

1 Introduction

A *statement* is a declarative sentence that has a well-defined truth value. A *proof* is a careful argument, expressed in the language of mathematics, that convinces the intended audience of the truth value of a statement. An *argument* is a group of statements, one of which is called the *conclusion*, wherein all the other statements (called *premises*) are claimed to support the truth of the conclusion.

Most statements of interest in mathematics are *implications*, which have logical form $P \Rightarrow Q$. (Here P and Q represent simpler statements, called component statements.) In English this can be written in numerous ways, including the following.

“If P , then Q .” “ Q if P .” “ P implies Q .” “ P only if Q .”
 “ P is sufficient for Q .” “ Q is necessary for P .”

Implications can be proved either directly or indirectly.

2 Direct Proof

Recall the truth table for $P \Rightarrow Q$.

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

Whenever P is false, the implication is true already. If, on the other hand, P is true, then Q must also be true in order for the implication to be true. Thus one way to prove $P \Rightarrow Q$ is to *assume P is true and give an argument demonstrating that Q must be true also*. This approach is called a *direct proof*. In applying this approach to a mathematical statement, P represents everything you’re assuming to be true (the hypothesis), and Q represents everything you’re trying to prove (the conclusion). The first step is to recognize the hypothesis and conclusion in the statement. Then, you need to construct a sequence of statements, each a logical consequence of the previous, starting with P and ending with Q . It isn’t always obvious how to reach Q by going forward from P . Using the *forward-backward* method, which also involves working backward from Q to statements that are closer to P , can be a big help. Solow’s book, *How to Read and Do Proofs*, on reserve in the library gives an excellent development of the forward-backward method.

3 Disproving an implication

A statement of the form “ R and S ” is true exactly when *both* R is true and S is true. The *negation* of a statement R is the statement “ R is false.” This is often abbreviated to “not R .” Disproving any statement consists of proving its negation. The negation of $P \Rightarrow Q$ is “ P and not Q ,” as can be deduced from (the second row of) the truth table for $P \Rightarrow Q$. This points the way toward disproving an implication. Show both that the hypothesis P is true and that the conclusion Q is false. Once you’ve done this, you’ve demonstrated that the implication is false.

4 Indirect Proof

An *indirect proof* is a proof of an implication using any method other than direct proof. There are two important methods of this type, and both involve negation. The *contrapositive* of the implication $P \Rightarrow Q$ is $(\text{not } Q) \Rightarrow (\text{not } P)$. It is easy to check that the contrapositive of an implication is logically equivalent to the original implication, *i.e.* they have the same truth value for every combination of truth values of the component statements P and Q .

One method of indirect proof is *proving the contrapositive*. This involves using direct proof to prove the contrapositive of the implication. To do this, assume the original conclusion Q is false and give an argument demonstrating that P must be false also. Successfully completing such an argument proves not only the contrapositive, but the original implication as well, since it is logically equivalent to the contrapositive.

The other method of indirect proof is *proof by contradiction*. A *contradiction* is a statement that is false for every combination of truth values of its component statements. The most common form of contradiction is “ S and not S .” Let C denote a contradiction. Then the implication $(\text{not } R) \Rightarrow C$ is logically equivalent to R . To use proof by contradiction, assume R is false and give an argument that concludes with a contradiction C . Successfully completing such an argument proves $(\text{not } R) \Rightarrow C$, and thus proves R as well. To apply proof by contradiction to an implication $P \Rightarrow Q$, just replace R above by $P \Rightarrow Q$, and begin by assuming the implication is false as described in Section 3.

Providing a direct proof is preferable to providing an indirect proof. An indirect proof often obscures the logical connection between the hypothesis and the conclusion, and thus may give little insight into *why* the statement is true. Nonetheless, there are situations where an indirect proof is more feasible. For instance, consider indirect proof if 1) Direct proof isn’t getting anywhere, 2) The conclusion contains “not”, 3) The negation of the conclusion provides useful information, or 4) The original hypothesis is difficult to work with.

5 Proving Biconditionals

Another important type of statement in mathematics is a *biconditional* $P \iff Q$, which is true exactly when P and Q have the same truth value. In English this can be written in numerous ways, including the following.

“ P if and only if Q .” “ P is equivalent to Q .”
“ P is a necessary and sufficient condition for Q .”

Two of the English representations above, those involving “and”, hint at the connection between biconditional and implication. $P \iff Q$ is logically equivalent to the statement “ $(P \Rightarrow Q)$ and $(Q \Rightarrow P)$.” Thus proving $P \iff Q$ is a two-step task: First prove the implication $P \Rightarrow Q$, and then prove its *converse* $Q \Rightarrow P$. It’s best to indicate the beginning of the second part of such a proof using the word “Conversely”.

6 Proof by cases

The statement “ P or Q ” is true exactly when *at least one* of P or Q is true. Implications of the form $(P \text{ or } Q) \Rightarrow R$ are common. To prove such a statement directly, you may assume “ P or Q .” The problem is that you don’t know *which* of P or Q is true. Thus, it is necessary to give *two* arguments, called *cases* in this situation. For the first case, assume P is true and argue from this that R is true. Then, for the second case, assume Q is true and argue that R is true. After completing both cases, you have demonstrated that the truth of R follows from the hypothesis “ P or Q .” Of course, an “or” statement could involve more than two component statements, and the approach above can easily be extended to cover this situation. A proof will require one case for each component in the “or” statement.

Often some of the cases in a proof by cases are almost identical. In this situation, after completing one of the cases, it’s sufficient to include a comment such as “The second case is similar and is therefore omitted.” Another way to accomplish this is to use the phrase “Without loss of generality”. When you assume one of the components of the “or” statement “without loss of generality”, you’re indicating that arguments for other cases are very similar and will not be included. Consider carefully whether the cases are really similar enough to use this type of argument!

7 Quantified statements

A *predicate* (or *conditional statement* or *open sentence*) is a declarative sentence that contains one or more variables, with each variable representing a value in some set (its *domain*), which becomes a statement when specific values are substituted for the variables. By itself, a predicate is not a statement: it might be true for some values of the variables and false for others. For simplicity, let’s consider a predicate $P(x)$ containing only one variable. We often want to consider *how many* values of x make $P(x)$ true. Actually there are typically only two such questions of mathematical interest:

- 1) Is $P(x)$ true for *at least one* value of x in the domain D ?
- 2) Is $P(x)$ true for *every* value of x in the domain D ?

We can formulate Question 1 into the statement “There exists $x \in D$ such that $P(x)$.” This is called an *existentially quantified statement* (e.q.s.). The phrase “There exists” is

called an *existential quantifier* and can also be expressed in English as “There is” or “For some” (among others).

We can formulate Question 2 into the statement “For all $x \in D$, $P(x)$.” This is called an *universally quantified statement* (u.q.s.). The phrase “For all” is called an *universal quantifier* and can also be expressed in English as “For every” or “For each” or “For arbitrary” or “For given” (among others).

Quantifiers can often be hidden. For example, the statements

“The equation $x^2 + 2x + 1 = 0$ has a real root.”

and “ $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.”

are both quantified statements. (Can you find the quantifiers?) For another situation where quantifiers are implicit, consider that an implication involving variables is really a quantified statement. For example, the statement

“If $x > 0$, then $x^3 > 0$.”

probably means “For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, if $x > 0$, then $x^3 > 0$.” The “probably” indicates that it is rather dangerous to leave quantifiers out, but the practice is pretty common nonetheless.

The first steps in dealing with quantified statements are to recognize them and then to rewrite them in one of the standard forms above. Next you need to form an opinion about whether the statement is true or false. Then proceed by performing the appropriate task below.

To *prove* the e.q.s. “There exists $x \in D$ such that $P(x)$.”, find one *example* of an $x \in D$ such that $P(x)$ is true.

The negation of the e.q.s. above is “For all $x \in D$, not $P(x)$.” Thus it’s trickier to *disprove* an e.q.s., because you need to show that $P(x)$ is false for *every* $x \in D$. Two possible approaches are

- 1) Show the only values x for which $P(x)$ is true aren’t in D .
- 2) *Assume* there’s an x in D for which $P(x)$ is true, and show this implies a contradiction.

To *prove* the u.q.s. “For all $x \in D$, $P(x)$.”, start by letting x represent any element of D , and then show $P(x)$ is true for that x . Such proofs begin, “Let $x \in D$.” or “Let x be a given element of D .” or “Let x be an arbitrary element of D .” The conclusion of the argument should be something like “Therefore $P(x)$.”

The negation of the u.q.s. above is “There exists $x \in D$ such that (not $P(x)$).” Thus *disproving* a u.q.s. can often be fairly easy. All you need to do is find one specific element c in D for which $P(c)$ is false. (Then $P(x)$ won’t be true *for all* $x \in D$!) Such a c is called a *counterexample* to the u.q.s.

8 Proof by Induction

A nonempty subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ is *well-ordered* if every nonempty subset of S has a least element. The most basic well-ordered set is the set of natural numbers \mathbb{N} . More generally, any set of the form $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \geq m\}$ for some fixed integer m is well-ordered. If the domain of a u.q.s. is a set of the form described, then another method called *induction* is available for proving

the u.q.s. Actually there are two techniques that fall under the term induction. Each is based on a Principle of Mathematical Induction (PMI). We omit statements of the PMI's themselves.

Theorem 1 (PMI technique) *Let $A = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \geq m\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, and let $P(n)$ be a predicate with domain A . If*

1. $P(m)$ is true and
2. The implication $P(n) \Rightarrow P(n + 1)$ is true for all $n \in A$,

then $P(n)$ is true for all $n \in A$.

Carrying out a proof by induction involves two steps: 1) Proving the base case and 2) the induction step. Before doing anything else it helps to precisely write out the predicate $P(n)$ for reference. It helps to think of $P(n)$ like a rule for a function, into which you can plug various values of n . The base case is the statement $P(m)$, where m is the least element of the set as described above. To get the base case, replace every n in $P(n)$ with the fixed integer m . Then prove the resulting statement. This is usually the easy part.

The induction step consists of proving the u.q.s. "For all $n \in A$, $P(n) \Rightarrow P(n + 1)$." As usual, start this by letting $n \in A$ be arbitrary. Then assume that $P(n)$ is true. (This assumption is called the induction hypothesis.) The goal is to use this assumption to argue that $P(n + 1)$ is true. It helps to write out the predicate $P(n + 1)$ explicitly by replacing every n in $P(n)$ with $n + 1$. This way you can see what you're trying to prove. Then try to relate $P(n + 1)$ to the information in $P(n)$, which you'll need to use somehow to deduce the truth of $P(n + 1)$.

Sometimes the PMI technique is not enough—we might need more than just $P(n)$ to get $P(n + 1)$. In a case like this, we can use the Strong PMI technique (also known as Generalized PMI or the Second PMI).

Theorem 2 (Strong PMI technique) *Let $A = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \geq m\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, and let $P(n)$ be a predicate with domain A . If*

1. $P(m)$ is true and
 2. The implication $(P(m) \text{ and } P(m + 1) \text{ and } \dots \text{ and } P(n)) \Rightarrow P(n + 1)$ is true for all $n \in A$,
- then $P(n)$ is true for all $n \in A$.*

Here, we get to assume $P(k)$ is true for all $k \leq n$.

9 Proofs involving sets

Suppose A and B are sets. To show that A is a subset of B (i.e. $A \subset B$), do the following. Let a be an arbitrary element of A and then show $a \in B$.

Showing that $A = B$ consists of two steps. You must show both 1) $A \subset B$ and 2) $B \subset A$.

10 Proofs involving functions

To show that two functions f and g are equal, you must demonstrate that they have 1) the same domain A , 2) the same codomain B , and 3) the same value at every argument, *i.e.* $f(a) = g(a)$ for all $a \in A$.

To prove that a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is onto (surjective), let $y \in Y$ be arbitrary and show that there exists an $x \in X$ such that $f(x) = y$.

There are two standard ways to prove that a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is 1-1 (injective). The one that is usually easier consists of assuming that $x_1, x_2 \in X$ satisfying $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ and then arguing that $x_1 = x_2$. The other method involves assuming $x_1, x_2 \in X$ such that $x_1 \neq x_2$ and arguing that $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$.

To prove that a function f is a 1-1 correspondence (bijection), show that it is both 1-1 and onto.

These are the most basic approaches to proving that a function has these special properties. But there are also higher level approaches that can be easier when they work. Denote identity function on a set X by I_X . (Thus $I_X(x) = x$ for all $x \in X$.) Then a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is

1. 1-1 if and only if there exists a function $g : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $g \circ f = I_X$,
2. onto if and only if there exists a function $h : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $f \circ h = I_Y$, and
3. a 1-1 correspondence if and only if there exists a function $g : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $g \circ f = I_X$ and $f \circ g = I_Y$.