1.7.1

C) Vx Q(x) v P(3) True. P(3) is prime in all instances. Proposition

D) $\exists \times (Q(x) \land P(x))$ (d(1) = True. $P(1) = 1 = 1^2 = 1$ True when variable \times is 1. Proposition

E) $\forall x (\tau Q(x) \mathbf{v} P(x))$ Q(3) = False $\tau(F) = T$ P(3) = True Talse for variable x is y Q(4) = True $\tau(T) = F$ P(4) = False Not Proposition.

1.7.2 C) Vx (TG) * EG))

D) = (EG) ~ TG))

1,5.2 b) p n (7p->9) = p

PΛ (¬P > q)

pΛ (¬P > q) Conditional

pΛ (pvq) Double Neg.

(¬Λρ)ν (¬¬η)

Τ ν (¬¬η)

(¬¬¬η)

(¬¬¬¬¬)

ρη(γρ-γη) ρη (γης) (ρης) ν (γης) Τυ (γης) χ(ρης)

ρ Λ (10->9) ρΛ (77ρ ν q) (ω) ρΛ (ρν q) δω)(N g ρ Absorb. 1.5.2.

() (p>q) n(p>r) = p>(qnr)

(pog) n (por) Cond. (pog) n (por) Cond. (pog) n (por) Cond. por (gnr) Pistrib. por (gnr) Condit.

D) >p -> (q ->r) = q -> (pvr)

7p > (q>r)
77p v (q>r) Cond.
77p v (7q vr) Cond.
p v (7q vr) Double Neg.
7q v (p v n) Commut.
q -> (p v r) Conditi.

E) (p>r) v (q>r) = (p x q) >n

(por) v (qor) (ipvr) v (qor) Cond. (ipvr) v (iqvr) Cond. (ipviq) v (rvr) Assa. (ipviq) v r Idempotent i (prq) v r DeMorgan (prq) ->r Cond. 1.5.2

G) (PAGAIR) V (PAZGAZR) = PAZR (PAGAZR) V (PAZGAZR) PA((GAZR) V (ZGAZR)) Distrib. PA (ZRA (GVZG) Distrib. PA (ZRA T) Complement PAZR Identity

H) p (par) = 7pvn

pt>(pr)
(pr)(pr)) \((pr) \rightarrow p) \) (ond.
(\tap v (pr)) \(\lambda (pr) \rightarrow P) \) (ond.
(\tap v (pr)) \(\lambda (pr) \rightarrow P) \) (ond.
(\tap v (pr)) \(\lambda (pr) \rightarrow (pr)) \) (commutable
(\tap v (pr)) \(\lambda (pr) \) \(\la

1.p-> 9 Hypothesis
2. pv 9 Londitism Identity, 1
3. 9 > r Hypothesis
7. > 9 v r Conditional Identity, 3
5. 7 Hypothesis
6. X

1. 9 -> 1 Hypothesis
2. 7 Mypothesis
3. 79 Modus Pollens 1, 2
4. p-> 9 Hypothesis
5 7 Modus Pollens 3, 4

D) (pvq) → r :. r B) P -> (qnr)

1. p-> (gar) Hypothesis 2. rpv (gar) (on dilional 1 3. rg Hypothesis 4. (rpvq) a(rpvr) Distrib 2 5. x

1. p -> (qnr) /gpthsis 2. 7p v (qnr)

1. (pvq) » r Hypo. 2. 7 (pvq) v Cond. 3. (7px79) v DuMory 4. (rv7p) ~ (rv7q) 5. P Hypo.

E) pra B) p => (gar) 1. p -> (qnr) | spother's
2. ip v (qnr) | Conditional 1
3. (7pvq) n (7pvr) Distribute 2
4 (7pvq) | Simp 3
5 (7pvr) | Simp 3
6. 79 | Dysjandine 4:6. 1. pvq Hypo.
2. 79 Hypo.
3. yvp Comm. 1
4 p Disjunct. 3, 4
5. 7pvr Hypo.
6. p>r Condition 5
7 r Modus Porns 4, Modus Parens 4,6 1 (pvq) >r Hypo 2.7(pvq) vr Bo Cordt. 1 3 (7pn7q) vr DelMorg. 2 4 (rv7p) n (rv7q) Bistrib. 3 5 (rv7q) Simp 4 6 (rv7q) Simp 4 7 p HypoH 9 p>r 9 p>r 1, par Hypothesis. Midns Porens 3,4 6. p. >9 Agpithesis
8 g nu Conjuction 7,5

Remin $A = \mathcal{E}1, 2, 3, \mathcal{E}1, 2, 33, \mathcal{E}2, 333$ 1. a $\mathcal{E}2, 33 \in A = T$ 1. b $\mathcal{E}2, 33 \in A = T$ 1. c $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}1, 2, 333 \in A = F$ 1. d $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}1, 2, 333 \in A = T$ 1. 13. 1

Lx S(x) n B(x)

If its included in the argument, and is a hypothesis of that argument the element is traticular.

If its not included in the argument, and is deduced by the rules of inference, the element would be either Patienter or Arbitory

We can always State an Alribitory element in an argulament

2.2.1 Direct Proofs

DIF rand some rational numbers, then the product of rand s is a rational number.

Post. Direct Poof
Assume r and s are rational numbers. Rutional numbers by definition is '6: a \$ 0 & b \$ 0. We can then have r = % and s = %.

r·s = %. & = a = % = %(%). When we find the product of rands using this definition, the product can be factored to have % which is a rational number concluding the theory

2.2.2 Direct Proof or Counter Example

B) If x + y is an even integer. x and y are bother even.

False. Comber example: 1+3=4

2.3.1 Contrapositive Proofs

L) For every pair of R, x and y : f x+y > 20, the x>10 ay > 10

Post. Contrapositive Post.
Assure X210 and y210, we will prove x+y ≥ 20. If
X ≤ 10, we can have X=10. If y ≤ 10 we can have y=10.
When we add x+y=10+10 we get 20, which satisfies
X+y ≤ 20 = 20 ≤ 20. Hus combuding the proof.

2.4.1 Proofs by Contradiction.

F) There is no largest rational negative number.

Proof. Pauf by contradiction

Assume there is a largest rational regative number defined by r. We can then multiply r by 2 to get of 2r. 2r. 2r. 2r. which contradicts the agreement statement, proving that there is no largest rational regative number.