Review.



Theory: If you drink alcohol you must be at least 18.

Which cards do you turn over?

Drink Alcohol \implies " \ge 18"

"< 18" \Longrightarrow Don't Drink Alcohol. Contrapositive.

(A) (B) (C) and/or (D)?

Propositional Forms: $\land, \lor, \neg, P \Longrightarrow Q \equiv \neg P \lor Q$.

Truth Table. Putting together identities. (E.g., cases, substitution.)

Predicates, P(x), and quantifiers. $\forall x, P(x)$.

DeMorgan's: $\neg (P \lor Q) \equiv \neg P \land \neg Q$. $\neg \forall x, P(x) \equiv \exists x, \neg P(x)$.

Divides.

a|b means

- (A) There exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, with a = kb.
- (B) There exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, with b = ka.
- (C) There exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$, with b = ka.
- (D) There exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, with k = ab.
- (E) a divides b

CS70: Lecture 2. Outline.

Today: Proofs!!!

- 1. By Example.
- 2. Direct. (Prove $P \Longrightarrow Q$.)
- 3. by Contraposition (Prove $P \Longrightarrow Q$)
- 4. by Contradiction (Prove P.)
- 5. by Cases

If time: discuss induction.

Direct Proof.

Theorem: For any $a, b, c \in Z$, if $a \mid b$ and $a \mid c$ then $a \mid (b - c)$.

Proof: Assume a|b and a|c

b = aq and c = aq' where $q, q' \in Z$

b-c=aq-aq'=a(q-q') Done?

(b-c)=a(q-q') and (q-q') is an integer so by definition of divides

a|(b-c)

Works for $\forall a, b, c$?

Argument applies to every $a, b, c \in Z$.

Used distributive property and definition of divides.

Direct Proof Form:

Goal: $P \Longrightarrow Q$

Assume P.

Therefore Q.

Quick Background and Notation.

Integers closed under addition.

 $a,b\in Z \implies a+b\in Z$

a|b means "a divides b".

2|4? Yes! Since for q = 2, 4 = (2)2.

7|23? No! No *q* where true.

4|2? No!

Formally: $a|b \iff \exists g \in Z \text{ where } b = ag.$

3|15 since for q = 5, 15 = 3(5).

A natural number p > 1, is **prime** if it is divisible only by 1 and itself.

Another direct proof.

Let D_3 be the 3 digit natural numbers.

Theorem: For $n \in D_3$, if the alternating sum of digits of n is divisible by 11, then 11|n.

 $\forall n \in D_3, (11|\text{alt. sum of digits of } n) \implies 11|n$

Examples:

 \Box

n = 121 Alt Sum: 1 - 2 + 1 = 0. Divis. by 11. As is 121.

n = 605 Alt Sum: 6 - 0 + 5 = 11 Divis. by 11. As is 605 = 11(55)

Proof: For $n \in D_3$, n = 100a + 10b + c, for some a, b, c.

Assume: Alt. sum: a - b + c = 11k for some integer k.

Add 99a + 11b to both sides.

100a+10b+c=11k+99a+11b=11(k+9a+b)

Left hand side is n, k+9a+b is integer. $\implies 11|n$.

Direct proof of $P \Longrightarrow Q$:

Assumed P: 11|a-b+c. Proved Q: 11|n.

The Converse

```
Thm: \forall n \in D_3, (11|\text{alt. sum of digits of } n) \implies 11|n| Is converse a theorem? \forall n \in D_3, (11|n) \implies (11|\text{alt. sum of digits of } n) Yes? No?
```

Another Contraposition...

Another Direct Proof.

```
Theorem: \forall n \in D_3, (11|n) \Longrightarrow (11|\text{alt. sum of digits of } n)
Proof: Assume 11|n.

n = 100a + 10b + c = 11k \Longrightarrow
99a + 11b + (a - b + c) = 11k \Longrightarrow
a - b + c = 11k - 99a - 11b \Longrightarrow
a - b + c = 11(k - 9a - b) \Longrightarrow
a - b + c = 11(k - 9a - b) \Longrightarrow
a - b + c = 11\ell \text{ where } \ell = (k - 9a - b) \in Z

That is 11|\text{alternating sum of digits.}

Note: similar proof to other. In this case every \Longrightarrow is \Longleftrightarrow
Often works with arithmetic properties ...
...not when multiplying by 0.

We have.

Theorem: \forall n \in N', (11|\text{alt. sum of digits of } n) \iff (11|n)
```

Proof by contradiction:form

```
Theorem: \sqrt{2} is irrational.

Must show: For every a,b\in Z, (\frac{a}{b})^2\neq 2.

A simple property (equality) should always "not" hold.

Proof by contradiction:

Theorem: P.

\neg P \implies P_1 \cdots \implies R
```

$$\begin{array}{l} \neg P \implies P_1 \cdots \implies R \\ \neg P \implies Q_1 \cdots \implies \neg R \\ \neg P \implies R \land \neg R \equiv \text{False} \\ \text{or } \neg P \implies \text{False} \end{array}$$

Contrapositive of $\neg P \Longrightarrow False$ is $True \Longrightarrow P$. Theorem P is true. And proven.

Proof by Contraposition

```
Thm: For n \in Z^+ and d|n. If n is odd then d is odd. n=2k+1 and n=k'd. what do we know about d? What to do? Is it even true? Hey, that rhymes ...and there is a pun ... colored blue. Anyway, what to do? Goal: Prove P \implies Q. Assume \neg Q ...and prove \neg P. Conclusion: \neg Q \implies \neg P equivalent to P \implies Q. Proof: Assume \neg Q: d is even. d=2k. d|n so we have n=qd=q(2k)=2(kq)
```

Contradiction

n is even. $\neg P$

Theorem: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.

Assume $\neg P$: $\sqrt{2} = a/b$ for $a, b \in Z$.

Reduced form: a and b have no common factors.

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

$$2b^2 = a^2 = 4k^2$$

 a^2 is even $\implies a$ is even. a = 2k for some integer k

$$b^2 = 2k^2$$

 b^2 is even $\implies b$ is even.

a and b have a common factor. Contradiction.

Proof by contradiction: example

Theorem: There are infinitely many primes.

Proof:

▶ Assume finitely many primes: $p_1,...,p_k$.

Consider number

$$q = (p_1 \times p_2 \times \cdots p_k) + 1.$$

ightharpoonup q cannot be one of the primes as it is larger than any p_i .

▶ q has prime divisor p ("p > 1" = R) which is one of p_i .

▶ p divides both $x = p_1 \cdot p_2 \cdots p_k$ and q, and divides q - x,

 $ightharpoonup p > p | q - x \implies p \le q - x = 1.$

▶ so $p \le 1$. (Contradicts R.)

The original assumption that "the theorem is false" is false, thus the theorem is proven.

Proof by cases.

Theorem: There exist irrational x and y such that x^y is rational.

Let $x = y = \sqrt{2}$.

Case 1: $x^y = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ is rational. Done!

Case 2: $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ is irrational.

New values: $x = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$, $y = \sqrt{2}$.

 \triangleright

$$x^{y} = \left(\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}*\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^{2} = 2.$$

Thus, we have irrational x and y with a rational x^y (i.e., 2).

One of the cases is true so theorem holds.

Question: Which case holds? Don't know!!!

Product of first *k* primes..

Did we prove?

▶ "The product of the first *k* primes plus 1 is prime."

► No.

▶ The chain of reasoning started with a false statement.

Consider example..

 \triangleright 2 × 3 × 5 × 7 × 11 × 13 + 1 = 30031 = 59 × 509

▶ There is a prime *in between* 13 and q = 30031 that divides q.

 \triangleright Proof assumed no primes in between p_k and q.

Be careful.

Theorem: 3 = 4

Proof: Assume 3 = 4.

Start with 12 = 12.

Divide one side by 3 and the other by 4 to get

4 = 3.

By commutativity theorem holds.

Don't assume what you want to prove!

Proof by cases.

Theorem: $x^5 - x + 1 = 0$ has no solution in the rationals.

Proof: First a lemma...

Lemma: If x is a solution to $x^5 - x + 1 = 0$ and x = a/b for $a, b \in Z$,

then both a and b are even.

Reduced form $\frac{a}{b}$: a and b can't both be even! + Lemma

 \implies no rational solution.

Proof of lemma: Assume a solution of the form a/b.

$$\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^5 - \frac{a}{b} + 1 = 0$$

Multiply by b^5 ,

$$a^5 - ab^4 + b^5 = 0$$

Case 1: a odd, b odd: odd - odd +odd = even. Not possible.

Case 2: a even, b odd: even - even +odd = even. Not possible.

Case 3: a odd, b even: odd - even +even = even. Not possible.

Case 4: a even, b even: even - even +even = even. Possible.

The fourth case is the only one possible, so the lemma follows.

Be really careful!

Theorem: 1 = 2

Proof: For
$$x = y$$
, we have $(x^2 - xy) = x^2 - y^2$
 $x(x - y) = (x + y)(x - y)$
 $x = (x + y)$

x = 2x 1 = 2

Poll: What is the problem?

(A) Assumed what you were proving.

(B) No problem. Its fine.

(C) x - y is zero.

(D) Can't multiply by zero in a proof.

Dividing by zero is no good. Multiplying by zero is wierdly cool!

Also: Multiplying inequalities by a negative.

 $P \Longrightarrow Q$ does not mean $Q \Longrightarrow P$.

Summary: Note 2.

Direct Proof:

To Prove: $P \Longrightarrow Q$. Assume P. Prove Q.

By Contraposition: To Prove: $P \Longrightarrow Q$ Assume $\neg Q$. Prove $\neg P$.

By Contradiction:

To Prove: P Assume $\neg P$. Prove False.

By Cases: informal.

Universal: show that statement holds in all cases.

Existence: used cases where one is true.

Either $\sqrt{2}$ and $\sqrt{2}$ worked. or $\sqrt{2}$ and $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ worked.

Careful when proving!

Don't assume the theorem. Divide by zero. Watch converse. ...

CS70: Note 3. Induction!

Poll. What's the biggest number?

- (A) 100
- (B) 101
- (C) n+1
- (D) infinity.
- (E) This is about the "recursive leap of faith."