## LECTURE 3

# Methods of Proof, Cont'd

Last time we discussed some of the basic techniques for proving propositions. We began with the notion of a **direct proof** and one of its implementations, the **forward-backward method**. Then we discussed an alternative to the direct proof, **proof by contradiction**.

I would like to begin today's lecture with another example of proof by contradiction.

EXAMPLE 3.1. Use the method of proof by contradiction to show that the equation

 $x^2 + 2mx + 2n = 0$ 

has no odd roots if m and n are odd.

This proposition is equivalent to one of the form  $P \Rightarrow Q$  if we take P to be the statement "m and n are odd integers", and Q to be the statement "there exists no odd integer x such that  $x^2 + 2mx + 2n = 0$ ". Not-Q is then the statement that there exists an odd integer x such that  $x^2 + 2mx + 2n = 0$ .

To apply the method of proof by contradiction, we suppose P and not-Q are true and look for a contradiction with known facts.

So let x be an odd integer satisfying

$$x^2 + 2mx + 2n = 0$$

and suppose both m and n are odd. Then

$$x^2 = -2(mx+n) \quad .$$

The right hand side, being a multiple of 2, is clearly even. So  $x^2$  is even. On the other hand, x is supposed to be odd. In your last homework assignment you proved (hopefully) that if x is odd, then  $x^2$  is necessarily odd. We have thus arrived at a contradiction with a known fact. Since P and not-Q can not be simultaneously true, we have

"*P* is true" 
$$\Rightarrow$$
 "not-*Q* is false"

or

 $P \Rightarrow Q$  .

### 1. The Contrapositive Method

The contrapositive method is a variation of the proof by contradiction method in which one tries to work forward from the hypothesis "not-Q is true" to conclude that "not-P" is true. For if we can show that

$$not-Q \Rightarrow not-P$$

then we can conclude that

 $P \Rightarrow Q$ .

The justification for conclusion runs as follows:

'P is true" 
$$\Rightarrow$$
 "not-P is false"

i

"not-P is false" and "not-Q 
$$\Rightarrow$$
 not-P is true"  $\Rightarrow$  "not-Q is false" ii

"not-Q is false"  $\Rightarrow$  "Q is true" *iii* 

EXAMPLE 3.2. Let's use the contrapositive method to prove

**Proposition** If n is an integer and  $n^2$  is an odd integer, then n is odd.

#### proof.

In this proposition the hypothesis P is "n is an integer and  $n^2$  is an odd integer" and the conclusion Q we're trying to reach is "n is odd". So not-Q is "n is even" and not-P is " $n^2$  is even". Thus, in view of the fact that

"not-
$$Q \Rightarrow$$
 not- $P$  is true"  $\Rightarrow$  " $P \Rightarrow Q''$ 

it suffices to prove that if n is even, then  $n^2$  is even. And this we have already done; so we're finished.

#### 2. Proof by Construction

Another method of proof is particularly useful for proving statements involving existential quantifiers (e.g., "there exists at least one ...").

This method works as follows:

In order to prove a statement of the form

it suffices to construct (guess, produce, devise an algorithm to produce, etc.), using the hypothesis "such and such", the object in the conclusion and show that it satisfies the properties "so and so".

EXAMPLE 3.3. Prove that if a < b, then there exists a real number c such that

Proof. Set

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

Then

$$c - a = \frac{a + b - 2a}{2} = \frac{b - a}{2} > 0$$

since b > a; and

$$b - c = \frac{2b - a - b}{2} = \frac{b - a}{2} > 0$$

for the same reason. Thus, we have constructed a number c with the desired properties.

Example 3.4.

**Proposition** If a, b, c, d, e and f are real numbers such that

 $(ad - bc) \neq 0 \quad ,$ 

then the two equations

$$ax + by = e$$
$$cx + dy = f$$

can be solved for x and y.

proof. Our hypothesis is that a, b, c, d, e and f are real numbers such that

$$(ad-bc) \neq 0$$
,

and the conclusion we are trying to prove is that there exists real numbers x and y such that

Now set

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= \frac{de-bf}{ad-bc} &, \\ y' &= \frac{af-ce}{ad-bc} &. \end{aligned}$$

These numbers are well defined because, by hypothesis,  $ad - bc \neq 0$ .

Now insert these expressions for x and y into (3.2). It is easily verifed that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} ax' + by' &=& e \\ cx' + dy' &=& f \end{array}$$

and so we can satisfy the conclusion of the proposition by setting x = x' and y = y'.