## Informal Proofs CS 130

#### Alex Vondrak

ajvondrak@csupomona.edu

Winter 2012

Is the following WFF logically valid?

#### $\forall x [(P(x) \lor \neg P(x))]$

Is the following WFF logically valid?

#### $\forall x[((P(x) \land B(x)) \implies O(x))]$

Let the universe be the natural numbers (0, 1, 2, ...). Also, let

 $P(x) = "x ext{ is prime"}$ B(x) = "x > 2" $O(x) = "x ext{ is odd"}$ 

Is the following WFF true?

$$\forall x[((P(x) \land B(x)) \implies O(x))]$$

Let the universe be the natural numbers (0, 1, 2, ...). Also, let

$$P(x) =$$
 "x is prime"  
 $B(x) =$  "x > 2"  
 $O(x) =$  "x is odd"

Suppose we want to prove

$$\vdash \quad \forall x[((P(x) \land B(x)) \implies O(x))]$$

What does P(x) mean in more "primitive" terms? (A)  $\forall y[((y > 1 \land y < x) \implies \neg \exists z[x = yz])]$ (B)  $\exists y[x = 2y + 1]$ (C)  $\exists y[x = 2y]$ (D) O(x) must be true

Let the universe be the natural numbers (0, 1, 2, ...). Also, let

$$P(x) =$$
 "x is prime"  
 $B(x) =$  "x > 2"  
 $O(x) =$  "x is odd"

Suppose we want to prove

$$\vdash \quad \forall x[((P(x) \land B(x)) \implies O(x))]$$

What does O(x) mean in more "primitive" terms? (A)  $\forall y[((y > 1 \land y < x) \implies \neg \exists z[x = yz])]$ (B)  $\exists y[x = 2y + 1]$ (C)  $\exists y[x = 2y]$ (D) B(x) must be true

Alex Vondrak (ajvondrak@csupomona.edu)

Let the universe be the natural numbers (0, 1, 2, ...). Also, let

$$P(x) = "x \text{ is prime"}$$
$$B(x) = "x > 2"$$
$$O(x) = "x \text{ is odd"}$$

Suppose we want to prove

$$\vdash \quad \forall x[((P(x) \land B(x)) \implies O(x))]$$

Do we have ways to reconstruct facts about equality, multiplication, and addition using only predicate logic?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No

Let the universe be the natural numbers (0, 1, 2, ...). Also, let

$$P(x) = "x \text{ is prime"}$$
$$B(x) = "x > 2"$$
$$O(x) = "x \text{ is odd"}$$

Suppose we want to prove

$$- \quad \forall x[((P(x) \land B(x)) \implies O(x))]$$

If we had the right additional axioms & theorems, could we prove this statement?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No
- (C) It depends

Let the universe be the natural numbers (0, 1, 2, ...). Also, let

$$P(x) = "x \text{ is prime"}$$
$$B(x) = "x > 2"$$
$$O(x) = "x \text{ is odd"}$$

Suppose we want to prove

$$- \quad \forall x[((P(x) \land B(x)) \implies O(x))]$$

If we had the right additional axioms & theorems, could we prove any true statement about the natural numbers?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No
- (C) It depends

Let the universe be the natural numbers (0, 1, 2, ...). Also, let

P(x) = "x is even" B(x) = "x > 2"O(x) = "x is the sum of two primes"

Is the following WFF true?

$$\forall x[((P(x) \land B(x)) \implies O(x))]$$

## From Formal to Informal

What additional axioms do mathematicians work with?

- Peano Arithmetic
- Euclidean Geometry
- Real Closed Fields (i.e., real numbers)
- . . .

#### Theorem (Gödel's First Incompleteness Theorem)

No consistent axiomatic system (e.g., propositional logic, predicate logic) is capable of proving all truths about the natural numbers.

#### Reality Check

Formal systems still provide a scaffold on which we base many principles of mathematics, but...

- We're human, and formalisation is pretty technical
- We only have half a quarter left—let's prove interesting things!

## Formal Proof vs Informal Proof

#### Formal Proof

- WFFs & justifications line-by-line
- Systematic
- Relies on appeal to precise axiomatization

#### Informal Proof

- Natural language (e.g., English)
- Still systematic, but it feels less restrictive
- Relies on underlying, less overt formality

#### Example: x is even $\vdash x+1$ is odd

1. <i>E</i> ( <i>x</i> )	Hypothesis
2. $(E(x) \implies \exists k[x=2k])$	Definition of "even"
3. $\exists k[x=2k]$	Modus Ponens: lines 1 & 2
4. $x = 2\underline{k}$	Existential Instantiation: line 3
$5. \ x+1=2\underline{k}+1$	Add same quantity to both sides: line 4
$6. \exists k[x+1=2k+1]$	Existential Generalization: line 5
7. $(\exists k[x+1=2k+1] \implies O(x+1))$	)) Definition of "odd"
8. $O(x+1)$	Modus Ponens: lines 6 and 7

Ideally, a formal and informal proof of the same thing will mirror each other. Which of the following is the best English analog for line 1?

- (A) "x is even" is a true statement.
- (B) x is an even number.
- (C) It is my opinion that x is even.
- (D) Suppose x is an even number.

## Example: x is even $\vdash x+1$ is odd

1. <i>E</i> ( <i>x</i> )	Hypothesis
2. $(E(x) \implies \exists k[x=2k])$	Definition of "even"
3. $\exists k[x=2k]$	Modus Ponens: lines 1 & 2
4. $x = 2\underline{k}$	Existential Instantiation: line 3
$5. \ x+1=2\underline{k}+1$	Add same quantity to both sides: line 4
$6. \exists k[x+1=2k+1]$	Existential Generalization: line 5
7. $(\exists k[x+1=2k+1] \implies O(x+1))$	)) Definition of "odd"
8. $O(x+1)$	Modus Ponens: lines 6 and 7

Ideally, a formal and informal proof of the same thing will mirror each other. Which of the following is the best English analog for lines 2-4?

- (A) By definition, x = 2k.
- (B) By definition and Modus Ponens, x = 2k.
- (C) By definition, x = 2k for some constant k.
- (D) By definition and Modus Ponens, x = 2k for some constant k.

#### Example: x is even $\vdash$ x + 1 is odd

1. <i>E</i> ( <i>x</i> )	Hypothesis
2. $(E(x) \implies \exists k[x=2k])$	Definition of "even"
3. $\exists k[x=2k]$	Modus Ponens: lines 1 & 2
4. $x = 2\underline{k}$	Existential Instantiation: line 3
$5. \ x+1=2\underline{k}+1$	Add same quantity to both sides: line 4
$6. \exists k[x+1=2k+1]$	Existential Generalization: line 5
7. $(\exists k[x+1=2k+1] \implies O(x+1))$	)) Definition of "odd"
8. $O(x+1)$	Modus Ponens: lines 6 and 7

Ideally, a formal and informal proof of the same thing will mirror each other. Which of the following is the best English analog for lines 5-8?

- (A) Adding equal quantities to both sides yields x + 1 = 2k + 1.
- (B) Adding 1 to both sides yields x + 1 = 2k + 1.
- (C) Adding 1 to both sides yields x + 1 = 2k + 1, so x + 1 and 2k + 1 are odd.
- (D) Adding 1 to both sides yields x + 1 = 2k + 1, so x + 1 is odd by definition.

#### Guidelines

- The Deduction Theorem
  - Often tacit wherever there's an implication
  - "Assume that [antecedent]. We show that [consequent]."
- Hypotheses & Tautologies
  - "It's clear that..."
  - "We know that..."
  - "Assume that..."
- Modus Ponens
  - Not often associated with excess verbiage
  - "Because [antecedent], it follows that [consequent]."

- Universal Generalization
  - Often implicit: if we discuss a variable, we assume it's arbitrary
  - "Since x was arbitrary, \_\_\_\_\_ holds true in general."
- Instantiation
  - Existential vs Universal is largely context-dependent
  - "Fix an x such that..."
  - "Let x be..."
  - "Consider an arbitrary x such that ...."
  - "For some constant *c*, ...."

Consider once more the Goldbach Conjecture

"Every even number bigger than 2 is equal to the sum of two primes."

If we wanted to prove this true, what would we need to do?

- (A) Let x be an arbitrary even number greater than 2, show it must be equal to two primes
- (B) Fix x to a particular even number greater than 2 (e.g., 1024), show it is equal to the sum of two primes
- (C) List out as many even xs greater than 2 as possible, confirm that each one is equal to the sum of two primes
- (D) It can't be proven

Consider once more the Goldbach Conjecture

"Every even number bigger than 2 is equal to the sum of two primes."

If we wanted to prove this false, what would we need to do?

- (A) Let x be an arbitrary even number greater than 2, show it can't be equal to two primes
- (B) Fix x to a particular even number greater than 2 (e.g., 1024), show it is not equal to the sum of two primes
- (C) Let x be an arbitrary number that is odd or  $\leq 2$ , show that it is equal to the sum of two primes
- (D) It can't be proven

Let the universe of discourse be the natural numbers (0, 1, 2, ...). Also, let

$$E(x) = "x$$
 is even"  
 $O(x) = "x$  is odd"  
 $s(x) = x^2$ 

"Behind the scenes", what is the following sentence saying?

"The square of an even natural number is always odd."

(A)  $\forall x[O(x)]$ (B)  $\forall x[O(s(x))]$ (C)  $\forall x[(E(x) \land O(s(x)))]$ (D)  $\forall x[(E(x) \implies O(s(x)))]$ 

Let the universe of discourse be the natural numbers (0, 1, 2, ...). Also, let

$$E(x) = "x$$
 is even"  
 $O(x) = "x$  is odd"  
 $s(x) = x^2$ 

"The square of an even natural number is always odd."

i.e.,  $\forall x [(E(x) \implies O(s(x)))]$ . Suppose we want to prove this sentence is true. What would we need to do?

(A) Let x be an arbitrary even value, show its square must be odd.

- (B) Let x be an arbitrary value whose square is odd, show that x is even.
- (C) Fix x to a particular even value, show that the square must be odd.
- (D) Fix x to a particular value whose square is odd, show that x is even.

Let the universe of discourse be the natural numbers (0, 1, 2, ...). Also, let

$$E(x) = "x$$
 is even"  
 $O(x) = "x$  is odd"  
 $s(x) = x^2$ 

"The square of an even natural number is always odd."

i.e.,  $\forall x [(E(x) \implies O(s(x)))]$ . Suppose we want to prove this sentence is false. What would we need to do?

(A) Let x be an arbitrary even value, show its square must be even.

- (B) Let x be an arbitrary value whose square is even, show that x is even.
- (C) Fix x to a particular even value, show that the square must be even.
- (D) Fix x to a particular value whose square is even, show that x is even.

In summary, to prove something of the form

 $\forall x[P(x)]$ 

- (A) Find a particular x such that  $\neg P(x)$
- (B) Find a particular x such that P(x)
- (C) For every x possible, show P(x)
- (D) For every x possible, show  $\neg P(x)$

In summary, to disprove something of the form

 $\forall x[P(x)]$ 

- (A) Find a particular x such that  $\neg P(x)$
- (B) Find a particular x such that P(x)
- (C) For every x possible, show P(x)
- (D) For every x possible, show  $\neg P(x)$

Extrapolating, to prove something of the form

 $\exists x[P(x)]$ 

- (A) Find a particular x such that  $\neg P(x)$
- (B) Find a particular x such that P(x)
- (C) For every x possible, show P(x)
- (D) For every x possible, show  $\neg P(x)$

Extrapolating, to disprove something of the form

 $\exists x[P(x)]$ 

- (A) Find a particular x such that  $\neg P(x)$
- (B) Find a particular x such that P(x)
- (C) For every x possible, show P(x)
- (D) For every x possible, show  $\neg P(x)$

## Proof Strategies: Example vs Counterexample

Definition (Proof by Example) To prove:  $\vdash \exists x[P(x)]$ Show: an example—an x such that P(x)

Definition (Disproof by Counterexample) To prove:  $\vdash \neg \forall x [P(x)]$ Show: a counterexample—an x such that  $\neg P(x)$ 

#### Question

Which one of these seems more useful?

(A) Proof by Example

(B) Disproof by Counterexample

# Definition (Exhaustive Proof) To prove: $\vdash \quad \forall x[P(x)]$ Show: $P(\underline{x})$ is true for every possible constant $\underline{x}$

#### ALSO

To prove:  $\vdash \neg \exists x [P(x)]$ Show:  $\neg P(\underline{x})$  is true for every possible constant  $\underline{x}$ 

Everyone in this classroom is male.

- (A) Proof by Example
- (B) Disproof by Counterexample
- (C) Exhaustive Proof
- (D) None of the above

Nobody in this classroom is male.

- (A) Proof by Example
- (B) Disproof by Counterexample
- (C) Exhaustive Proof
- (D) None of the above

Somebody in this classroom is male.

- (A) Proof by Example
- (B) Disproof by Counterexample
- (C) Exhaustive Proof
- (D) None of the above

Which technique would you employ on the following sentence if you assumed it was true?

Everybody in this classroom likes CS 130.

- (A) Proof by Example
- (B) Disproof by Counterexample
- (C) Exhaustive Proof
- (D) None of the above

Which technique would you employ on the following sentence if you assumed it was false?

Everybody in this classroom likes CS 130.

- (A) Proof by Example
- (B) Disproof by Counterexample
- (C) Exhaustive Proof
- (D) None of the above

No three positive integers *a*, *b*, and *c* can satisfy the equation  $a^n + b^n = c^n$  for any integer n > 2.

- (A) Proof by Example
- (B) Disproof by Counterexample
- (C) Exhaustive Proof
- (D) None of the above

## Proof Strategies: Direct Proof

#### Definition (Direct Proof)

To prove:  $\vdash$   $(P \implies Q)$ Show:  $P \vdash Q$ 

#### Informally,

```
Proof ("If P, then Q").
Suppose P.
:
Therefore Q.
```

In a formal proof, how does proving

$$P \vdash Q$$

prove  $\vdash (P \implies Q)$ ?

(A) The converse of the Deduction Theorem

- (B) The Deduction Theorem
- (C) The Soundness Theorem
- (D) The Completeness Theorem

Let the universe of discourse be the integers  $(\ldots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \ldots)$ . Also, let

$$E(x) = "x$$
 is even"  
 $s(x) = x^2$ 

How would you symbolize the following sentence?

"The square of an even integer is even."

(A) 
$$\forall x[E(s(x))]$$
  
(B)  $\forall x[(E(x) \land E(s(x)))]$   
(C)  $\forall x[(E(x) \Longrightarrow E(s(x)))]$   
(D)  $\forall x[(E(s(x)) \Longrightarrow E(x))]$ 

Can we use a direct proof to prove the following sentence?

"The square of an even integer is even."

- (A) No, this is a  $\forall$  statement
- (B) No, direct proof is only available in propositional logic
- (C) Yes, just let x be arbitrary (with Universal Instantiation) beforehand
- (D) Yes, just fix x to a specific constant beforehand

Direct Proof ("The square of an even integer is even.")

How should we begin this proof?

- (A) Assume x is an even integer
- (B) Assume  $x^2$  is an even integer
- (C) Let x be an even integer, say 12
- (D) Let  $x^2$  be an even integer, say 12

Direct Proof ("The square of an even integer is even.") Assume x is an even integer.

Which of the following can we deduce?

- (A) By definition, x = 2k + 1 for some integer k
- (B) By definition, x = 2k for some integer k
- (C) By definition,  $x = 2^k$  for some integer k
- (D) By definition,  $x^2$  is even

÷

Direct Proof ("The square of an even integer is even.") Assume x is an even integer. By definition, x = 2k for some integer k.

How can we figure out the value of  $x^2$  from the equation x = 2k?

- (A) Multiply both sides by x
- (B) Multiply both sides by 2k
- (C) Square both sides
- (D) Take the square root of both sides

#### Direct Proof ("The square of an even integer is even.")

Assume x is an even integer. By definition, x = 2k for some integer k. Squaring both sides yields  $x^2 = (2k)^2 = ?$ 

#### Which of the following is the most useful equivalent of $(2k)^2$ ?

(A)  $x^2$ (B)  $2^2k^2$ (C)  $4k^2$ (D)  $2(2k^2)$ 

#### Direct Proof ("The square of an even integer is even.")

Assume x is an even integer. By definition, x = 2k for some integer k. Squaring both sides yields  $x^2 = (2k)^2 = 2(2k^2)$ .

What can we conclude about  $x^2$ ?

- (A)  $x^2$  is even, since it's equal to 4 times an integer  $(k^2)$
- (B)  $x^2$  is even, since it's equal to 2 times an integer  $(2k^2)$
- (C) x<sup>2</sup> is even, since the square of any arbitrary x is equal to 2(2k<sup>2</sup>)
  (D) Nothing

#### Direct Proof ("The square of an even integer is even.")

Assume x is an even integer. By definition, x = 2k for some integer k. Squaring both sides yields  $x^2 = (2k)^2 = 2(2k^2)$ . By definition,  $x^2$  is even because it's equal to 2 times an integer constant  $(2k^2)$ . Direct Proof ("Let x be an integer. If  $x^2$  is even, then so is x.")

How should we begin this proof?

- (A) Assume x is an integer.
- (B) Assume x is an integer such that  $x^2$  is even.
- (C) Assume  $x^2$  is an integer.
- (D) Assume  $x^2$  is an integer such that x is even.

Direct Proof ("Let x be an integer. If  $x^2$  is even, then so is x.") Assume x is an integer such that  $x^2$  is even.

Which of the following can we infer?

- (A) By definition,  $x^2 = 2k$  for some integer k
- (B) By definition, x = 2k for some integer k
- (C) By definition,  $x^2 = (2k)^2$  for some integer k
- (D) None of the above

Direct Proof ("Let x be an integer. If  $x^2$  is even, then so is x.") Assume x is an integer such that  $x^2$  is even. By definition,  $x^2 = 2k$  for some integer k.

How can we figure out the value of x from the equation  $x^2 = 2k$ ?

- (A) Square both sides
- (B) Divide both sides by x
- (C) Take the square root of both sides
- (D) Divide both sides by 2k

#### Direct Proof ("Let x be an integer. If $x^2$ is even, then so is x.")

Assume x is an integer such that  $x^2$  is even. By definition,  $x^2 = 2k$  for some integer k. Taking the square root of both sides yields  $x = \sqrt{2k}$ .

What can we infer from this?

- (A) Something useful
- (B) Nothing useful

### Proof Strategies: Proof by Contraposition

#### Definition (Proof by Contraposition)

To prove: 
$$\vdash$$
  $(P \Longrightarrow Q)$   
Show:  $\vdash$   $(\neg Q \Longrightarrow \neg P)$ 

$$(\neg B \implies \neg A) \vdash (A \implies B)$$
 (Axiom 3i)

In a formal proof, this would be a use of Axiom 3i from Homework 2:

$$\vdots$$
line #. ( $\neg Q \implies \neg P$ )
line #+1. ( $P \implies Q$ )

Justification Axiom 3i: line #

1.

Proof by Contraposition ("Let x be an integer. If  $x^2$  is even, then so is x.")

How should we begin this proof?

- (A) Let x be an integer
- (B) Let x be an even integer
- (C) Let x be an odd integer
- (D) Let x be an odd non-integer

Proof by Contraposition ("Let x be an integer. If  $x^2$  is even, then so is x.") Let x be an odd integer.

What can we infer from this?

- (A) By definition, x = 2k for some integer k
- (B) By definition, x = 2(k + 1) for some integer k
- (C) By definition, x = 2k + 1 for some integer k
- (D) By definition,  $x \neq 2$

Proof by Contraposition ("Let x be an integer. If  $x^2$  is even, then so is x.") Let x be an odd integer. By definition, x = 2k + 1 for some integer k.

How can we figure out the value of  $x^2$  from the equation x = 2k + 1?

- (A) Square both sides
- (B) Multiply both sides by x
- (C) Subtract one from both sides, then square both sides
- (D) None of the above

Proof by Contraposition ("Let x be an integer. If  $x^2$  is even, then so is x.") Let x be an odd integer. By definition, x = 2k + 1 for some integer k. Squaring both sides yields  $x^2 = (2k + 1)^2 = 4k^2 + 2k + 1 = ?$ .

Which of the following is the most useful equivalent of  $4k^2 + 2k + 1$ ?

- (A)  $(2k + 1)^2$ (B)  $(2k)^2 + 2k + 1$ (C)  $2(2k^2 + k) + 1$
- (D)  $4k^2 + k + k + 1$

# Proof by Contraposition ("Let x be an integer. If $x^2$ is even, then so is x.") Let x be an odd integer. By definition, x = 2k + 1 for some integer k. Squaring both sides yields $x^2 = (2k + 1)^2 = 4k^2 + 2k + 1$ $= 2(2k^2 + k) + 1$ .

What can we conclude about  $x^2$ ?

- (A) By definition,  $x^2$  is odd
- (B) By definition,  $x^2$  is even
- (C)  $x^2$  is either even or odd
- (D) Can't say whether  $x^2$  is even or odd

Proof by Contraposition ("Let x be an integer. If  $x^2$  is even, then so is x.") Let x be an odd integer. By definition, x = 2k + 1 for some integer k. Squaring both sides yields  $x^2 = (2k + 1)^2 = 4k^2 + 2k + 1$  $= 2(2k^2 + k) + 1$ . By definition,  $x^2$  is odd, since it's equal to 2c + 1 for the integer constant  $c = (2k^2 + k)$ .

### Proof Strategies: Proof by Cases

## Definition (Proof by Cases) To prove: $\vdash$ (( $A_1 \lor A_2$ ) $\Longrightarrow$ B) Show: $\vdash$ ( $A_1 \Longrightarrow$ B) and $\vdash$ ( $A_2 \Longrightarrow$ B)

Informally, where A is equivalent to  $(A_1 \lor A_2)$ ,

```
Proof by Cases ("If A, then B.")
By cases on A:
(A = A_1) Assume A_1.... Therefore B.
(A = A_2) Assume A_2.... Therefore B.
```

"There exist irrational numbers a & b such that  $a^b$  is rational."

What does it mean for a number to be rational?

- (A) It is a whole number
- (B) It can be expressed as a fraction of two integers
- (C) It can be written in decimal notation
- (D) When written in decimal notation, it has infinitely many digits

"There exist irrational numbers a & b such that  $a^b$  is rational."

#### Proof.

Consider  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ .

- Is  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  rational?
- (A) Yes, it is rational
- (B) No, it is irrational
- (C) I don't really know one way or the other, but one of the above must be true
- (D) It's impossible to know one way or the other

"There exist irrational numbers a & b such that  $a^b$  is rational."

#### Proof.

```
Consider \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}. We have the following cases:
\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}} is rational: ...
\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}} is irrational: ...
```

Consider the possibility that  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  is rational. Is  $\sqrt{2}$  rational?

- (A) Yes, it is rational
- (B) No, it is irrational
- (C) I don't really know one way or the other
- (D) It's impossible to know one way or the other

"There exist irrational numbers a & b such that  $a^b$  is rational."

#### Proof.

Consider  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ . We have the following cases:  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  is rational:  $a = b = \sqrt{2}$ , which is irrational  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  is irrational: Let  $a = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  and  $b = \sqrt{2}$ . Then,  $a^b = (\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}})^{\sqrt{2}} = ?$ 

Consider the possibility that  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  is irrational. Which of the following is the most useful proper

- Which of the following is the most useful property of exponents here? (A)  $(x^y)^z = x^{yz}$
- (B)  $x^{y}x^{z} = x^{y+z}$
- (C) Both of the above
- (C) Doth of the above

(D) None of the above

"There exist irrational numbers a & b such that  $a^b$  is rational."

#### Proof.

Consider  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ . We have the following cases:  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  is rational:  $a = b = \sqrt{2}$ , which is irrational  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  is irrational: Let  $a = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  and  $b = \sqrt{2}$ . Then,  $a^{b} = (\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}})^{\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2} \times \sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^{?}$ 

What is 
$$\sqrt{2} \times \sqrt{2}$$
?  
(A)  $\sqrt{2}$   
(B) 2  
(C)  $2\sqrt{2}$   
(D) 4

"There exist irrational numbers a & b such that  $a^b$  is rational."

#### Proof.

Consider  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ . We have the following cases:  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  is rational:  $a = b = \sqrt{2}$ , which is irrational  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  is irrational: Let  $a = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  and  $b = \sqrt{2}$ . Then,  $a^{b} = (\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}})^{\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2} \times \sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^{2} = ?$ 

What is 
$$\sqrt{2}^{2}$$
?  
(A)  $\sqrt{2}$   
(B) 2  
(C)  $2\sqrt{2}$   
(D) 4

Alex Vondrak (ajvondrak@csupomona.edu)

"There exist irrational numbers a & b such that  $a^b$  is rational."

#### Proof.

Consider  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ . We have the following cases:  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  is rational:  $a = b = \sqrt{2}$ , which is irrational  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  is irrational: Let  $a = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  and  $b = \sqrt{2}$ . Then,  $a^{b} = (\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}})^{\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2} \times \sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^{2} = 2$ .

#### Is 2 rational?

- (A) Yes, it is rational
- (B) No, it is irrational
- (C) I don't really know one way or the other
- (D) It's impossible to know one way or the other

## Proof Strategies: Proof by Contradiction

#### Definition (Proof by Contradiction)

```
To prove: \vdash P
```

Show:  $\vdash$   $(\neg P \implies \bot)$ —that is, derive a contradiction

Intuitively, if P is false, we could prove (i.e., demonstrate the supposed truth of) something that's false. This is clearly ridiculous, so P must be true.

Informally, to prove P by contradiction,

#### Proof by Contradiction.

To the contrary, suppose  $\neg P$ .

Thus, [something that's false]—a contradiction. Therefore, P must be true.

"There is no smallest positive (nonzero) rational number."

Proof by Contradiction.

What do we assume for the sake of contradiction?

- (A) There is no smallest positive (nonzero) rational number
- (B) There is a smallest positive (nonzero) rational number
- (C) There is a smallest positive (possible zero) rational number
- (D) There is a smallest negative (nonzero) rational number

"There is no smallest positive (nonzero) rational number."

#### Proof by Contradiction.

To the contrary, suppose there is a smallest positive (nonzero) rational number, a/b where a & b are integers > 0.

With of the following is a smaller positive nonzero rational number? (A) (a-1)/b(B) a/(b-1)(C) (a+1)/b(D) a/(b+1) "There is no smallest positive (nonzero) rational number."

#### Proof by Contradiction.

To the contrary, suppose there is a smallest positive (nonzero) rational number, a/b where a & b are integers > 0.

a/(b+1) is also a positive, nonzero rational number. However,

$$rac{a}{(b+1)} < rac{a}{b}$$

even though a/b was assumed to the the smallest—a contradiction. Thus, there is no smallest positive (nonzero) rational number.

What do we assume for the sake of contradiction?

- (A)  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational
- (B)  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational
- (C) There is some number x that is irrational
- (D) There is some number x that is rational

To the contrary, suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational.

What does  $\sqrt{2}$  being rational give us?

(A) 
$$\sqrt{2} = a/b$$
 for some integers  $a$  and  $b$ 

(B)  $\sqrt{2}$  can be written in decimal notation in a finite number of digits

- (C)  $\sqrt{2}/b$  is equal to some rational number
- (D)  $\sqrt{2}$  is not the smallest rational number

To the contrary, suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational. Then,  $\sqrt{2} = a/b$  for some integers a and b (where  $b \neq 0$ ). :

Would it be possible for *a* and *b* to have common factors? (A) Yes (B) No

To the contrary, suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational. Then,  $\sqrt{2} = a/b$  for some integers a and b (where  $b \neq 0$ ).

Would it okay to assume *a* and *b* have no common factors? (A) Yes (B) No

#### Proof by Contradiction ( $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational).

To the contrary, suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational. Then,  $\sqrt{2} = a/b$  for some integers *a* and *b* (where  $b \neq 0$ ). Without loss of generality, *a* and *b* have no common factors.

$$\sqrt{2} = \frac{a}{b}$$

What should we do now in our search for a contradiction?

- (A) Multiply both sides by b
- (B) Square both sides
- (C) Divide both sides by  $\sqrt{2}$
- (D) Multiply both sides by  $\sqrt{2}$

#### Proof by Contradiction ( $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational).

To the contrary, suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational. Then,  $\sqrt{2} = a/b$  for some integers *a* and *b* (where  $b \neq 0$ ). Without loss of generality, *a* and *b* have no common factors.

$$\sqrt{2} = a/b$$
$$2 = a^2/b^2$$
$$2b^2 = a^2$$

What does this tell us about  $a^2$ ?

(A)  $a^2$  is rational

(D) None of the above

Alex Vondrak (ajvondrak@csupomona.edu)

#### Proof by Contradiction ( $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational).

To the contrary, suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational. Then,  $\sqrt{2} = a/b$  for some integers *a* and *b* (where  $b \neq 0$ ). Without loss of generality, *a* and *b* have no common factors.

$$\sqrt{2} = a/b$$
$$2 = a^2/b^2$$
$$2b^2 = a^2$$

What does  $a^2$  being even tell us about a?

- (A) a is even
- (B) a is odd
- (C) a might be even or odd
- (D) None of the above

### Proof by Contradiction ( $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational).

To the contrary, suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational. Then,  $\sqrt{2} = a/b$  for some integers *a* and *b* (where  $b \neq 0$ ). Without loss of generality, *a* and *b* have no common factors. Facts:

• 
$$2b^2 = a^2$$

• a is even—that is, a = 2k for some constant k

What should we do with these facts?

- (A) Square both sides of the equation a = 2k
- (B) Substitute 2k for a in the equation  $2b^2 = a^2$
- (C) Substitute  $\sqrt{2b^2}$  for *a* in the equation a = 2k
- (D) Substitute 2k for a in the equation  $\sqrt{2} = a/b$

### Proof by Contradiction ( $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational).

To the contrary, suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational. Then,  $\sqrt{2} = a/b$  for some integers *a* and *b* (where  $b \neq 0$ ). Without loss of generality, *a* and *b* have no common factors. Facts:

•  $2b^2 = a^2$ 

• a is even—that is, a = 2k for some constant k

$$2b2 = a2$$
  

$$2b2 = (2k)2$$
  

$$2b2 = 2(2k2)$$
  

$$b2 = 2k2$$

### Proof by Contradiction ( $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational).

To the contrary, suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational. Then,  $\sqrt{2} = a/b$  for some integers *a* and *b* (where  $b \neq 0$ ). Without loss of generality, *a* and *b* have no common factors. Facts:

- $2b^2 = a^2$
- a is even—that is, a = 2k for some constant k

• 
$$b^2 = 2k^2$$

#### What does this tell us about $b^2$ ?

Alex Vondrak (ajvondrak@csupomona.edu)

#### Proof by Contradiction ( $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational).

To the contrary, suppose  $\sqrt{2} = a/b$  for some integers *a* and *b* ( $b \neq 0$ ). WLOG, *a* and *b* have no common factors. Then,

• 
$$2b^2 = a^2$$

• a is even—that is, a = 2k for some constant k

• 
$$b^2 = 2k^2$$

• *b* is even

Where is our contradiction?

- (A) a and b have no common factors
- (B) a and b are both even
- (C)  $a^2$  and  $b^2$  are both even
- (D)  $\sqrt{2}$  is not actually equal to a/b