### 제2장 Proofs

- 2.1 Mathematical Systems, Direct Proofs, and Counterexamples
- 2.2 More Methods of Proofs
- 2.3 Resolutions Proofs
- 2.4 Mathematical Induction
- 2.5 Strong Form of Induction and the Well-Ordering Property



# 2.1 Mathematical Systems, Direct Proofs, and Counterexamples

- □ A mathematical system consists of axiom<sup>공리</sup>, definition<sup>정의</sup>, and undefined term □정의 용어.
  - Axioms are assumed to be true.
  - Given two distinct points, there is exactly one line that contains them.
  - Given a line and a point not on the line, there is exactly one line through the point which is parallel to the line.
  - Definitions are used to create new concepts in terms of existing ones.
  - Two triangles are congruent if their vertices can be paired so that the corresponding sides are equal and so are the corresponding angles.
  - Two angles are supplementary if the sum of their measures is 180 degrees.

# 2.1 Mathematical systems, Direct Proofs, and Counterexamples

- □ A mathematical system consists of **axiom**<sup>공리</sup>, **definition**<sup>정의</sup>, and **undefined term**미정의 용어.
  - Some terms are not explicitly defined but rather are implicitly defined by the axioms.
  - Point, Line
- □ A **theorem**정리 is a proposition that has been proved to be true.
- □ A **lemma**보조정리 is a theorem that is usually not too interesting in its own right but is useful in proving another theorem.
- □ A **corollary**따름정리 is a theorem that follows easily from another theorem.
  - If a triangle is an isosceles triangle, the angles are equal
- □ An argument that establishes the truth of a theorem is called a **proof**증명.



# 2.1 Mathematical systems, Direct Proofs, and Counterexamples (직접 증명<sup>direct proof</sup>)

□ Theorems are often of the form:

For all 
$$x_1, x_2, ..., x_n$$
, if  $p(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$ , then  $q(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$ .

This universally quantified statement is true provided that

if 
$$p(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$$
, then  $q(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$  (1.1)

is true for all  $x_1, x_2, ..., x_n$  in the domain of discourse.

 $\begin{array}{c|ccc} p & q & p \rightarrow q \\ \hline T & T & T \\ T & F & F \\ \hline F & T & T \\ \end{array}$ 

□ To prove (1.1), we assume that  $x_1, x_2, ..., x_n$  are arbitrary members of the domain of discourse.

If  $p(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$  is false, (1.1) is true.

A **direct proof** assumes that  $p(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$  is true and then shows directly that  $q(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$  is true.



# 2.1 Mathematical systems, Direct Proofs, and Counterexamples (직접 증명<sup>direct proof</sup>)

- Definition 2.1.7 An integer n is even 작수 if there exists an integer k such that n = 2k. An integer n is odd 홀수 if there exists an integer k such that n = 2k + 1.
- □ 예제 2.1.10

For all integers m and n, if m is odd and n is even, then m + n is odd.

 $\ \square$  Proof) Let m and n be arbitrary integers, and suppose that m is odd and n is even. We must prove that m+n is odd.

By definition, since m is odd, there exists an integer  $k_1$  such that  $m=2k_1+1$ . Also, by definition, since n is even, there exists an integer  $k_2$  such that  $n=2k_2$ .

Now  $m + n = (2k_1 + 1) + (2k_2) = 2(k_1 + k_2) + 1$ . Thus, there exists an integer k (namely  $k = k_1 + k_2$ ) such that m + n = 2k + 1. Therefore, m + n is odd.



# 2.1 Mathematical systems, Direct Proofs, and Counterexamples (직접 증명<sup>direct proof</sup>)

예제 2.1.11 Prove that for all sets X, Y, and Z,  $X \cap (Y - Z) = (X \cap Y) - (X \cap Z)$ 

- □ Poof) We must show that for all x, if  $x \in X \cap (Y Z)$ , then  $x \in (X \cap Y) (X \cap Z)$  (1.3) if  $x \in (X \cap Y) (X \cap Z)$ , then  $x \in X \cap (Y Z)$  (1.4)
- Let any  $x \in X \cap (Y Z)$ . Then  $x \in X$  and  $x \in Y Z$ . Since  $x \in Y - Z$ ,  $x \in Y$  and  $x \notin Z$ . Since  $x \in X$  and  $x \in Y$ ,  $x \in X \cap Y$ . Since  $x \notin Z$ ,  $x \notin X \cap Z$ . Since  $x \in X \cap Y$  and  $x \notin X \cap Z$ , then  $x \in (X \cap Y) - (X \cap Z)$ . We have proved equation (1.3).
- Let any  $x \in (X \cap Y) (X \cap Z)$ . Then  $x \in X \cap Y$ ,  $x \notin X \cap Z$ Since  $x \in X \cap Y$ ,  $x \in X$  and  $x \in Y$ . Since  $x \in X$  and  $x \notin X \cap Z$ ,  $x \notin Z$ Since  $x \in Y$  and  $x \notin Z$ ,  $x \in Y - Z$ Since  $x \in X$  and  $x \in Y - Z$ ,  $x \in X \cap (Y - Z)$ . proved equation (1.4).



# 2.1 Mathematical systems, Direct Proofs, and Counterexamples (Disproving a Universally Quantified Statement 전칭 한정된 문장의 반증)

- □ To disprove  $\forall x P(x)$  we simply need to find one member x in the domain of discourse that makes P(x) false. Such a value for x is called a counterexample  $^{\text{tid}}$ .
- $\square$  예제 2.1.14 Prove that the statement  $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ (2^n + 1 \text{ is prime})$  is false.

A counterexample is n = 3 since  $2^3 + 1 = 9$ , which is not prime  $^{2}$ ?



# 2.1 Mathematical systems, Direct Proofs, and Counterexamples (Some Common Errors.)

- □ For all integer m and n, if m and n are even integers then mn is a square (i.e.,  $mn = a^2$  for some integer a)
- □ Faulty proof) Since m and n are even, m = 2k and n = 2k. Now  $mn = (2k)(2k) = (2k)^2$ . If we let a = 2k, then  $mn = a^2$  ( $m = 2k_1$  and  $n = 2k_2$  for some integers  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ . The integers  $k_1$  and  $k_1$  need not be equal.)
- Circular reasoning순환 추론: For all integers m and n, if m and m+n are even, then n is even: Erroneous proof) Let  $m=2k_1$  and  $n=2k_2$ . Then  $m+n=2k_1+2k_2$ . Therefore,  $n=(m+n)-m=(2k_1+2k_2)-2k_1=2(k_1+k_2-k_1)$  Thus n is even. (We cannot write  $n=2k_2$ , which is supposed to prove!).



#### 2.2 More Methods of Proofs (proof by contradiction)

- □ A contradiction  $^{\cancel{\square}}$  is a proposition of the form  $r \land \neg r$ .
- □ To prove  $p \rightarrow q$  is true, assume p is true and q is false, and derive a contradiction. Since the derivation shows that  $(p \land \neg q) \rightarrow (r \land \neg r)$  is true,  $(p \land \neg q) \rightarrow (r \land \neg r) \equiv p \rightarrow q$  justifies the proof method.
- 여제 2.2.1 A proof by contradiction. For every  $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ , if  $n^2$  is even, then n is even.
- $\square$  We assume the hypothesis  $n^2$  is even and that the conclusion is false, n is odd.

Since n is odd, there exists an integer k such that n = 2k + 1.  $n^2 = (2k + 1)^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1$ Thus  $n^2$  is odd, which contradicts the hypothesis  $n^2$  is even. The proof by contradiction is complete.



#### 2.2 More Methods of Proofs (proof by contradiction)

- □ Proof) Let x and y be arbitrary real numbers. Suppose that the conclusion is false, i.e,  $\neg(x \ge 1 \lor y \ge 1)$  is true.

By De Morgan's laws of logic,

$$\neg(x \ge 1 \lor y \ge 1) \equiv \neg(x \ge 1) \land \neg(y \ge 1) \equiv (x < 1) \land (y < 1)$$
  
In words, we are assuming that  $x < 1$  and  $y < 1$ .  
Adding these inequalities to obtain  $x + y < 1 + 1 = 2$ .

At this point, we have derived a contradiction:

$$x + y \ge 2$$
 and  $x + y < 2$ .

Thus we conclude that for all real numbers x and y, if  $x + y \ge 2$ , then either  $x \ge 1$  or  $y \ge 1$ .



#### 2.2 More Methods of Proofs (proof by contradiction)

□ Assume ¬p and derive a contradiction.  $p \neq q p \rightarrow q$  Since the derivation shows that  $p \neq q p \rightarrow q$   $p \rightarrow \rightarrow q$  p

Proof) Assume that  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational. Then there exist integers p and q such that  $\sqrt{2} = p/q$ . p/q is in lowest term so that p and q are not both even.

Squaring  $\sqrt{2} = p/q$  then multiplying by  $q^2$  gives  $2q^2 = p^2$ . So  $p^2$  is even.

By 예제 2.2.1., p is even, Thus p=2k for some integer k.  $2q^2=(2k)^2=4k^2$ . Canceling 2 gives  $q^2=2k^2$ . Therefore  $q^2$  is even. q is even.

Thus p and q are both even, which contradicts our assumption that p and q are not both even. Therefore,  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational.

#### 2.2 More Methods of Proofs (proof by contrapositive)

- $\square p \to q \equiv \neg q \to \neg p$
- □ Proof) We begin by letting x be an arbitrary real number. We prove the contrapositive of the given statement: if x is not irrational, then  $x^2$  is not irrational or, equivalently, if x is rational  $\mathbb{C}^2$  \cdot \text{then }  $x^2$  is rational.

So suppose that *x* is rational.

Then x = p/q for some integers p and q.

Now  $x^2 = p^2/q^2$ .

Since  $x^2$  is the quotient of integers,  $x^2$  is rational.

The proof is complete.



- Proof by cases is used when the original hypothesis naturally divides itself into various cases. e.g.,
  - "*x* is a real number" can be divided into cases:
  - (a) *x* is a nonnegative real number
  - (b) *x* is a negative real number.
- □ Suppose that the task is to prove  $p \rightarrow q$  and that p is equivalent to  $p_1 \lor p_2 \lor \cdots \lor p_n$  ( $p_1, \dots, p_n$  are the cases).
- Instead of proving

$$(p_1 \lor p_2 \lor \cdots \lor p_n) \to q$$

we prove

$$(p_1 \to q) \land (p_2 \to q) \land \dots \land (p_n \to q).$$
 (2.2)

□ As we will show, proof by cases is justified because the two statements are equivalent.



□ Suppose that q is true.
Then all the implications in ① and ② are true.
Thus ① and ② are true.

 $\begin{array}{c|cccc} p & q & p \rightarrow q \\ \hline T & T & T \\ T & F & F \\ F & T & T \\ F & F & T \\ \end{array}$ 

- □ Suppose that q is false.  $F F \sqcap T$ If all the  $p_i$  are false, then all the implications in ① and ② are true, so ① and ② are true.

  If for some  $j, p_j$  is true, then  $p_1 \vee \dots \vee p_n$  is true, so ① is false. Since  $p_i \rightarrow q$  is false, ② is false. Thus ① and ② are false.
- □ Therefore, ① and ② are equivalent.



- □ Exhaustive proof(전수증명) Sometimes the number of cases to prove is finite, so we can check them all one by one.
- 여제 2.2.6 Prove that  $2m^2 + 3n^2 = 40$  has no solution in positive integers. (i.e.,  $2m^2 + 3n^2 = 40$  is false for all positive integers m and n.)
- □ Proof) If  $2m^2 + 3n^2 = 40$ , we must have  $2m^2 \le 40$ . Thus  $m^2 \le 20$  and  $m \le 4$ . Similarly, we must have  $3n^2 \le 40$ . Thus  $n^2 \le 40/3$  and  $n \le 3$ . Thus it suffices to check the cas

Since 
$$2m^2 + 3n^2 \neq 40$$
 for 1 5 11 21 35  $m = 1, 2, 3, 4$  and  $n = 1, 2, 3, n$  2 14 20 30 44 and  $2m^2 + 3n^2 > 40$  for 3 29 35 45 59  $m > 4$  or  $n > 3$ , we conclude

that  $2m^2 + 3n^2 = 40$  has no solution in positive integers.



- $\square$  예제 2.2.7 Prove that for every real number  $x, x \leq |x|$ .
- □ Discussion Since x is a real number, either  $x \ge 0$  or x < 0. We use this or statement to divide the proof into cases. We divide the proof into cases because the definition of absolute value is itself divided into cases  $x \ge 0$  and x < 0. Case 1 is  $x \ge 0$  and case 2 is x < 0.
- □ Proof) If  $x \ge 0$ , by definition |x| = x. Thus  $|x| \ge x$ . If x < 0, by definition |x| = -x. Since |x| = -x > 0 and x < 0,  $|x| \ge x$ . In either case,  $|x| \ge x$ ; so the proof is complete.



#### 2.2 More Methods of Proofs (Proofs of Equivalence)

- To prove
  p if and only if q
  prove
  if p then q and if q then p
- □ This is justified by  $p \leftrightarrow q \equiv (p \rightarrow q) \land (q \rightarrow p)$
- $\square$  예제 2.2.9 Prove that for all integer n, n is odd iff n-1 is even.
- Proof) We first prove that if n is odd then n-1 is even. If n is odd, then n=2k+1 for some integer k. Now n-1=(2k+1)-1=2k. Therefore, n-1 is even. Next we prove that if n-1 is even then n is odd. If n-1 is even, then n-1=2k for some integer k. Now n=2k+1. Therefore, n is odd. The proof is complete.



#### 2.2 More Methods of Proofs (Existence Proofs)

- $\square$  A proof of  $\exists x \ P(x)$ .
- □ An existence proof of  $\exists x \ P(x)$  that exhibits an element a of the domain of discourse that makes P(a) true is called a constructive proof 건설적인 증명.
- $\square$  예제 2.2.12 Let a and b be real numbers with a < b. Prove that there exists a real number x satisfying a < x < b.
- $\square$  Proof) It suffices to find one real number x satisfying a < x < b. The real number

$$x = \frac{a+b}{2}$$

surely satisfies a < x < b.



- Resolution proof was Proposed by J. A. Robinson (1965)
  - Hypothesis and conclusion are written as clauses
  - clause: a compound statement with terms separated by "or (∨)", and each term is a single variable or the negation (¬) of a single variable
    - Ex)  $p \lor q \lor (\neg r)$  is a clause,  $(p \land q) \lor r \lor (\neg s)$  is not a clause
  - depends on a single rule:
     If p \( \) q and \( \pri \) r are both true, then q \( \varphi \) is true
- $\Box$  예제 2.3.1 a  $\vee$  b  $\vee$   $\neg$  c  $\vee$  d is a clause
- $\square$  예제 2.3.2 xy  $\vee$  w  $\vee$   $\neg$  c is not a clause as xy consists of two variables
- □ q q q q is not a clause since terms are separated by  $\rightarrow$



- □ 예제 2.3.4 Prove the following using resolution
  - 1.  $a \lor b$
  - 2.  $\neg a \lor c$
  - $3. \neg c \lor d$ 
    - $\therefore$  b  $\vee$  d
  - Sol) From 1 and 2, we drive 4.  $b \lor c$  From 3 and 4, we drive  $b \lor d$
- Special cases

If  $p \lor q$  and  $\neg p$  are both true, then q is true If  $\neg p \lor r$  and p are both true, then r is true



- □ 예제 2.3.5 Prove the following using resolution
  - 1. a
  - 2.  $\neg a \lor c$
  - $3. \neg c \lor d$ 
    - ∴d
  - Sol) From 1 and 2, we drive 4. c
    From 3 and 4, we drive d
- Hypothesis must be expressed by equivalent expressions

$$\neg (a \lor b) \equiv \neg a \neg b,$$
  $\neg (ab) \equiv \neg a \lor \neg b$   
 $a \lor bc \equiv (a \lor b) (a \lor c)$ 



□ 예제 2.3.6 Prove the following using resolution

1. 
$$a \lor \neg bc$$

$$2. \neg (a \lor d)$$

Sol) 1.1 a  $\lor \neg$  b

$$2.1 \text{ a} \lor \text{c}$$

1.1 and 2.1 are derived from 1

$$3.1 \neg a$$

$$4.1 \neg d$$

3.1 and 4.1 are derived from 2

□ Principle of Mathematical Induction수학적 귀납법의 원리

Suppose that we have a propositional function S(n) whose domain of discourse is the set of positive integers. Suppose that S(1) is true; (4.7)

for all  $n \ge 1$ , if S(n) is true, then S(n + 1) is true. (4.8) Then S(n) is true for every positive integer n.

- □ (4.7) Basis Step기본단계, (4.8) Inductive Step귀납단계
- Hereafter, "induction" will mean "mathematical induction."
- □ To verify that the statements  $S(n_0)$ ,  $S(n_0 + 1)$ ,... are true, the Basis Step become  $S(n_0)$  is true.

the Inductive Step become for all  $n \ge n_0$ , if S(n) is true, then S(n + 1) is true.



- 이제 2.4.3 Use induction to show that  $n! \ge 2^{n-1}$  for all  $n \ge 1$ . (4.9)
- □ Basis Step (n = 1): We must show that (4.9) is true if n = 1. 1! = 1,  $2^{1-1} = 1$ .  $1! \ge 2^{1-1}$
- Inductive Step: We assume that  $n! \ge 2^{n-1}$  is true. We must prove that  $(n+1)! \ge 2^n$  (4.11) is true.

$$(n + 1)! = (n + 1)(n!)$$
  
 $\geq (n + 1)2^{n-1}$  by the assumption  
 $\geq 2 \cdot 2^{n-1}$  since  $n + 1 \geq 2$   
 $= 2^{n}$ .

Therefore, (4.11) is true.

□ Since the Basis Step and the Inductive Step have been verified, the Principle of Mathematical Induction tells us that (4.9) is true for every positive integer n.



 $\square$  예제 2.4.4 Use induction to show that if  $r \neq 1$ ,

$$a + ar^{1} + ar^{2} + \dots + ar^{n} = \frac{a(r^{n+1} - 1)}{r - 1}$$
 (4.12) for all  $n \ge 0$ .

- □ Basis Step (n = 0): For n = 0, (4.12) becomes  $a = a(r^1 1) / (r 1)$ , which is true.
- □ Inductive Step: Assume that statement (4.12) is true for n.

$$a + ar^{1} + ar^{2} + \dots + ar^{n} + ar^{n+1} = \frac{a(r^{n+1} - 1)}{r - 1} + ar^{n+1}$$

$$= \frac{a(r^{n+1} - 1)}{r - 1} + \frac{ar^{n+1}(r - 1)}{r - 1} = \frac{a(r^{n+2} - 1)}{r - 1}$$

□ Since the Basis Step and the Inductive Step have been verified, the Principle of Mathematical Induction tells us that (4.12) is true for all  $n \ge 0$ .



- $\square$  예제 2.4.5 Show that  $5^n 1$  is divisible by 4 for all  $n \ge 1$ .
- □ Basis Step (n = 1)If n = 1,  $5^n - 1 = 5^1 - 1 = 4$ , which is divisible by 4.
- Inductive Step
  We assume that  $5^n 1$  is divisible by 4.
  We must then show that  $5^{n+1} 1$  is divisible by 4.
  Since  $5^n 1$  is divisible by 4,  $5^n 1 = 4k$  for some integer k.
  So  $5^n = 4k + 1$ .  $5^{n+1} 1 = 5 \cdot 5^n 1 = 5 \cdot (4k + 1) 1 = 4(5k + 1)$ ,
  Thus  $5^{n+1} 1$  is divisible by 4
- □ Since the Basis Step and the Inductive Step have been verified, the Principle of Mathematical Induction tells us that  $5^n 1$  is divisible by 4 for all  $n \ge 1$ .



{*b*}

*{c}* 

{*a*}

 $\{a,b\}$ 

## 2.4 수학적 귀납법Mathematical Induction

 $\square$  정리 2.4.6 Let X be a set. If |X| = n, then for all  $n \ge 0$   $|\mathcal{P}(X)| = 2^n$  (4.13)

□ Proof

1) Basis Step 
$$(n = 0)$$
  
If  $n = 0$ ,  $X$  is the empty set.  $\mathcal{P}(X) = \{\emptyset\}$ . Thus,  $|\mathcal{P}(X)| = 1 = 2^0 = 2^n$ . Thus,  $(4.13)$  is true for  $n = 0$ .

2) Inductive Step: Assume that (4.13) holds for n. Let X be a set with n+1 elements. Choose  $x \in X$ .

Lemma: Since each subset S of X that contains x can be paired uniquely with  $S - \{x\}$ , exactly half of the subsets of X contain x, and exactly half of the subsets of X do not contain x.

If  $Y = X - \{x\}$ , Y has n elements. By the inductive assumption,  $|\mathcal{P}(Y)| = 2^n$ . But the subsets of Y are precisely the subsets of X that do not contain x. By the previous Lemma, we conclude that  $|\mathcal{P}(Y)| = |\mathcal{P}(X)|/2$ .

Therefore,  $|\mathcal{P}(X)| = 2|\mathcal{P}(Y)| = 2 \cdot 2^n = 2^{n+1}$ .



- □ A **loop invariant**(루프 불변) is a statement about **program** variables that is true just before a loop begins executing and is also true after each iteration of the loop.
- A loop invariant is true after the loop finishes, at which point the invariant tells us something about the state of the variables.
- uhile (condition)
  // loop body
- We can use mathematical induction to prove that an invariant has the desired behavior.
- □ The Basis Step proves that the invariant is true before the condition that controls looping is tested for the first time.
- The Inductive Step assumes that the invariant is true and then proves that if the condition that controls looping is true, the invariant is true after the loop body executes.

예제 2.4.8 Use a loop invariant to prove that when the pseudocode terminates, fact is equal to n!.

```
i = 1
fact = 1
while (i < n) {
   i = i + 1
   fact = fact * i
}</pre>
```

- $\square$  Sol) We prove that fact = i! is an invariant for the while loop.
- □ Just before the while loop begins executing, i = 1 and fact = 1, so fact = 1!. We have proved the Basis Step.
- □ Assume that fact = i!. If i < n is true, i becomes i + 1 and fact becomes fact \* (i + 1) = i! \* (i + 1) = (i + 1)!. We have proved the Inductive Step. Therefore, fact = i! is an invariant for the while loop.</p>
- □ The while loop terminates when i = n. Because fact = i! is an invariant, at this point, fact = n!.



□ Strong Form of Mathematical Induction Suppose that we have a propositional function S(n) whose domain of discourse is the set of integers greater than or equal to  $n_0$ . Suppose that

Basic Step :  $S(n_0)$  is true

Induction Step : for all  $n > n_0$ , if S(k) is true for all  $k, n_0 \le k < n$ , then S(n) is true.

Then S(n) is true for every integer  $n \ge n_0$ .

 The two forms of mathematical induction are logically equivalent.



- □ 예제 2.5.1 Show that postage 우편 요금 of 4 cents or more can be achieved by using only 2-cent and 5-cent stamps 우표.
- Basis Steps (n = 4, n = 5)We can make 4-cents postage by using two 2-cent stamps. We can make 5-cents postage by using one 5-cent stamp. The Basis Steps are verified.  $n-2 \ge 4$

□ Inductive Step

We assume that  $n \ge 6$  and that postage of k cents or more can be achieved by using only 2-cent and 5-cent stamps for  $4 \le k < n$ . By the inductive assumption, we can make postage of n-2 cents. We add a 2-cent stamp to make n cents postage. The Inductive Step is complete.



 $\square$   $\square$   $\square$   $\square$  2.5.2 If the sequence  $c_1, c_2,...$  is defined by the equations  $c_1 = 0$ ,  $c_n = c_{|n/2|} + n$  for all n > 1.

then 
$$c_n < 2n$$
, for all  $n \ge 1$ .  $c_2 = c_{\lfloor 2/2 \rfloor} + 2 = c_1 + 2 = 2$   
Basis Step  $(n = 1)$   $c_5 = c_{\lfloor 5/2 \rfloor} + 5 = c_2 + 5 = 7$ 

- □ Basis Step (n = 1)Since  $c_1 = 0 < 2 = 2 \cdot 1$ , the Basis Step is verified.
- Inductive Step We assume that  $c_k < 2k$ , for all k,  $1 \le k < n$ , and prove that  $c_n < 2n$ , for all n > 1. Since 1 < n,  $2 \le n$ . Thus  $1 \le n/2 < n$ . Thus  $1 \le |n/2| < n$ . By the inductive assumption

$$c_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} = c_{\rm k} < 2k = 2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$$

Now

$$c_n = c_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} + n < 2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + n \le 2(n/2) + n = 2n.$$

The Inductive Step is complete.



- □ The **Well-Ordering Property** for nonnegative integers: Every nonempty set of nonnegative integers has a least element.
- □ This property is equivalent to the two forms of induction.
- □ 정리 2.5.6 Quotient-Remainder Theorem 몫-나머지 정리 If d and n are integers, d > 0, there exist integers q (quotient) and r (remainder) satisfying n = dq + r,  $0 \le r < d$ . Furthermore, q and r are unique.
- Proof) Let  $X = \{n dk \mid n dk \ge 0, k \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ . We show that X is nonempty using proof by cases. If  $n \ge 0$ , then  $n - d \cdot 0 = n \ge 0$  so n is in X. Suppose that n < 0. Since d is a positive integer,  $1 - d \le 0$ . Thus  $n - dn = n(1 - d) \ge 0$ . In this case, n - dn is in X. Therefore X is nonempty.



- □ Since X is a nonempty set of nonnegative integers, by the Well-Ordering Property, X has a smallest element r. We let q denote the specific value of k for which r = n dq. Then n = dq + r. Since r is in  $X, r \ge 0$ . We use proof by contradiction to show that r < d. Suppose that  $r \ge d$ . Then n d(q + 1) = n dq d = r d. Since  $r d \ge 0$ ,  $r d \in X$  and r d < r. But r is the smallest integer in X. This contradiction shows that r < d.
- □ We have shown that if d and n are integers, d > 0, there exist integers q and r satisfying n = dq + r  $0 \le r < d$ .



 $\square$  We turn now to the uniqueness of q and r. Suppose that

$$n = dq_1 + r_1 \qquad 0 \le r_1 < d$$

and

$$n = dq_2 + r_2 \qquad 0 \le r_2 < d$$

We must show that  $q_1 = q_2$  and  $r_1 = r_2$ .

Subtracting the previous equations, we obtain

$$0 = (dq_1 + r_1) - (dq_2 + r_2) = d(q_1 - q_2) - (r_2 - r_1)$$

which can be rewritten  $d(q_1 - q_2) = r_2 - r_1$ .

The preceding equation shows that d divides  $r_2 - r_1$ .

Because  $0 \le r_1 < d$  and  $0 \le r_2 < d$ ,  $-d < r_2 - r_1 < d$ .

But the only integer between -d and d divisible by d is 0. Therefore,  $r_1 = r_2$ . Thus,  $d(q_1 - q_2) = 0$ ; hence,  $q_1 = q_2$ .

The proof is complete.

