

Gersting page094_example9

hughmcguire

Proof of the following formula:

$$\text{odd}(xy) \leftrightarrow \text{odd}(x) \wedge \text{odd}(y)$$

(#)	Suppositions and derivations	Theorem and subgoals
	We presuppose the following:	
(1)	$(\forall z)[\text{odd}(z) \leftrightarrow \text{even}(z)]$	
(2)	$(\forall z)[\text{even}(z) \leftrightarrow (\exists k)(z = 2k)]$	
(3)	$(\forall a,b,c)[(ab)c = a(bc)]$	
(4)	$(\forall z)[\text{odd}(z) \leftrightarrow (\exists k)(z = 2k + 1)]$	
(5)	$(\forall a,b,c,d)[(a+b)(c+d) = ac + bc + ad + bd]$	
(6)	$4 = 2 \cdot 2$	
(7)	$(\forall a,b,c,d)[ab + ac + ad = a(b+c+d)]$	
		We start working with the formula being proved as follows:
(8)		$\text{odd}(xy) \leftrightarrow \text{odd}(x) \wedge \text{odd}(y)$
		\equiv by rewriting the form " $\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2$ " to " $(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge (\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi_1)$ "
(9)		$(\text{odd}(xy) \rightarrow \text{odd}(x) \wedge \text{odd}(y))$ \wedge $(\text{odd}(x) \wedge \text{odd}(y) \rightarrow \text{odd}(xy))$
		We'll handle that formula's subparts in separate cases (below):
		Case 1:
(10)		$\text{odd}(xy) \rightarrow \text{odd}(x) \wedge \text{odd}(y)$

		\equiv by rewriting the form " $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$ " to " $\varphi_2' \rightarrow \varphi_1'$ "
(11)		$(\text{odd}(x) \wedge \text{odd}(y))' \rightarrow [\text{odd}(xy)]'$
		\equiv by rewriting the form " $(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2)'$ " to " $\varphi_1' \vee \varphi_2'$ "
(12)		$[\text{odd}(x)]' \vee [\text{odd}(y)]' \rightarrow [\text{odd}(xy)]'$
		\equiv by (1) with " $z := x$ "
(13)		$[\text{even}(x)] \vee [\text{odd}(y)]' \rightarrow [\text{odd}(xy)]'$
		\equiv by (1) with " $z := y$ "
(14)		$[\text{even}(x)] \vee [\text{even}(y)] \rightarrow [\text{odd}(xy)]'$
		\equiv by (1) with " $z := xy$ "
(15)		$[\text{even}(x)] \vee [\text{even}(y)] \rightarrow [\text{even}(xy)]$
	We'll assume that formula's antecedent:	
(16)	$[\text{even}(x)] \vee [\text{even}(y)]$	
		and we'll work on proving the consequent:
(17)		$\text{even}(xy)$
		\equiv by (2) with " $z := xy$ "
(18)		$(\exists k)((xy) = 2k)$
		Removing that variable quantification clarifies that to prove that formula, it will suffice to find a value for the variable.
(19)		$(xy) = 2k$
	We'll handle formula (16)'s subparts in separate cases (below):	
	Case 1a:	
(20)	$\text{even}(x)$	
		\equiv by (2) with " $z := x$ "
(21)	$(\exists k)(x = 2k)$	

	That formula indicates there exists some value say " m_1 " satisfying that quantified formula, i.e.:	
(22)	$x = 2m_1$	
		Applying that equation to formula (19) yields:
(23)		$((2m_1)y) = 2k$
		\downarrow by (3) with " $a := 2, b := m_1, c := y, k := m_1y$ "
(24)		true
		That concludes the proof for this case.
	Case 1b:	
(25)	$\text{even}(y)$	
	\equiv by (2) with " $z := y$ "	
(26)	$(\exists k)(y = 2k)$	
	That formula indicates there exists some value say " n_1 " satisfying that quantified formula, i.e.:	
(27)	$y = 2n_1$	
		Applying that equation to formula (19) yields:
(28)		$(x(2n_1)) = 2k$
		\equiv by simplifying
(29)		$(2xn_1) = 2k$
		Assigning " $k := xn_1$ " in that formula yields:
(30)		$(2xn_1) = 2(xn_1)$
		\equiv by simplifying
(31)		true
		That concludes the proof for this case.

		Case 2:
(32)		$\text{odd}(x) \wedge \text{odd}(y) \rightarrow \text{odd}(xy)$
	We'll assume that formula's antecedents:	
(33)	$\text{odd}(x)$	
	and also:	
(34)	$\text{odd}(y)$	
		and we'll work on proving the consequent:
(35)		$\text{odd}(xy)$
		\equiv by (4) with " $z := xy$ "
(36)		$(\exists k)((xy) = 2k + 1)$
		Removing that variable quantification clarifies that to prove that formula, it will suffice to find a value for the variable.
(37)		$(xy) = 2k + 1$
	Applying the equivalence in formula (4) to formula (33) with " $z := x$ " yields:	
(38)	$(\exists k)(x = 2k + 1)$	
	That formula indicates there exists some value say "n" satisfying that quantified formula, i.e.:	
(39)	$x = 2n + 1$	
	Applying the equivalence in formula (4) to formula (34) with " $z := y$ " yields:	
(40)	$(\exists k)(y = 2k + 1)$	
	That formula indicates there exists some value say "m" satisfying that quantified formula, i.e.:	
(41)	$y = 2m + 1$	

		We'll work on transforming the left-hand side of formula (37) to the right-hand side as follows:
(42)		\underline{xy}
		= by (39)
(43)		$(2n+1)\underline{y}$
		= by (41)
(44)		$(2n+1)(2m+1)$
		= by (5) with "a := 2n, b := 1, c := 2m, d := 1"
(45)		$(2n)(2m) + 1(2m) + (2n)\cdot 1 + 1\cdot 1$
		= by simplifying
(46)		$4nm + 2m + 2\cdot n + 1$
		= by (6)
(47)		$\underline{(2\cdot 2)nm} + 2m + 2\cdot n + 1$
		= by (3) with "a := 2, b := 2, c := nm"
(48)		$[2(2(nm))] + 2m + 2\cdot n + 1$
		= by (7) with "a := 2, b := 2(nm), c := m, d := n"
(49)		$[2([2(nm)]+m+n)] + 1$
		And that satisfies our earlier goal (37) with "k := [2(nm)] + m + n"; i.e. we have:
(50)		true
		That concludes this part of the proof.
		Thus, the theorem that was given is true in all cases.

identification:
1206470962462
1206470146762
815700