20. Determine whether these are valid arguments.

a) If x is a positive real number, then x^2 is a positive real number. Therefore, if a^2 is positive, where a is a real number, then a is a positive real number.

b) If $x^2 \neq 0$, where x is a real number, then $x \neq 0$. Let a be a real number with $a^2 \neq 0$; then $a \neq 0$.

21. Which rules of inference are used to establish the conclusion of Lewis Carroll's argument described in Example 26 of Section 1.4?

22. Which rules of inference are used to establish the conclusion of Lewis Carroll's argument described in Example 27 of Section 1.4?

23. Identify the error or errors in this argument that supposedly shows that if $\exists x P(x) \wedge \exists x Q(x)$ is true then $\exists x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ is true.

1. $\exists x P(x) \vee \exists x Q(x)$	Premise
2. $\exists x P(x)$	Simplification from (1)
3. $P(c)$	Existential instantiation from (2)
4. $\exists x Q(x)$	Simplification from (1)
5. $Q(c)$	Existential instantiation from (4)
6. $P(c) \wedge Q(c)$	Conjunction from (3) and (5)
7. $\exists x(P(x) \wedge Q(x))$	Existential generalization

24. Identify the error or errors in this argument that supposedly shows that if $\forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x))$ is true then $\forall x P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x)$ is true.

1. $\forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x))$	Premise
2. $P(c) \vee Q(c)$	Universal instantiation from (1)
3. $P(c)$	Simplification from (2)
4. $\forall x P(x)$	Universal generalization from (3)
5. $Q(c)$	Simplification from (2)
6. $\forall x Q(x)$	Universal generalization from (5)
7. $\forall x(P(x) \vee \forall x Q(x))$	Conjunction from (4) and (6)

25. Justify the rule of universal modus tollens by showing that the premises $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$ and $\neg Q(a)$ for a particular element a in the domain, imply $\neg P(a)$.

26. Justify the rule of **universal transitivity**, which states that if $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$ and $\forall x(Q(x) \rightarrow R(x))$ are true, then $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow R(x))$ is true, where the domains of all quantifiers are the same.

27. Use rules of inference to show that if $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow (Q(x) \wedge S(x)))$ and $\forall x(P(x) \wedge R(x))$ are true, then $\forall x(R(x) \wedge S(x))$ is true.

28. Use rules of inference to show that if $\forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x))$ and $\forall x((\neg P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \rightarrow R(x))$ are true, then $\forall x(\neg R(x) \rightarrow P(x))$ is also true, where the domains of all quantifiers are the same.

29. Use rules of inference to show that if $\forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x))$, $\forall x(\neg Q(x) \vee S(x))$, $\forall x(R(x) \rightarrow \neg S(x))$, and $\exists x \neg P(x)$ are true, then $\exists x \neg R(x)$ is true.

30. Use resolution to show the hypotheses "Allen is a bad boy or Hillary is a good girl" and "Allen is a good boy or David is happy" imply the conclusion "Hillary is a good girl or David is happy."

31. Use resolution to show that the hypotheses "It is not raining or Yvette has her umbrella," "Yvette does not have her umbrella or she does not get wet," and "It is raining or Yvette does not get wet" imply that "Yvette does not get wet."

32. Show that the equivalence $p \wedge \neg p \equiv \mathbf{F}$ can be derived using resolution together with the fact that a conditional statement with a false hypothesis is true. [*Hint:* Let $q = r = \mathbf{F}$ in resolution.]

33. Use resolution to show that the compound proposition $(p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee \neg q) \wedge (\neg p \vee \neg q)$ is not satisfiable.

***34.** The Logic Problem, taken from *WFF'N PROOF, The Game of Logic*, has these two assumptions:

1. "Logic is difficult or not many students like logic."

2. "If mathematics is easy, then logic is not difficult."

By translating these assumptions into statements involving propositional variables and logical connectives, determine whether each of the following are valid conclusions of these assumptions:

a) That mathematics is not easy, if many students like logic.

b) That not many students like logic, if mathematics is not easy.

c) That mathematics is not easy or logic is difficult.

d) That logic is not difficult or mathematics is not easy.

e) That if not many students like logic, then either mathematics is not easy or logic is not difficult.

***35.** Determine whether this argument, taken from Kalish and Montague [KaMo64], is valid.

> If Superman were able and willing to prevent evil, he would do so. If Superman were unable to prevent evil, he would be impotent; if he were unwilling to prevent evil, he would be malevolent. Superman does not prevent evil. If Superman exists, he is neither impotent nor malevolent. Therefore, Superman does not exist.

1.7 Introduction to Proofs

Introduction

In this section we introduce the notion of a proof and describe methods for constructing proofs. A proof is a valid argument that establishes the truth of a mathematical statement. A proof can use the hypotheses of the theorem, if any, axioms assumed to be true, and previously proven theorems. Using these ingredients and rules of inference, the final step of the proof establishes the truth of the statement being proved.

In our discussion we move from formal proofs of theorems toward more informal proofs. The arguments we introduced in Section 1.6 to show that statements involving propositions and quantified statements are true were formal proofs, where all steps were supplied, and the rules for each step in the argument were given. However, formal proofs of useful theorems can be extremely long and hard to follow. In practice, the proofs of theorems designed for human consumption are almost always **informal proofs**, where more than one rule of inference may be used in each step, where steps may be skipped, where the axioms being assumed and the rules of inference used are not explicitly stated. Informal proofs can often explain to humans why theorems are true, while computers are perfectly happy producing formal proofs using automated reasoning systems.

The methods of proof discussed in this chapter are important not only because they are used to prove mathematical theorems, but also for their many applications to computer science. These applications include verifying that computer programs are correct, establishing that operating systems are secure, making inferences in artificial intelligence, showing that system specifications are consistent, and so on. Consequently, understanding the techniques used in proofs is essential both in mathematics and in computer science.

Some Terminology

Links

Formally, a **theorem** is a statement that can be shown to be true. In mathematical writing, the term theorem is usually reserved for a statement that is considered at least somewhat important. Less important theorems sometimes are called **propositions**. (Theorems can also be referred to as **facts** or **results**.) A theorem may be the universal quantification of a conditional statement with one or more premises and a conclusion. However, it may be some other type of logical statement, as the examples later in this chapter will show. We demonstrate that a theorem is true with a **proof**. A proof is a valid argument that establishes the truth of a theorem. The statements used in a proof can include **axioms** (or **postulates**), which are statements we assume to be true (for example, the axioms for the real numbers, given in Appendix 1, and the axioms of plane geometry), the premises, if any, of the theorem, and previously proven theorems. Axioms may be stated using primitive terms that do not require definition, but all other terms used in theorems and their proofs must be defined. Rules of inference, together with definitions of terms, are used to draw conclusions from other assertions, tying together the steps of a proof. In practice, the final step of a proof is usually just the conclusion of the theorem. However, for clarity, we will often recap the statement of the theorem as the final step of a proof.

A less important theorem that is helpful in the proof of other results is called a **lemma** (plural *lemmas* or *lemmata*). Complicated proofs are usually easier to understand when they are proved using a series of lemmas, where each lemma is proved individually. A **corollary** is a theorem that can be established directly from a theorem that has been proved. A **conjecture** is a statement that is being proposed to be a true statement, usually on the basis of some partial evidence, a heuristic argument, or the intuition of an expert. When a proof of a conjecture is found, the conjecture becomes a theorem. Many times conjectures are shown to be false, so they are not theorems.

Understanding How Theorems Are Stated

Extra Examples

Before we introduce methods for proving theorems, we need to understand how many mathematical theorems are stated. Many theorems assert that a property holds for all elements in a domain, such as the integers or the real numbers. Although the precise statement of such theorems needs to include a universal quantifier, the standard convention in mathematics is to omit it. For example, the statement

> "If $x > y$, where x and y are positive real numbers, then $x^2 > y^2$."

really means

> "For all positive real numbers x and y, if $x > y$, then $x^2 > y^2$."

Furthermore, when theorems of this type are proved, the first step of the proof usually involves selecting a general element of the domain. Subsequent steps show that this element has the property in question. Finally, universal generalization implies that the theorem holds for all members of the domain.

Methods of Proving Theorems

Assessment

Proving mathematical theorems can be difficult. To construct proofs we need all available ammunition, including a powerful battery of different proof methods. These methods provide the overall approach and strategy of proofs. Understanding these methods is a key component of learning how to read and construct mathematical proofs. One we have chosen a proof method, we use axioms, definitions of terms, previously proved results, and rules of inference to complete the proof. Note that in this book we will always assume the axioms for real numbers found in Appendix 1. We will also assume the usual axioms whenever we prove a result about geometry. When you construct your own proofs, be careful not to use anything but these axioms, definitions, and previously proved results as facts!

To prove a theorem of the form $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$, our goal is to show that $P(c) \rightarrow Q(c)$ is true, where c is an arbitrary element of the domain, and then apply universal generalization. In this proof, we need to show that a conditional statement is true. Because of this, we now focus on methods that show that conditional statements are true. Recall that $p \rightarrow q$ is true unless p is true but q is false. Note that to prove the statement $p \rightarrow q$, we need only show that q is true if p is true. The following discussion will give the most common techniques for proving conditional statements. Later we will discuss methods for proving other types of statements. In this section, and in Section 1.8, we will develop a large arsenal of proof techniques that can be used to prove a wide variety of theorems.

When you read proofs, you will often find the words "obviously" or "clearly." These words indicate that steps have been omitted that the author expects the reader to be able to fill in. Unfortunately, this assumption is often not warranted and readers are not at all sure how to fill in the gaps. We will assiduously try to avoid using these words and try not to omit too many steps. However, if we included all steps in proofs, our proofs would often be excruciatingly long.

Direct Proofs

A **direct proof** of a conditional statement $p \rightarrow q$ is constructed when the first step is the assumption that p is true; subsequent steps are constructed using rules of inference, with the final step showing that q must also be true. A direct proof shows that a conditional statement $p \rightarrow q$ is true by showing that if p is true, then q must also be true, so that the combination p true and q false never occurs. In a direct proof, we assume that p is true and use axioms, definitions, and previously proven theorems, together with rules of inference, to show that q must also be true. You will find that direct proofs of many results are quite straightforward, with a fairly obvious sequence of steps leading from the hypothesis to the conclusion. However, direct proofs sometimes require particular insights and can be quite tricky. The first direct proofs we present here are quite straightforward; later in the text you will see some that are less obvious.

We will provide examples of several different direct proofs. Before we give the first example, we need to define some terminology.

DEFINITION 1 The integer n is *even* if there exists an integer k such that $n = 2k$, and n is *odd* if there exists an integer k such that $n = 2k + 1$. (Note that every integer is either even or odd, and no integer is both even and odd.) Two integers have the *same parity* when both are even or both are odd; they have *opposite parity* when one is even and the other is odd.

EXAMPLE 1 Give a direct proof of the theorem "If n is an odd integer, then n^2 is odd."

Solution: Note that this theorem states $\forall n P((n) \to Q(n))$, where $P(n)$ is "n is an odd integer" and $Q(n)$ is "n^2 is odd." As we have said, we will follow the usual convention in mathematical proofs by showing that $P(n)$ implies $Q(n)$, and not explicitly using universal instantiation. To begin a direct proof of this theorem, we assume that the hypothesis of this conditional statement is true, namely, we assume that n is odd. By the definition of an odd integer, it follows that $n = 2k + 1$, where k is some integer. We want to show that n^2 is also odd. We can square both sides of the equation $n = 2k + 1$ to obtain a new equation that expresses n^2. When we do this, we find that $n^2 = (2k + 1)^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1$. By the definition of an odd integer, we can conclude that n^2 is an odd integer (it is one more than twice an integer). Consequently, we have proved that if n is an odd integer, then n^2 is an odd integer. ◀

Extra Examples

EXAMPLE 2 Give a direct proof that if m and n are both perfect squares, then nm is also a perfect square. (An integer a is a **perfect square** if there is an integer b such that $a = b^2$.)

Solution: To produce a direct proof of this theorem, we assume that the hypothesis of this conditional statement is true, namely, we assume that m and n are both perfect squares. By the definition of a perfect square, it follows that there are integers s and t such that $m = s^2$ and $n = t^2$. The goal of the proof is to show that mn must also be a perfect square when m and n are; looking ahead we see how we can show this by substituting s^2 for m and t^2 for n into mn. This tells us that $mn = s^2t^2$. Hence, $mn = s^2t^2 = (ss)(tt) = (st)(st) = (st)^2$, using commutativity and associativity of multiplication. By the definition of perfect square, it follows that mn is also a perfect square, because it is the square of st, which is an integer. We have proved that if m and n are both perfect squares, then mn is also a perfect square. ◀

Proof by Contraposition

Direct proofs lead from the premises of a theorem to the conclusion. They begin with the premises, continue with a sequence of deductions, and end with the conclusion. However, we will see that attempts at direct proofs often reach dead ends. We need other methods of proving theorems of the form $\forall x(P(x) \to Q(x))$. Proofs of theorems of this type that are not direct proofs, that is, that do not start with the premises and end with the conclusion, are called **indirect proofs**.

An extremely useful type of indirect proof is known as **proof by contraposition**. Proofs by contraposition make use of the fact that the conditional statement $p \to q$ is equivalent to its contrapositive, $\neg q \to \neg p$. This means that the conditional statement $p \to q$ can be proved by showing that its contrapositive, $\neg q \to \neg p$, is true. In a proof by contraposition of $p \to q$, we take $\neg q$ as a premise, and using axioms, definitions, and previously proven theorems, together with rules of inference, we show that $\neg p$ must follow. We will illustrate proof by contraposition with two examples. These examples show that proof by contraposition can succeed when we cannot easily find a direct proof.

EXAMPLE 3 Prove that if n is an integer and $3n + 2$ is odd, then n is odd.

Solution: We first attempt a direct proof. To construct a direct proof, we first assume that $3n + 2$ is an odd integer. This means that $3n + 2 = 2k + 1$ for some integer k. Can we use this fact to show that n is odd? We see that $3n + 1 = 2k$, but there does not seem to be any direct way to conclude that n is odd. Because our attempt at a direct proof failed, we next try a proof by contraposition.

Extra Examples

The first step in a proof by contraposition is to assume that the conclusion of the conditional statement "If $3n + 2$ is odd, then n is odd" is false; namely, assume that n is even. Then, by the definition of an even integer, $n = 2k$ for some integer k. Substituting $2k$ for n, we find that $3n + 2 = 3(2k) + 2 = 6k\ + 2 = 2(3k + 1)$. This tells us that $3n + 2$ is even (because it is a multiple of 2), and therefore not odd. This is the negation of the premise of the theorem. Because the negation of the conclusion of the conditional statement implies that the hypothesis is false, the original conditional statement is true. Our proof by contraposition succeeded; we have proved the theorem "If $3n + 2$ is odd, then n is odd." ◀

EXAMPLE 4 Prove that if $n = ab$, where a and b are positive integers, then $a \le \sqrt{n}$ or $b \le \sqrt{n}$.

Solution: Because there is no obvious way of showing that $a \le \sqrt{n}$ or $b \le \sqrt{n}$ directly from the equation $n = ab$, where a and b are positive integers, we attempt a proof by contraposition.

The first step in a proof by contraposition is to assume that the conclusion of the conditional statement "If $n = ab$, where a and b are positive integers, then $a \le \sqrt{n}$ or $b \le \sqrt{n}$" is false. That is, we assume that the statement $(a \le \sqrt{n}) \vee (b \le \sqrt{n})$ is false. Using the meaning of disjunction together with De Morgan's law, we see that this implies that both $a \le \sqrt{n}$ and $b \le \sqrt{n}$ are false. This implies that $a > \sqrt{n}$ and $b > \sqrt{n}$. We can multiply these inequalities together (using the fact that if $0 < s < t$ and $0 < u < v$, then $su < tv$) to obtain $ab > \sqrt{n} \cdot \sqrt{n} = n$. This shows that $ab \ne n$, which contradicts the statement $n = ab$.

Because the negation of the conclusion of the conditional statement implies that the hypothesis is false, the original conditional statement is true. Our proof by contraposition succeeded; we have proved that if $n = ab$, where a and b are positive integers, then $a \le \sqrt{n}$ or $b \le \sqrt{n}$.◀

VACUOUS AND TRIVIAL PROOFS We can quickly prove that a conditional statement $p \to q$ is true when we know that p is false, because $p \to q$ must be true when p is false. Consequently, if we can show that p is false, then we have a proof, called a **vacuous proof**, of the conditional statement $p \to q$. Vacuous proofs are often used to establish special cases of theorems that state that a conditional statement is true for all positive integers [i.e., a theorem of the kind $\forall n P(n)$, where $P(n)$ is a propositional function]. Proof techniques for theorems of this kind will be discussed in Section 5.1.

EXAMPLE 5 Show that the proposition $P(0)$ is true, where $P(n)$ is "If $n > 1$, then $n^2 > n$" and the domain consists of all integers.

Solution: Note that $P(0)$ is "If $0 > 1$, then $0^2 > 0$." We can show $P(0)$ using a vacuous proof. Indeed, the hypothesis $0 > 1$ is false. This tells us that $P(0)$ is automatically true. ◀

Remark: The fact that the conclusion of this conditional statement, $0^2 > 0$, is false is irrelevant to the truth value of the conditional statement, because a conditional statement with a false hypothesis is guaranteed to be true.

We can also quickly prove a conditional statement $p \to q$ if we know that the conclusion q is true. By showing that q is true, it follows that $p \to q$ must also be true. A proof of $p \to q$ that uses the fact that q is true is called a **trivial proof**. Trivial proofs are often important when special cases of theorems are proved (see the discussion of proof by cases in Section 1.8) and in mathematical induction, which is a proof technique discussed in Section 5.1.

EXAMPLE 6 Let $P(n)$ be "If a and b are positive integers with $a \geq b$, then $a^n \geq b^n$," where the domain consists of all nonnegative integers. Show that $P(0)$ is true.

Solution: The proposition $P(0)$ is "If $a \geq b$, then $a^0 \geq b^0$." Because $a^0 = b^0 = 1$, the conclusion of the conditional statement "If $a \geq b$, then $a^0 \geq b^0$" is true. Hence, this conditional statement, which is $P(0)$, is true. This is an example of a trivial proof. Note that the hypothesis, which is the statement "$a \geq b$," was not needed in this proof. ◀

A LITTLE PROOF STRATEGY We have described two important approaches for proving theorems of the form $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$: direct proof and proof by contraposition. We have also given examples that show how each is used. However, when you are presented with a theorem of the form $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$, which method should you use to attempt to prove it? We will provide a few rules of thumb here; in Section 1.8 we will discuss proof strategy at greater length. When you want to prove a statement of the form $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$, first evaluate whether a direct proof looks promising. Begin by expanding the definitions in the hypotheses. Start to reason using these hypotheses, together with axioms and available theorems. If a direct proof does not seem to go anywhere, try the same thing with a proof by contraposition. Recall that in a proof by contraposition you assume that the conclusion of the conditional statement is false and use a direct proof to show this implies that the hypothesis must be false. We illustrate this strategy in Examples 7 and 8. Before we present our next example, we need a definition.

DEFINITION 2 The real number r is *rational* if there exist integers p and q with $q \neq 0$ such that $r = p/q$. A real number that is not rational is called *irrational*.

EXAMPLE 7 Prove that the sum of two rational numbers is rational. (Note that if we include the implicit quantifiers here, the theorem we want to prove is "For every real number r and every real number s, if r and s are rational numbers, then $r + s$ is rational.)

Extra Examples

Solution: We first attempt a direct proof. To begin, suppose that r and s are rational numbers. From the definition of a rational number, it follows that there are integers p and q, with $q \neq 0$, such that $r = p/q$, and integers t and u, with $u \neq 0$, such that $s = t/u$. Can we use this information to show that $r + s$ is rational? The obvious next step is to add $r = p/q$ and $s = t/u$, to obtain

$$r + s = \frac{p}{q} + \frac{t}{u} = \frac{pu + qt}{qu}.$$

Because $q \neq 0$ and $u \neq 0$, it follows that $qu \neq 0$. Consequently, we have expressed $r + s$ as the ratio of two integers, $pu + qt$ and qu, where $qu \neq 0$. This means that $r + s$ is rational. We have proved that the sum of two rational numbers is rational; our attempt to find a direct proof succeeded. ◀

EXAMPLE 8 Prove that if n is an integer and n^2 is odd, then n is odd.

Solution: We first attempt a direct proof. Suppose that n is an integer and n^2 is odd. Then, there exists an integer k such that $n^2 = 2k + 1$. Can we use this information to show that n is odd? There seems to be no obvious approach to show that n is odd because solving for n produces the equation $n = \pm\sqrt{2k + 1}$, which is not terribly useful.

Because this attempt to use a direct proof did not bear fruit, we next attempt a proof by contraposition. We take as our hypothesis the statement that n is not odd. Because every integer is odd or even, this means that n is even. This implies that there exists an integer k such that $n = 2k$. To prove the theorem, we need to show that this hypothesis implies the conclusion that n^2 is not odd, that is, that n^2 is even. Can we use the equation $n = 2k$ to achieve this? By squaring both sides of this equation, we obtain $n^2 = 4k^2 = 2(2k^2)$, which implies that n^2 is also even because $n^2 = 2t$, where $t = 2k^2$. We have proved that if n is an integer and n^2 is odd, then n is odd. Our attempt to find a proof by contraposition succeeded. ◀

Proofs by Contradiction

Suppose we want to prove that a statement p is true. Furthermore, suppose that we can find a contradiction q such that $\neg p \to q$ is true. Because q is false, but $\neg p \to q$ is true, we can conclude that $\neg p$ is false, which means that p is true. How can we find a contradiction q that might help us prove that p is true in this way?

Because the statement $r \wedge \neg r$ is a contradiction whenever r is a proposition, we can prove that p is true if we can show that $\neg p \to (r \wedge \neg r)$ is true for some proposition r. Proofs of this type are called **proofs by contradiction**. Because a proof by contradiction does not prove a result directly, it is another type of indirect proof. We provide three examples of proof by contradiction. The first is an example of an application of the pigeonhole principle, a combinatorial technique that we will cover in depth in Section 6.2.

EXAMPLE 9 Show that at least four of any 22 days must fall on the same day of the week.

Extra Examples

Solution: Let p be the proposition "At least four of 22 chosen days fall on the same day of the week." Suppose that $\neg p$ is true. This means that at most three of the 22 days fall on the same day of the week. Because there are seven days of the week, this implies that at most 21 days could have been chosen, as for each of the days of the week, at most three of the chosen days could fall on that day. This contradicts the premise that we have 22 days under consideration. That is, if r is the statement that 22 days are chosen, then we have shown that $\neg p \to (r \wedge \neg r)$. Consequently, we know that p is true. We have proved that at least four of 22 chosen days fall on the same day of the week. ◀

EXAMPLE 10 Prove that $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational by giving a proof by contradiction.

Solution: Let p be the proposition "$\sqrt{2}$ is irrational." To start a proof by contradiction, we suppose that $\neg p$ is true. Note that $\neg p$ is the statement "It is not the case that $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational," which says that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational. We will show that assuming that $\neg p$ is true leads to a contradiction.

If $\sqrt{2}$ is rational, there exist integers a and b with $\sqrt{2} = a/b$, where $b \neq 0$ and a and b have no common factors (so that the fraction a/b is in lowest terms.) (Here, we are using the fact that every rational number can be written in lowest terms.) Because $\sqrt{2} = a/b$, when both sides of this equation are squared, it follows that

$$2 = \frac{a^2}{b^2}.$$

Hence,

$$2b^2 = a^2.$$

By the definition of an even integer it follows that a^2 is even. We next use the fact that if a^2 is even, a must also be even, which follows by Exercise 16. Furthermore, because a is even, by the definition of an even integer, $a = 2c$ for some integer c. Thus,

$$2b^2 = 4c^2.$$

Dividing both sides of this equation by 2 gives

$$b^2 = 2c^2.$$

By the definition of even, this means that b^2 is even. Again using the fact that if the square of an integer is even, then the integer itself must be even, we conclude that b must be even as well.

We have now shown that the assumption of $\neg p$ leads to the equation $\sqrt{2} = a/b$, where a and b have no common factors, but both a and b are even, that is, 2 divides both a and b. Note that the statement that $\sqrt{2} = a/b$, where a and b have no common factors, means, in particular, that 2 does not divide both a and b. Because our assumption of $\neg p$ leads to the contradiction that 2 divides both a and b and 2 does not divide both a and b, $\neg p$ must be false. That is, the statement p, "$\sqrt{2}$ is irrational," is true. We have proved that $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational. ◀

Proof by contradiction can be used to prove conditional statements. In such proofs, we first assume the negation of the conclusion. We then use the premises of the theorem and the negation of the conclusion to arrive at a contradiction. (The reason that such proofs are valid rests on the logical equivalence of $p \rightarrow q$ and $(p \wedge \neg q) \rightarrow \mathbf{F}$. To see that these statements are equivalent, simply note that each is false in exactly one case, namely when p is true and q is false.)

Note that we can rewrite a proof by contraposition of a conditional statement as a proof by contradiction. In a proof of $p \rightarrow q$ by contraposition, we assume that $\neg q$ is true. We then show that $\neg p$ must also be true. To rewrite a proof by contraposition of $p \rightarrow q$ as a proof by contradiction, we suppose that both p and $\neg q$ are true. Then, we use the steps from the proof of $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ to show that $\neg p$ is true. This leads to the contradiction $p \wedge \neg p$, completing the proof. Example 11 illustrates how a proof by contraposition of a conditional statement can be rewritten as a proof by contradiction.

EXAMPLE 11 Give a proof by contradiction of the theorem "If $3n + 2$ is odd, then n is odd."

Solution: Let p be "$3n + 2$ is odd" and q be "n is odd." To construct a proof by contradiction, assume that both p and $\neg q$ are true. That is, assume that $3n + 2$ is odd and that n is not odd. Because n is not odd, we know that it is even. Because n is even, there is an integer k such that $n = 2k$. This implies that $3n + 2 = 3(2k) + 2 = 6k + 2 = 2(3k + 1)$. Because $3n + 2$ is $2t$, where $t = 3k + 1$, $3n + 2$ is even. Note that the statement "$3n + 2$ is even" is equivalent to the statement $\neg p$, because an integer is even if and only if it is not odd. Because both p and $\neg p$ are true, we have a contradiction. This completes the proof by contradiction, proving that if $3n + 2$ is odd, then n is odd. ◀

Note that we can also prove by contradiction that $p \rightarrow q$ is true by assuming that p and $\neg q$ are true, and showing that q must be also be true. This implies that $\neg q$ and q are both true, a contradiction. This observation tells us that we can turn a direct proof into a proof by contradiction.

PROOFS OF EQUIVALENCE To prove a theorem that is a biconditional statement, that is, a statement of the form $p \leftrightarrow q$, we show that $p \rightarrow q$ and $q \rightarrow p$ are both true. The validity of this approach is based on the tautology

$$(p \leftrightarrow q) \leftrightarrow (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p).$$

EXAMPLE 12 Prove the theorem "If n is an integer, then n is odd if and only if n^2 is odd."

Solution: This theorem has the form "p if and only if q," where p is "n is odd" and q is "n^2 is odd." (As usual, we do not explicitly deal with the universal quantification.) To prove this theorem, we need to show that $p \rightarrow q$ and $q \rightarrow p$ are true.

Extra Examples

We have already shown (in Example 1) that $p \rightarrow q$ is true and (in Example 8) that $q \rightarrow p$ is true.

Because we have shown that both $p \rightarrow q$ and $q \rightarrow p$ are true, we have shown that the theorem is true. ◀

Sometimes a theorem states that several propositions are equivalent. Such a theorem states that propositions $p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n$ are equivalent. This can be written as

$$p_1 \leftrightarrow p_2 \leftrightarrow \cdots \leftrightarrow p_n,$$

which states that all n propositions have the same truth values, and consequently, that for all i and j with $1 \le i \le n$ and $1 \le j \le n$, p_i and p_j are equivalent. One way to prove these mutually equivalent is to use the tautology

$$p_1 \leftrightarrow p_2 \leftrightarrow \cdots \leftrightarrow p_n \leftrightarrow (p_1 \to p_2) \wedge (p_2 \to p_3) \wedge \cdots \wedge (p_n \to p_1).$$

This shows that if the n conditional statements $p_1 \to p_2, p_2 \to p_3, \ldots, p_n \to p_1$ can be shown to be true, then the propositions $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n$ are all equivalent.

This is much more efficient than proving that $p_i \to p_j$ for all $i \ne j$ with $1 \le i \le n$ and $1 \le j \le n$. (Note that there are $n^2 - n$ such conditional statements.)

When we prove that a group of statements are equivalent, we can establish any chain of conditional statements we choose as long as it is possible to work through the chain to go from any one of these statements to any other statement. For example, we can show that p_1, p_2, and p_3 are equivalent by showing that $p_1 \to p_3$, $p_3 \to p_2$, and $p_2 \to p_1$.

EXAMPLE 13 Show that these statements about the integer n are equivalent:

p_1: n is even.
p_2: $n - 1$ is odd.
p_3: n^2 is even.

Solution: We will show that these three statements are equivalent by showing that the conditional statements $p_1 \to p_2$, $p_2 \to p_3$, and $p_3 \to p_1$ are true.

We use a direct proof to show that $p_1 \to p_2$. Suppose that n is even. Then $n = 2k$ for some integer k. Consequently, $n - 1 = 2k - 1 = 2(k - 1) + 1$. This means that $n - 1$ is odd because it is of the form $2m + 1$, where m is the integer $k - 1$.

We also use a direct proof to show that $p_2 \to p_3$. Now suppose $n - 1$ is odd. Then $n - 1 = 2k + 1$ for some integer k. Hence, $n = 2k + 2$ so that $n^2 = (2k + 2)^2 = 4k^2 + 8k + 4 = 2(2k^2 + 4k + 2)$. This means that n^2 is twice the integer $2k^2 + 4k + 2$, and hence is even.

To prove $p_3 \to p_1$, we use a proof by contraposition. That is, we prove that if n is not even, then n^2 is not even. This is the same as proving that if n is odd, then n^2 is odd, which we have already done in Example 1. This completes the proof. ◀

COUNTEREXAMPLES In Section 1.4 we stated that to show that a statement of the form $\forall x P(x)$ is false, we need only find a **counterexample**, that is, an example x for which $P(x)$ is false. When presented with a statement of the form $\forall x P(x)$, which we believe to be false or which has resisted all proof attempts, we look for a counterexample. We illustrate the use of counterexamples in Example 14.

EXAMPLE 14 Show that the statement "Every positive integer is the sum of the squares of two integers" is false.

Extra Examples

Solution: To show that this statement is false, we look for a counterexample, which is a particular integer that is not the sum of the squares of two integers. It does not take long to find a counterexample, because 3 cannot be written as the sum of the squares of two integers. To show this is the case, note that the only perfect squares not exceeding 3 are $0^2 = 0$ and $1^2 = 1$. Furthermore, there is no way to get 3 as the sum of two terms each of which is 0 or 1. Consequently, we have shown that "Every positive integer is the sum of the squares of two integers" is false. ◀

Mistakes in Proofs

There are many common errors made in constructing mathematical proofs. We will briefly describe some of these here. Among the most common errors are mistakes in arithmetic and basic algebra. Even professional mathematicians make such errors, especially when working with complicated formulae. Whenever you use such computations you should check them as carefully as possible. (You should also review any troublesome aspects of basic algebra, especially before you study Section 5.1.)

Each step of a mathematical proof needs to be correct and the conclusion needs to follow logically from the steps that precede it. Many mistakes result from the introduction of steps that do not logically follow from those that precede it. This is illustrated in Examples 15–17.

EXAMPLE 15 What is wrong with this famous supposed "proof" that $1 = 2$?

"Proof:" We use these steps, where a and b are two equal positive integers.

Step	**Reason**
1. $a = b$	Given
2. $a^2 = ab$	Multiply both sides of (1) by a
3. $a^2 - b^2 = ab - b^2$	Subtract b^2 from both sides of (2)
4. $(a - b)(a + b) = b(a - b)$	Factor both sides of (3)
5. $a + b = b$	Divide both sides of (4) by $a - b$
6. $2b = b$	Replace a by b in (5) because $a = b$ and simplify
7. $2 = 1$	Divide both sides of (6) by b

Solution: Every step is valid except for one, step 5 where we divided both sides by $a - b$. The error is that $a - b$ equals zero; division of both sides of an equation by the same quantity is valid as long as this quantity is not zero. ◀

EXAMPLE 16 What is wrong with this "proof?"

"Theorem:" If n^2 is positive, then n is positive.

"Proof:" Suppose that n^2 is positive. Because the conditional statement "If n is positive, then n^2 is positive" is true, we can conclude that n is positive.

Solution: Let $P(n)$ be "n is positive" and $Q(n)$ be "n^2 is positive." Then our hypothesis is $Q(n)$. The statement "If n is positive, then n^2 is positive" is the statement $\forall n(P(n) \rightarrow Q(n))$. From the hypothesis $Q(n)$ and the statement $\forall n(P(n) \rightarrow Q(n))$ we cannot conclude $P(n)$, because we are not using a valid rule of inference. Instead, this is an example of the fallacy of affirming the conclusion. A counterexample is supplied by $n = -1$ for which $n^2 = 1$ is positive, but n is negative. ◀

EXAMPLE 17 What is wrong with this "proof?"

"Theorem:" If n is not positive, then n^2 is not positive. (This is the contrapositive of the "theorem" in Example 16.)

"Proof:" Suppose that n is not positive. Because the conditional statement "If n is positive, then n^2 is positive" is true, we can conclude that n^2 is not positive.

Solution: Let $P(n)$ and $Q(n)$ be as in the solution of Example 16. Then our hypothesis is $\neg P(n)$ and the statement "If n is positive, then n^2 is positive" is the statement $\forall n(P(n) \rightarrow Q(n))$. From the hypothesis $\neg P(n)$ and the statement $\forall n(P(n) \rightarrow Q(n))$ we cannot conclude $\neg Q(n)$, because we are not using a valid rule of inference. Instead, this is an example of the fallacy of denying the hypothesis. A counterexample is supplied by $n = -1$, as in Example 16. ◀

Finally, we briefly discuss a particularly nasty type of error. Many incorrect arguments are based on a fallacy called **begging the question**. This fallacy occurs when one or more steps of a proof are based on the truth of the statement being proved. In other words, this fallacy arises when a statement is proved using itself, or a statement equivalent to it. That is why this fallacy is also called **circular reasoning**.

EXAMPLE 18 Is the following argument correct? It supposedly shows that n is an even integer whenever n^2 is an even integer.

> Suppose that n^2 is even. Then $n^2 = 2k$ for some integer k. Let $n = 2l$ for some integer l. This shows that n is even.

Solution: This argument is incorrect. The statement "let $n = 2l$ for some integer l" occurs in the proof. No argument has been given to show that n can be written as $2l$ for some integer l. This is circular reasoning because this statement is equivalent to the statement being proved, namely, "n is even." Of course, the result itself is correct; only the method of proof is wrong. ◀

Making mistakes in proofs is part of the learning process. When you make a mistake that someone else finds, you should carefully analyze where you went wrong and make sure that you do not make the same mistake again. Even professional mathematicians make mistakes in proofs. More than a few incorrect proofs of important results have fooled people for many years before subtle errors in them were found.

Just a Beginning

We have now developed a basic arsenal of proof methods. In the next section we will introduce other important proof methods. We will also introduce several important proof techniques in Chapter 5, including mathematical induction, which can be used to prove results that hold for all positive integers. In Chapter 6 we will introduce the notion of combinatorial proofs.

In this section we introduced several methods for proving theorems of the form $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$, including direct proofs and proofs by contraposition. There are many theorems of this type whose proofs are easy to construct by directly working through the hypotheses and definitions of the terms of the theorem. However, it is often difficult to prove a theorem without resorting to a clever use of a proof by contraposition or a proof by contradiction, or some other proof technique. In Section 1.8 we will address proof strategy. We will describe various approaches that can be used to find proofs when straightforward approaches do not work. Constructing proofs is an art that can be learned only through experience, including writing proofs, having your proofs critiqued, and reading and analyzing other proofs.