

1. We cannot help everyone, but everyone can help some one.

$$\forall x \exists y (\neg \text{help}(x, y)) \wedge \forall x \exists y (\text{help}(x, y))$$

$$\forall x (\neg \forall y (\text{help}(x, y))) \wedge \forall x \exists y (\text{help}(x, y))$$

2. No one who has no complete knowledge of himself will ever have a true understanding of another.

This statement means, there exists one who has no knowledge of himself will ever have a true understanding of another is false.

$$\neg [\exists x (\neg \text{know}(x, x) \wedge \exists y (\text{understand}(x, y)))]$$

$$\forall x (\neg \text{know}(x, x) \rightarrow \forall y (\neg \text{understand}(x, y)))$$

3. Negate the following:  $\forall x \exists \epsilon ((x > 0 \wedge \epsilon > 0) \wedge \forall y (y > 0 \rightarrow x - y \geq \epsilon))$

**solution:**  $\exists x \forall \epsilon ((x > 0 \wedge \epsilon > 0) \rightarrow \exists y (y > 0 \wedge x - y < \epsilon))$

NOTE: while applying negation,  $\forall$  flips to  $\exists$  and vice versa. Similarly,  $\rightarrow$  flips to  $\wedge$  and vice versa.

4. Some Republicans like all Democrats. No Republican likes any Socialist. Therefore, no Democrat is a Socialist.  $\exists x (R(x) \wedge \forall y (D(y) \rightarrow \text{like}(x, y)))$  — (1)

$$\neg (\exists x (R(x) \wedge \exists y (S(y) \wedge \text{like}(x, y))) \equiv \forall x (R(x) \rightarrow \forall y (S(y) \rightarrow \neg \text{like}(x, y))))$$
 — (2)

$$\forall x (D(x) \rightarrow \neg S(x)).$$
 — (3)

The above claim is true, we shall present a direct proof.

(3) EI, UI of (1)  $R(a) \wedge (D(b) \rightarrow \text{like}(a, b))$ , for some  $a$  and any  $b$

(4) UI of (2)  $R(a) \rightarrow (S(b) \rightarrow \neg \text{like}(a, b))$ , for any  $a$  and  $b$

Note:  $P \wedge Q \rightarrow P$  is a tautology.

(5) From (3),  $R(a)$

Note:  $P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q)$  is a tautology.

(6) From (5) and (4),  $(S(b) \rightarrow \neg \text{like}(a, b))$

(7) Contrapositive of (6);  $\text{like}(a, b) \rightarrow \neg S(b)$

Note:  $((P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R)) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)$  is a tautology.

(8) From (3), we get  $(D(b) \rightarrow \text{like}(a, b))$

(9) From (8) and (7), we get  $D(b) \rightarrow \neg S(b)$

Since  $b$  is arbitrary,

UG:  $\forall x (D(x) \rightarrow \neg S(x))$ , the required claim.

5. Prove or Disprove.

$$[\exists x P(x) \rightarrow \forall x Q(x)] \rightarrow \forall x [P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)]$$

. The Claim is true and we shall present below a proof.

By definition;  $\exists x P(x) \rightarrow \forall x Q(x) \equiv \neg \exists x P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x)$

It follows that,  $\forall x \neg P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x) \equiv \forall x (\neg P(x) \vee Q(x))$

Thus,  $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$ .

6.  $\forall x [P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)] \rightarrow [\exists x P(x) \rightarrow \forall x Q(x)]$

The above claim is false. We need a counter example which satisfies the premise and does not satisfy the conclusion. In particular, the example is such that  $\exists x P(x)$  is true and  $\forall x Q(x)$  is false.

UOD: set of natural numbers,  $P(x)$   $x$  is divisible by 6,  $Q(x)$   $x$  is divisible by 2.

It is clear that if a number is div by 6 then it is div by 2 and thus,  $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$  is true always.

Also,  $\exists x P(x)$  is true, for example  $x = 6$ .

Further,  $\forall xQ(x)$  is false, not every natural number is divisible by 2.  
Therefore, the conclusion is false.

7. Express the following using the first order logic by clearly mentioning UOD, predicates used: Everyone who gets admitted into an IIT gets a job. Therefore, if there are no jobs, then nobody gets admitted into any IIT.

Premise:  $\forall x(person(x) \wedge (\exists y(IIT(y) \wedge admit(x, y))) \rightarrow (\exists z(job(z) \wedge getjob(x, z))))$

Conclusion:  $\forall z(\neg(job(z)) \rightarrow \neg(\exists x(person(x) \wedge \exists y(IIT(y) \wedge admit(x, y))))$ . (or)  
 $\neg\exists z((job(z)) \rightarrow \forall x(person(x) \wedge \exists y(IIT(y)) \rightarrow \neg admit(x, y))$ .

The claim is false. Consider a venn diagram with two sets  $A$  : set of jobs  $B$  : students admitted in IITs.  $A \cap B$  denotes, students of some IIT gets job.  $B \setminus A$  denotes students in other IITs.