

# Introduction to Proofs - Negation

Prof Mike Pawliuk

UTM

May 14, 2020

Slides available at: [mikepawliuk.ca](http://mikepawliuk.ca)

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 Canada License.



# Learning Objectives (for this video)

By the end of this video, participants should be able to:

- 1 Create the negation of an English statement.
- 2 Formally negate a mathematical statement involving AND, NOT, IF/THEN.
- 3 Formally negate a mathematical statement involving multiple quantifiers

# Motivation and first examples

## Motivation

The negation of a mathematical statement is the formal way of taking its “opposite”.

## Motivation

The negation of a mathematical statement is the formal way of taking its “opposite”.

**Note.** When trying to get intuition for a negation of a statement  $R$ , it is helpful to ask “If someone said  $R$  to me, what would I need to know to be sure that they are lying?”

# Negations of and/or

**Example.** Let  $P$ : “I am tall”, and  $Q$ : “I play basketball”.

# Negations of and/or

**Example.** Let  $P$ : “I am tall”, and  $Q$ : “I play basketball”.

- 1 If someone says  $P \wedge Q$ , the negation is  $(\neg P) \vee (\neg Q)$ : I am short or I don't play basketball.

# Negations of and/or

**Example.** Let  $P$ : “I am tall”, and  $Q$ : “I play basketball”.

- 1 If someone says  $P \wedge Q$ , the negation is  $(\neg P) \vee (\neg Q)$ : I am short or I don't play basketball.
- 2 If someone says  $P \vee Q$ , the negation is  $(\neg P) \wedge (\neg Q)$ : I am short and I don't play basketball.

# Negations of and/or

**Example.** Let  $P$ : “I am tall”, and  $Q$ : “I play basketball”.

- 1 If someone says  $P \wedge Q$ , the negation is  $(\neg P) \vee (\neg Q)$ : I am short or I don't play basketball.
- 2 If someone says  $P \vee Q$ , the negation is  $(\neg P) \wedge (\neg Q)$ : I am short and I don't play basketball.

## DeMorgan's laws

- 1  $\neg(P \wedge Q)$  is logically equivalent to  $(\neg P) \vee (\neg Q)$ .
- 2  $\neg(P \vee Q)$  is logically equivalent to  $(\neg P) \wedge (\neg Q)$ .



## Exercises

Express the following statements using and/or.

①  $0 \leq x < 1$ .

②  $\neg(0 \leq x < 1)$ .

## Exercises

Express the following statements using and/or.

①  $0 \leq x < 1$ .

②  $\neg(0 \leq x < 1)$ .

**Solution 1.**  $(0 \leq x) \wedge (x < 1)$ .

## Exercises

Express the following statements using and/or.

①  $0 \leq x < 1$ .

②  $\neg(0 \leq x < 1)$ .

**Solution 1.**  $(0 \leq x) \wedge (x < 1)$ .

**Solution 2.**

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(0 \leq x < 1) &\Leftrightarrow \neg(0 \leq x \wedge x < 1) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg(0 \leq x) \vee \neg(x < 1) && \text{by Demorgan's law} \\ &\Leftrightarrow x < 0 \vee 1 \leq x\end{aligned}$$

# Negations of implications

**Example.** Let  $P$ : “I get an A in my intro to proofs course”, and  $Q$ : “I pass my intro to proofs course”.

# Negations of implications

**Example.** Let  $P$ : “I get an A in my intro to proofs course”, and  $Q$ : “I pass my intro to proofs course”.

If someone says  $P \implies Q$ , the negation is  $P \wedge (\neg Q)$ : I got an A, but I didn't pass..

# Negations of implications

**Example.** Let  $P$ : “I get an A in my intro to proofs course”, and  $Q$ : “I pass my intro to proofs course”.

If someone says  $P \implies Q$ , the negation is  $P \wedge (\neg Q)$ : I got an A, but I didn't pass..

## Negation of an implication

$\neg(P \implies Q)$  is logically equivalent to  $P \wedge (\neg Q)$ .

# Negations of universal quantifiers

**Example 1.** “Every person in this course was born in Toronto.”

**Negation:**

# Negations of universal quantifiers

**Example 1.** “Every person in this course was born in Toronto.”

**Negation:** “There is a person in this course who was born somewhere other than Toronto.”



# Negations of universal quantifiers

**Example 1.** “Every person in this course was born in Toronto.”

**Negation:** “There is a person in this course who was born somewhere other than Toronto.”

## Negation of universal quantifiers

$\neg(\forall x \in A, P(x))$  is logically equivalent to  $(\exists x \in A)[\neg P(x)]$ .

# Proof technique for universal quantifiers

## Proof technique (universal quantifiers)

To prove “ $(\forall x \in A)[P(x)]$ ” is true, you must show that every  $x$  in  $A$  has the property  $P(x)$ .

# Proof technique for universal quantifiers

## Proof technique (universal quantifiers)

To prove “ $(\forall x \in A)[P(x)]$ ” is true, you must show that every  $x$  in  $A$  has the property  $P(x)$ .

**Note.** No, one example is not enough to prove a universal statement.

# Proof technique for universal quantifiers

## Proof technique (universal quantifiers)

To prove “ $(\forall x \in A)[P(x)]$ ” is true, you must show that every  $x$  in  $A$  has the property  $P(x)$ .

**Note.** No, one example is not enough to prove a universal statement.

## Proof technique (negation of universal quantifiers)

To prove “ $\neg(\forall x \in A)[P(x)]$ ” is true, you need to find only one example of an  $x$  in  $A$  that does not have the property  $P(x)$ . (This  $x$  is called a counterexample.)

# Negations of existential quantifiers

**Example 2.** “There is a person in this course who is over 150 years old.”

**Negation:**

# Negations of existential quantifiers

**Example 2.** “There is a person in this course who is over 150 years old.”

**Negation:** “Every person in this course is under (or exactly) 150 years old.”

# Negations of existential quantifiers

**Example 2.** “There is a person in this course who is over 150 years old.”

**Negation:** “Every person in this course is under (or exactly) 150 years old.”

## Negation of existential quantifiers

$\neg(\exists x \in A, P(x))$  is logically equivalent to  $(\forall x \in A)[\neg P(x)]$ .

# Proof technique for existential quantifiers

## Proof technique (existential quantifiers)

To prove “ $(\exists x \in A)[P(x)]$ ” is true, you must show that there is at least one  $x$  in  $A$  that has the property  $P(x)$ .

**Note.** Yes, one example is enough to prove an existential statement.



# Proof technique for existential quantifiers

## Proof technique (existential quantifiers)

To prove “ $(\exists x \in A)[P(x)]$ ” is true, you must show that there is at least one  $x$  in  $A$  that has the property  $P(x)$ .

**Note.** Yes, one example is enough to prove an existential statement.

## Proof technique (negation of existential quantifiers)

To prove “ $\neg(\exists x \in A)[P(x)]$ ” is true, you need to show that all  $x$  in  $A$  that do not have the property  $P(x)$ .

## Example

Negate these statements and then decide which is true: the original statement or the negation.

①  $(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0]$

②  $(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n > n^2]$

# Example 1

## Example

Negate these statements and then decide which is true: the original statement or the negation.

①  $(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0]$

②

**Solution 1.**

$$\neg(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0] \equiv$$

$$\equiv$$
$$\equiv$$

# Example 1

## Example

Negate these statements and then decide which is true: the original statement or the negation.

①  $(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0]$

②

**Solution 1.**

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0] &\equiv (\exists x \in \mathbb{R})\neg[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0] \\ &\equiv \\ &\equiv\end{aligned}$$

# Example 1

## Example

Negate these statements and then decide which is true: the original statement or the negation.

①  $(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0]$

②

## Solution 1.

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0] &\equiv (\exists x \in \mathbb{R})\neg[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0] \\ &\equiv (\exists x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \wedge \neg(x > 0)] \\ &\equiv\end{aligned}$$

# Example 1

## Example

Negate these statements and then decide which is true: the original statement or the negation.

①  $(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0]$

②

## Solution 1.

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0] &\equiv (\exists x \in \mathbb{R})\neg[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0] \\ &\equiv (\exists x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \wedge \neg(x > 0)] \\ &\equiv (\exists x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \wedge x \leq 0]\end{aligned}$$

# Example 1

## Example

Negate these statements and then decide which is true: the original statement or the negation.

①  $(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0]$

②

## Solution 1.

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0] &\equiv (\exists x \in \mathbb{R})\neg[x^2 > 0 \implies x > 0] \\ &\equiv (\exists x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \wedge \neg(x > 0)] \\ &\equiv (\exists x \in \mathbb{R})[x^2 > 0 \wedge x \leq 0]\end{aligned}$$

This is true. Proof: Take  $x = -5 < 0$ , so  $x^2 = 25 > 0$ .

## Example 2

### Example

Negate these statements and then decide which is true: the original statement or the negation.

1

2  $(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n > n^2]$

**Solution 2.**

$$\neg(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n > n^2] \equiv$$
$$\equiv$$



## Example 2

### Example

Negate these statements and then decide which is true: the original statement or the negation.

1

2  $(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n > n^2]$

**Solution 2.**

$$\neg(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n > n^2] \equiv (\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\neg[2^n > n^2]$$
$$\equiv$$

## Example 2

### Example

Negate these statements and then decide which is true: the original statement or the negation.

1

2  $(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n > n^2]$

**Solution 2.**

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n > n^2] &\equiv (\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\neg[2^n > n^2] \\ &\equiv (\forall n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n \leq n^2]\end{aligned}$$

## Example 2

### Example

Negate these statements and then decide which is true: the original statement or the negation.

1

2  $(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n > n^2]$

**Solution 2.**

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n > n^2] &\equiv (\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\neg[2^n > n^2] \\ &\equiv (\forall n \in \mathbb{N})[2^n \leq n^2]\end{aligned}$$

This is false. The original statement is true. Proof:  $n = 1 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $2^n = 2 > 1 = 1^2$ .

## Example 3 - Multiple Quantifiers

### Example 3

Negate “ $(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x]$ ”.

## Example 3 - Multiple Quantifiers

### Example 3

Negate “ $(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x]$ ”.

**Solution.**

$$\neg(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x]$$

## Example 3 - Multiple Quantifiers

### Example 3

Negate “ $(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x]$ ”.

**Solution.**

$$\neg(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x] \equiv (\forall x \in \mathbb{R})\neg(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x]$$

## Example 3 - Multiple Quantifiers

### Example 3

Negate “ $(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x]$ ”.

**Solution.**

$$\neg(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x] \quad (\forall x \in \mathbb{R})\neg(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x] \\ (\forall x \in \mathbb{R})(\exists y \in \mathbb{R})\neg[y < x]$$

## Example 3 - Multiple Quantifiers

### Example 3

Negate “ $(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x]$ ”.

**Solution.**

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x] &= (\forall x \in \mathbb{R})\neg(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x] \\ &= (\forall x \in \mathbb{R})(\exists y \in \mathbb{R})\neg[y < x] \\ &= (\forall x \in \mathbb{R})(\exists y \in \mathbb{R})[y \geq x]\end{aligned}$$



## Example 3 - Multiple Quantifiers

### Example 3

Negate “ $(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x]$ ”.

**Solution.**

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x] &= (\forall x \in \mathbb{R})\neg(\forall y \in \mathbb{R})[y < x] \\ &= (\forall x \in \mathbb{R})(\exists y \in \mathbb{R})\neg[y < x] \\ &= (\forall x \in \mathbb{R})(\exists y \in \mathbb{R})[y \geq x]\end{aligned}$$

This is true. Proof. Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Take  $y = x + 1$ . Note that  $y = x + 1 \geq x$ .

**End boss exercise.** Negate the following statement:

$$(\forall \epsilon > 0)(\exists \delta > 0)[0 < |x - 2| < \delta \implies |x^2 - 4| < \epsilon]$$

(Hint: You have all the tools you need to conquer this boss. Go slowly!)

- Do you prefer to negate statements formally (using the process described here), or informally by “just thinking about it”?
- Negate  $P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3$ .
- How is deMorgan’s law related to universal and existential statements?