

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Mathematics for Computer Science
MIT 6.042J/18.062J

Propositional Logic, II

Proof by Cases
Proof by Contradiction

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.1

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Proof by Truth Tables

DeMorgan's Law

$\neg (P \vee Q)$ is equivalent to $\bar{P} \wedge \bar{Q}$

P	Q	$\neg (P \vee Q)$
T	T	F
T	F	F
F	T	F
F	F	T

\bar{P}	\bar{Q}	$\bar{P} \wedge \bar{Q}$
F	F	F
F	T	F
T	F	F
T	T	T

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.2

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Proof by Deductions

A student is trying to prove that propositions P , Q , and R are all true. She proceeds as follows.

First, she proves three facts:

- P implies Q
- Q implies R
- R implies P .

Then she concludes,

"Thus P , Q , and R are obviously all true."

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.3

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Proposed Deduction Rule

From: P implies Q , Q implies R , R implies P

Conclude: P , Q , and R are true.

$$\frac{(P \rightarrow Q), (Q \rightarrow R), (R \rightarrow P)}{P \wedge Q \wedge R}$$

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.4

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Sound Rule?

Conclusion true whenever all antecedents true.

$$P \rightarrow Q \quad Q \rightarrow R \quad R \rightarrow P \quad P \wedge Q \wedge R$$

Antecedents

Conclusion

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.5

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Sound Rule?

Conclusion true whenever all antecedents true.

P	Q	R
T	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	T	F
F	F	T
F	F	F

$$P \rightarrow Q \quad Q \rightarrow R \quad R \rightarrow P \quad P \wedge Q \wedge R$$

Antecedents

Conclusion

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.6

6

9

13

7

12

10

5

3

1

4

14

15

8

11

2

Sound Rule?

Conclusion true whenever all antecedents true.

P	Q	R
T	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	T	F
F	F	T
F	F	F

$P \rightarrow Q$	$Q \rightarrow R$	$R \rightarrow P$
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	T	F
T	T	T

$P \wedge Q \wedge R$	sound?
T	
F	
F	
F	
F	
F	
F	
F	
F	

Antecedents

Conclusion

Feb. 12, 2007Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.lec 2M.7

6

9

13

7

12

10

5

3

1

4

14

15

8

11

2

Sound Rule?

Conclusion true whenever all antecedents true.

P	Q	R
T	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	T	F
F	F	T
F	F	F

$P \rightarrow Q$	$Q \rightarrow R$	$R \rightarrow P$
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	T	F
T	T	T

$P \wedge Q \wedge R$	sound?
T	
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	

Feb. 12, 2007Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.lec 2M.8

6

9

13

7

12

10

5

3

1

4

14

15

8

11

2

Sound Rule?

Conclusion true whenever all antecedents true.

P	Q	R
T	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	T	F
F	F	T
F	F	F

$P \rightarrow Q$	$Q \rightarrow R$	$R \rightarrow P$
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	T	F
T	T	T

$P \wedge Q \wedge R$	sound?
T	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	

Feb. 12, 2007Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.lec 2M.9

6

9

13

7

12

10

5

3

1

4

14

15

8

11

2

Sound Rule?

Conclusion true whenever all antecedents true.

P	Q	R
T	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	T	F
F	F	T
F	F	F

$P \rightarrow Q$	$Q \rightarrow R$	$R \rightarrow P$
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	T	F
T	T	T

$P \wedge Q \wedge R$	sound?
T	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	

Feb. 12, 2007Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.lec 2M.10

6

9

13

7

12

10

5

3

1

4

14

15

8

11

2

Sound Rule?

Conclusion true whenever all antecedents true.

P	Q	R
T	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	T	F
F	F	T
F	F	F

$P \rightarrow Q$	$Q \rightarrow R$	$R \rightarrow P$
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	T	T
T	T	F
T	F	T
T	T	F
T	T	T

$P \wedge Q \wedge R$	sound?
T	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	OK
F	NOT OK!

Feb. 12, 2007Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.lec 2M.11

6

9

13

7

12

10

5

3

1

4

14

15

8

11

2

Reasoning by Cases

Quicker proof of unsoundness than from truth tables

Feb. 12, 2007Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.lec 2M.12

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Quicker by Cases

$$\frac{P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R, R \rightarrow P}{P \wedge Q \wedge R}$$

Case 1: P is **true**. Now, if antecedents are true, then Q must be true (because P implies Q). Then R must be true (because Q implies R). So the conclusion $P \wedge Q \wedge R$ is true.
This case is OK.

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.13

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Quicker by Cases

$$\frac{P \rightarrow Q, Q \rightarrow R, R \rightarrow P}{P \wedge Q \wedge R}$$

Case 2: P is **false**. To make antecedents **true**, R must be **false** (because R implies P), so Q must be **false** (because Q implies R). This assignment does make the antecedents **true**, but the conclusion $P \wedge Q \wedge R$ is (very) **false**.
This case is not OK.

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.14

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Goldbach Conjecture

Every even integer greater than 2 is the sum of two primes.

Evidence: $4 = 2 + 2$
 $6 = 3 + 3$
 $8 = 5 + 3$
 \vdots
 $20 = ? \quad 13 + 7$

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.15

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Goldbach Conjecture

True for all even numbers with up to **13 digits!**

(Rosen, p.182)

It remains an **OPEN problem**:
no counterexample, no proof.
UNTIL NOW!...

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.16

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Goldbach Conjecture

The answer is on my desk!
(Proof by Cases)

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.17

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Team Problem

Problem 1

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.18

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Proof by Contradiction

$$\frac{\bar{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{F}}{P}$$

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.19

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Proof by Contradiction

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

Proof (by contradiction):

- Suppose $\sqrt{2}$ was rational.
- Choose m, n integers without common prime factors (always possible) such that

$$\sqrt{2} = \frac{m}{n}$$

- Show that m & n are both even, a contradiction!

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.20

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Proof by Contradiction

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

Proof (by contradiction):

$$\sqrt{2} = \frac{m}{n}$$

$$\sqrt{2}n = m$$

$$2n^2 = m^2$$

so m is even.

so can assume $m = 2l$

$$m^2 = 4l^2$$

$$2n^2 = 4l^2$$

$$n^2 = 2l^2$$

so n is even.

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.21

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Quickie

Proof assumes that

If m^2 is even, then m is even.

Why!

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.22

6	9	13	7
12		10	5
3	1	4	14
15	8	11	2

Team Problem

Problems 2 & 3

Feb. 12, 2007

Copyright © Albert R. Meyer, 2007. All rights reserved.

lec 2M.23