Web Solutions for

How to Read and Do Proofs

An Introduction to Mathematical Thought Processes

Fifth Edition

Daniel Solow Department of Operations Weatherhead School of Management Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, OH 44106 e-mail: daniel.solow@case.edu web: http://weatherhead.cwru.edu/solow/



John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Contents

1	Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 1	1
2	Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 2	3
3	Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 3	7
4	Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 4	11
5	Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 5	13
6	Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 6	17
7	Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 7	21
8	Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 8	23
9	Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 9	25
10	Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 10	29
		iii

iv CONTENTS

11 Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 11	31
12 Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 12	33
13 Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 13	35
14 Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 14	39
15 Web Solutions to Exercises in Chapter 15	41
Web Solutions to Exercises in Appendix A	43
Web Solutions to Exercises in Appendix B	47
Web Solutions to Exercises in Appendix C	49
Web Solutions to Exercises in Appendix D	53

- 1.5 a. Hypothesis: A, B and C are sets of real numbers with $A \subseteq B$. Conclusion: $A \cap C \subseteq B \cap C$.
 - b. Hypothesis: For a positive integer n, the function f defined by:

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} n/2, & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ \\ 3n+1, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

For an integer $k \ge 1$, $f^k(n) = f^{k-1}(f(n))$, and $f^1(n) = f(n)$. Conclusion: For any positive integer n, there is an integer k > 0 such that $f^k(n) = 1$.

c. Hypothesis: x is a real number. Conclusion: The minimum value of $x(x-1) \ge -1/4$.

(T = true, F = false)

				,
A	B	C	$A \Rightarrow B$	$(A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow C$
Т	Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	Т	\mathbf{F}	Т	\mathbf{F}
Т	\mathbf{F}	Т	\mathbf{F}	Т
Т	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	Т
\mathbf{F}	Т	Т	Т	Т
\mathbf{F}	Т	\mathbf{F}	Т	\mathbf{F}
\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	Т	Т	Т
\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	Т	\mathbf{F}

2.1 The forward process makes use of the information contained in the hypothesis A. The backward process tries to find a chain of statements leading to the fact that the conclusion B is true.

With the backward process, you start with the statement B that you are trying to conclude is true. By asking and answering key questions, you derive a sequence of new statements with the property that if the sequence of new statements is true, then B is true. The backward process continues until you obtain the statement A or until you can no longer ask and/or answer the key question.

With the forward process, you begin with the statement A that you assume is true. You then derive from A a sequence of new statements that are true as a result of A being true. Every new statement derived from A is directed toward linking up with the last statement obtained in the backward process. The last statement of the backward process acts as the guiding light in the forward process, just as the last statement in the forward process helps you choose the right key question and answer.

2.4 (c) is incorrect because it uses the specific notation given in the problem.

- 2.18 a. Show that the two lines do not intersect.Show that the two lines are both perpendicular to a third line.Show that the two lines are both vertical or have equal slopes.Show that the two lines are each parallel to a third line.Show that the equations of the two lines are identical or have no common solution.
 - b. Show that their corresponding side-angle-sides are equal. Show that their corresponding angle-side-angles are equal. Show that their corresponding side-side-sides are equal. Show that they are both congruent to a third triangle.
- 2.23 (1) How can I show that a triangle is equilateral?
 - (2) Show that the three sides have equal length (or show that the three angles are equal).
 - (3) Show that $\overline{RT} = \overline{ST} = \overline{SR}$ (or show that $\angle R = \angle S = \angle T$).

2.34 For sentence 1: The fact that $c^n = c^2 c^{n-2}$ follows by algebra. The author then substitutes $c^2 = a^2 + b^2$, which is true from the Pythagorean theorem applied to the right triangle.

For sentence 2: For a right triangle, the hypotenuse c is longer than either of the two legs a and b so, c > a, c > b. Because n > 2, $c^{n-2} > a^{n-2}$ and $c^{n-2} > b^{n-2}$ and so, from sentence 1, $c^n = a^2c^{n-2} + b^2c^{n-2} > a^2(a^{n-2}) + b^2(b^{n-2})$.

For sentence 3: Algebra from sentence 2.

2.39 a. The number to the left of each line in the following figure indicates which rule is used.



b. The number to the left of each line in the following figure indicates which rule is used.



c. A: s given A1: ss rule 1 A2: ssss rule 1 B1: sssst rule 4 B: tst rule 3

2.42 **Analysis of Proof.** A key question associated with the conclusion is, "How can I show that a triangle is equilateral?" One answer is to show that all three sides have equal length, specifically,

$$B1: \ \overline{RS} = \overline{ST} = \overline{RT}.$$

To see that $\overline{RS} = \overline{ST}$, work forward from the hypothesis to establish that

B2: Triangle RSU is congruent to triangle SUT.

Specifically, from the hypothesis, SU is a perpendicular bisector of RT, so

 $A1: \ \overline{RU} = \overline{UT}.$

In addition,

 $\begin{array}{rl} A2: & \angle RUS = \angle SUT = 90^{o}.\\ A3: & \overline{SU} = \overline{SU}. \end{array}$

Thus the side-angle-side theorem states that the two triangles are congruent and so B2 has been established.

It remains (from B1) to show that

$$B3: \ \overline{RS} = \overline{RT}.$$

Working forward from the hypothesis you can obtain this because

$$A4: \ \overline{RS} = 2\overline{RU} = \overline{RU} + \overline{UT} = \overline{RT}.$$

Proof. To see that triangle RST is equilateral, it will be shown that $\overline{RS} = \overline{ST} = \overline{RT}$. To that end, the hypothesis that SU is a perpendicular bisector of RT ensures (by the side-angle-side theorem) that triangle RSU is congruent to triangle SUT. Hence, $\overline{RS} = \overline{ST}$. To see that $\overline{RS} = \overline{RT}$, by the hypothesis, one can conclude that $\overline{RS} = 2\overline{RU} = \overline{RU} + \overline{UT} = \overline{RT}$. \Box

- 3.4 (A is the hypothesis and A1 is obtained by working forward one step.)a. A: n is an odd integer.
 - A1: n = 2k + 1, where k is an integer.
 - b. $A: s \text{ and } t \text{ are rational numbers with } t \neq 0.$
 - A1 : s = p/q, where p and q are integers with $q \neq 0$. Also, t = a/b, where $a \neq 0$ and $b \neq 0$ are integers.
 - c. $A: \sin(X) = \cos(X)$.
 - A1: x/z = y/z (or x = y).
 - d. A: a, b, c are integers for which a|b and b|c.
 - A1 : b = pa and c = qb, where p and q are both integers.
- $3.7 \quad (T = true, F = false)$

a. Truth Table for "A AND B."

A	В	"A AND B"
Т	Т	Т
Т	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}
\mathbf{F}	Т	\mathbf{F}
F	\mathbf{F}	F

A	B	NOT B	"A AND NOT B"
Т	Т	F	F
Т	\mathbf{F}	Т	Т
\mathbf{F}	Т	\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}
\mathbf{F}	\mathbf{F}	Т	\mathbf{F}

- 3.14 a. If the four statements in part (a) are true, then you can show that A is equivalent to any of the alternatives by using Exercise 3.13. For instance, to show that A is equivalent to D, you already know that "D implies A." By Exercise 3.13, because "A implies B," "B implies C," and "C implies D," you have that "A implies D."
 - b. The advantage of the approach in part (a) is that only four proofs are required $(A \Rightarrow B, B \Rightarrow C, C \Rightarrow D$, and $D \Rightarrow A$) as opposed to the six proofs $(A \Rightarrow B, B \Rightarrow A, A \Rightarrow C, C \Rightarrow A, A \Rightarrow D$, and $D \Rightarrow A$) required to show that A is equivalent to each of the three alternatives.

3.20 Analysis of Proof. The key question for this problem is, "How can I show that a triangle is isosceles?" This proof answers this question by recognizing that the conclusion of Proposition 3 is the same as the conclusion you are trying to reach. So, if the current hypothesis implies that the hypothesis of Proposition 3 is true, then the triangle is isosceles. Because triangle UVW is a right triangle, on matching up the notation, all that remains to be shown is that $\sin(U) = \sqrt{u/2v}$ implies $w = \sqrt{2uv}$. To that end,

$$A: \sin(U) = \sqrt{\frac{u}{2v}}$$
 (by hypothesis)

 $A1: \sin(U) = \frac{u}{w}$ (by definition of sine)

$$A2: \ \frac{u}{w} = \sqrt{\frac{u}{2v}} \quad (\text{from } A \text{ and } A1)$$

- A3: $\frac{u}{2v} = \frac{u^2}{w^2}$ (square both sides of A2)
- $A4: uw^2 = 2vu^2$ (cross-multiply A3)
- $A5: w^2 = 2vu$ (divided A4 by u)
- $B: w = \sqrt{2uv}$ (take the square root of both sides of A5)

It has been shown that the hypothesis of Proposition 3 is true, so the conclusion of Proposition 3 is also true. Hence triangle UVW is isosceles.

3.26 Analysis of Proof. The forward-backward method gives rise to the key question, "How can I show that a triangle is isosceles?" Using the definition of an isosceles triangle, you must show that two of its sides are equal, which, in this case, means you must show that

$$B1: u = v.$$

Working forward from the hypothesis, you have the following statements and reasons

Statement	Reason	
$A1:\sin(U)=\sqrt{u/2v}.$	Hypothesis.	
$A2: \sqrt{u/2v} = u/w.$	Definition of sine.	
$A3: w^2 = 2uv.$	From $A2$ by algebra.	
$A4: u^2 + v^2 = w^2.$	Pythagorean theorem.	
$A5: u^2 + v^2 = 2uv$	Substituting w^2 from A3 in A4.	
$A6: u^2 - 2uv + v^2 = 0.$	From $A5$ by algebra.	
A7: u - v = 0.	Factoring $A6$ and taking square root.	

Thus, u = v, completing the proof.

Proof. Because $\sin(U) = \sqrt{u/2v}$ and also $\sin(U) = u/w$, $\sqrt{u/2v} = u/w$, or, $w^2 = 2uv$. Now from the Pythagorean theorem, $w^2 = u^2 + v^2$. On substituting 2uv for w^2 and then performing algebraic manipulations, one has u = v. \Box

4.8 Analysis of Proof. The appearance of the key words "there is" in the conclusion suggests using the construction method to find a real number x such that $x^2 - 5x/2 + 3/2 = 0$. Factoring this equation means you want to find a real number x such that (x - 3/2)(x - 1) = 0. So the desired real number is either x = 1 or x = 3/2 which, when substituted in $x^2 - 5x/2 + 3/2$, yields 0. The real number is not unique as either x = 1 or x = 3/2 works.

Proof. Factoring $x^2 - 5x/2 + 3/2 = 0$ yields (x - 3/2)(x - 1) = 0, so x = 1 or x = 3/2. Thus, there exists a real number, namely, x = 1 or x = 3/2, such that $x^2 - 5x/2 + 3/2 = 0$. The real number is not unique.

4.15 The proof is not correct. The mistake occurs because the author uses the same symbol x for the element that is in $R \cap S$ and in $S \cap T$ where, in fact, the element in $R \cap S$ need not be the same as the element in $S \cap T$.

- 5.3 a. \exists a mountain \ni \forall other mountains, this one is taller than the others. b. \forall angle t, $\sin(2t) = 2\sin(t)\cos(t)$.

 - c. \forall nonnegative real numbers p and q, $\sqrt{pq} \ge (p+q)/2$. d. \forall real numbers x and y with x < y, \exists a rational number $r \ni x < r < y$.

5.9	Key Question:	How can I show that a real number (namely, v) is an upper bound
		for a set of real numbers (namely, S)?
	Key Answer:	Show that every element in the set is \leq the number and so it must
		be shown that
	B1:	For every element $s \in S, s \leq v$.
	A1 :	Choose an element $s' \in S$ for which it must be shown that
	B2:	$s' \leq v.$

Analysis of Proof. The appearance of the quantifier "for every" in 5.18the conclusion suggests using the choose method, whereby one chooses

A1 : An element $t \in T$,

for which it must be shown that

B1: t is an upper bound for the set S.

A key question associated with B1 is, "How can I show that a real number (namely, t) is an upper bound for a set (namely, S)?" By definition, one must show that

B2: For every element $x \in S, x \leq t$.

The appearance of the quantifier "for every" in the backward statement B2 suggests using the choose method, whereby one chooses

A2: An element $x \in S$,

for which it must be shown that

 $B3: x \leq t.$

To do so, work forward from A2 and the definition of the set S in the hypothesis to obtain

 $A3: x(x-3) \le 0.$

From A3, either $x \ge 0$ and $x - 3 \le 0$, or, $x \le 0$ and $x - 3 \ge 0$. But the latter cannot happen, so

 $A4: x \ge 0 \text{ and } x - 3 \le 0.$

From A4,

 $A5: x \leq 3.$

But, from A1 and the definition of the set T in the hypothesis

 $A6: t \ge 3.$

Combining A5 and A6 yields B3, thus completing the proof.

5.22 Analysis of Proof. The forward-backward method gives rise to the key question, "How can I show that a set (namely, C) is convex?" One answer is by the definition, whereby it must be shown that

B1: For all elements x and y in C, and for all real numbers t with $0 \le t \le 1, tx + (1-t)y \in C$.

The appearance of the quantifiers "for all" in the backward statement B1 suggests using the choose method to choose

A1 : Elements x and y in C, and a real number t with $0 \le t \le 1$,

for which it must be shown that

 $B2: tx + (1-t)y \in C$, that is, $a[tx + (1-t)y] \le b$.

Turning to the forward process, because x and y are in C (see A1),

 $A2: ax \leq b \text{ and } ay \leq b.$

Multiplying both sides of the two inequalities in A2, respectively, by the nonnegative numbers t and 1-t (see A1) and adding the inequalities yields:

 $A3: \ tax + (1-t)ay \le tb + (1-t)b.$

Performing algebra on A3 yields B2, and so the proof is complete the proof.

Proof. Let t be a real number with $0 \le t \le 1$, and let x and y be in C. Then $ax \le b$ and $ay \le b$. Multiplying both sides of these inequalities by $t \ge 0$ and $1 - t \ge 0$, respectively, and adding yields $a[tx + (1 - t)y] \le b$. Hence, $tx + (1 - t)y \in C$. Therefore, C is a convex set and the proof is complete. \square

6.1 The reason you need to show that Y has the certain property is because you only know that the something happens for objects with the certain property. You do not know that the something happens for objects that do not satisfy the certain property. Therefore, if you want to use specialization to claim that the something happens for this particular object Y, you must be sure that Y has the certain property.

6.16 Analysis of Proof. The forward-backward method gives rise to the key question, "How can I show that a function (namely, f) is \geq another function (namely, h) on a set (namely, S)?" According to the definition, it is necessary to show that

B1: For every element $x \in S$, $f(x) \ge h(x)$.

Recognizing the key words "for all" in the backward statement B1, the choose method is used to choose

A1: An element $x \in S$,

for which it must be shown that

 $B2: f(x) \ge h(x).$

Turning now to the forward process, because $f \ge g$ on S, by definition,

A2: For every element $y \in S$, $f(y) \ge g(y)$.

(Note the use of the symbol y so as not to overlap with the symbol x in A1.) Likewise, because $g \ge h$ on S, by definition,

A3 : For every element $z \in S$, $g(z) \ge h(z)$.

Recognizing the key words "for every" in the forward statements A2 and A3, the desired conclusion in B2 is obtained by specialization. Specifically, specializing A2 with y = x (noting that $x \in S$ from A1) yields:

 $A4: f(x) \ge g(x).$

Likewise, specializing A3 with z = x (noting that $x \in S$ from A1) yields:

 $A5: g(x) \ge h(x).$

Combining A4 and A5, you have

 $A6: f(x) \ge g(x) \ge h(x).$

The proof is now complete because A6 is the same as B2.

Proof. Let $x \in S$. From the hypothesis that $f \geq g$ on S, it follows that $f(x) \geq g(x)$. Likewise, because $g \geq h$ on S, you have $g(x) \geq h(x)$. Combining these two means that $f(x) \geq g(x) \geq h(x)$ and so $f \geq h$ on S. \Box

6.20 Analysis of Proof. The appearance of the quantifier "for all" in the conclusion indicates that you should use the choose method to choose

A1 : A real number $s' \ge 0$,

for which it must be shown that

B1: The function s'f is convex.

An associated key question is, "How can I show that a function (namely, s'f) is convex?" Using the definition in Exercise 5.2(c), one answer is to show that

B2: For all real numbers x and y, and for all t with $0 \le t \le 1$, $s'f(tx + (1-t)y) \le ts'f(x) + (1-t)s'f(y)$.

The appearance of the quantifier "for all" in the backward process suggests using the choose method to choose

A2 : Real numbers x' and y', and $0 \le t' \le 1$,

for which it must be shown that

$$B3: s'f(t'x' + (1 - t')y') \le t's'f(x') + (1 - t')s'f(y').$$

The desired result is obtained by working forward from the hypothesis that f is a convex function. By the definition in Exercise 5.2(c), you have that

A3 : For all real numbers x and y, and for all t with $0 \le t \le 1$, $f(tx + (1-t)y) \le tf(x) + (1-t)f(y)$.

Specializing the statement in A3 to x = x', y = y', and t = t' (noting that $0 \le t' \le 1$) yields

$$A4: f(t'x' + (1 - t')y') \le t'f(x') + (1 - t')f(y').$$

The desired statement B3 is obtained by multiplying both sides of the inequality in A4 by the nonnegative number s', thus completing the proof.

Proof. Let $s' \ge 0$. To show that s'f is convex, let x' and y' be real numbers, and let t' with $0 \le t' \le 1$. It will be shown that $s'f(t'x' + (1 - t')y') \le t's'f(x') + (1 - t')s'f(y')$.

Because f is a convex function by hypothesis, it follows from the definition that $f(t'x' + (1-t')y') \leq t'f(x') + (1-t')f(y')$. The desired result is obtained by multiplying both sides of this inequality by the nonnegative number s'.

7.20 Analysis of Proof. The forward-backward method gives rise to the key question, "How can I show that a function (namely, f) is bounded above?" One answer is by the definition, whereby one must show that

B1: There is a real number y such that for every real number $x, -x^2 + 2x \le y$.

The appearance of the quantifier "there is" in the backward statement B1 suggests using the construction method to produce the desired value for y. Trial and error might lead you to construct y = 1 (any value of $y \ge 1$ will also work). Now it must be shown that this value of y = 1 is correct, that is:

B2: For every real number $x, -x^2 + 2x \le 1$.

The appearance of the quantifier "for all" in the backward statement B2 suggests using the choose method to choose

A1: A real number x,

for which it must be shown that

 $B3: -x^2 + 2x \le 1$, that is, $x^2 - 2x + 1 \ge 0$.

But because $x^2 - 2x + 1 = (x - 1)^2$, this number is always ≥ 0 . Thus B3 is true, completing the proof.

Proof. To see that the function $f(x) = -x^2 + 2x$ is bounded above, it will be shown that for all real numbers $x, -x^2 + 2x \le 1$. To that end, let x be any real number. Then $x^2 - 2x + 1 = (x - 1)^2 \ge 0$, thus completing the proof. \Box

7.22 Analysis of Proof. The first key words in the conclusion from the left are "for every," so the choose method is used to choose

A1 : A real number $\epsilon > 0$,

for which it must be shown that

B1: There is an element $x \in S$ such that $x > 1 - \epsilon$.

Recognizing the key words "there is" in the backward statement B1, the construction method is used to produce the desired element in S. To that end, from the hint, you can write S as follows:

 $S = \{ \text{real numbers } x : \text{there is an integer } n \ge 2 \text{ with } x = 1 - 1/n \}.$

Thus, you can construct x = 1 - 1/n, for an appropriate choice of the integer $n \ge 2$. To find the value for n, from B1, you want

 $x = 1 - 1/n > 1 - \epsilon$, that is, $1/n < \epsilon$, that is, $n > 1/\epsilon$.

In summary, noting that $\epsilon > 0$ from A1, if you let $n \ge 2$ be any integer $> 1/\epsilon$, then $x = 1 - 1/n \in S$ satisfies the desired property in B1, namely, that $x = 1 - 1/n > 1 - \epsilon$. The proof is now complete.

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$. To see that there is an element $x \in S$ such that $x > 1 - \epsilon$, let $n \ge 2$ be an integer for which $n > 1/\epsilon$. It then follows from the defining property that $x = 1 - 1/n \in S$ and by the choice of n that $x = 1 - 1/n > 1 - \epsilon$. It has thus been shown that for every real number $\epsilon > 0$, there is an element $x \in S$ such that $x > 1 - \epsilon$, thus completing the proof. \Box



THERE ARE NO APPLICABLE EXERCISES FOR CHAPTER 8.

9.12 Analysis of Proof. By contradiction, assume A and NOT B, that is:

 $\begin{array}{rl} A: & n-1,\,n,\, {\rm and}\,\,n+1 \mbox{ are consecutive positive integers.} \\ A1 \ (NOT \ B): & (n+1)^3=n^3+(n-1)^3. \end{array}$

A contradiction is reached by showing that

B1: $n^2(n-6) = 2$ and $n^2(n-6) \ge 49$.

To that end, rewriting A1 by algebra, you have:

 $\begin{array}{rl} A2: & n^3+3n^2+3n+1=n^3+n^3-3n^2+3n-1, \mbox{ or } \\ A3: & n^3-6n^2=2, \mbox{ or } \\ A4: & n^2(n-6)=2. \end{array}$

From A4, because $n^2 > 0$, it must be that

A5: n-6 > 0, that is, $n \ge 7$.

But when $n \ge 7$, $n - 6 \ge 1$, and $n^2 \ge 49$, so

 $A6: n^2(n-6) \ge n^2 \ge 49.$

Now A6 contradicts A4 because A6 states that $n^2(n-6) \ge 49$ while A4 states that $n^2(n-6) = 2$. This contradiction completes the proof.

Proof. Assume, to the contrary, that the three consecutive integers n-1, n, and n+1 satisfy

$$(n+1)^3 = n^3 + (n-1)^3.$$

Expanding these expressions and rewriting yields

$$n^2(n-6) = 2.$$

Because $n^2 > 0$, n - 6 > 0, that is, $n \ge 7$. But then $n^2(n - 6) \ge n^2 \ge 49$. This contradicts the fact that $n^2(n - 6) = 2$, thus completing the proof. \Box

9.17 **Analysis of Proof.** When using the contradiction method, you can assume the hypothesis that

 $A: x \ge 0, y \ge 0, x + y = 0,$

and also that

A1 (NOT B): Either $x \neq 0$ or $y \neq 0$.

From A1, suppose first that

 $A2: x \neq 0.$

Because $x \ge 0$ from A, it must be that

A3: x > 0.

A contradiction to the fact that $y \ge 0$ is reached by showing that

B1: y < 0.

Specifically, because x + y = 0 from A,

A4: y = -x.

Because -x < 0 from A3, a contradiction has been reached. A similar argument applies for the case where $y \neq 0$ (see A1).

Proof. Assume that $x \ge 0$, $y \ge 0$, x + y = 0, and that either $x \ne 0$ or $y \ne 0$. If $x \ne 0$, then x > 0 and y = -x < 0, but this contradicts the fact that $y \ge 0$. Similarly, if $y \ne 0$, then y > 0, and x = -y < 0, but this contradicts the fact that $x \ge 0$. \Box

9.24 Analysis of Proof. By the contradiction method, assume that

A1: The number of primes is finite.

From A1, there will be a prime number that is larger than all the other prime numbers. So,

A2: Let *n* be the largest prime number.

Consider the number n! + 1 and let

A3: p be any prime number that divides n! + 1.

A contradiction is reached by showing that

B1: p > n.

To see that p > n, by contradiction, suppose that 1 . From the proposition in Exercise 9.23, it follows that <math>p does not divide n! + 1, which contradicts A3 and completes the proof.

Proof. Assume, to the contrary, that there are a finite number of primes. Let n be the largest prime and let p be any prime divisor of n! + 1. Now if 1 , then by the proposition in Exercise 9.23, it follows that <math>p does not divide n! + 1. This contradiction completes the proof. \Box

9.27 Analysis of Proof. The proof is by contradiction, so the author assumes that

A1 (NOT B): The polynomial $x^4 + 2x^2 + 2x + 2$ can be expressed as the product of the two polynomials $x^2 + ax + b$ and $x^2 + cx + d$ in which a, b, c, and d are integers.

Working forward by multiplying the two polynomials, you have that

A2:
$$x^4 + 2x^2 + 2x + 2 = (x^2 + ax + b)(x^2 + cx + d) = x^4 + (a + c)x^3 + (b + ac + d)x^2 + (bc + ad)x + bd.$$

Equating coefficients of like powers of x on both sides, it follows that

From A6, b is odd (± 1) and d is even (± 2) or vice versa. Suppose, first, that

A7 : Case 1: b is odd and d is even.

(Subsequently, the case when b is even and d is odd is considered.) It now follows that, because the right side of A5 is even, the left side is also. Because d is even, so is ad. It must therefore be the case that

A8: bc is even.

However, from A7, b is odd, so it must be that

A9: c is even.

But then, from the left side of A4, you have

A10: b + ac + d is odd + even + even, which is odd.

This is because b is odd (see A7), ac is even (from A9), and d is even (see A7). However, A10 is a contradiction because the right side of A4, namely, 2, is even. This establishes a contradiction for Case 1 in A7. A similar contradiction is reached in Case 2, when b is even and d is odd, thus completing the proof.

10.17 Analysis of Proof. With the contrapositive method, you assume

A1 (NOT B): There is an integer solution, say m, to the equation $n^2 + n - c = 0.$

You must then show that

B1 (NOT A): c is not odd, that is, c is even.

But from A1, you have that

A2: $c = m + m^2$.

Observe that $m + m^2 = m(m + 1)$ is the product of two consecutive integers and is therefore even, thus establishing B1 and completing the proof.

Proof. Assume that there is an integer solution, say m, to the equation $n^2 + n - c = 0$. It will be shown that c is even. But $c = m + m^2 = m(m+1)$ is even because the product of two consecutive integers is even.

10.20 Analysis of Proof. By the contrapositive method, you can assume

A1 (NOT B): The quadrilateral RSTU is not a rectangle.

You must then show that

B1 (NOT A): There is an obtuse angle.

The appearance of the quantifier "there is" in the backward statement B1 suggests turning to the forward process to construct the obtuse angle.

Working forward from A1, you can conclude that

A2 : At least one angle of the quadrilateral is not 90 degrees, say angle R.

If angle R has more than 90 degrees, then R is the desired angle and the proof is complete. Otherwise,

A3: Angle R has less than 90 degrees.

Because the sum of all the angles in RSTU is 360 degrees, A3 means that

A4 : The remaining angles of the quadrilateral must add up to more than 270 degrees.

Among these three angles that add up to more than 270 degrees, one of them must be greater than 90 degrees, and that is the desired obtuse angle. The proof is now complete.

Proof. Assume that the quadrilateral RSTU is not a rectangle, and hence, one of its angles, say R, is not 90 degrees. An obtuse angle will be found. If angle R has more than 90 degrees, then R is the desired obtuse angle. Otherwise the remaining three angles add up to more than 270 degrees. Thus one of the remaining three angles is obtuse, and so the proof is complete. \Box

10.22 Analysis of Proof. By the contrapositive method, you can assume

A1 (NOT B): x < 0.

It must be shown that

B1 (NOT A): There is a real number $\epsilon > 0$ such that $x < -\epsilon$.

Recognizing the key words "there is" in the backward statement B1, the construction method is used to produce the desired $\epsilon > 0$. Turning to the forward process to do so, from A1, because x < 0, construct ϵ as any value with $0 < \epsilon < -x$. (Note that this construction is possible because -x > 0.) By design, $\epsilon > 0$ and, because $\epsilon < -x$, it follows that $x < -\epsilon$. Thus ϵ has all the needed properties in B1, and the proof is complete.

Proof. Assume, to the contrary, that x < 0. It will be shown that there is a real number $\epsilon > 0$ such that $x < -\epsilon$. To that end, construct ϵ as any value with $0 < \epsilon < -x$ (noting that this is possible because -x > 0). Clearly $\epsilon > 0$ and because $\epsilon < -x$, $x < -\epsilon$, thus completing the proof. \Box

11.10 Analysis of Proof. According to the indirect uniqueness method, one must first construct a real number x for which mx + b = 0. But because the hypothesis states the $m \neq 0$, you can construct

$$A1: x = -b/m.$$

This value is correct because

A2: mx + b = m(-b/m) + b = -b + b = 0.

To establish the uniqueness by the indirect uniqueness method, suppose that

A3 : y is a real number with $y \neq x$ such that my + b = 0.

A contradiction to the hypothesis that $m \neq 0$ is reached by showing that

B1: m = 0.

Specifically, from A2 and A3,

A4: mx + b = my + b.

Subtracting the right side of the equality in A4 from the left side and rewriting yields

A5: m(x-y) = 0.

On dividing both sides of the equality in A5 by the nonzero number x - y (see A3), it follows that m = 0. This contradiction establishes the uniqueness.

Proof. To construct the number x for which mx + b = 0, let x = -b/m (because $m \neq 0$). Then mx + b = m(-b/m) + b = 0.

Now suppose that $y \neq x$ and also that my + b = 0. Then mx + b = my + b, and so m(x - y) = 0. But because $x - y \neq 0$, it must be that m = 0. This contradicts the hypothesis that $m \neq 0$ and completes the proof. \Box

12.3 a. The time to use induction instead of the choose method to show that, "For every integer $n \ge n_0$, P(n) is true" is when you can relate P(n) to P(n-1), for then you can use the induction hypothesis that P(n-1) is true, and this should help you establish that P(n) is true. If you were to use the choose method, you would choose

A1 : An integer $n \ge n_0$,

for which it must be shown that

B1: P(n) is true.

With the choose method, you cannot use the assumption that P(n-1) is true to do so.

b. It is not possible to use induction when the object is a real number because showing that P(n) implies P(n+1) "skips over" many values of the object. As a result, the statement will not have been proved for such values.

12.9 **Proof.** First it is shown that P(n) is true for n = 5. But $2^5 = 32$ and $5^2 = 25$, so $2^5 > 5^2$ and so P(n) is true for n = 5. Assuming that P(n) is true, you must then prove that P(n+1) is true. So assume

 $P(n): 2^n > n^2.$

It must be shown that

$$P(n+1): 2^{n+1} > (n+1)^2.$$

Starting with the left side of P(n + 1) and using the fact that P(n) is true, you have:

$$2^{n+1} = 2(2^n) > 2(n^2).$$

To obtain P(n + 1), it must still be shown that for n > 5, $2n^2 > (n + 1)^2 = n^2 + 2n + 1$, or, by subtracting $n^2 + 2n - 1$ from both sides and factoring, that $(n - 1)^2 > 2$. This last statement is true because, for n > 5, $(n - 1)^2 \ge 4^2 = 16 > 2$. \Box

12.17 **Proof.** For n = 1 the statement becomes:

$$P(1): \ [\cos(x) + i\sin(x)]^1 = \cos(1x) + i\sin(1x).$$

Now P(1) is true because both sides evaluate to $\cos(x) + i\sin(x)$.

Now assume the statement is true for n-1, that is:

$$P(n-1): \ [\cos(x) + i\sin(x)]^{n-1} = \cos((n-1)x) + i\sin((n-1)x).$$

It must be shown that P(n) is true, that is:

$$P(n): [\cos(x) + i\sin(x)]^n = \cos(nx) + i\sin(nx).$$

Using P(n-1) and the facts that

$$cos(a+b) = cos(a) cos(b) - sin(a) sin(b),$$

$$sin(a+b) = sin(a) cos(b) + cos(a) sin(b),$$

starting with the left side of P(n), you have:

$$\begin{aligned} [\cos(x) + i\sin(x)]^n &= [\cos(x) + i\sin(x)]^{n-1}[\cos(x) + i\sin(x)] \\ &= [\cos((n-1)x) + i\sin((n-1)x)][\cos(x) + i\sin(x)] \\ &= [\cos((n-1)x)\cos(x) - \sin((n-1)x)\sin(x)] + \\ &\quad i[\sin((n-1)x)\cos(x) + \cos((n-1)x)\sin(x)] \\ &= \cos(nx) + i\sin(nx). \end{aligned}$$

This establishes that P(n) is true, thus completing the proof. \Box

12.20 The author relates P(n + 1) to P(n) by using the product rule of differentiation to express

$$[x(x^{n})]' = (x)'(x^{n}) + x(x^{n})'.$$

The author then uses the induction hypothesis to replace $(x^n)'$ with nx^{n-1} .

12.25 The proof is incorrect because when n = 1 and r = 1, the right side of P(1) is undefined because you cannot divide by zero. A similar problem arises throughout the rest of the proof.

13.6 The author uses a proof by cases when the following statement containing the key words "either/or" is encountered in the forward process:

A1: Either the factor b is odd or even.

Accordingly, the author considers the following two cases:

Case 1: The factor b is odd. The author then works forward from this information to establish the contradiction that the left side of equation (2) is odd and yet is equal to the even number 2.

Case 2: The factor b is even. The author claims, without providing details, that this case also leads to a contradiction.

13.11 Analysis of Proof. With this proof by elimination, you assume that

$$A: \quad x^3 + 3x^2 - 9x - 27 \ge 0 \text{ and} \\ A1 \ (NOT \ D): \quad x < 3.$$

It must be shown that

B1 (C): $x \leq -3$.

By factoring A, it follows that

$$A2: x^3 + 3x^2 - 9x - 27 = (x - 3)(x + 3)^2 \ge 0.$$

Dividing both sides of A2 by x - 3 < 0 (from A1) yields

 $A3: (x+3)^2 \le 0.$

Because $(x+3)^2$ is also ≥ 0 , from A3, it must be that

 $A4: (x+3)^2 = 0$, so x+3 = 0, that is, x = -3.

Thus B1 is true, completing the proof.

Proof. Assume that $x^3 + 3x^2 - 9x - 27 \ge 0$ and x < 3. Then it follows that $x^3 + 3x^2 - 9x - 27 = (x - 3)(x + 3)^2 \ge 0$. Because x < 3, $(x + 3)^2$ must be 0, so x + 3 = 0, that is, x = -3. Thus, $x \le -3$, completing the proof. \Box

13.12 Analysis of Proof. Observe that the conclusion can be written as:

B: Either a = b or a = -b.

The key words "either/or" in the backward process now suggest proceeding with a proof by elimination, in which you can assume the hypothesis and

 $A1: a \neq b.$

It must be shown that

B1: a = -b.

Working forward from the hypotheses that a|b and b|a, by definition:

A2: There is an integer k such that b = ka.

A3: There is an integer m such that a = mb.

Substituting a = mb in the equality in A2 yields:

A4: b = kmb.

If b = 0 then, from A3, a = 0 and so B1 is clearly true and the proof is complete. Thus, you can assume that $b \neq 0$. Therefore, on dividing both sides of the equality in A4 by b you obtain:

A5: km = 1.

From A5 and the fact that k and m are integers (see A2 and A3), it must be that

A6: Either (k = 1 and m = 1) or (k = -1 and m = -1).

Recognizing the key words "either/or" in the forward statement A6, a proof by cases is used.

Case 1: k = 1 and m = 1. In this case, A2 leads to a = b, which cannot happen according to A1.

Case 2: k = -1 and m = -1. In this case, from A2, it follows that a = -b, which is precisely B1, thus completing the proof.

Proof. To see that $a = \pm b$, assume that a|b, b|a, and $a \neq b$. It will be shown that a = -b. By definition, it follows that there are integers k and m such that b = ka and a = mb. Consequently, b = kmb. If b = 0, then a = mb = 0 and so a = -b. Thus, assume that $b \neq 0$. It then follows that km = 1. Because k and m are integers, it must be that k = m = 1 or k = m = -1. However, because $a \neq b$, it must be that k = m = -1. From this it follows that a = mb = -b, and so the proof is complete. \Box



14.7 Analysis of Proof. Recognizing the key word "min" in the conclusion and letting $z = \max\{ub : ua \le c, u \ge 0\}$, the max/min methods results in the following equivalent quantified statement:

B1: For every real number x with $ax \ge b$ and $x \ge 0$, it follows that $cx \ge z = \max\{ub : ua \le c, u \ge 0\}$.

The key words "for every" in the backward statement B1 suggest using the choose method to choose

A1 : A real number x with $ax \ge b$ and $x \ge 0$,

for which it must be shown that

 $B2: cx \ge \max\{ub: ua \le c, u \ge 0\}.$

Recognizing the key word "max" in B2, the max/min methods lead to the need to prove the following equivalent quantified statement:

B3 : For every real number u with $ua \le c$ and $u \ge 0$, $cx \ge ub$.

The key words "for every" in the backward statement B3 suggest using the choose method to choose

A2: A real number u with $ua \leq c$ and $u \geq 0$,

for which it must be shown that

 $B4: cx \ge ub.$

To reach B4, multiply both sides of $ax \ge b$ in A1 by $u \ge 0$ to obtain

 $A3:\ uax\geq ub.$

Likewise, multiply both sides of $ua \leq c$ in A2 by $x \geq 0$ to obtain

 $A4:\ uax\leq cx.$

The desired conclusion in B4 that $cx \ge ub$ follows by combining A3 and A4.

Proof. To reach the desired conclusion that $cx \ge ub$, let x and u be real numbers with $ax \ge b$, $x \ge 0$, $ua \le c$, and $u \ge 0$. Multiplying $ax \ge b$ through by $u \ge 0$ and $ua \le c$ through by $x \ge 0$, it follows that $ub \le uax \le cx$. \Box

- 15.5 a. Using induction, you would first have to show that $4! > 4^2$. Then you would assume that $n! > n^2$ and $n \ge 4$, and show that $(n+1)! > (n+1)^2$.
 - b. Using the choose method, you would choose an integer m for which $m \ge 4$. You would then try to show that $m! > m^2$.
 - c. Converting the statement to the form, "If ... then ..." you obtain, "If n is an integer with $n \ge 4$, then $n! > n^2$." With the forwardbackward method, you would then assume that n is an integer with $n \ge 4$ and work forward to show that $n! > n^2$.
 - d. Using contradiction, you would assume that there is an integer $n \ge 4$ such that $n! \le n^2$ and then work forward to reach a contradiction.

Appendix A Web Solutions to Exercises

A.2 One different key question is, "How can I show that the intersection of two sets is a subset of another set." (Other answers are possible.)

A.8 Analysis of Proof. The first step of induction is to show that the statement is true for n = 1 which, for this exercise, means you must show that the following statement is true:

P(1): If the sets S and T each have n = 1 elements, then $S \times T$ has $1^2 = 1$ element.

Now P(1) is true because if $S = \{s\}$ and $T = \{t\}$, then $S \times T = \{(s,t)\}$, which has exactly one element.

The next step of induction is to assume that the statement is true for n, that is, assume that

P(n): If the sets S and T each have n elements, then $S \times T$ has n^2 elements.

44 WEB SOLUTIONS TO EXERCISES IN APPENDIX A

You must then show that the statement is true for n + 1, that is, you must show that

P(n+1): If the sets S and T each have
$$n + 1$$
 elements, then $S \times T$ has $(n + 1)^2 = n^2 + 2n + 1$ elements.

The key to a proof by induction is to write P(n + 1) in terms of P(n). To that end, suppose that

$$S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n, s_{n+1}\}$$
 and $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_n, t_{n+1}\}.$

Letting S' and T' be the sets consisting of the first n elements of S and T, respectively, from the induction hypothesis you know that $S' \times T'$ has n^2 elements. It remains to show that $S \times T$ contains 2n + 1 elements in addition to the n^2 elements of $S' \times T'$. But, the remaining elements of $S \times T$ consist of the following. For the element $s_{n+1} \in S$, you can construct the following additional n elements of $S \times T$: $(s_{n+1}, t_1), \ldots, (s_{n+1}, t_n)$. Likewise, for the element $t_{n+1} \in T$, you can construct the following additional n elements of $S \times T$: $(s_1, t_{n+1}), \ldots, (s_n, t_{n+1})$. The final element of $S \times T$ is (s_{n+1}, t_{n+1}) . The proof is now complete.

Proof. If the sets S and T each have n = 1 elements, then $S \times T$ has $1^2 = 1$ element because if $S = \{s\}$ and $T = \{t\}$, then $S \times T = \{(s, t)\}$, which has exactly one element.

Assume now that the statement is true for n. It must be shown that if the sets S and T each have n + 1 elements, then $S \times T$ has $(n + 1)^2 = n^2 + 2n + 1$ elements. To that end, letting S' and T' be the sets consisting of the first n elements of S and T, respectively, you can count the following number of elements in $S \times T$:

 $\begin{array}{ll} S' \times T' & n^2 \text{ elements by the induction hypothesis} \\ (s_{n+1},t_1),\ldots,(s_{n+1},t_n) & n \text{ elements} \\ (s_1,t_{n+1}),\ldots,(s_n,t_{n+1}) & n \text{ elements} \\ (s_{n+1},t_{n+1}) & 1 \text{ element} \end{array}$

Putting together the pieces, $S \times T$ has $n^2 + n + n + 1 = (n + 1)^2$ elements, and so the proof is complete. \Box

A.14 The desired condition for f(x) = ax + b to be injective is that $a \neq 0$, as established in the following proof.

Analysis of Proof. A key question associated with the conclusion is, "How can I show that a function (namely, f(x) = ax + b) is injective?" Using the definition, one answer is to show that

B1: For all real numbers u and v with $u \neq v$, $au + b \neq av + b$.

Recognizing the key words "for all" in the backward statement B1, you should now use the choose method to choose **A1:** Real numbers u and v with $u \neq v$,

for which you must show that

B2: $au + b \neq av + b$.

Recognizing the key word "not" in B2 (and also in A1), you should now consider using either the contradiction or contrapositive method. Here, the contrapositive method is used. So, you can assume that

A2 (NOT B2): au + b = av + b.

According to the contrapositive method, you must now show that

B3 (NOT A1): u = v.

You can obtain B3 by working forward from A2 and the assumption that $a \neq 0$, as follows:

 $\begin{array}{ll} au+b=av+b & (\text{from } A2) \\ au=av & (\text{subtract } b \text{ from both sides}) \\ u=v & (\text{divide both sides by } a\neq 0). \end{array}$

The proof is now complete.

Proof. To show that the function f(x) = ax + b is injective, assuming that $a \neq 0$, let u and v be real numbers with f(u) = f(v), that is, au + b = av + b. It will be shown that u = v, but this is true because

 $au + b = av + b \quad (\text{from } A2)$ $au = av \quad (\text{subtract } b \text{ from both sides})$ $u = v \quad (\text{divide both sides by } a \neq 0).$

The proof is now complete. \Box

Appendix B Web Solutions to Exercises

- B.10 a. A common key question associated with the properties in Table B.2 is, "How can I show that two matrices are equal?"
 - b. Using the definition, one answer to the key question in part (a) is to show that the matrices have the same dimensions and that all elements of the two matrices are equal. Applying this answer to the matrices A+B = B+A that both have the dimensions $m \times n$ means you must show that for every integer i = 1, ..., m and j = 1, ..., n, $(A+B)_{ij} = (B+A)_{ij}$, that is, you must show that
 - **B1:** For every integer i = 1, ..., m and for every integer $j = 1, ..., n, A_{ij} + B_{ij} = B_{ij} + A_{ij}$.
 - c. Based on the answer in part (b), the next technique you should use is the choose method because the key words "for every" appear in the backward statement B1. For that statement, you would choose

A1: Integers *i* and *j* with $1 \le i \le m$ and $1 \le j \le n$,

for which you must show that

B2: $A_{ij} + B_{ij} = B_{ij} + A_{ij}$.

Appendix C Web Solutions to Exercises

C.3 Analysis of Proof. The forward-backward method is used to begin the proof because there are no key words in the hypothesis or conclusion. A key question associated with the conclusion a|(b+c) is, "How can I show that an integer (namely, a) divides another integer (namely, b + c)?" Using the definition, one answer is to show that

B1: There is an integer d such that b + c = da.

Recognizing the key words "there is" in the backward statement B1, you should now use the construction method. Specifically, turn to the forward process to construct the desired integer d.

Working forward from the hypothesis that a divides b, by definition, you know that

A1: There is an integer e such that b = ea.

Likewise, from the hypothesis that a divides c, by definition,

50 WEB SOLUTIONS TO EXERCISES IN APPENDIX C

A2: There is an integer f such that c = fa.

Adding the equalities in A1 and A2 results in

A3: b + c = ea + fa = (e + f)a.

From A3 you can see that the desired value of the integer d in B1 is d = e + f. According to the construction method, you must still show that this value of d satisfies the certain property and the something that happens in B1, namely, that b + c = da, but this is clear from A3.

Proof. To show that a|(b + c), by definition, it is shown that there is an integer d such that b + c = da. However, from the hypothesis that a|b, there is an integer e such that b = ea. Likewise, from the hypothesis that a|c, there is an integer f such that c = fa. Letting d = e + f, it is easy to see that b + c = ea + fa = (e + f)a = da, thus completing the proof. \Box

C.8 Analysis of Proof. To reach the conclusion, work forward from the hypothesis that $a \odot b = a \odot c$ by combining both sides on the left with the element a^{-1} (which exists by property (3) of a group) to obtain

A1: $a^{-1} \odot (a \odot b) = a^{-1} \odot (a \odot c)$.

Now specialize the for-all statement in property (1) of a group to both sides of A1 to obtain

A2: $(a^{-1} \odot a) \odot b = (a^{-1} \odot a) \odot c$.

Using the fact that $a^{-1} \odot a = e$ from property (3) of a group, A2 becomes

A3: $e \odot b = e \odot c$.

Finally, specialize property (2) of a group to both sides of A3 to obtain

A4: b = c.

The proof is now complete because A4 is the same as the conclusion of the proposition. \Box

Proof. To reach the conclusion that b = c, you have that

 $\begin{array}{rcl} a \odot b &=& a \odot c & (\text{hypothesis}) \\ a^{-1} \odot (a \odot b) &=& a^{-1} \odot (a \odot c) & (\text{combine both sides with } a^{-1}) \\ (a^{-1} \odot a) \odot b &=& (a^{-1} \odot a) \odot c & (\text{property (1) of a group}) \\ e \odot b &=& e \odot c & (\text{property of } a^{-1}) \\ b &=& c & (\text{property of } e). \end{array}$

The proof is now complete. \Box

C.10 Analysis of Proof. The forward-backward method is used to begin the proof because there are no key words in either the hypothesis or the conclusion. Starting with the forward process, because $a^{-1} \in G$, you can specialize the for-all statement in property (3) of a group to state that

A1: There is an
$$(a^{-1})^{-1} \in G$$
 such that $a^{-1} \odot (a^{-1})^{-1} = (a^{-1})^{-1} \odot a^{-1} = e$.

Now, if you can show that $a \in G$ also satisfies the property of $(a^{-1})^{-1}$ in A1 then, because the inverse element is unique (see Exercise C.7), by the forward uniqueness method (see Section 11.1), it must be that $(a^{-1})^{-1} = a$. Thus, you must show that

B1:
$$a^{-1} \odot a = a \odot a^{-1} = e$$
.

However, B1 is true by property (3) in the definition of a group, and so the proof is complete.

Proof. Because $a^{-1} \in G$, by property (3) of a group, there is an element $(a^{-1})^{-1} \in G$ such that $a^{-1} \odot (a^{-1})^{-1} = (a^{-1})^{-1} \odot a^{-1} = e$. Now $a \in G$ also satisfies $a^{-1} \odot a = a \odot a^{-1} = e$. Thus, because the inverse element is unique (see Exercise C.7), it must be that $(a^{-1})^{-1} = a$, completing the proof. \Box

Appendix D Web Solutions to Exercises

D.5 Analysis of Proof. Not recognizing any key words in the hypothesis or conclusion, the forward-backward method is used to begin the proof. A key question associated with the conclusion is, "How can I show that a number (namely, 0) is a lower bound for a set (namely, T)?" Using the definition of a lower bound, you must show that

B1: For all elements $x \in T$, $x \ge 0$.

Recognizing the key words "for all" in the backward statement B1, you should now use the choose to choose

A1: An element $x \in T$,

for which it must be shown that

B2: $x \ge 0$.

Working forward from A1 using the defining property of T, you know that

54 WEB SOLUTIONS TO EXERCISES IN APPENDIX D

A2: x > 0 and $x^2 > 2$.

The fact that x > 0 in A2 ensures that B2 is true, thus completing the proof.

Proof. To see that 0 is a lower bound for T, let $x \in T$ (the word "let" here indicates that the choose method is used). But then, by the defining property of T, x > 0. This shows that 0 is a lower bound for T, thus completing the proof. \Box

D.13 Analysis of Proof. The words, "Suppose, to the contrary, ..." indicate that the author is using the contradiction method. Accordingly, the author assumes the hypothesis

A: For every real number $\epsilon > 0$, $|x - y| < \epsilon$.

and also

A1 (NOT B): $x \neq y$.

The author then specializes A to the specific value $\epsilon = |x - y|$. To apply specialization, it is necessary to show that this value of ϵ satisfies the certain property in A of being > 0. This, however, is true because $x \neq y$ from A1 and so $\epsilon = |x - y| > 0$. The result of specializing A2 to $\epsilon = |x - y|$ is that

A2: |x - y| < |x - y|.

Now A2 is a contradiction because a number (namely, |x - y|) cannot be strictly less than itself, thus completing the proof.