

4190.101
Discrete Mathematics

Chapter 1 The Foundations: Logic and Proofs
Part III: Proofs

Gunhee Kim

Rules of Inference

Section 1.6

Section Summary

- Valid Arguments
- Inference Rules for Propositional Logic
- Using Rules of Inference to Build Arguments
- Rules of Inference for Quantified Statements
- Building Arguments for Quantified Statements

Revisiting the Socrates Example

- We have the two premises:
 - “All men are mortal.”
 - “Socrates is a man.”
- And the conclusion:
 - “Socrates is mortal.”
- How do we get the conclusion from the premises?

The Argument

- We can express the premises (above the line) and the conclusion (below the line) in predicate logic as an argument:

$$\forall x (Man(x) \rightarrow Mortal(x))$$

$$Man(Socrates)$$

$$\therefore Mortal(Socrates)$$

- We will see shortly that this is a valid argument.

Valid Arguments

- We will show how to construct valid arguments in two stages; first for propositional logic and then for predicate logic. The rules of inference are the essential building block in the construction of valid arguments.
- 1. Propositional Logic
 - Inference Rules
- 2. Predicate Logic
 - Inference rules for propositional logic plus additional inference rules to handle variables and quantifiers.

Arguments in Propositional Logic

- An *argument* in propositional logic is a sequence of propositions. All but the final proposition are called *premises*. The last statement is the *conclusion*.
- The argument is valid if the premises imply the conclusion.
- An *argument form* is an argument that is valid no matter what propositions are substituted into its propositional variables.
- If the premises are p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n and the conclusion is q then
$$(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \rightarrow q$$
 is a tautology.
- Inference rules are all simple argument forms that will be used to construct more complex argument forms.

Rules of Inference for Propositional Logic: Modus Ponens

$$\frac{p \rightarrow q \quad p}{\therefore q}$$

Corresponding Tautology:

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

Example:

Let p be “It is snowing.”

Let q be “I will study discrete math.”

“If it is snowing, then I will study discrete math.”

“It is snowing.”

“Therefore, I will study discrete math.”

Rules of Inference for Propositional Logic: Modus Tollens

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} p \rightarrow q \\ \neg q \end{array}}{\therefore \neg p}$$

Corresponding Tautology:
 $(\neg q \wedge (p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow \neg p$

Example:

Let p be “it is snowing.”

Let q be “I will study discrete math.”

“If it is snowing, then I will study discrete math.”

“I will not study discrete math.”

“Therefore, it is not snowing.”

Hypothetical Syllogism

$$\begin{array}{l} p \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \hline \therefore p \rightarrow r \end{array}$$

Corresponding Tautology:

$$((p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$$

Example:

Let p be “it snows.”

Let q be “I will study discrete math.”

Let r be “I will get an A.”

“If it snows, then I will study discrete math.”

“If I study discrete math, I will get an A.”

“Therefore, If it snows, I will get an A.”

Disjunctive Syllogism

$$\frac{p \vee q \quad \neg p}{\therefore q}$$

Corresponding Tautology:

$$(\neg p \wedge (p \vee q)) \rightarrow q$$

Example:

Let p be “I will study discrete math.”

Let q be “I will study English literature.”

“I will study discrete math or I will study English literature.”

“I will not study discrete math.”

“Therefore , I will study English literature.”

Addition

$$\frac{p}{\therefore p \vee q}$$

Corresponding Tautology:

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

Example:

Let p be “I will study discrete math.”

Let q be “I will visit Las Vegas.”

“I will study discrete math.”

“Therefore, I will study discrete math or I will visit Las Vegas.”

Simplification

$$\frac{p \wedge q}{\therefore q}$$

Corresponding Tautology:
 $(p \wedge q) \rightarrow p$

Example:

Let p be “I will study discrete math.”

Let q be “I will study English literature.”

“I will study discrete math and English literature”

“Therefore, I will study discrete math.”

Conjunction

$$\frac{p}{q} \quad \frac{q}{\therefore p \wedge q}$$

Corresponding Tautology:

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

Example:

Let p be “I will study discrete math.”

Let q be “I will study English literature.”

“I will study discrete math.”

“I will study English literature.”

“Therefore, I will study discrete math and I will study English literature.”

Resolution

Resolution plays an important role in AI and is used in Prolog.

$$\frac{\neg p \vee r \quad p \vee q}{\therefore q \vee r}$$

Corresponding Tautology:

$$((\neg p \vee r) \wedge (p \vee q)) \rightarrow (q \vee r)$$

Example:

Let p be “I will study discrete math.”

Let r be “I will study English literature.”

Let q be “I will study databases.”

“I will not study discrete math or I will study English literature.”

“I will study discrete math or I will study databases.”

“Therefore, I will study databases or I will English literature.”

Resolution

Resolution plays an important role in AI and is used in Prolog.

$$\frac{\neg p \vee r \quad p \vee q}{\therefore q \vee r}$$

Corresponding Tautology:

$$((\neg p \vee r) \wedge (p \vee q)) \rightarrow (q \vee r)$$

p	q	r	$p \vee q$	$\neg p \vee r$	$((p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r))$	$(q \vee r)$	$((p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r)) \rightarrow (q \vee r)$
T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	F	F	T	T
T	F	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	T	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	F	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	T	F	F	T

Using the Rules of Inference to Build Valid Arguments

- A *valid argument* is a sequence of statements. Each statement is either a premise or follows from previous statements by rules of inference. The last statement is called conclusion.
- A valid argument takes the following form:

$$\begin{array}{c} S_1 \\ S_2 \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ S_n \\ \therefore C \end{array}$$

Valid Arguments

- **Example 1:** From the single proposition

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

Show that q is a conclusion.

- **Solution:**

Step

Reason

1. $p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)$

Premise **Simplification**

2. p

~~Conjunction~~ using (1)

3. $p \rightarrow q$

~~Conjunction~~ using (1)

4. q

Modus Ponens using (2) and (3)

Valid Arguments

- **Example 2:** With these hypotheses:
 - “It is not sunny this afternoon and it is colder than yesterday.”
 - “We will go swimming only if it is sunny.”
 - “If we do not go swimming, then we will take a canoe trip.”
 - “If we take a canoe trip, then we will be home by sunset.”
- Using the inference rules, construct a valid argument for the conclusion:
 - “We will be home by sunset.”
- **Solution:**
- 1. Choose propositional variables:
 - p: “It is sunny this afternoon.” r: “We will go swimming.”
 - t: “We will be home by sunset.” q: “It is colder than yesterday.”
 - s: “We will take a canoe trip.”
- 2. Translation into propositional logic:

Hypotheses: $\neg p \wedge q, r \rightarrow p, \neg r \rightarrow s, s \rightarrow t$

Conclusion: t

Valid Arguments

- **Solution:** Hypotheses: $\neg p \wedge q, r \rightarrow p, \neg r \rightarrow s, s \rightarrow t$
Conclusion: t
- 3. Construct the valid arguments

Step	Reason
1. $\neg p \wedge q$	Premise
2. $\neg p$	Simplification using (1)
3. $r \rightarrow p$	Premise
4. $\neg r$	Modus tollens using (2) and (3)
5. $\neg r \rightarrow s$	Premise
6. s	Modus ponens using (4) and (5)
7. $s \rightarrow t$	Premise
8. t	Modus ponens using (6) and (7)

Handling Quantified Statements

- Valid arguments for quantified statements are a sequence of statements. Each statement is either a premise or follows from previous statements by rules of inference which include:
 - Rules of Inference for Propositional Logic
 - Rules of Inference for Quantified Statements
- The rules of inference for quantified statements are introduced in the next several slides.

Universal Instantiation (UI)

$$\frac{\forall x P(x)}{\therefore P(c)}$$

Example:

Our domain consists of all dogs and Fido is a dog.

“All dogs are cuddly.”

“Therefore, Fido is cuddly.”

Universal Generalization (UG)

$$\frac{P(c) \text{ for an arbitrary } c}{\therefore \forall x P(x)}$$

Used often implicitly in mathematical proofs

Existential Instantiation (EI)

$$\frac{\exists x P(x)}{\therefore P(c) \text{ for some element } c}$$

Example:

“There is someone who got an A in the course.”

“Let’s call her Michelle and say that Michelle got an A”

Existential Generalization (EG)

$$\frac{P(c) \text{ for some element } c}{\therefore \exists x P(x)}$$

Example:

“Michelle got an A in the class.”

“Therefore, someone got an A in the class.”

Using Rules of Inference

- **Example 1:** Using the rules of inference, construct a valid argument to show that “John Smith has two legs” is a consequence of the premises:
“Every man has two legs.” “John Smith is a man.”
- **Solution:** Let $M(x)$ denote “ x is a man” and $L(x)$ “ x has two legs” and let John Smith be a member of the domain.

- **Valid Argument:**

Step	Reason
1. $\forall x(M(x) \rightarrow L(x))$	Premise
2. $M(J) \rightarrow L(J)$	UI from (1)
3. $M(J)$	Premise
4. $L(J)$	Modus Ponens using (2) and (3)

Using Rules of Inference

- **Example 2:** Use the rules of inference to construct a valid argument showing that the conclusion
“Someone who passed the first exam has not read the book.”
follows from the premises :
“A student in this class has not read the book.”
“Everyone in this class passed the first exam.”
- **Solution:** Let $C(x)$ denote “ x is in this class,” $B(x)$ denote “ x has read the book,” and $P(x)$ denote “ x passed the first exam.”
- **Valid Argument:**
 - First translate the premises and conclusion into symbolic form.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \exists x(C(x) \wedge \neg B(x)) \\ \forall x(C(x) \rightarrow P(x)) \end{array}}{\therefore \exists x(P(x) \wedge \neg B(x))}$$

Using Rules of Inference

• **Valid Argument:**

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \exists x(C(x) \wedge \neg B(x)) \\ \forall x(C(x) \rightarrow P(x)) \end{array}}{\therefore \exists x(P(x) \wedge \neg B(x))}$$

Step	Reason
1. $\exists x(C(x) \wedge \neg B(x))$	Premise
2. $C(a) \wedge \neg B(a)$	EI from (1)
3. $C(a)$	Simplification from (2)
4. $\forall x(C(x) \rightarrow P(x))$	Premise
5. $C(a) \rightarrow P(a)$	UI from (4)
6. $P(a)$	MP from (3) and (5)
7. $\neg B(a)$	Simplification from (2)
8. $P(a) \wedge \neg B(a)$	Conj from (6) and (7)
9. $\exists x(P(x) \wedge \neg B(x))$	EG from (8)

Returning to the Socrates Example

$$\frac{\forall x(Man(x) \rightarrow Mortal(x)) \quad Man(Socrates)}{\therefore Mortal(Socrates)}$$

- **Valid Argument:**

Step	Reason
1. $\forall x(Man(x) \rightarrow Mortal(x))$	Premise
2. $Man(Socrates) \rightarrow Mortal(Socrates)$	UI from (1)
3. $Man(Socrates)$	Premise
4. $Mortal(Socrates)$	MP from (2) and (3)

Universal Modus Ponens

- Universal Modus Ponens combines universal instantiation and modus ponens into one rule.
- This rule could be used in the Socrates example.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \\ P(a), \text{ where } a \text{ is a particular} \\ \text{element in the domain} \end{array}}{\therefore Q(a)}$$

Introduction to Proofs

Section 1.7

Section Summary

- Mathematical Proofs
- Forms of Theorems
- Direct Proofs
- Indirect Proofs
 - Proof of the Contrapositive
 - Proof by Contradiction

Proofs of Mathematical Statements

- A *proof* is a valid argument that establishes the truth of a statement.
- In math, CS, and other disciplines, informal proofs which are generally shorter, are generally used.
 - More than one rule of inference are often used in a step.
 - Steps may be skipped.
 - The rules of inference used are not explicitly stated.
 - Easier for to understand and to explain to people.
 - But it is also easier to introduce errors.
- Proofs have many practical applications:
 - verification that computer programs are correct
 - establishing that operating systems are secure
 - enabling programs to make inferences in artificial intelligence
 - showing that system specifications are consistent

Definitions

- A *theorem* is a statement that can be shown to be true using:
 - Definitions
 - Other theorems
 - *Axioms* (statements which are given as true)
 - Rules of inference
- A *lemma* is a ‘helping theorem’ or a result which is needed to prove a theorem.
- A *corollary* is a result which follows directly from a theorem.
- Less important theorems are sometimes called *propositions*.
- A *conjecture* is a statement that is being proposed to be true. Once a proof of a conjecture is found, it becomes a theorem. It may turn out to be false.

Forms of Theorems

- Many theorems assert that a property holds for all elements in a domain, such as the integers, the real numbers, or some of the discrete structures that we will study in this class.
- Often the universal quantifier (needed for a precise statement of a theorem) is omitted by standard mathematical convention.
 - For example, the statement:
“If $x > y$, where x and y are positive real numbers, then $x^2 > y^2$ ”
 - Really means
“For all positive real numbers x and y , if $x > y$, then $x^2 > y^2$.”

Proving Theorems

- Many theorems have the form:

$$\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$$

- To prove them, we show that where c is an arbitrary element of the domain, $P(c) \rightarrow Q(c)$
- By universal generalization the truth of the original formula follows.
- So, we must prove something of the form:

$$p \rightarrow q$$

Proving Conditional Statements: $p \rightarrow q$

- *Trivial Proof*: If we know q is true, then $p \rightarrow q$ is true as well.
 - “If it is raining then $1=1$.”
- *Vacuous Proof*: If we know p is false, then $p \rightarrow q$ is true as well.
 - “If I am both rich and poor then $2 + 2 = 5$.”
- Even though these examples seem silly, both trivial and vacuous proofs are often used in mathematical induction, as we will see in Chapter 5

Even and Odd Integers

- **Definition:** The integer n is even if there exists an integer k such that $n = 2k$, and n is odd if there exists an integer k , such that $n = 2k + 1$.
 - Every integer is either even or odd and no integer is both even and odd.
- We will need this basic fact about the integers in some of the example proofs to follow. We will learn more about the integers in Chapter 4

Proving Conditional Statements: $p \rightarrow q$

- *Direct Proof*: Assume that p is true. Use rules of inference, axioms, and logical equivalences to show that q must also be true.
- **Example**: Give a direct proof of the theorem “If n is an odd integer, then n^2 is odd.”
- **Solution**: Assume that n is odd. Then $n = 2k + 1$ for an integer k . Squaring both sides of the equation, we get:
$$n^2 = (2k + 1)^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1 = 2r + 1,$$
where $r = 2k^2 + 2k$, an integer.
We have proved that if n is an odd integer, then n^2 is an odd integer. ◀

(◀ marks the end of the proof.
Sometimes **QED** is used instead.)

Proving Conditional Statements: $p \rightarrow q$

- **Definition:** The real number r is *rational* if there exist integers p and q where $q \neq 0$ such that $r = p/q$
- **Example:** Prove that the sum of two rational numbers is rational.
- **Solution:** Assume r and s are two rational numbers. Then there must be integers p, q and also t, u such that

$$r = p/q, \quad s = t/u, \quad u \neq 0, \quad q \neq 0$$

$$r + s = \frac{p}{q} + \frac{t}{u} = \frac{pu + qt}{qu} = \frac{v}{w} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{where } v = pu + qt \\ w = qu \neq 0 \end{array}$$

- Thus the sum is rational. ◀

Proving Conditional Statements: $p \rightarrow q$

- **Proof by Contraposition:** Assume $\neg q$ and show $\neg p$ is true also. This is sometimes called an *indirect proof* method.
 - If we give a direct proof of $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ then we have a proof of $p \rightarrow q$.
- **Example:** Prove that if n is an integer and $3n + 2$ is odd, then n is odd.
- **Solution:** Assume n is even. So, $n = 2k$ for some integer k . Thus $3n + 2 = 3(2k) + 2 = 6k + 2 = 2(3k + 1) = 2j$ for $j = 3k + 1$
- Therefore $3n + 2$ is even. Since we have shown $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$, $p \rightarrow q$ must hold as well.
 - If n is an integer and $3n + 2$ is odd (not even), then n is odd (not even)

Proving Conditional Statements: $p \rightarrow q$

- **Example:** Prove that for an integer n , if n^2 is odd, then n is odd.
- **Solution:** Use proof by contraposition. Assume n is even (i.e., not odd). Therefore, there exists an integer k such that $n = 2k$.
Hence, $n^2 = 4k^2 = 2(2k^2)$ and n^2 is even (i.e., not odd).
- We have shown that if n is an even integer, then n^2 is even. Therefore by contraposition, for an integer n , if n^2 is odd, then n is odd.

Proving Conditional Statements: $p \rightarrow q$

- *Proof by Contradiction* (AKA *reductio ad absurdum*): To prove proposition p , assume $\neg p$ and derive a contradiction such as $p \wedge \neg p$. Since we have shown that $\neg p \rightarrow \mathbf{F}$ is true, it follows that the contrapositive $\mathbf{T} \rightarrow p$ also holds. (An indirect form of proof).
- **Example:** Prove p : “At least 4 out of 22 days must fall on the same day of the week.”
 - Let r be “22 days are chosen”.
- **Solution:** $\neg p$: “no more than 3 of the 22 days fall on the same day of the week”. Because there are 7 days of the week, we could only have picked 21 days ($r \wedge \neg r$).
- This contradicts the assumption that we have picked 22 days ($\neg p \rightarrow r \wedge \neg r$). ◀

Proof by Contradiction

- **Example** (A preview of Chapter 4): Use a proof by contradiction to give a proof that $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- **Solution:** Suppose $\sqrt{2}$ is rational. Then there exists integers a and b with $\sqrt{2} = a/b$, where $b \neq 0$ and a and b have no common factors (see Chapter 4). Then

$$2 = \frac{a^2}{b^2} \qquad 2b^2 = a^2$$

- Therefore a^2 must be even. If a^2 is even then a must be even (an exercise). Since a is even, $a = 2c$ for some integer c . Thus,

$$2b^2 = 4c^2 \qquad b^2 = 2c^2$$

- Therefore b^2 is even. Again then b must be even as well.
- But then 2 must divide both a and b . This contradicts our assumption that a and b have no common factors. We have proved by contradiction that our initial assumption must be false and therefore $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational. ◀

Theorems that are Biconditional Statements

- To prove a theorem that is a biconditional statement, that is, a statement of the form $p \leftrightarrow q$, we show that $p \rightarrow q$ and $q \rightarrow p$ are both true.
- **Example:** Prove the theorem: “If n is an integer, then n is odd if and only if n^2 is odd.”
 - Sometimes iff is used as an abbreviation for “if and only if,” as in “If n is an integer, then n is odd iff n^2 is odd.”
- **Solution:** We have already shown (previous slides) that both $p \rightarrow q$ and $q \rightarrow p$. Therefore we can conclude $p \leftrightarrow q$.

What is Wrong with This?

- “Proof” that $1 = 2$

Step	Reason
1. $a = b$	Premise
2. $a^2 = a \times b$	Multiply both sides of (1) by a
3. $a^2 - b^2 = a \times b - b^2$	Subtract b^2 from both sides of (2)
4. $(a - b)(a + b) = b(a - b)$	Algebra on (3)
5. $a + b = b$	Divide both sides by $a - b$
6. $2b = b$	Replace a by b in (5) because $a = b$
7. $2 = 1$	Divide both sides of (6) by b

- **Solution:** Step 5. $a - b = 0$ by the premise and division by 0 is undefined.

Looking Ahead

- If direct methods of proof do not work:
 - We may need a clever use of a proof by contraposition.
 - Or a proof by contradiction.
 - In the next section, we will see strategies that can be used when straightforward approaches do not work.
 - In Chapter 5, we will see mathematical induction and related techniques.
 - In Chapter 6, we will see combinatorial proofs

Proof Methods and Strategy

Section 1.8

Section Summary

- Proof by Cases
- Existence Proofs
 - Constructive
 - Nonconstructive
- Disproof by Counterexample
- Nonexistence Proofs
- Uniqueness Proofs
- Proof Strategies
- Proving Universally Quantified Assertions
- Open Problems

Proof by Cases

- To prove a conditional statement of the form:

$$(p_1 \vee p_2 \vee \dots \vee p_n) \rightarrow q$$

- Use the tautology

$$\begin{aligned} &[(p_1 \vee p_2 \vee \dots \vee p_n) \rightarrow q] \leftrightarrow \\ &[(p_1 \rightarrow q) \wedge (p_2 \rightarrow q) \wedge \dots \wedge (p_n \rightarrow q)] \end{aligned}$$

- Each of the implications $p_i \rightarrow q$ is a *case*.

Proof by Cases

- **Example:** Let $a @ b = \max\{a, b\} = a$ if $a \geq b$, otherwise $a @ b = \max\{a, b\} = b$.
- Show that for all real numbers a, b, c
 $(a @ b) @ c = a @ (b @ c)$
 - This means the operation $@$ is associative.

Proof: Let a, b , and c be arbitrary real numbers.

Then one of the following 6 cases must hold.

1. $a \geq b \geq c$
2. $a \geq c \geq b$
3. $b \geq a \geq c$
4. $b \geq c \geq a$
5. $c \geq a \geq b$
6. $c \geq b \geq a$

Proof by Cases

- Case 1: $a \geq b \geq c$
 - $(a @ b) = a, a @ c = a, b @ c = b$
 - Hence $(a @ b) @ c = a = a @ (b @ c)$
 - Therefore the equality holds for the first case.
- A complete proof requires that the equality be shown to hold for all 6 cases. But the proofs of the remaining cases are similar. Try them.



Without Loss of Generality

- **Example:** Show that if x and y are integers and both $x \cdot y$ and $x + y$ are even, then both x and y are even.
- **Proof:** Use a proof by contraposition. Suppose x and y are not both even. Then, one or both are odd. Without loss of generality, assume that x is odd. Then $x = 2m + 1$ for some integer m .
 - *Case 1:* y is even. Then $y = 2n$ for some integer n , so $x + y = (2m + 1) + 2n = 2(m + n) + 1$ is odd.
 - *Case 2:* y is odd. Then $y = 2n + 1$ for some integer n , so $x \cdot y = (2m + 1)(2n + 1) = 2(2m \cdot n + m + n) + 1$ is odd. ◀
- We only cover the case where x is odd because the case where y is odd is similar. The use phrase *without loss of generality* (WLOG) indicates this.

Existence Proofs

- Proof of theorems of the form $\exists x P(x)$.
- *Constructive* existence proof:
 - Find an explicit value of c , for which $P(c)$ is true.
 - Then $\exists x P(x)$ is true by Existential Generalization (EG).
- **Example:** Show that there is a positive integer that can be written as the sum of cubes of positive integers in two different ways:
- **Proof:** 1729 is such a number since

$$1729 = 10^3 + 9^3 = 12^3 + 1^3$$



Srinivasa Ramanujan
(1887-1920)



Godfrey Harold Hardy
(1877-1947)


Nonconstructive Existence Proofs

- In a *nonconstructive* existence proof, we assume no c exists which makes $P(c)$ true and derive a contradiction.
- **Example:** Show that there exist irrational numbers x and y such that x^y is rational.
- **Proof:** We know that $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
 - If $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ is rational, we have two irrational numbers x and y with x^y rational, namely $x = \sqrt{2}$ and $y = \sqrt{2}$.
 - If $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ is irrational, then we can let $x = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ and $y = \sqrt{2}$ so that $x^y = (\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}})^{\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^{(\sqrt{2} \sqrt{2})} = \sqrt{2}^2 = 2$. ◀

Counterexamples

- Recall $\exists x \neg P(x) \equiv \neg \forall x P(x)$.
- To establish that $\neg \forall x P(x)$ is true (or $\forall x P(x)$ is false) find a c such that $\neg P(c)$ is true (or $P(c)$ is false).
- In this case c is called a *counterexample* to the assertion $\forall x P(x)$.
- **Example:** “Every positive integer is the sum of the squares of 3 integers.” The integer 7 is a counterexample. So the claim is false.

Uniqueness Proofs

- Some theorems assert the existence of a unique element with a particular property, $\exists!x P(x)$. The two parts of a *uniqueness proof* are
 - *Existence*: We show that an element x with the property exists.
 - *Uniqueness*: We show that if $y \neq x$, then y does not have the property.
- **Example**: Show that if a and b are real numbers and $a \neq 0$, then there is a unique real number r such that $ar + b = 0$.
- **Solution**:
 - Existence: The real number $r = -b/a$ is a solution of $ar + b = 0$ because $a(-b/a) + b = -b + b = 0$.
 - Uniqueness: Suppose that s is a real number such that $as + b = 0$. Then $ar + b = as + b$, where $r = -b/a$. Subtracting b from both sides and dividing by a shows that $r = s$. 

Proof Strategies for proving $p \rightarrow q$

- Choose a method.
 1. First try a direct method of proof.
 2. If this does not work, try an indirect method (e.g., try to prove the contrapositive).
- For whichever method you are trying, choose a strategy.
 1. First try *forward reasoning*. Start with the axioms and known theorems and construct a sequence of steps that end in the conclusion. Start with p and prove q , or start with $\neg q$ and prove $\neg p$.
 2. If this doesn't work, try *backward reasoning*. When trying to prove q , find a statement p that we can prove with the property $p \rightarrow q$.

Backward Reasoning

- **Example:** Suppose that two people play a game taking turns removing, 1, 2, or 3 stones at a time from a pile that begins with 15 stones. The person who removes the last stone wins the game. Show that the first player can win the game no matter what the second player does.
- **Proof:** Let n be the last step of the game.
 - **Step n :** Player₁ can win if the pile contains 1, 2, or 3 stones.
 - **Step $n-1$:** Player₂ will have to leave such a pile if the pile that he/she is faced with has 4 stones.
 - **Step $n-2$:** Player₁ can leave 4 stones when there are 5, 6, or 7 stones left at the beginning of his/her turn.

Backward Reasoning

- **Proof:** Let n be the last step of the game.
 - **Step n-3:** Player₂ must leave such a pile, if there are 8 stones .
 - **Step n-4:** Player₁ has to have a pile with 9,10, or 11 stones to ensure that there are 8 left.
 - **Step n-5:** Player₂ needs to be faced with 12 stones to be forced to leave 9,10, or 11.
 - **Step n-6:** Player₁ can leave 12 stones by removing 3 stones.
- Now reasoning forward, the first player can ensure a win by removing 3 stones and leaving 12.

Universally Quantified Assertions

- To prove theorems of the form $\forall x P(x)$, assume x is an arbitrary member of the domain and show that $P(x)$ must be true. Using UG it follows that $\forall x P(x)$.
- **Example:** An integer x is even if and only if x^2 is even.
- **Solution:** The quantified assertion is

$$\forall x [x \text{ is even} \leftrightarrow x^2 \text{ is even}]$$

We assume x is arbitrary.

Recall that $p \leftrightarrow q$ is equivalent to $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$

So, we have two cases to consider. These are considered in turn.

Continued on next slide →


Universally Quantified Assertions

- **Case 1.** We show that if x is even then x^2 is even using a direct proof (the *only if* part or *necessity*).
 - If x is even then $x = 2k$ for some integer k .
 - Hence $x^2 = 4k^2 = 2(2k^2)$ which is even since it is an integer divisible by 2.
 - This completes the proof of case 1.
- **Case 2.** We show that if x^2 is even then x must be even (the *if* part or *sufficiency*). We use a proof by contraposition.
 - Assume x is not even and then show that x^2 is not even.
 - If x is not even then it must be odd. So, $x = 2k + 1$ for some k .
Then $x^2 = (2k + 1)^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1$
which is odd and hence not even. This completes the proof of case 2.
- Since x was arbitrary, the result follows by UG.
 - Therefore we have shown that x is even if and only if x^2 is even.




Proof and Disproof: Tilings


- **Example 1:** Can we tile the standard checkerboard using dominos?
- **Solution:** Yes! One example provides a constructive existence proof.



The Standard Checkerboard



Two Dominoes



One Possible Solution


Tilings

- **Example 2:** Can we tile a checkerboard obtained by removing one of the four corner squares of a standard checkerboard?
- **Solution:**
 - Our checkerboard has $64 - 1 = 63$ squares.
 - Since each domino has two squares, a board with a tiling must have an even number of squares.
 - The number 63 is not even.
 - We have a contradiction.




Tilings

- **Example 3:** Can we tile a board obtained by removing both the upper left and the lower right squares of a standard checkerboard?



Nonstandard Checkerboard



Dominoes

Tilings

- **Solution:**

- There are 62 squares in this board.
- To tile it we need 31 dominos.
- *Key fact:* Each domino covers one black and one white square.
- Therefore the tiling covers 31 black squares and 31 white squares.
- Our board has either 30 black squares and 32 white squares or 32 black squares and 30 white squares.
- Contradiction!



The Role of Open Problems

- Unsolved problems have motivated much work in mathematics. Fermat's Last Theorem was conjectured more than 300 years ago. It has only recently been finally solved.
- **Fermat's Last Theorem:** The equation $x^n + y^n = z^n$ has no solutions in integers x , y , and z , with $xyz \neq 0$ whenever n is an integer with $n > 2$.
- A proof was found by Andrew Wiles in the 1990s.

An Open Problem

- **The $3x + 1$ Conjecture:** Let T be the transformation that sends an even integer x to $x/2$ and an odd integer x to $3x + 1$. For all positive integers x , when we repeatedly apply the transformation T , we will eventually reach the integer 1.
- For example, starting with $x = 13$:
 - $T(13) = 3 \cdot 13 + 1 = 40$, $T(40) = 40/2 = 20$, $T(20) = 20/2 = 10$,
 - $T(10) = 10/2 = 5$, $T(5) = 3 \cdot 5 + 1 = 16$, $T(16) = 16/2 = 8$,
 - $T(8) = 8/2 = 4$, $T(4) = 4/2 = 2$, $T(2) = 2/2 = 1$
- The conjecture has been verified using computers up to 5.6×10^{13} .

Additional Proof Methods

- Later we will see many other proof methods:
 - Mathematical induction, which is a useful method for proving statements of the form $\forall n P(n)$, where the domain consists of all positive integers.
 - Structural induction, which can be used to prove such results about recursively defined sets.
 - Cantor diagonalization is used to prove results about the size of infinite sets.
 - Combinatorial proofs use counting arguments.