#### Proofs

Computer Science & Engineering 235 – Discrete Mathematics

## Christopher M. Bourke cbourke@cse.unl.edu

# Introduction I

"A proof is a proof. What kind of a proof? It's a proof. A proof is a proof. And when you have a good proof, it's because it's proven." –Jean Chrétien

"Mathematical proofs, like diamonds, are hard and clear, and will be touched with nothing but strict reasoning." –John Locke

Mathematical proofs are, in a sense, the only truly absolute knowledge we can have. They provide us with a guarantee as well as an explanation (and hopefully some deep insight).

# Introduction II

Mathematical proofs are necessary in computer science.

- An algorithm must always be proven *correct*.
- You may also want to show that its more *efficient* than another method. This requires a proof.
- Proving certain properties of data structures may lead to new, more efficient or simpler algorithms.
- Arguments may entail assumptions. It may be useful and/or necessary to make sure these assumptions are actually valid.

#### Introduction Terminology

- A theorem is a statement that can be shown to be true (via a proof).
- A *proof* is a sequence of statements that form an argument.
- Axioms or postulates are statements taken to be self-evident, or assumed to be true.
- Lemmas and corollaries are also (certain types of) theorems. A proposition (as opposed to a proposition in logic) is usually used to denote a fact for which a proof has been omitted.
- A conjecture is a statement whose truth value is unknown.
- The rules of inferences are the means used to draw conclusions from other assertions. These form the basis of various methods of proof.

Theorems Example

Consider, for example, Fermat's Little Theorem.

Theorem (Fermat's Little Theorem)

If p is a prime which does not divide the integer a, then  $a^{p-1} = 1 \pmod{p}$ .

What is the assumption? Conclusion?

# Proofs: A General How To I

An argument is  $\ensuremath{\textit{valid}}$  if whenever all the hypotheses are true, the conclusion also holds.

From a sequence of assumptions,  $p_1,p_2,\ldots,p_n,$  you draw the conclusion q. That is;

 $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_n) \to q$ 

# Proofs: A General How To II

Usually, a proof involves proving a theorem via intermediate steps.

# Example

Consider the theorem "If x > 0 and y > 0, then x + y > 0." What are the assumptions? Conclusion? What steps would you take?

Each step of a proof must be justified.

# Rules of Inference

Table 1, page 72 provides *Rules of Inference* Available on your cheat sheet as well

Rules of Inference

Intuitively, modus ponens (or law of detachment) can be described as the inference, "p implies q; p is true; therefore q holds".

In logic terms, modus ponens is the tautology

$$(p \land (p \to q)) \to q$$

Notation note: "therefore" is sometimes denoted , , so we have, p and  $p \to q,$  , q.

Modus Ponens: "the way that affirms by affirming"

# Rules of Inference

Addition involves the tautology

$$p \to (p \lor q)$$

Intuitively, if we know p to be true, we can conclude that either p or q are true (or both).

In other words,  $p \therefore p \lor q$ .

#### Example

I read the newspaper today, therefore I read the newspaper or I watched the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{news}}\xspace{.}^1$ 

<sup>1</sup>Note that these are not mutually exclusive.

Rules of Inference

The conjunction is almost trivially intuitive. It is based on the tautology

 $((p) \land (q)) \to (p \land q)$ 

Note the subtle difference though. On the left hand side, we independently know p and q to be true. Therefore, we conclude that the right hand side, a *logical conjunction* is true.

# Rules of Inference

Simplification

Simplification is based on the tautology

 $(p \land q) \to p$ 

so that we have  $p \wedge q$ ,  $\therefore p$ .

#### Example

Prove that if 0 < x < 10, then  $x \ge 0$ .

- $0 < x < 10 \equiv (x > 0) \land (x < 10)$
- $(x > 0) \land (x < 10)$  implies that x > 0 by simplification.
- ▶ x > 0 implies  $(x > 0) \lor (x = 0)$  by addition.
- $\blacktriangleright \ (x>0) \lor (x=0) \equiv (x \ge 0).$

# Rules of Inference

Modus Tollens

Similar to modus ponens, modus tollens is based on the tautology


$$(\neg q \land (p \to q)) \to \neg p$$

In other words, if we know that q is not true and that p implies q then we can conclude that p does not hold either. This forms the basis of the method *proof by contrapositive*.

## Example

If you are a UNL student you are a cornhusker. Don Knuth was not a cornhusker. Therefore, we can conclude that Knuth was not a UNL student.

Modus Tollendo tollens: "the way that denies by denying"



Rules of Inference Hypothetical Syllogism

Based on the tautology

$$\left((p \to q) \land (q \to r)\right) \to (p \to r)$$

Essentially, this shows that rules of inference are, in a sense, *transitive*.

Example

If you don't get a job you won't make any money. If you don't make any money, you will starve. Therefore, if you don't get a job, you will starve. Rules of Inference

A disjunctive syllogism is formed on the basis of the tautology

$$\left((p \lor q) \land \neg p\right) \to q$$

Reading this in English, we see that if either p or q hold and we know that p does *not* hold; we can conclude that q must hold.

#### Example

The sky is either clear or cloudy. Well, it isn't cloudy, therefore the sky is clear.

For *resolution*, we have the following tautology.

$$\left((p \lor q) \land (\neg p \lor r)\right) \to (q \lor r)$$

Essentially, if we have two true disjunctions that have mutually exclusive propositions, then we can conclude that the disjunction of the two non-mutually exclusive propositions is true.

Example?

**Rules of Inference** 

Resolution


# Example I


The best way to become accustomed to proofs is to see many examples.


To begin with, we give a *direct* proof of the following theorem.

Theorem

The sum of two odd integers is even.







# If And Only If

If you are asked to show an equivalence (i.e.  $p \iff q$ , "if and only if"), you must show an implication in both directions.

That is, you can show (independently or via the same technique) that  $p \Rightarrow q \text{ and } q \Rightarrow p.$ 

Example

Show that x is odd if and only if  $x^2 + 2x + 1$  is even.

# Fallacies

Even a bad example is worth something—it teaches us what not to do.

A theorem may be true, but a bad proof doesn't testify to it.

There are three common mistakes (actually probably many more). These are known as *fallacies* 

Fallacy of affirming the conclusion.

$$(q \land (p \to q)) \to p$$

is not a tautology.

Fallacy of denying the hypothesis.

 $(\neg p \land (p \to q)) \to \neg q$ 

• Circular reasoning. Here, you use the conclusion as an assumption, avoiding an actual proof.

## If And Only If Example Continued

Proof.			
x is odd	$\begin{array}{c} \Leftrightarrow \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{aligned} x &= 2n + 1, n \in \mathbb{Z} \\ x + 1 &= 2n + 2 \\ x + 1 &= 2(n + 1) \\ x + 1 &\text{is even} \\ (x + 1)^2 &\text{is even} \\ x^2 + 2x + 1 &\text{is even} \end{aligned}$	by definition algebra factoring by definition since $x$ is even iff $x^2$ is even algebra

# Fallacies

Sometimes bad proofs arise from illegal operations rather than poor logic. Consider this classically bad proof that 2 = 1:

Divide both sides by  $(a^2 - ab)$ 

Let 
$$a = b$$

= abMultiply both sides by a $a^2 + a^2 - 2ab = ab + a^2 - 2ab$  Add  $(a^2 - 2ab)$  to both sides  $2(a^2 - ab) = a^2 - ab$ Factor, collect terms = 1

So what's wrong with the proof?

# **Proofs With Quantifiers**

Rules of inference can be extended in a straightforward manner to quantified statements.

- Universal Instantiation (traditional syllogism). Given the premise that  $\forall x P(x)$ , and  $c \in X$  (where X is the universe of discourse) we conclude that P(c) holds.
- Universal Generalization Here we select an arbitrary element in the universe of discourse  $c \in X$  and show that P(c) holds. We can therefore conclude that  $\forall x P(x)$  holds.
- ▶ Existential Instantiation Given the premise that  $\exists x P(x)$  holds, we simply give it a name, c and conclude that P(c) holds.
- **Existential Generalization** Conversely, when we establish that P(c) is true for a specific  $c \in X$ , then we can conclude that  $\exists x P(x)$ .

# **Proofs With Quantifiers**

#### Example

Example

Show that the premise "A car in this garage has an engine problem," and "Every car in this garage has been sold" imply the conclusion "A car which has been sold has an engine problem."

- Let G(x) be "x is in this garage."
- Let E(x) be "x has an engine problem."
- Let S(x) be "x has been sold."
- The premises are as follows.
- $\blacktriangleright \exists x (G(x) \land E(x))$
- $\blacktriangleright \forall x (G(x) \to S(x))$
- The conclusion we want to show is  $\exists x(S(x) \land E(x))$

#### **Proofs With Quantifiers** Example Continued

#### proof

	$\exists x(G(x) \land E(x)) G(c) \land E(c) G(c) \forall x(G(x) \rightarrow S(x)) (G(c) \rightarrow S(c)) S(c) E(c) S(c) C(c) E(c) S(c) \land E(c) \exists x(S(x) \land E(x)) E(x)) E(x) C(c) C(c)$	Premise Existential Instantiation of (1) Simplification from (2) Second Premise Universal Instantiation from (4) Modus ponens from (3) and (5) Simplification from (2) Conjunction from (6), (7) Evictorial Concollization from (8)
(9)	$\exists x (S(x) \land E(x))$	Existential Generalization from (8) $\Box$

# Trivial Proofs I

Trivial proofs often form the base case of a proof by induction.

A trivial proof (not trivial as in "easy") can be given when the conclusion is shown to be (always) true. That is, if q is true then  $p \rightarrow q$  is true.

#### Example

Prove that if x > 0 then  $(x+1)^2 - 2x > x^2$ .

#### Types of Proofs

- Trivial Proofs
- Vacuous Proofs
- Direct Proofs
- Proof by Contrapositive (Indirect Proofs)
- Proof by Contradiction
- Proof by Cases
- Equivalence Proofs
- Existence Proofs (Constructive & Nonconstructive)
- Uniqueness Proofs

# Trivial Proofs II Proof. Its easy to see that $(x+1)^2 - 2x = (x^2 + 2x + 1) - 2x$ $= x^2 + 1$ $\geq x^2$ and so the conclusion holds without using the hypothesis.

# Vacuous Proofs

If a premise p is false, then the implication  $p \rightarrow q$  is (trivially) true.

A vacuous proof is a proof that relies on the fact that no element in the universe of discourse satisfies the premise (thus the statement exists in a vacuum in the UoD).

#### Example

If x is a prime number divisible by 16, then  $x^2 < 0$ .

No prime number is divisible by 16, thus this statement is *true* (counter-intuitive as it may be)

(In Most of the proofs we have seen so far are *direct proofs*. In a direct proof, you assume the hypothesis p and give a direct series of implications using the rules of inference as well as other results (proved independently) to show the conclusion q holds.

Proof by Contrapositive (Indirect Proofs)

Recall that  $p\to q$  is logically equivalent to  $\neg q\to \neg p.$  Thus, a proof by contrapositive can be given.

Here, you assume that the conclusion is false and then give a series of implications (etc.) to show that such an assumption implies that the premise is false.

Example

Prove that if  $x^3 < 0$  then x < 0.

# Proof by Contrapositive Example

The contrapositive is "if  $x \ge 0$ , then  $x^3 \ge 0$ ."

Proof.

Direct Proof

If x = 0, then trivially,  $x^3 = 0 \ge 0$ .

 $\begin{array}{rrr} x>0 &\Rightarrow& x^2>0\\ &\Rightarrow& x^3\geq 0 \end{array}$ 

# Proof by Contradiction I

To prove a statement p is true, you may assume that it is  $\mathit{false}$  and then proceed to show that such an assumption leads to a contradiction with a known result.

In terms of logic, you show that for a known result r,

 $\neg p \rightarrow (r \land \neg r)$ 

is true, which leads to a contradiction since  $(r \wedge \neg r)$  cannot hold.

At work here is *disjunctive syllogism*:

$$\neg p \to (r \land \neg r) \equiv p \lor (r \land \neg r)$$

but since  $(r \wedge \neg r)$  is known to be a contradiction, it must be the case that p is true.

# Proof by Contradiction II

#### Abstract Example:

- $\blacktriangleright$  Want to show that  $p \rightarrow q$
- Assume  $p \rightarrow q$  is false
- ▶ The only way this is possible is if p is true and q is false
- ▶ Show that p and  $\neg q$  imply  $\neg p$ :  $(p \land \neg q) \rightarrow \neg p$
- $\blacktriangleright$  But this leads to a contradiction:  $\neg(p \rightarrow q) \land \neg p$  is a contradiction
- $\blacktriangleright$  Thus our original assumption that  $p \rightarrow q$  was false
- Therefore,  $p \rightarrow q$  is true!

# Proof by Contradiction III

#### Another approach:

- $\blacktriangleright$  Want to show p
- $\blacktriangleright$  By way of contradiciton, assume p is not true, that is assume  $\neg p$
- Use this assumption to show some result  $\neg q$ ; that is:

 $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$ 

- $\blacktriangleright$  However, if q is known to be true, then we've reached a contradiction:
- $\blacktriangleright \ \neg p \to \neg q$  is true and  $\neg q$  is false, then  $\neg p$  must be false and so p must be true
- ► At work here: modus tollens!

Proof	by	Contradiction IV	
-------	----	------------------	--

#### Example

Let a be a non-zero rational number ( $a \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$ ) and let b be an irrational number. Prove that ab is an irrational number.

## Proof by Contradiction

## Proof.

Example

We start by assuming (by way of contradiction) that the conclusion is false, that is, for  $a \in \mathbb{Q}$  and b an irrational number,  $ab = c \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

By definition, there exist integers  $n_1,n_2,m_1,m_2$  such that  $a=\frac{n_1}{m_1}$  and  $c=\frac{n_2}{m_2}.$  Therefore we have that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} b=c & \Longleftrightarrow & \frac{n_1}{m_1}b=\frac{n_2}{m_2}\\ & \Leftrightarrow & n_1b=\frac{n_2m_1}{m_2}\\ & \Leftrightarrow & b=\frac{n_2m_1}{m_2n_1} \end{array}$$

Since  $n_1, n_2, m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , by definition, we have that  $b \in \mathbb{Q}$ , a contradiction. Therefore, the theorem holds.

a

# Proof by Contradiction I

#### Example

Show that  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational.<sup>3</sup>

proof

- By way of contradiction, assume  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational, that is
- $\sqrt{2} = \frac{a}{b}$  where a, b are in *lowest terms* (b does not divide a)
- Then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 2 & = & \frac{a^2}{b^2} \\ 2b^2 & = & a^2 \end{array}$$

- $\blacktriangleright$  Thus,  $a^2$  is even and so a is even, a=2k
- But then

 $2b^2 = (2k)^2 = 2(2k^2)$ 

SO

 $b^2 = 2k^2$ 

## Proof by Contradiction II Example

- $\blacktriangleright$  Thus,  $b^2$  is even and so b is even
- $\blacktriangleright$  This contradicts the assumption that a,b were in lowest terms and so  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational

<sup>3</sup>this proof is commonly attributed to Hippasus of Metapontum, 5th century BCE; his proof of the existence of irrational numbers was counter to Pythagarean philosophy and various accounts indicate that he was drowned at sea either by his peers or the gods

# Proof by Cases

Sometimes it is easier to prove a theorem by breaking it down into *cases* and proving each one separately.

 $9n^2 + 3n - 2$ 

#### Example

Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Prove that

is even.

# Proof by Cases

Example

## Proof.

Observe that  $9n^2 + 3n - 2 = (3n + 2)(3n - 1)$  is the product of two integers. Consider the following cases.

**Case 1**: 3n + 2 is even. Then trivially we can conclude that  $9n^2 + 3n - 2$  is even since one of its two factors is even.

**Case 2**: 3n + 2 is odd. Note that the difference between (3n + 2) and (3n - 1) is 3, therefore, if (3n + 2) is odd, it must be the case that (3n - 1) is even. Just as before, we conclude that  $9n^2 + 3n - 2$  is even since one of its two factors is even.

Existence & Uniqueness Proofs I

A constructive existence proof asserts a theorem by providing a specific, concrete example of a statement. Such a proof only proves a statement of the form  $\exists x P(x)$  for some predicate P. It does not prove the statement for all such x.

A nonconstructive existence proof also shows a statement of the form  $\exists x P(x)$ , but it does not necessarily need to give a specific example x. Such a proof usually proceeds by contradiction—assume that  $\neg \exists x P(x) \equiv \forall x \neg P(x)$  holds and then get a contradiction.

# Existence & Uniqueness Proofs II

A uniqueness proof is used to show that a certain element (specific or not) has a certain property. Such a proof usually has two parts, a proof of existence  $(\exists xP(x))$  and a proof of uniqueness (if  $x \neq y$ , then  $\neg P(y)$ ). Together, we have the following

$$\exists x \big( P(x) \land \forall y (y \neq x \to \neg P(y)) \big)$$

# Counter Examples

Sometimes you are asked to *disprove* a statement. In such a situation, you are actually trying to *prove* the negation.

With statements of the form  $\forall x P(x)$ , it suffices to give a *counter example* since the existence of an element x such that  $\neg P(x)$  is true proves that  $\exists x \neg P(x)$  which is the negation of  $\forall x P(x)$ .

# Counter Examples Example

#### Example

Prove or disprove:  $n^2+n+1$  is a prime number for all  $n\geq 1$ 

A simple counter example is n=4. Then  $n^2+n+1=4^2+4+1=21=3\cdot 7$  which is clearly not prime.

# Counter Examples

A word of caution

No matter how many you give, you can never *prove* a theorem by giving examples (unless the universe of discourse is finite—why?).

Counter examples can only be used to disprove universally quantified statements.

Do not give a proof by simply giving an example.

# **Proof Strategies I**

If there were a single strategy that always worked for proofs, mathematics would be easy.

In fact, it can be shown (Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem) that in any formal logic system, there are statements that *cannot* be proven or refuted.

Moreover, no *algorithm* exists for proving statements in a formal system as it is *undecidable*.

# **Proof Strategies II**

The best advice I can give is:

- ▶ Don't take things for granted, try proving assertions *first* before you take them as fact.
- Don't peek at proofs. Try proving something for yourself before looking at the proof.
- The best way to improve your proof skills is practice.

# **Proof Tips**

- ► Examples are not proofs
- Often more than one way to prove something
- If stuck: try the contrapositive (or something else)
- $\blacktriangleright$  If you need to prove an "if and only if" statement, you *must* prove both ways: ( $\Rightarrow$ ) and ( $\Leftarrow$ )
- $\blacktriangleright$  If proving a list of statements are equivalent: suffices to show  $(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (1)$
- Treat a proof as a roadmap
  - Understand where you are (premise)
  - Realize where you want to go (conclusion)
  - Apply definitions (and other known facts) to where you are to get more information
  - Individual steps toward your end goal

