



UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN



# DMA: Proofs

Laura Mančinska  
Institut for Matematiske Fag



# Outline

- Proof method: case analysis



# Outline

- Proof method: case analysis
- To prove or to disprove?



# Outline

- Proof method: case analysis
- To prove or to disprove?
- The axiomatic method
- “The blue-eyed islanders”



# Proof by case analysis

Task: Prove  $q$



# Proof by case analysis

Task: Prove  $q$

## Proof template

- Write: “We use case analysis.”



# Proof by case analysis

**Task:** Prove  $q$

## Proof template

- Write: “We use case analysis.”
- Identify a list of conditions, at least one of which must hold.  
(If it is not obvious that the list is exhaustive, you must prove it.)



# Proof by case analysis

**Task:** Prove  $q$

## Proof template

- Write: “We use case analysis.”
- Identify a list of conditions, at least one of which must hold.  
(If it is not obvious that the list is exhaustive, you must prove it.)
- For each condition:
  - State the condition.
  - Prove  $q$  assuming that the condition holds.





# Proof by case analysis (example)

**Task:** Prove that in every set  $S$  of 6 people there are

- at least 3 mutual strangers OR
- at least 3 mutual friends.



# Proof by case analysis (example)

**Task:** Prove that in every set  $S$  of 6 people there are

- at least 3 mutual strangers OR
- at least 3 mutual friends.

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of six people and  $P \in \mathcal{A}$  be one of them. **We analyze cases:**



# Proof by case analysis (example)

**Task:** Prove that in every set  $S$  of 6 people there are

- at least 3 mutual strangers OR
- at least 3 mutual friends.

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of six people and  $P \in \mathcal{A}$  be one of them. **We analyze cases:**

- 1  $P$  has at least 3 (different) friends  $F_1, F_2, F_3 \in \mathcal{A}$ .
- 2  $P$  is stranger to at least 3 (different) people  $S_1, S_2, S_3 \in \mathcal{A}$ .



# Proof by case analysis (example)

**Task:** Prove that in every set  $S$  of 6 people there are

- at least 3 mutual strangers OR
- at least 3 mutual friends.

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of six people and  $P \in \mathcal{A}$  be one of them. **We analyze cases:**

- 1  $P$  has at least 3 (different) friends  $F_1, F_2, F_3 \in \mathcal{A}$ .
- 2  $P$  is stranger to at least 3 (different) people  $S_1, S_2, S_3 \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**Q:** Why is the list exhaustive?

(finish on the board)



# To prove or to disprove?

Sometimes we don't know whether a statement  $q$  is true or not.



# To prove or to disprove?

Sometimes we don't know whether a statement  $q$  is true or not.

- 1 If  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  are odd, then  $x + y$  is even.



# To prove or to disprove?

Sometimes we don't know whether a statement  $q$  is true or not.

- 1 If  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  are odd, then  $x + y$  is even.
  - True (we proved it on Tuesday).



# To prove or to disprove?

Sometimes we don't know whether a statement  $q$  is true or not.

- ① If  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  are odd, then  $x + y$  is even.
  - True (we proved it on Tuesday).
- ② For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(x = y) \Leftrightarrow (x^2 = y^2)$ .





# To prove or to disprove?

Sometimes we don't know whether a statement  $q$  is true or not.

- ① If  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  are odd, then  $x + y$  is even.
  - True (we proved it on Tuesday).
- ② For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(x = y) \Leftrightarrow (x^2 = y^2)$ .
  - Not true. Why?



# To prove or to disprove?

Sometimes we don't know whether a statement  $q$  is true or not.

- ① If  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  are odd, then  $x + y$  is even.
  - True (we proved it on Tuesday).
- ② For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(x = y) \Leftrightarrow (x^2 = y^2)$ .
  - Not true. Why?
- ③ Let  $a, b, d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . If  $d \mid (ab)$ , then  $d \mid a$  or  $d \mid b$ .



# To prove or to disprove?

Sometimes we don't know whether a statement  $q$  is true or not.

- ① If  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  are odd, then  $x + y$  is even.
  - True (we proved it on Tuesday).
- ② For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(x = y) \Leftrightarrow (x^2 = y^2)$ .
  - Not true. Why?
- ③ Let  $a, b, d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . If  $d \mid (ab)$ , then  $d \mid a$  or  $d \mid b$ .
  - Not true. Why?



# To prove or to disprove?

Sometimes we don't know whether a statement  $q$  is true or not.

- ❶ If  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  are odd, then  $x + y$  is even.
  - True (we proved it on Tuesday).
- ❷ For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(x = y) \Leftrightarrow (x^2 = y^2)$ .
  - Not true. Why?
- ❸ Let  $a, b, d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . If  $d \mid (ab)$ , then  $d \mid a$  or  $d \mid b$ .
  - Not true. Why?

An  $x$  which invalidates " $\forall x \in S P(x)$ " is called a **counterexample**.



# To prove or to disprove?

Sometimes we don't know whether a statement  $q$  is true or not.

- ❶ If  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  are odd, then  $x + y$  is even.
  - True (we proved it on Tuesday).
- ❷ For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(x = y) \Leftrightarrow (x^2 = y^2)$ .
  - Not true. Why?
- ❸ Let  $a, b, d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . If  $d \mid (ab)$ , then  $d \mid a$  or  $d \mid b$ .
  - Not true. Why?

An  $x$  which invalidates “ $\forall x \in S P(x)$ ” is called a **counterexample**.

To **disprove** a “for all”-type statement, we only need a counterexample.



# The axiomatic method

In 300 BC Euclid invented the **axiomatic method** for establishing the truth of a statement.



# The axiomatic method

In 300 BC Euclid invented the **axiomatic method** for establishing the truth of a statement.

- Postulate a number of axioms.



# The axiomatic method

In 300 BC Euclid invented the **axiomatic method** for establishing the truth of a statement.

- Postulate a number of axioms.
- **Prove** new statements from axioms and previously proven statements.





# The axiomatic method

In 300 BC Euclid invented the **axiomatic method** for establishing the truth of a statement.

- Postulate a number of axioms.
- **Prove** new statements from axioms and previously proven statements.

**Proof** is a sequence of logical deductions (valid arguments).



# Warm-up

- Assume, we have shown that an implication

$$p \Rightarrow q$$

is a true statement.



# Warm-up

- Assume, we have shown that an implication

$$p \Rightarrow q$$

is a true statement.

- **Q:** Can we conclude that  $q$  is a true statement?



# Warm-up

- **Assume**, we have shown that an implication

$$p \Rightarrow q$$

is a true statement.

- **Q:** Can we conclude that  $q$  is a true statement?
- **A: No!** When we prove that  $(p \Rightarrow q)$  is true, we don't show that  $q$  is true, but that

*if  $p$  is true, then  $q$  is true.*



# Warm-up

- **Assume**, we have shown that an implication

$$p \Rightarrow q$$

is a true statement.

- **Q:** Can we conclude that  $q$  is a true statement?
- **A: No!** When we prove that  $(p \Rightarrow q)$  is true, we don't show that  $q$  is true, but that

*if  $p$  is true, then  $q$  is true.*

- **Q:** What additional assumption do we need, to conclude that  $q$  is true?



# Warm-up

- **Assume**, we have shown that an implication

$$p \Rightarrow q$$

is a true statement.

- **Q:** Can we conclude that  $q$  is a true statement?
- **A: No!** When we prove that  $(p \Rightarrow q)$  is true, we don't show that  $q$  is true, but that

*if  $p$  is true, then  $q$  is true.*

- **Q:** What additional assumption do we need, to conclude that  $q$  is true?
- Indeed,  $(p \wedge (p \Rightarrow q)) \Rightarrow q$  is a tautology (check!).



# Logical deductions

**Def.** Given logical statements  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  and  $q$ , we say that  $q$  **logically follows** from  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  if

$(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \Rightarrow q$  is a tautology.



# Logical deductions

**Def.** Given logical statements  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  and  $q$ , we say that  $q$  **logically follows** from  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  if

$(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \Rightarrow q$  is a tautology.

Notation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p_1 & & \\ p_2 & & \\ \vdots & & \\ p_n & & \\ \hline \therefore q & \text{Conclusion} & \end{array} \quad \text{Hypotheses}$$





# Logical deductions

**Def.** Given logical statements  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  and  $q$ , we say that  $q$  **logically follows** from  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  if

$$(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \Rightarrow q \quad \text{is a tautology.}$$

Notation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p_1 & & \\ p_2 & & \\ \vdots & & \\ p_n & & \\ \hline \therefore q & \text{Conclusion} & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Hypotheses} \end{array}$$

## Example (modus ponens)

$$\begin{array}{c} p \\ p \Rightarrow q \\ \hline q \end{array}$$



# On Tuesday...

We proved that for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ :

$$(a \text{ is even}) \Leftrightarrow (a^2 \text{ is even})$$



## On Tuesday...

We proved that for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ :

$$(a \text{ is even}) \Leftrightarrow (a^2 \text{ is even})$$

We also proved that  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational via proof by contradiction:

- Assume (for contradiction) that  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational, i.e.  $\sqrt{2} = \frac{a}{b}$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , where  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ .
- Then  $2 = \frac{a^2}{b^2}$ .



# On Tuesday...

We proved that for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ :

$$(a \text{ is even}) \Leftrightarrow (a^2 \text{ is even})$$

We also proved that  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational via proof by contradiction:

- Assume (for contradiction) that  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational, i.e.  $\sqrt{2} = \frac{a}{b}$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , where  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ .
- Then  $2 = \frac{a^2}{b^2}$ . So  $a^2 = 2b^2$



# On Tuesday...

We proved that for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ :

$$(a \text{ is even}) \Leftrightarrow (a^2 \text{ is even})$$

We also proved that  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational via proof by contradiction:

- Assume (for contradiction) that  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational, i.e.  $\sqrt{2} = \frac{a}{b}$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , where  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ .
- Then  $2 = \frac{a^2}{b^2}$ . So  $a^2 = 2b^2$  which shows that  $a^2$  is even.



## On Tuesday...

We proved that for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ :

$$(a \text{ is even}) \Leftrightarrow (a^2 \text{ is even})$$

We also proved that  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational via proof by contradiction:

- Assume (for contradiction) that  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational, i.e.  $\sqrt{2} = \frac{a}{b}$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , where  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ .
- Then  $2 = \frac{a^2}{b^2}$ . So  $a^2 = 2b^2$  which shows that  $a^2$  is even.

So we had established that

$$a^2 \text{ is even} \quad \wedge \quad ((a^2 \text{ is even}) \Rightarrow (a \text{ is even}))$$



## On Tuesday...

We proved that for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ :

$$(a \text{ is even}) \Leftrightarrow (a^2 \text{ is even})$$

We also proved that  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational via proof by contradiction:

- Assume (for contradiction) that  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational, i.e.  $\sqrt{2} = \frac{a}{b}$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , where  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ .
- Then  $2 = \frac{a^2}{b^2}$ . So  $a^2 = 2b^2$  which shows that  $a^2$  is even.

So we had established that

$$a^2 \text{ is even} \quad \wedge \quad ((a^2 \text{ is even}) \Rightarrow (a \text{ is even}))$$

Then we concluded that  $a$  must be even. This was modus ponens.



# A logical deduction?

## Example.

If today is Wednesday, then Mette has POP today.

Today is not Wednesday.

---

Mette does not have POP today.





# A logical deduction?

## Example.

If today is Wednesday, then Mette has POP today.

Today is not Wednesday.

---

Mette does not have POP today.

Not a valid argument, since

$$((p \Rightarrow q) \wedge (\sim p)) \Rightarrow (\sim q)$$

is *not* a tautology. (When does it fail to be true?)



# A logical deduction?

## Example.

If I cycle to university, then I arrive tired.

I did not arrive tired.

---

I did not cycle to university.



# A logical deduction?

## Example.

If I cycle to university, then I arrive tired.

I did not arrive tired.

---

I did not cycle to university.

Valid argument, since

$$((p \Rightarrow q) \wedge (\sim q)) \Rightarrow (\sim p)$$

is a tautology (check!).



# Let's “prove” that $1/8 > 1/4$

*Bogus proof*

$$3 > 2 \quad \Leftrightarrow$$

$$3\log_{10}(1/2) > 2\log_{10}(1/2) \quad \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\log_{10}(1/2)^3 > \log_{10}(1/2)^2 \quad \Leftrightarrow$$

$$(1/2)^3 > (1/2)^2$$



# Let's “prove” that $1/8 > 1/4$

*Bogus proof*

$$3 > 2 \quad \Leftrightarrow$$

$$3\log_{10}(1/2) > 2\log_{10}(1/2) \quad \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\log_{10}(1/2)^3 > \log_{10}(1/2)^2 \quad \Leftrightarrow$$

$$(1/2)^3 > (1/2)^2$$



What's wrong here?



## A common mistake

Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . It is a fact that the Arithmetic Mean is at least as large as the Geometric Mean, namely,

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \geq \sqrt{ab}$$



## A common mistake

Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . It is a fact that the Arithmetic Mean is at least as large as the Geometric Mean, namely,

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \geq \sqrt{ab}$$

*Bogus proof*

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \geq \sqrt{ab} \quad \text{so}$$

$$a+b \geq 2\sqrt{ab} \quad \text{so}$$

$$a^2 + 2ab + b^2 \geq 4ab \quad \text{so}$$

$$a^2 - 2ab + b^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{so}$$

$$(a-b)^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{which we know is true.}$$



## A common mistake

Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . It is a fact that the Arithmetic Mean is at least as large as the Geometric Mean, namely,

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \geq \sqrt{ab}$$

*Bogus proof*

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \geq \sqrt{ab} \quad \text{so}$$

$$a+b \geq 2\sqrt{ab} \quad \text{so}$$

$$a^2 + 2ab + b^2 \geq 4ab \quad \text{so}$$

$$a^2 - 2ab + b^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{so}$$

$$(a-b)^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{which we know is true.}$$

So we have shown that  $(a+b)/2 \geq \sqrt{ab}$ .





## A common mistake

Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . It is a fact that the Arithmetic Mean is at least as large as the Geometric Mean, namely,

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \geq \sqrt{ab}$$

*Bogus proof*

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \geq \sqrt{ab} \quad \text{so}$$

$$a+b \geq 2\sqrt{ab} \quad \text{so}$$

$$a^2 + 2ab + b^2 \geq 4ab \quad \text{so}$$

$$a^2 - 2ab + b^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{so}$$

$$(a-b)^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{which we know is true.}$$

So we have shown that  $(a+b)/2 \geq \sqrt{ab}$ .



What is wrong here and how can we fix it?



# A common mistake

Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . It is a fact that the Arithmetic Mean is at least as large as the Geometric Mean, namely,

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \geq \sqrt{ab}$$

*Bogus proof*

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \geq \sqrt{ab} \quad \text{so}$$

$$a+b \geq 2\sqrt{ab} \quad \text{so}$$

$$a^2 + 2ab + b^2 \geq 4ab \quad \text{so}$$

$$a^2 - 2ab + b^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{so}$$

$$(a-b)^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{which we know is true.}$$

So we have shown that  $(a+b)/2 \geq \sqrt{ab}$ . □

What is wrong here and how can we fix it?

**Take-away:** NEVER start with what you want to prove.



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 100 with blue eyes and 100 with brown eyes.



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 100 with blue eyes and 100 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 100 with blue eyes and 100 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.

**The pirate captain:** visits every night and will free any *blue-eyed* person who can tell him their own eye color. (He will kill anyone who guesses incorrectly.)



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 100 with blue eyes and 100 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.

**The pirate captain:** visits every night and will free any *blue-eyed* person who can tell him their own eye color. (He will kill anyone who guesses incorrectly.)

**The guru:** proclaims on Day 1 that someone on the island has blue eyes.



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 100 with blue eyes and 100 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.

**The pirate captain:** visits every night and will free any *blue-eyed* person who can tell him their own eye color. (He will kill anyone who guesses incorrectly.)

**The guru:** proclaims on Day 1 that someone on the island has blue eyes.

**The question:** Who gets off the island and when?



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** **1** with blue eyes and **1** with brown eyes.





# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 1 with blue eyes and 1 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 1 with blue eyes and 1 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.

**The pirate captain:** visits every night and will free any *blue-eyed* person who can tell him their own eye color. (He will kill anyone who guesses incorrectly.)



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 1 with blue eyes and 1 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.

**The pirate captain:** visits every night and will free any *blue-eyed* person who can tell him their own eye color. (He will kill anyone who guesses incorrectly.)

**The guru:** proclaims on Day 1 that someone on the island has blue eyes.



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 1 with blue eyes and 1 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.

**The pirate captain:** visits every night and will free any *blue-eyed* person who can tell him their own eye color. (He will kill anyone who guesses incorrectly.)

**The guru:** proclaims on Day 1 that someone on the island has blue eyes.

**The question:** Who gets off the island and when?



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 2 with blue eyes and 2 with brown eyes.



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 2 with blue eyes and 2 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 2 with blue eyes and 2 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.

**The pirate captain:** visits every night and will free any *blue-eyed* person who can tell him their own eye color. (He will kill anyone who guesses incorrectly.)



# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 2 with blue eyes and 2 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.

**The pirate captain:** visits every night and will free any *blue-eyed* person who can tell him their own eye color. (He will kill anyone who guesses incorrectly.)

**The guru:** proclaims on Day 1 that someone on the island has blue eyes.





# Puzzle: The blue-eyed islanders

**The islanders:** 2 with blue eyes and 2 with brown eyes.

**They don't know:** their own eye color and they don't know the total number of blue-eyed people. Also they cannot talk to each other.

**The pirate captain:** visits every night and will free any *blue-eyed* person who can tell him their own eye color. (He will kill anyone who guesses incorrectly.)

**The guru:** proclaims on Day 1 that someone on the island has blue eyes.

**The question:** Who gets off the island and when?

