CSE 311: Foundations of Computing

Topic 4: Number Theory



"I *asked* you a question, buddy. ... What's the square root of 5,248?"

Mechanical vs Creative Predicate Logic

- We've done examples with "meaningless" predicates such as $\forall x P(x) \rightarrow \exists x P(x)$
 - Saw how to (often) mechanically solve by looking at "shape" of the goal.
 - We'll need these skills in all domains!
- When we enter "interesting" domains of discourse, we will use domain knowledge.
 - We will see how to creatively solve goals, especially with rules like Intro ∨, Intro ∃, Elim ∧, Elim ∀.

- Remainder of the course will use predicate logic to prove <u>important</u> properties of <u>interesting</u> objects
 - start with math objects that are widely used in CS
 - eventually more CS-specific objects
- Encode domain knowledge in predicate definitions
- Then apply predicate logic to infer useful results

Domain of Discourse Integers $\begin{tabular}{l} \hline Predicate Definitions \\ \hline Even(x) \equiv \exists y \ (x = 2 \cdot y) \\ Odd(x) \equiv \exists y \ (x = 2 \cdot y + 1) \end{tabular}$

Number Theory

- Direct relevance to computing
 - everything in a computer is a number

colors on the screen are encoded as numbers

• Many significant applications in CS...

• Memory is an array, so pixel positions must be mapped to array indexes



Pixels in Memory



stored at index 16 = 12 + 4= 2 · 6 + 4

Pixels in Memory



Stored at index n. How do we calculate n from i and j? $n = i \cdot 6 + j$ For a, b with b > 0, we can divide b into a. Suppose that

$$\frac{a}{b} = q$$

The number q is called the *quotient*.

This equation involve fractions. We want to stick to integers! Multiplying both sides by b, this becomes

$$a = qb$$

When there exists some such q, we write " $b \mid a$ ".

Divisibility

Definition: "b divides a"

For *a*, *b* with $b \neq 0$: $b \mid a \coloneqq \exists q \ (a = qb)$

Check Your Understanding. Which of the following are true?

Divisibility

Definition: "b divides a"

For *a*, *b* with $b \neq 0$:

$$b \mid a \coloneqq \exists q \ (a = qb)$$

Check Your Understanding. Which of the following are true?



For a, b with b > 0, we can divide b into a.

If $b \nmid a$, then we end up with a *remainder* r with 0 < r < b. Now,

instead of
$$\frac{a}{b} = q$$
 we have $\frac{a}{b} = q + \frac{r}{b}$

Multiplying both sides by *b* gives us a = qb + r

For a, b with b > 0, we can divide b into a.

If $b \mid a$, then we have a = qb for some q. If $b \nmid a$, then we have a = qb + r for some q, r with 0 < r < b.

In general, we have a = qb + r for some q, r with $0 \le r < b$, where r = 0 iff $b \mid a$.

Division Theorem

For a, b with b > 0there exist *unique* integers q, r with $0 \le r < b$ such that a = qb + r.

To put it another way, if we divide *b* into *a*, we get a unique quotient $q = a \operatorname{div} b$ and non-negative remainder $r = a \operatorname{mod} b$

a = (*a* **div** *b*) *b* + (*a* **mod** *b*)

 $\forall a \ \forall b \ (b > 0) \rightarrow (a = (a \ \operatorname{div} b)b + (a \ \operatorname{mod} b))$

Pixels in Memory



Stored at index n. How do we calculate n from i and j? $n = i \cdot 6 + j$

Pixels in Memory



Stored at index n.i = n div 6How do we calculate i and j from n? $j = n \mod 6$

- Direct relevance to computing
 - important toolkit for programmers
- Many significant applications
 - Cryptography & Security
 - Data Structures
 - Distributed Systems

Modular Arithmetic

- Arithmetic over a finite domain
- Almost all computation is over a finite domain

I'm ALIVE!

```
public class Test {
   final static int SEC IN YEAR = 365*24*60*60;
   public static void main(String args[]) {
       System.out.println(
          "I will be alive for at least " +
          SEC_IN_YEAR * 101 + " seconds."
       );
   }
}
          ----jGRASP exec: java Test
         I will be alive for at least -186619904 seconds.
          ----jGRASP: operation complete.
```





If a = 7q + r, then $r \ (= a \mod b)$ is where you stop after taking a steps on the clock

(a + b) mod 7 (a × b) mod 7



+	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1	2	3	4	5	6	0
2	2	3	4	5	6	0	1
3	3	4	5	6	0	1	2
4	4	5	6	0	1	2	3
5	5	6	0	1	2	3	4
6	6	0	1	2	3	4	5

x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	0	2	4	6	1	3	5
3	0	3	6	2	5	1	4
4	0	4	1	5	2	6	3
5	0	5	3	1	6	4	2
6	0	6	5	4	3	2	1

Definition: "a is congruent to b modulo m"

For a, b, m with m > 0 $a \equiv_m b \coloneqq m \mid (a - b)$

New notion of "sameness" that will help us understand modular arithmetic

Definition: "a is congruent to b modulo m"

For
$$a, b, m$$
 with $m > 0$
 $a \equiv_m b \coloneqq m \mid (a - b)$

The standard math notation is

 $a \equiv b \pmod{m}$

A chain of equivalences is written

 $a \equiv b \equiv c \equiv d \pmod{m}$

Many students find this confusing, so we will use \equiv_m instead.

Definition: "a is congruent to b modulo m"

For a, b, m with m > 0

$$a \equiv_m b \coloneqq m \mid (a - b)$$

Check Your Understanding. What do each of these mean? When are they true?

 $x \equiv_2 0$

This statement is the same as saying "x is even"; so, any x that is even (including negative even numbers) will work.

-1 ≡₅ 19

This statement is true. 19 - (-1) = 20 which is divisible by 5

y ≡₇ 2

This statement is true for y in $\{ ..., -12, -5, 2, 9, 16, ... \}$. In other words, all y of the form 2+7k for k an integer.

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Proof Plan:

1.
$$(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b)$$
??2. $(a \equiv_m b) \rightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$??3. $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b) \land$ $(a \equiv_m b) \rightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ 4. $(a \equiv_m b) \leftrightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ Intro \land : 1, 24. $(a \equiv_m b) \leftrightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ Equivalent: 3

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

1. $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b)$??

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

1.1. $a \mod m = b \mod m$

Assumption

1.? $a \equiv_m b$?? 1. $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b)$ Direct Proof

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

1.1. $a \mod m = b \mod m$

Assumption

1.? $m \mid a - b$ 1.? $a \equiv_m b$ 1. $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b)$

?? Def of ≡ Direct Proof

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

1.1. $a \mod m = b \mod m$

Assumption

1.? $\exists q \ (a - b = qm)$ 1.? $m \mid a - b$ 1.? $a \equiv_m b$ 1. $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b)$?? Def of | Def of ≡ Direct Proof

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

1.1. $a \mod m = b \mod m$ **1.2.** $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$ **1.3.** $\boldsymbol{b} = (\boldsymbol{b} \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{m}) \boldsymbol{m} + (\boldsymbol{b} \operatorname{mod} \boldsymbol{m})$ Apply Division

Assumption **Apply Division**

1.?
$$\exists q \ (a - b = qm)$$

1.? $m \mid a - b$
1.? $a \equiv_m b$
1. $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b)$

?? Def of | Def of ≡ **Direct Proof**

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

1.1. $a \mod m = b \mod m$ Assumption **1.2.** $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$ **Apply Division 1.3.** $b = (b \operatorname{div} m) m + (b \operatorname{mod} m)$ **Apply Division 1.4.** $a - b = ((a \operatorname{div} m) - (b \operatorname{div} m))m$ Algebra **1.5.** $\exists q (a - b = qm)$ Intro **∃ 1.6.** *m* ∣ *a* − *b* Def of | 1.7. $a \equiv_m b$ Def of ≡ **Direct Proof**

1. $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b)$

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Suppose that $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Assumption

Apply Division Apply Division

Algebra

Intro ∃ Def of | Def of ≡ Direct Proof

Therefore, $a \equiv_m b$.

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Suppose that $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

By the Division Theorem, we can write $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$ and $b = (b \operatorname{div} m) m + (b \operatorname{mod} m)$. Assumption

Apply Division Apply Division

Algebra

Intro ∃ Def of | Def of ≡ Direct Proof

Therefore, $a \equiv_m b$.

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Suppose that $a \mod m = b \mod m$. By the Division Theorem, we can write $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$ and $b = (b \operatorname{div} m) m + (b \operatorname{mod} m).$ Subtracting these we can see that $a - b = ((a \operatorname{div} m) - (b \operatorname{div} m))m +$ $((a \mod m) - (b \mod m))$ $= ((a \operatorname{div} m) - (b \operatorname{div} m))m$ since $(a \mod m) - (b \mod m) = 0$

Assumption

Apply Division Apply Division

Algebra

Intro ∃ Def of | Def of ≡ Direct Proof

Therefore, $a \equiv_m b$.
Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Suppose that $a \mod m = b \mod m$. By the Division Theorem, we can write $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \mod m)$ and $b = (b \operatorname{div} m) m + (b \mod m)$.

Assumption

Apply Division Apply Division

Subtracting these we can see that

 $a - b = ((a \operatorname{div} m) - (b \operatorname{div} m))m + ((a \operatorname{mod} m) - (b \operatorname{mod} m))) = ((a \operatorname{div} m) - (b \operatorname{div} m))m$ since $(a \operatorname{mod} m) - (b \operatorname{mod} m) = 0$. Therefore, by definition, $m \mid (a - b)$ and so $a \equiv_m b$, by definition.

Intro ∃ Def of | Def of ≡ Direct Proof

Algebra

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

2. $(a \equiv_m b) \rightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$??

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

2.1. $a \equiv_m b$

Assumption

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

2.1. $a \equiv_m b$ 2.2. $m \mid a - b$ Assumption Def of |

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

2.1. $a \equiv_m b$ 2.2. $m \mid a - b$ 2.3. $\exists q (a - b = qm)$ Assumption Def of ≡ Def of |

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

2.1.
$$a \equiv_m b$$

2.2. $m \mid a - b$
2.3. $\exists q (a - b = qm)$
2.4. $a - b = km$

Assumption Def of ≡ Def of | Elim ∃

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

2.1.
$$a \equiv_m b$$

2.2. $m \mid a - b$
2.3. $\exists q \ (a - b = qm)$
2.4. $a - b = km$
2.5. $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$

Assumption Def of ≡ Def of | Elim ∃ Apply Division

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

2.1.
$$a \equiv_m b$$
Assumption2.2. $m \mid a - b$ Def of \equiv 2.3. $\exists q \ (a - b = qm)$ Def of \mid 2.4. $a - b = km$ Elim \exists 2.5. $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$ Apply Division2.6. $b = (a \operatorname{div} m - k) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$ Algebra

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

2.1. $a \equiv_m b$ Assumption2.2. $m \mid a - b$ Def of \equiv 2.3. $\exists q \ (a - b = qm)$ Def of \mid 2.4. a - b = kmElim \exists 2.5. $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$ Apply Division2.6. $b = (a \operatorname{div} m - k) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$ Algebra2.7. $b \operatorname{div} m = (a \operatorname{div} m - k) \land$ Apply DivUnique $b \operatorname{mod} m = a \operatorname{mod} m$ Apply DivUnique

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

2.1. $a \equiv_m b$ Assumption 2.2. $m \mid a - b$ Def of ≡ **2.3.** $\exists q (a - b = qm)$ Def of | 2.4. a - b = kmElim 3 **2.5.** $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$ **Apply Division 2.6.** $b = (a \operatorname{div} m - k) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$ Algebra **2.7.** *b* div $m = (a \operatorname{div} m - k) \wedge$ **Apply DivUnique** $b \mod m = a \mod m$ **2.8.** $a \mod m = b \mod m$ Elim \wedge **2.** $(a \equiv_m b) \rightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ **Direct Proof**

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$.

Assumption

Def of ≡ Def of | Elim ∃

Apply Division

Algebra

Apply DivUnique Elim ∃

Therefore, $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$.

Then, $m \mid (a - b)$ by the definition of congruence. So, a - b = km for some integer k by the definition of divides. Equivalently, a = b + km. Assumption

Def of ≡ Def of ∣ Elim ∃

Apply Division

Algebra

Apply DivUnique Elim ∃

Therefore, $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$.AssumptionThen, $m \mid (a - b)$ by the definition of congruence.Def of \equiv So, a - b = km for some integer k by the definition ofDef of \equiv divides. Equivalently, a = b + km.Def of \mid By the Division Theorem, we have $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \mod m)$, with $0 \leq (a \mod m) < m$.Assumption

Algebra

Apply DivUnique Elim 3

Therefore, $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$.

Then, $m \mid (a - b)$ by the definition of congruence. So, a - b = km for some integer k by the definition of divides. Equivalently, a = b + km.

By the Division Theorem, we have $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$, with $0 \le (a \operatorname{mod} m) < m$.

Combining these, we have $(a \operatorname{div} m)m + (a \mod m) = a = b + km$. Solving for b gives $b = (a \operatorname{div} m)m + (a \mod m) - km = ((a \operatorname{div} m) - k)m + (a \mod m)$.

Assumption

Def of	≡
Def of	
Elim 3	

Apply Division

Algebra

Apply DivUnique Elim 3

Therefore, $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$.

Then, $m \mid (a - b)$ by the definition of congruence. So, a - b = km for some integer k by the definition of divides. Equivalently, a = b + km.

By the Division Theorem, we have $a = (a \operatorname{div} m) m + (a \operatorname{mod} m)$, with $0 \le (a \operatorname{mod} m) < m$.

Combining these, we have $(a \operatorname{div} m)m + (a \mod m) = a = b + km$. Solving for b gives $b = (a \operatorname{div} m)m - km + (a \mod m) = ((a \operatorname{div} m) - k)m + (a \mod m)$.

By the uniqueness property in the Division Theorem, we must have $b \mod m = a \mod m$ (and, although we don't need it, also $b \dim m = a \dim m - k$).

Assumption

Def of	≡
Def of	
Elim 3	

Apply Division

Algebra

Apply DivUnique Elim ∃

- What we have just shown
 - The mod *m* function maps any integer *a* to a remainder *a* mod $m \in \{0,1,..,m-1\}$.
 - Imagine grouping together all integers that have the same value of the mod m function That is, the same remainder in $\{0,1,..,m-1\}$.
 - The \equiv_m predicate compares integers a, b. It is true if and only if the mod m function has the same value on a and on b.

That is, a and b are in the same group.

Recall: Familiar Properties of "="

- If a = b and b = c, then a = c.
 - i.e., if a = b = c, then a = c
- If a = b and c = d, then a + c = b + d.
 - since c = c is true, we can "+ c" to both sides
- If a = b and c = d, then ac = bd.
 - since c = c is true, we can " $\times c$ " to both sides

These facts allow us to use algebra to solve problems

Recall: Properties of "=" Used in Algebra

If $a = b$ and $b = c$, then $a = c$.	"Transitivity"
If $a = b$, then $a + c = b + c$.	"Add Equations"
If $a = b$, then $ac = bc$.	"Multiply Equations"

These are **Theorems** that we use *implicitly* in Algebra

Example: given 5x + 4 = 2x + 25, prove that 3x = 21.

Let's see how to do this in **formal** logic...

If $a = b$ and $b = c$, then $a = c$.	"Transitivity"
If $a = b$, then $a + c = b + c$.	"Add Equations"
If $a = b$, then $ac = bc$.	"Multiply Equations"

1.
$$5x + 4 = 2x + 25$$
Given**2.** $-4 = -4$ Algebra**3.** $5x = 2x + 21$ Add Equations: **1**, **24.** $-2x = -2x$ Algebra**5.** $3x = 21$ Add Equations: **3**, **4**

Recall: Properties of "=" Used in Algebra

If
$$a = b$$
 and $b = c$, then $a = c$."Transitivity"If $a = b$, then $a + c = b + c$."Add Equations"If $a = b$, then $ac = bc$."Multiply Equations"

1.
$$5x + 4 = 2x + 25$$
 Given

...

5. 3x = 21 **Transitivity**

<u>Careful</u>: proved $5x + 4 = 2x + 25 \Rightarrow 3x = 21$ **not** $3x = 21 \Rightarrow 5x + 4 = 2x + 25$ the second is a "backward" proof

Recall: Familiar Properties of "="

- If a = b and b = c, then a = c.
 - i.e., if a = b = c, then a = c
- If a = b and c = d, then a + c = b + d.
 - since c = c is true, we can "+ c" to both sides
- If a = b and c = d, then ac = bd.
 - since c = c is true, we can " $\times c$ " to both sides

Same facts apply to "≤" with non-negative numbers

What about " \equiv_m "?

Let a, b, c and m be integers with m > 0. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$.

Let a, b, c and m be integers with m > 0. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$.

1.
$$(a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m c)$$
 ??

Let a, b, c and m be integers with m > 0. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$.

2.1.
$$a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c$$

Assumption

2.?.
$$a \equiv_m c$$

1. $(a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m c)$

Let a, b, c and m be integers with m > 0. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$.

2.1. $a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c$ Assumption2.2. $a \equiv_m b$ Elim \land : 2.12.3. $b \equiv_m c$ Elim \land : 2.1

2.?.
$$a \equiv_m c$$

1. $(a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m c)$



2.?.
$$a \equiv_m c$$

1. $(a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m c)$

2.1.
$$a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c$$
Assumption2.2. $a \equiv_m b$ Elim \land : 2.12.3. $b \equiv_m c$ Elim \land : 2.12.4. $m \mid a - b$ Def of \equiv : 2.22.5. $m \mid b - c$ Def of \equiv : 2.32.6. $\exists q (a - b = qm)$ Def of \mid : 2.42.7. $\exists q (b - c = qm)$ Def of \mid : 2.5

2.?.
$$a \equiv_m c$$

1. $(a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m c)$

?? **Direct Proof**

2.1

2.1

2.1.
$$a \equiv_{m} b \land b \equiv_{m} c$$

2.2. $a \equiv_{m} b$
2.3. $b \equiv_{m} c$
2.4. $m \mid a - b$
2.5. $m \mid b - c$
2.6. $\exists q (a - b = qm)$
2.7. $\exists q (b - c = qm)$
2.8. $a - b = km$
2.9. $b - c = jm$

Assumption Elim \land : 2.1 Elim \land : 2.1 Def of \equiv : 2.2 Def of \equiv : 2.3 Def of \mid : 2.3 Def of \mid : 2.4 Def of \mid : 2.5 Elim \exists : 2.6 Elim \exists : 2.7

2.?. $a \equiv_m c$ **1.** $(a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m c)$

Let a, b, c and m be integers with m > 0. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$.

2.1. $a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c$	Assumption
•••	
2.8. $a - b = km$	Elim ∃: 2.6
2.9. $b - c = jm$	Elim ∃: 2.7

2.?.
$$a \equiv_m c$$

1. $(a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m c)$

Let a, b, c and m be integers with m > 0. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$.

Assumption
Elim ∃: 2.6
Elim ∃: 2.7

2.?.
$$m \mid a - b$$
 ??
2.?. $a \equiv_m c$ Def of \equiv
1. $(a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m c)$ Direct Proof

Let a, b, c and m be integers with m > 0. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$.

Assumption
Elim ∃: 2.6
Elim ∃: 2.7

2.?.
$$\exists q \ (a - c = qm)$$
??2.?. $m \mid a - c$ Def of |2.?. $a \equiv_m c$ Def of \equiv 1. $(a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m c)$ Direct Proof

2.1. $a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c$ Assumption 2.8. a - b = kmElim ∃: 2.6 2.9. b - c = jmElim ∃: 2.7 2.10. a - c = (k + j)mAlgebra **2.11.** $\exists q (a - c = qm)$ Intro ∃: 2.10 2.12. $m \mid a - c$ Def of |: 2.11 2.13. $a \equiv_m c$ Def of ≡: 2.12 **1.** $(a \equiv_m b \land b \equiv_m c) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m c)$ **Direct Proof**

Let a, b, c and m be integers with m > 0. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$.

Assumption

Def of ≡

Def of |

Elim 3

Algebra

Intro ∃ Def of ∣

Def of ≡

Direct Proof

Therefore, $a \equiv_m c$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$.

By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (b - c)$. By the definition of divides, we know that a - b = km and b - c = jm for some integers k and j.

Assumption

Elim ∧ Def of ≡ Def of | Elim ∃ Algebra Intro ∃ Def of | Def of ≡ Direct Proof

Therefore, $a \equiv_m c$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$.

By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (b - c)$. By the definition of divides, we know that a - b = km and b - c = jm for some integers k and j.

Adding these, gives a - c = km + jm = (k + j)m.

Algebra Intro ∃ Def of | Def of ≡ Direct Proof

Therefore, $a \equiv_m c$.

Assumption

Elim A

Def of ≡

Def of |

Elim 7

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$.

By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (b - c)$. By the definition of divides, we know that a - b = km and b - c = jm for some integers k and j.

Assumption

Elim ∧ Def of ≡ Def of | Elim ∃ Algebra Intro ∃ Def of | Def of ≡

Direct Proof

Adding these, gives a - c = km + jm = (k + j)m.

Therefore, by the definition of divides, we have shown that $m \mid (a - c)$, and then, $a \equiv_m c$ by the definition of congruence.
Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

1. $(a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d) \rightarrow (a + c \equiv_m b + d)$??

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

2.1. $a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d$ Assumption

2.?.
$$a + c \equiv_m b + d$$
 ??
1. $(a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d) \rightarrow (a + c \equiv_m b + d)$ Direct Proof

2.1. $a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d$	Assumption
$2.2. a \equiv_m b$	Elim ^: 2.1
$2.3. c \equiv_m d$	Elim ^: 2.1

2.?.
$$a + c \equiv_m b + d$$
 ??
1. $(a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d) \rightarrow (a + c \equiv_m b + d)$ Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

2.1. $a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d$ Assumption2.2. $a \equiv_m b$ Elim \land : 2.12.3. $c \equiv_m d$ Elim \land : 2.12.4. $m \mid a - b$ Def of \equiv : 2.22.5. $m \mid c - d$ Def of \equiv : 2.3

2.?. $a + c \equiv_m b + d$?? 1. $(a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d) \rightarrow (a + c \equiv_m b + d)$ Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

2.1. $a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d$	Assumption
2.2. $a \equiv_m b$	Elim ^: 2.1
2.3. $c \equiv_m d$	Elim ^: 2.1
2.4. $m \mid a - b$	Def of ≡: 2.2
2.5. $m \mid c - d$	Def of ≡: 2.3
2.6. $\exists q \ (a - b = qm)$	Def of : 2.4
2.7. $\exists q \ (c - d = qm)$	Def of : 2.5

2.?. $a + c \equiv_m b + d$?? 1. $(a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d) \rightarrow (a + c \equiv_m b + d)$ Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

2.1.
$$a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d$$
Assumption2.2. $a \equiv_m b$ Elim \land : 2.12.3. $c \equiv_m d$ Elim \land : 2.12.4. $m \mid a - b$ Def of \equiv : 2.22.5. $m \mid c - d$ Def of \equiv : 2.32.6. $\exists q (a - b = qm)$ Def of \mid : 2.42.7. $\exists q (c - d = qm)$ Def of \mid : 2.52.8. $a - b = km$ Elim \exists : 2.62.9. $c - d = jm$ Elim \exists : 2.7

2.?. $a + c \equiv_m b + d$?? 1. $(a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d) \rightarrow (a + c \equiv_m b + d)$ Direct Proof

2.1. $a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d$	Assumption
•••	
2.8. $a - b = km$	Elim ∃: 2.6
2.9. $c - d = jm$	Elim ∃: 2.7

2.?.
$$m \mid (a + c) - (b + d)$$
 ??
2.?. $a + c \equiv_m b + d$ Def of \equiv
1. $(a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d) \rightarrow (a + c \equiv_m b + d)$ Direct Proof

2.1. $a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d$	Assumption
•••	
2.8. $a - b = km$	Elim ∃: 2.6
2.9. $c - d = jm$	Elim ∃: 2.7

2.?.
$$\exists q ((a + c) - (b + d) = qm)$$
 ??
2.?. $m \mid (a + c) - (b + d)$ Def of \mid
2.?. $a + c \equiv_m b + d$ Def of \equiv
1. $(a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d) \rightarrow (a + c \equiv_m b + d)$ Direct Proof

2.1.
$$a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d$$
Assumption...2.8. $a - b = km$ Elim $\exists : 2.6$ 2.9. $c - d = jm$ Elim $\exists : 2.7$ 2.10. $(a + c) - (b + d) = (k + j)m$ Algebra2.11. $\exists q ((a + c) - (b + d) = qm))$ Intro $\exists : 2.10$ 2.12. $m \mid (a + c) - (b + d)$ Def of $\mid : 2.11$ 2.13. $a + c \equiv_m b + d$ Def of $\equiv : 2.12$ 1. $(a \equiv_m b \land c \equiv_m d) \rightarrow (a + c \equiv_m b + d)$ Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

Assumption

Def of ≡

Def of ∣ Elim ∃

Algebra

Intro ∃ Def of | Def of ≡ Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$.

Assumption

Def of ≡ Def of |

Elim 3

Algebra

Intro ∃ Def of | Def of ≡

Therefore, $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$.

By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (c - d)$. By the definition of divides, we know that a - b = km and c - d = jm for some integers k and j.

Assumption

Elim ∧ Def of ≡ Def of |

Elim 3

Algebra

Intro ∃ Def of |

Def of ≡

Direct Proof

Therefore, $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$.

By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (c - d)$. By the definition of divides, we know that a - b = km and c - d = jm for some integers k and j.

Assumption

Elim ∧ Def of ≡ Def of ∣ Elim ∃

Adding these, gives
$$(a + c) - (b + d) =$$
 Algebra
 $(a - b) + (c - d) = km + jm = (k + j)m$.

Intro ∃ Def of | Def of ≡

Direct Proof

Therefore, $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$.

By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (c - d)$. By the definition of divides, we know that a - b = km and c - d = jm for some integers k and j.

Assumption

Elim ∧ Def of ≡ Def of ∣ Elim ∃

Adding these, gives
$$(a + c) - (b + d) =$$
 Algebra
 $(a - b) + (c - d) = km + jm = (k + j)m$.

Therefore, by the definition of divides, we have shown $m \mid (a + c) - (b + d)$, and then, we have $a + c \equiv_m b + d$ by the definition of congruence. Intro ∃ Def of ∣

Def of ≡

Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$. Assumption

Therefore, $ac \equiv_m bd$.

?? Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$. Assumption

By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (c - d)$. Def of \equiv

Therefore, $ac \equiv_m bd$.

?? Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$. Assumption By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (c - d)$. By the definition of Def of \equiv

divides, we know that a - b = jm and c - d = kmfor some integers j and k. Def of ≡ Def of | Elim ∃

Therefore, $ac \equiv_m bd$.

?? Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$. Assumption By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (c - d)$. By the definition of Def of ≡ Def of | divides, we know that a - b = jm and c - d = km

for some integers \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{k} .

Elim 7

Therefore, $m \mid ac - bd$, so $ac \equiv_m bd$ by the Def of ≡ definition of congruence.

Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$. Assumption By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (c - d)$. By the definition of divides, we know that a - b = jm and c - d = kmfor some integers j and k.

Show: $\exists k (ac - bd = km)$ Therefore, $m \mid ac - bd$ by the definition of divides, $Def of \models$ so $ac \equiv_m bd$ by the definition of congruence. Direct Proof

Let *m* be a positive integer. If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$.

Suppose that $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$. Assumption By the definition of congruence, we know that $m \mid (a - b)$ and $m \mid (c - d)$. By the definition of Def of ≡ divides, we know that a - b = jm and c - d = kmDef of | Elim 3 for some integers \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{k} . Equivalently, a = b + jm and c = d + km. Algebra Multiplying these gives ac = (b + jm)(d + km) =bd + bkm + djm + jkm = bd + (bk + dj + jk)m, Intro 7 so ac - bd = (bk + dj + jk)m. Def of | Def of ≡ Therefore, $m \mid ac - bd$ by the definition of divides, so $ac \equiv_m bd$ by the definition of congruence. **Direct Proof**

If
$$a \equiv_m b$$
 and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$.

If
$$a \equiv_m b$$
 and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$.

Corollary: If $a \equiv_m b$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + c$.

If
$$a \equiv_m b$$
 and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$.

Corollary: If $a \equiv_m b$, then $ac \equiv_m bc$.

If
$$a \equiv_m b$$
 and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$.

If
$$a \equiv_m b$$
, then $a + c \equiv_m b + c$.

If
$$a \equiv_m b$$
, then $ac \equiv_m bc$.

" \equiv_m " allows us to solve problems in modular arithmetic, e.g.

- add / subtract numbers from both sides of equations
- chains of " \equiv_m " values shows first and last are " \equiv_m "
- substitute " \equiv_m " values in equations (not proven yet)

Properties of " \equiv_m " Used in Algebra

If $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$	"Transitivity"
If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$	"Add Equations"
If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$ "Mu	ultiply Equations"

These are **Theorems** that we use *implicitly* in Algebra

Example: given that $5x + 4 \equiv_m 2x + 25$, prove that $3x \equiv_m 21$

Properties of " \equiv_m " Used in Algebra

If
$$a \equiv_m b$$
 and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$ "Transitivity"
If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$ "Add Equations"
If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$ "Multiply Equations"

1.
$$5x + 4 \equiv_m 2x + 25$$
 Given

 2. $-4 = -4$
 Algebra

 3. $5x \equiv_m 2x + 21$
 Add Equations: **2**, **1**?

Line 2 says "=" not " \equiv_m "

But "=" implies " \equiv_m " ! (equality is a special case)

Properties of " \equiv_m " Used in Algebra

If
$$a \equiv_m b$$
 and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$ "Transitivity"
If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + d$ "Add Equations"
If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$ "Multiply Equations"

1.
$$5x + 4 \equiv_m 2x + 25$$

2. $-4 = -4$
3. $-4 \equiv_m -4$
4. $5x \equiv_m 2x + 21$
5. $-2x = -2x$
6. $-2x \equiv_m -2x$
7. $3x \equiv_m 21$

Given Algebra To Modular: 2 Add Equations: 3, 1 Algebra To Modular Add Equations: 4, 6

Another Property of "=" Used in Algebra

If $a \equiv_m b$ and $b \equiv_m c$, then $a \equiv_m c$	"Transitivity"
If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $a + c \equiv_m b + c$	<i>d</i> "Add Equations"
If $a \equiv_m b$ and $c \equiv_m d$, then $ac \equiv_m bd$	"Multiply Equations"
If $a = b$, then $a \equiv_m b$.	"To Modular"

Can "plug in" (a.k.a. substitute) the known value of a variable

Example: given 2y + 3x = 25 and x = 7, prove that 2y + 21 = 25.

> This is <u>also</u> true of congruences! (We just don't have the tools to prove it yet.)

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

What numbers a and b did we **prove** this for?

We don't know anything about these numbers. I.e., they were **arbitrary**.

That means our proof could be changed...

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

1.1. $a \mod m = b \mod m$ Assumption 1.7. $a \equiv_m b$ Def of ≡ **1.** $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b)$ **Direct Proof** 2.1. $a \equiv_m b$ Assumption **2.8.** $a \mod m = b \mod m$ Elim \land **Direct Proof 2.** $(a \equiv_m b) \rightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ **3.** $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b) \land$ $(a \equiv_m b) \rightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ Intro \land **4.** $(a \equiv_m b) \leftrightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ Equivalent

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

Let *a* and *b* be arbitrary integers. **1.1.1.** $a \mod m = b \mod m$ Assumption 1.1.7. $a \equiv_m b$ Def of ≡ **1.1.** $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b)$ **Direct Proof 1.2.1.** $a \equiv_m b$ Assumption **1.2.8.** $a \mod m = b \mod m$ Elim \land **1.2.** $(a \equiv_m b) \rightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ **Direct Proof 1.3.** $(a \mod m = b \mod m) \rightarrow (a \equiv_m b) \land$ $(a \equiv_m b) \rightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ Intro \land **1.4.** $(a \equiv_m b) \leftrightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ Equivalent **1.** $\forall a \forall b ((a \equiv_m b) \leftrightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m))$ Intro ∀

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

> This is stated as $(a \equiv_m b) \leftrightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m)$ but it is **really** $\forall a \forall b ((a \equiv_m b) \leftrightarrow (a \mod m = b \mod m))$

> > This is a fact we can apply to <u>any</u> integers a and b (and m > 0).

<u>Rule</u>: unquantified variables are *implicitly* ∀-quantified (will see one exception later...)

Let a, b, m be integers with m > 0. Then, $a \equiv_m b$ if and only if $a \mod m = b \mod m$.

But the proof **stays** as is!

<u>Rule</u>: structure of the proof follows the structure of the claim