

Section 2.5 Proof of statements in the form of “ $p \vee q$ ”

Since $(p \vee q) \leftrightarrow (\sim p \rightarrow q)$, by Law of Implication, we can then prove $\sim p \rightarrow q$ instead of $p \vee q$. To prove $\sim p \rightarrow q$, we can assume $\sim p$ and show that q is true. Moreover, since $(p \vee q) \equiv (q \vee p)$ and $(q \vee p) \leftrightarrow (\sim q \rightarrow p)$, hence there are two ways to prove $p \vee q$.

- 1) Assume $\sim p$ and show that q is true.
- 2) Assume $\sim q$ and show that p is true

Example 1: Prove that if $(\sim x \wedge y) \rightarrow \sim z$, $\sim(x \vee y) \rightarrow w$, and $\sim x$, then $\sim z \vee w$.

Example 2: Prove that if $a \vee (b \wedge \sim c)$, $\sim a$, $b \rightarrow (d \rightarrow e)$, and $\sim c \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)$, then $[a \vee x \vee d] \rightarrow (y \vee e)$.

Example 3: Prove that if $(x \wedge y \wedge \sim z) \rightarrow \sim y$, then $\sim x \vee (y \rightarrow z)$.

Section 2.6 Proof of statements in the form of “ $p \leftrightarrow q$ ”

Since $(p \leftrightarrow q) \leftrightarrow [(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)]$, by Law of Equivalence, we can then prove $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$ instead of $p \leftrightarrow q$. To prove $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$, we have to prove that $p \rightarrow q$ is true and also $q \rightarrow p$ is true by the method of proving the statements in the form of $p \rightarrow q$.

Example 1: Prove that if $a \rightarrow (b \wedge c)$, $(d \wedge c) \rightarrow (e \wedge \sim a)$, $a \vee (d \rightarrow \sim e)$, and $d \wedge (b \rightarrow e)$, then $\sim e \leftrightarrow \sim a$.

Example 2: Prove that $[p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)] \leftrightarrow [\sim (p \rightarrow r) \rightarrow (q \rightarrow \sim p)]$.

Section 2.7 Proof of statements in the form of “ $(p \vee q) \rightarrow r$ ”

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 [(p \vee q) \rightarrow r] &\equiv [\sim(p \vee q) \vee r] && \text{Law of Implication} \\
 &\equiv [(\sim p \wedge \sim q) \vee r] && \text{De Morgan's Laws} \\
 &\equiv [(\sim p \vee r) \wedge (\sim q \vee r)] && \text{Distributive Laws} \\
 &\equiv [(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)] && \text{Law of Implication}
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can prove $(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$ instead of $(p \vee q) \rightarrow r$. In order to show that

$(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$ is true, we must show that $p \rightarrow r$ is true and also $q \rightarrow r$ is true.

Example 1: Let m and n be integers. Prove that *if m and n are even or m and n are odd, then the sum of m and n is even.*

We have now seen many examples of integers that can be expressed as $2x$ for some integer x . There are precisely the even integers, of course. However, some integers can also be written as $3x$ or $4x$ or as $-5x$ for some integer x . In general, for integers a and b with $a \neq 0$, we say that a **divides** b if there is an integer c such that $b = ac$. In this case, we write $a|b$.

If $a|b$, then we also say b is a **multiple** of a and that a is a **divisor** of b . Thus every even integer is a multiple of 2. If a does not divide b , then we write $a \nmid b$.

Example 2: Let m be any integer. Prove that if 4 divides m or 6 divides m , then $m^2 - 1$ is odd.