

## 4.2, 4.5

Andrew Lounsbury

February 23, 2020

### 1 4.2, p.107

1. (a)  $\frac{S0 + S0 = SS0}{\text{Yes: it's atomic}}$   
(b)  $\frac{\neg(0 < 0 \vee 0 < S0)}{\text{Yes: Let } \alpha := 0 < 0 \text{ and } \beta := 0 < S0. \\ \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ are atomic} \\ \alpha \vee \beta \text{ a } \Sigma\text{-formula (case 2)} \\ \neg(\alpha \vee \beta) \text{ a } \Sigma\text{-formula}}$   
(c)  $\frac{(\forall x < \overline{17})x < \overline{17}}{\text{Yes: case 4 - } (\forall x < t)\alpha}$   
(d)  $\frac{S0 \cdot S0 = S0 \wedge (\exists y < x)(\exists z < y)y + z = x}{\text{Yes: Let } \alpha := S0 \cdot S0 = S0 \text{ and } \beta := (\exists y < x)(\exists z < y)y + z = x. \\ \alpha \text{ is atomic} \\ \beta \text{ is a } \Sigma\text{-formula by case 4} \\ \alpha \wedge \beta \text{ is a } \Sigma\text{-formula by case 3}}$   
(e)  $\frac{(\forall y)(y < 0 \rightarrow 0 = 0)}{\text{No: unbounded universal quantifier}}$   
(f)  $\frac{(\exists x)(x < x)}{\text{Yes: case 4}}$
2. A formula is Cool if and only if it is a  $\Sigma$ -formula.

*Proof.*



3.  $\alpha := x < y \vee (\forall z < w)x + \overline{17} = \overline{42}$

- (a) Yes: Let  $\beta := x < y$  and  $\delta := (\forall z < w)x + \overline{17} = \overline{42}$ .  
 $\beta$  is atomic  
 $x + \overline{17} = \overline{42}$  is atomic, so  $\delta$  is a  $\Pi$ -formula  
 $\beta \vee \delta$  is a  $\Pi$ -formula by case 3
- (b)  $\neg\alpha := y \leq x \wedge \neg(\forall z < w)x + \overline{17} = \overline{42}$   
Yes: Let  $\beta := y \leq x$  and  $\delta := \neg(\forall z < w)x + \overline{17} = \overline{42}$ .  
 $\beta$  is a  $\Pi$ -formula  
 $x + \overline{17} = \overline{42}$  is a  $\Pi$ -formula, so  $(\forall z < w)x + \overline{17} = \overline{42}$  is a  $\Pi$ -formula  
 $\delta$  is a  $\Pi$ -formula by case 2  
 $\beta \wedge \delta$  is a  $\Pi$ -formula by case 3
- (c)  $\neg\alpha := y \leq x \wedge (\exists z < w)x + \overline{17} \neq \overline{42}$
- (d) If  $\alpha$  is any  $\Sigma$ -formula, then  $\neg\alpha$  is logically equivalent to a  $\Pi$ -formula.

*Proof.* We induct on the complexity of  $\alpha$ .

If  $\alpha$  is atomic, then  $\neg\alpha$  is clearly a  $\Pi$ -formula.

If  $\alpha := \neg\beta$ , where  $\beta$  is an atomic formula, then  $\neg\alpha := \beta$  is clearly a  $\Pi$ -formula.

Suppose  $\alpha := \beta \wedge \delta$ , where  $\beta$  and  $\delta$  are  $\Sigma$ -formulas. ■

## 2 4.5, p.112

1. (a)  $\langle 3, 0, 4, 2, 1 \rangle = 2^4 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 5^5 \cdot 7^3 \cdot 11^2 = 6,225,450,000$   
(b)  $(16910355000)_3 = (2^3 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 5^4 \cdot 7 \cdot 11^3)_3 = (\langle 2, 0, 3, 0, 4 \rangle)_3 = 3$   
(c)  $|16910355000| = |\langle 2, 0, 3, 0, 4 \rangle| = 5$   
(d)  $(16910355000)_{42} = 0$   
(e)  $\langle 2, 7, 1, 8 \rangle \curvearrowright \langle 2, 8, 1 \rangle = \langle 2, 7, 1, 8, 2, 8, 1 \rangle = 2^3 \cdot 3^8 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7^9 \cdot 11^3 \cdot 13^9 \cdot 17^2$   
(f)  $17 \curvearrowright 42 = 0$   
2 is the only prime code number.
2. Consider 6:  $\langle 6 \rangle = 2^7 = 128$ , so  $|\langle 6 \rangle| = |128| = |2^7| = 1$ , but  $|6| = |2 \cdot 3| = 2$ .