

Proofs with  $\exists$ -introduction and  $\exists$ -elimination are unnecessarily long and cumbersome...



There are alternatives!

# Proving an existential quantification

To prove

$$\exists x[x \in \mathbb{Z} : x^3 - 2x - 8 \geq 0]$$

Proof

It suffices to find a witness, i.e., an  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$  satisfying  
 $x^3 - 2x - 8 \geq 0$ .

$x = 3$  is a witness, since  $3 \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $3^3 - 2 \cdot 3 - 8 = 13 \geq 0$

Conclusion:  $\exists x[x \in \mathbb{Z} : x^3 - 2x - 8 \geq 0]$ .

also  $x = 5$  is a witness...

# Alternative $\exists$ introduction

How do we prove an existential quantification?

by finding  
a witness

$\exists$

...

(k) P(a)

...

(l) Q(a)

...

{ $\exists^*$ -intro on (k) and (l)}

(m)  $\exists x [P(x) : Q(x)]$

strategy: wait until a witness  
object appears

does not  
always work

(k < m, l < m)

# Using an existential quantification

We know

$$\exists x[x \in \mathbb{R} : a - x < 0 < b - x]$$

We can declare an  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$  (a witness) such that

$$a - x < 0 < b - x$$

and use it further in the proof. For example:

From  $a - x < 0$ , we get  $a < x$ .

From  $b - x > 0$ , we get  $x < b$ .

Hence,  $a < b$ .

# Alternative $\exists$ elimination

How do we use an existential quantification in a proof?

we pick a witness

$\exists$

|| |

(k)  $\exists x [P(x) : Q(x)]$

|| |

{ $\exists$ -elim on (k)}

(m) Pick x with P(x) and Q(x)

x must be new!

time for an example!

(k < m)