

## another proof of pigeonhole principle

 ${\bf Canonical\ name} \quad {\bf Another Proof Of Pigeonhole Principle}$ 

Date of creation 2013-03-22 16:02:12 Last modified on 2013-03-22 16:02:12

Owner ratboy (4018) Last modified by ratboy (4018)

Numerical id 5

Author ratboy (4018)

Entry type Proof Classification msc 03E05 By induction on n. It is harmless to let n=m+1, since 0 lacks proper subsets. Suppose that  $f: n \to n$  is injective.

To begin, note that  $m \in f[n]$ . Otherwise,  $f[m] \subseteq m$ , so that by the induction hypothesis, f[m] = m. Then f[n] = f[m], since  $f[n] \subseteq m$ . Therefore, for some k < m, f(k) = f(m).

Let  $g:f[n]\to f[n]$  transpose m and f(m). Then  $h|_m:m\to m$  is injective, where  $h=g\circ f$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $h|_m[m]=m$ . Therefore:

$$f[n] = g \circ h[n]$$

$$= h[n]$$

$$= m \cup \{m\}$$

$$= m + 1$$

$$= n.$$