

Direct Proof of $H \implies C$

1. Start with the hypotheses of H .
2. Use nothing but allowable justifications.
3. Deduce C .

Direct Proof of $(H_1 \wedge \dots \wedge H_n) \implies C$

1. List all of the individual hypotheses H_1, \dots, H_n as given.
2. Use nothing but allowable justifications.
3. Deduce C .

Direct Proof of $H \implies (C_1 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n)$ [Note this is equivalent to] $((H \implies C_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (H \implies C_n))$

1. Start with the hypotheses of H .
2. Use nothing but allowable justifications.
3. Deduce C_1 .
4. Independently deduce each of the remaining C_i .

Use of the Contrapositive to prove $H \implies C$

1. Present a direct proof of $\sim C \implies \sim H$.
2. That is, Start with $\sim C$
3. Use nothing but logical steps
4. Deduce $\sim H$

Proof by Contradiction of $H \implies C$ (Not liked by Constructivists)

1. Start with the hypothesis H .
2. Suppose the **RAA** hypothesis ($\sim C$)
3. Use H , ($\sim C$) and nothing but allowable justifications to deduce $(D \wedge (\sim D))$
4. Conclude $\sim (\sim C)$

How to deal with disjunctions

Disjoined Hypotheses $H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n \implies C$

1. Do it by cases: Solve the n individual problems $H_1 \implies C, H_2 \implies C, \dots, H_n \implies C$

Disjoined Conclusions $H \implies C_1 \vee \dots \vee C_n$

1. Note: If any C_i can be deduced from H then the result is true.
2. Method of “hidden cases”: Start with C and the negation of all but one C_i
3. Deduce this last C_i .

How to prove Universal statements $\forall x (p(x) \implies q(x))$

1. Start with an **arbitrary** element x in the universal set X
2. Show that $p(x) \implies q(x)$ using only the properties of x that make it an element of X .

How to prove Existential Statements $\exists x p(x)$

1. Best approach is to **actually exhibit** an instance of x for which $p(x)$ is true.
2. If the above doesn't work, try a proof by contradiction.
 - (a) Suppose for every x , $p(x)$ fails to be true and arrive at a contradiction.

Forward-Backward method for doing proofs

- Write out the hypotheses and the conclusions with space between
- Alternate between
 1. Logically deducing facts from the hypotheses
 2. Determining facts that imply the conclusions
 3. Join in the middle

Allowable Rules of Inference (deductions): these are all tautologies

1. **Modus Ponens** (mode that affirms) $((p \implies q) \wedge p) \implies q$
2. **Syllogism** $((p \implies q) \wedge (q \implies r)) \implies (p \implies r)$
3. **Modus Tollens** (mode that denies) $((p \implies q) \wedge (\sim q)) \implies (\sim p)$
4. **Contradiction** $((p \wedge (\sim q)) \implies (r \wedge (\sim r))) \implies q$
5. Tautology affirming using the **contrapositive** is valid: $(p \implies q) \iff ((\sim q) \implies (\sim p))$

Terminology

- $((\sim q) \implies (\sim p))$ is called the **contrapositive** of $(p \implies q)$
- $(q \implies p)$ is called the **converse** of $(p \implies q)$
- $(\sim p \implies \sim q)$ is called the **obverse** of $(p \implies q)$