall n \neg(n + 2 \text{ is even}) \iff \forall n (n + 2 \text{ is odd})$$

F

$$\exists n \neg p(n) \iff \exists n \neg(n + 2 \text{ is even}) \iff \exists n (n + 2 \text{ is odd})$$

T

We notice the following tautologies:

$$\neg(\exists x p(x)) \iff \forall x \neg p(x)$$

$$\neg(\forall x p(x)) \iff \exists x \neg p(x)$$

More examples:

- (a) Let
- $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$
- .

$$\forall x \forall y (x + y = y + x)$$

T

- (b) Let $n \in \mathbf{Z}$.
 $\forall n [(n \text{ is a prime}) \rightarrow (n \text{ is a odd})$ F
 $\forall n [((n \text{ is a prime}) \wedge (n \geq 3)) \rightarrow (n \text{ is a odd})]$ T
- (c) Let $n \in \mathbf{Z}$.
 $\forall n (n + 6 \leq 2^n)$ F
 $\forall n [(n + 6 \leq 2^n) \wedge (n \geq 4)]$ T
 Here $n = 3$ is a counterexample for the first statement. The second one is hard to prove (we'll learn it soon: **induction**).
- (d) Let $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$.
 $\forall x \forall y [(x > y) \rightarrow (x^2 > y^2)]$ F
 A counterexample: $x = 1, y = -2$.
- (e) Let $x, y \in \mathbf{R}_+ = \{ r \in \mathbf{R} \mid r > 0 \}$.
 $\forall x \forall y [(x > y) \rightarrow (x^2 > y^2)]$ T
- (f) Let $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$, and $p(x) := (x \geq 0), q(x) := (x^2 \geq 0)$.
 $\exists x (p(x) \rightarrow q(x))$ T
 $\forall x (p(x) \rightarrow q(x))$ T
- (g) We notice that the implication $\forall x p(x) \rightarrow \exists x p(x)$ is a tautology.
- (h) Let $x \in \mathbf{Z}_+$.
 $\forall x (x^2 \geq 1)$ T
 Let $x \in \mathbf{Z}$.
 $\forall x (x^2 \geq 1)$ F
- (i) Important tautology: $\forall x (p(x) \rightarrow q(x)) \iff \forall x (\neg q(x) \rightarrow \neg p(x))$
- (j) More tautologies:

$$\exists x (p(x) \wedge q(x)) \implies (\exists x p(x)) \wedge (\exists x q(x))$$

We notice that the implication

$$(\exists x p(x)) \wedge (\exists x q(x)) \rightarrow \exists x (p(x) \wedge q(x))$$

is not a tautology. Example: $p(x) = (x < 1), q(x) = (x \geq 1)$. Then the statement $(\exists x p(x)) \wedge (\exists x q(x))$ is true, but the statement $\exists x (p(x) \wedge q(x))$ is false. More tautologies:

$$\exists x (p(x) \vee q(x)) \iff (\exists x p(x)) \vee (\exists x q(x))$$

$$\forall x (p(x) \wedge q(x)) \iff (\forall x p(x)) \wedge (\forall x q(x))$$

$$(\forall x p(x)) \vee (\forall x q(x)) \implies \forall x (p(x) \vee q(x))$$

We notice that the implication

$$\forall x (p(x) \vee q(x)) \rightarrow (\forall x p(x)) \vee (\forall x q(x))$$

is not a tautology. The same example: $p(x) = (x < 1), q(x) = (x \geq 1)$. Then the statement $\forall x (p(x) \vee q(x))$ is true, but the statement $(\forall x p(x)) \vee (\forall x q(x))$ is false.

- (k) Let $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$. Then the statement $\forall x \exists y (x + y = 25)$ is true. Indeed for any given $x = a$, we can find $y = 25 - a$ so that $x + y = 25$.

- (l) However the statement $\exists y \forall x (x + y = 25)$ is false. Indeed assume that there exists $y = b$ so that for every x we have $x + b = 25$. Then this is true for $x = 25 - b$, but not for all x .
- (m) Check that the statement $\forall y \forall x (x + y = 25)$ is false, and the statement $\exists x \exists y (x + y = 25)$ is true.

Limits. Next we discuss definitions of $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x)$.

- Let $\{x_n\}$ be a sequence of real numbers. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = A$ if and only if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an integer N such that for every n ($n > N$) implies that $|x_n - A| < \epsilon$. In our terms, the following proposition

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N \forall n [(n > N) \rightarrow (|x_n - A| < \epsilon)]$$

is true. What does it mean that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \neq A$? The answer:

$$\begin{aligned} \neg(\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N \forall n [(n > N) \rightarrow (|x_n - A| < \epsilon)]) &\iff \exists \epsilon > 0 \forall N \exists n \neg[(n > N) \rightarrow (|x_n - A| < \epsilon)] \\ &\iff \exists \epsilon > 0 \forall N \exists n [(n > N) \wedge (|x_n - A| \geq \epsilon)]. \end{aligned}$$

- Let $f(x)$ be a function. We say that $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) = L$ is for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every x the inequality $0 < |x - a| < \delta$ implies $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$. In our terms, the following proposition

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0 \forall x [(0 < |x - a| \rightarrow (|f(x) - L| < \epsilon))]$$

is true. What does it mean that $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) \neq L$? The answer:

$$\begin{aligned} \neg\{\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0 \forall x [(0 < |x - a| \rightarrow (|f(x) - L| < \epsilon))]\} &\iff \\ \exists \epsilon > 0 \forall \delta > 0 \exists x \neg[(0 < |x - a| \rightarrow (|f(x) - L| < \epsilon))] &\iff \\ \exists \epsilon > 0 \forall \delta > 0 \exists x [(0 < |x - a| \wedge (|f(x) - L| \geq \epsilon))]. & \end{aligned}$$

Those two examples are very important to understand really well.

- Give examples when $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \neq A$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) \neq L$.