

# 1 Proof Writing

## 1.1 Consolidated Proof Writing Checklist

- Clearly articulate your assumptoins and want-to-shows
- Make each sentence "load-bearing"
- Scope and properly introduce variables
- Make specific claims about specific variables
- Don't repeat definitions – use them instead

Assume  $\rightarrow$  Want-To-Show  $\rightarrow$  Reasoning  $\rightarrow$  Return to Want-To-Show

## 1.2 Proof Templates

### *Direct (Universally Quantified):*

**Theorem:** For all [subject], [fact].

**Proof:** Pick an arbitrary [subject]. We want to show [fact]. (Optional sentence) Since we know [some useful information about [subject]], [we can represent [subject] like this]. Then we see that

[turn what we know about [subject] into [fact]]

Therefore, [fact] is true, as required. ■

### *Direct (Existentially Quantified):*

**Theorem:** For some [subject], [fact].

**Proof:** Pick [[subject] = a value that works]. We want to show [fact]. (Optional sentence) Since we know [some useful information about [subject]], [we can represent [subject] like this]. Then we see that

[turn [subject] into [fact] by plugging in the value that works]

Therefore, [fact] is true, as required. ■

### *Contrapositive:*

**Theorem:** [fact] (usually an implication [if this, then that]).

**Proof:** We will prove the contrapositive of this statement, namely, [contrapositive of [fact]] ([if not that, then not this] for implication). [copy relevant direct proof template]. ■

### *Contradiction*

**Theorem:** [fact]

**Proof:** Assume for the sake of contradiction that [negation of [fact]]. Since we know [something useful from our assumption], [we can represent our statement some useful way]. Then we see that

[simplify expression to something that breaks our assumption]

[what we found], but this is impossible because [the opposite of what we found is true] by assumption.

We have reached a contradiction, so our assumption must have been wrong. Therefore, [fact]. ■

**Biconditional:**  $P$  if and only if  $Q$ . Prove two separate statements  $\rightarrow$  If  $P$  is true, then  $Q$  is true and If  $Q$  is true, then  $P$  is true.

## 2 Set Theory

- **Set:** an unordered collection of distinct objects, which may be anything, including other sets.
- **Elements:** the objects that make up a set.  $S \in T$
- **Subset:** A set  $S$  is called a subset of a set  $T$  when all elements of  $S$  are also elements of  $T$ .  $S \subseteq T$
- **Power Set:** the set of all subsets of  $S$ .  $\wp(S) = \{T \mid T \subseteq S\}$
- **Cardinality:** number of elements elements a set contains.  $|S|$
- **Cantor's Theorem:** If  $S$  is a set, then  $|S| < |\wp(S)|$

	Is defined as...	If you <b>assume</b> this is true...	To <b>prove</b> that this is true...
$S \subseteq T$	$\forall x \in S. x \in T$	Initially, <b>do nothing</b> . Once you find some $z \in S$ , conclude $z \in T$ .	Ask the reader to pick an $x \in S$ . Then prove $x \in T$
$S = T$	$S \subseteq T \wedge T \subseteq S$	Assume $S \subseteq T$ and $T \subseteq S$ .	Prove $S \subseteq T$ . Also prove $T \subseteq S$ .
$x \in S \cap T$	$x \in S \wedge x \in T$	Assume $x \in S$ . Then assume $x \in T$ .	Prove $x \in S$ . Also prove $x \in T$ .
$x \in S \cup T$	$x \in S \vee x \in T$	Consider two cases: Case 1: $x \in S$ . Case 2: $x \in T$ .	Either prove $x \in S$ or prove $x \in T$ .
$X \in \wp(S)$	$X \subseteq S$ .	Assume $X \subseteq S$ .	Prove $X \subseteq S$ .
$x \in \{y \mid P(y)\}$	$P(x)$	Assume $P(x)$ .	Prove $P(x)$ .

Figure 1: Proofs with sets

## 3 Propositional Logic

Expression	English Translation	Negation of Expression
$A \wedge B$	A and B	2 possibilities: $\neg A \vee \neg B$ , $A \rightarrow \neg B$
$A \vee B$	A or B	$\neg A \wedge \neg B$
$\neg A$	Not A	A
$A \rightarrow B$	A implies B	$A \wedge \neg B$
$A \leftrightarrow B$	A if and only if B	2 possibilities: $A \leftrightarrow \neg B$ , $\neg A \leftrightarrow B$
$\top$	True	$\perp$
$\perp$	False	$\top$

Figure 2: Propositional Logic to English and Negations

## 4 First Order Logic

Expression	English Translation	Negation of Expression
$\forall x.(P(x))$	Everything is a P.	$\exists x.(\neg P(x))$
$\exists x.(P(x))$	Something is a P.	$\forall x.(\neg P(x))$
$\forall x.(\neg P(x))$	Nothing is a P.	$\exists x.(P(x))$
$\exists x.(\neg P(x))$	Something isn't a P.	$\forall x.(P(x))$
$\forall x.(A(x) \rightarrow B(x))$	All A's are B's.	$\exists x.(A(x) \wedge \neg B(x))$
$\exists x.(A(x) \wedge B(x))$	Some A is a B.	$\forall x.(A(x) \rightarrow \neg B(x))$
$\forall x.(A(x) \rightarrow \neg B(x))$	No A is a B.	$\exists x.(A(x) \wedge B(x))$
$\exists x.(A(x) \wedge \neg B(x))$	Some A isn't a B.	$\forall x.(A(x) \rightarrow B(x))$

Figure 3: First Order English Translations and Negations

	If you <b>assume</b> this is true...	To <b>prove</b> that this is true...
$\forall x. A$	Initially, <b>do nothing</b> . Once you find a $z$ through other means, you can state it has property $A$ .	Have the reader pick an arbitrary $x$ . We then prove $A$ is true for that choice of $x$ .
$\exists x. A$	Introduce a variable $x$ into your proof that has property $A$ .	Find an $x$ where $A$ is true. Then prove that $A$ is true for that specific choice of $x$ .
$A \rightarrow B$	Initially, <b>do nothing</b> . Once you know $A$ is true, you can conclude $B$ is also true.	Assume $A$ is true, then prove $B$ is true.
$A \wedge B$	Assume $A$ . Also assume $B$ .	Prove $A$ . Also prove $B$ .
$A \vee B$	Consider two cases. Case 1: $A$ is true. Case 2: $B$ is true.	Either prove $\neg A \rightarrow B$ or prove $\neg B \rightarrow A$ . <i>(Why does this work?)</i>
$A \leftrightarrow B$	Assume $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow A$ .	Prove $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow A$ .
$\neg A$	Simplify the negation, then consult this table on the result.	Simplify the negation, then consult this table on the result.

Figure 4: Proofs with first order logic

### Useful Facts:

- An implication with a false antecedent is vacuously true
- Existentially-quantified statements are false in an empty world, since nothing exists
- Universally-quantified statements are said to be vacuously true in empty worlds
- Universally quantified statements are true unless there's a counterexample