

**Definition 1.** For any set of positive naturals  $A$ , let  $S(A) = \{\text{prime } p : \exists a \in A \text{ s.t. } p|a\}$  be its **prime shadow**

Consider the following statements:

- i  $A$  is infinite and  $S(A)$  is finite
- ii  $\exists a, b \in S$  such that  $a|b$  and  $a \neq b$ .
- iii There exist infinitely many pairs  $a, b \in A$  with  $a \neq b$  such that  $a|b$ .
- iv  $\exists a_1, a_2, \dots \in A$  with  $a_1|a_2|a_3|\dots$
- v There exists a finite subset  $B$  of  $A$  such that  $\forall a \in A \setminus B \exists a_1, a_2, \dots \in A$  with  $a|a_1|a_2|a_3|\dots$

We will succesively prove that i implies ii, iii, iv, and finally v.

**Lemma 2.** i  $\implies$  ii

*Proof.* Since  $S(A)$  is finite, we can express  $S(A)$  as  $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ . Every element in  $A$  can be expressed as  $p_1^{e_1} p_2^{e_2} \dots p_n^{e_n}$  for some nonnegative integers  $e_1, \dots, e_n$ . Let  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^n$  take an element  $a$  to the  $n$ -tuple  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$  such that  $a = p_1^{e_1} \dots p_n^{e_n}$ . Then for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  let  $f_i(a)$  be the  $i$ -coordinate of  $f(a)$ .

We will prove i  $\implies$  ii by induction on the size of  $S(A)$ . As a base case, if  $|S(A)| = 1$  then every element of  $A$  is a power of  $p_1$ . In that case, for any pair  $(a, b)$ , either  $a|b$  or  $b|a$ .

Now assume that for any infinite set  $B$  with prime shadow of size  $n - 1$  there exists a pair  $b_1, b_2 \in B$  such that  $b_1|b_2$ . Suppose to the contrary that there does not exist a pair  $(a, b)$  such that  $a|b$ . Then for all pairs  $(a, b)$  there must exist an  $i$  such that  $f_i(a) > f_i(b)$ . Now fix  $x \in A$ . For all  $a \in A$  there is an  $i$  with  $f_i(a) < f_i(x)$ . By the pigeonhole principle, there must be some  $j$  such that for infinitely many  $a \in A$ ,  $f_j(a) < f_j(x)$ . Again by the pigeonhole principle we know that for some  $e < f_j(x)$  there are infinitely many  $a \in A$  such that  $f_j(a) = e$ .

Let

$$B = \left\{ \prod_{i \neq j} p_i^{f_i(a)} : a \in A \text{ s.t. } f_j(a) = e \right\}$$

We have  $S(B) = S(A) \setminus \{p_j\}$ , and  $B$  is infinite, therefore there exists a pair  $b_1, b_2 \in B$  such that  $b_1|b_2$ . Then  $b_1 p_j^e$  and  $b_2 p_j^e$  are elements of  $A$  and  $b_1 p_j^e | b_2 p_j^e$ . Thus we have completed the induction.  $\square$

As a side note, the above proof can be used to show that only finitely many numbers  $a$  in  $A$  are not part of a pair  $a, b \in A$  such that either  $a|b$  or  $b|a$ . But this is stronger than we need.

**Lemma 3.** i  $\implies$  iii

*Proof.* We will prove that for any natural  $k$  there exist  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in A$  with  $a_1|a_2|\dots|a_k$  by inducting on  $k$ . Lemma 2 gives us the base case with  $k = 2$ . So, assume that the statement is true for  $k - 1$ . If we consider the set

$$D = \left\{ \mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}) \in A^{k-1} : a_1|a_2|\dots|a_{k-1} \right\}$$

If this were finite, then we can take the set

$$A' = \{a \in A : \neg \exists \mathbf{d} \in D, 0 \leq i \leq k - 1 \text{ s.t. } d_i = a\}$$

This is still an infinite set if  $D$  is finite. But then our inductive hypothesis gives us a tuple  $(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{k-1}) \in D^{k-1}$  with  $d_1 | \dots | d_{k-1}$ , contradicting the definition of  $D$ . Therefore  $D$  must be infinite.

Now, consider the set

$$B = \{a \in A : \exists \mathbf{d} \in D \text{ s.t. } d_{k-1} = a\}$$

We want to show that  $B$  is infinite, so suppose to the contrary that  $B$  is finite. Then  $B$  has a maximum element  $b_m$ . But then  $D \subseteq \{1, \dots, b_m\}^{k-1}$ , which would mean that  $D$  is finite, even though we proved it was infinite. Therefore,  $B$  must be infinite.

Then lemma 2 guarantees us a pair  $b_1, b_2 \in B$  such that  $b_1 | b_2$ . Then there are some  $a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}$  such that  $a_1 | \dots | a_{k-2} | a_{k-1} = b_1$ . Then we have the  $k$ -tuple  $(a_1, \dots, a_{k-2}, b_1, b_2)$  with  $a_1 | \dots | a_{k-2} | b_1 | b_2$ , so we have completed the induction.

That means that there must be an infinite chain of divisibility in  $A$  because we showed that there is no maximum length for a chain of divisibility.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.** If  $A$  is an infinite subset of  $\mathbb{N}_+$  that has a finite prime shadow, then for cofinitely many  $a \in A$ , there exist  $a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots$  all in  $A$  with  $a_1 = a$  such that for all  $i > 0$ ,  $a_i | a_{i+1}$ . Informally, if  $A$  is an infinite subset of  $\mathbb{N}_+$  with finite prime shadow, then cofinitely many elements of  $A$  are part of an infinite ascending chain of divisibility.

*Proof.* Let  $B$  be the set of elements that are not part of an infinite chain of divisibility.

$$B = \left\{ a : \neg \exists (a_1, a_2, \dots) \in A^{\mathbb{N}} \text{ s.t. } a | a_1 | a_2 | \dots \right\}$$

Suppose  $B$  is infinite. Then lemma 3 tells us that there exists an infinite chain of divisibility in  $B$ . But that contradicts the definition of  $B$ , so  $B$  must be finite.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.** There are infinitely many primes

*Proof.* Start with  $a_1 = 2$ . Then iteratively define  $a_i$  as

$$1 + \prod_{n=1}^{i-1} a_n$$

Then for all  $i, j$ ,  $a_i$  and  $a_j$  are relatively prime. Then let  $A = \{a_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . This is an infinite set that has no infinite chain of divisibility, therefore  $S(A)$  cannot be finite. Thus there must be infinitely many primes.  $\square$