

MAT246 - Concepts in Abstract Mathematics

Callum Cassidy-Nolan

September 17, 2019

Contents

1	Lecture 1	9
1.1	Induction	9
2	Section One Problems	13
3	Lecture 2	15
3.1	Proof of Induction	15
3.2	Division	16
4	Lecture 3	19
4.1	There is no largest prime	19
5	Lecture 4	21
5.1	Modular Arithmetic	23

List of Definitions

1	Definition (The principle of mathematical induction)	9
2	Definition (Extended principle of mathematical induction)	11
3	Definition (Well Ordering Principle)	15
4	Definition (Divides)	16
5	Definition (Prime)	16
6	Definition (Complete Induction)	17
7	Definition (Composite)	23
8	Definition (Congruence)	23

List of Theorems

1	Theorem (Product of Primes)	16
2	Theorem (Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic)	21

Chapter 1

Lecture 1

1.1 Induction

Note 1

$$\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$$

Definition 1 (The principle of mathematical induction)

suppose $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$

If

- $1 \in S$
- $k + 1 \in S$ whenever $k \in S$

Then

$$\boxed{S = \mathbb{N}}$$

The principle of mathematical induction is simply saying if 1 is in S then $2, 3, \dots$ is also in S

Example 1.1.1

Prove

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \underbrace{1^2 + 2^2 + \dots + n^2 = \frac{n(n+1)(2n+1)}{6}}_{\chi}$$

Proof.

Let $S = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \chi \text{ holds} \}$ At this point we don't know what S consists of but we must

show it is \mathbb{N} , then we can conclude that the formula holds for all natural numbers. We commence by verifying that $1 \in S$, we have

$$1^2 = \frac{1(1+1)(2+1)}{6}$$

both the right hand side and left hand side are equal to each other, so the formula holds for 1.

We will now show if $k \in S$ then $k+1 \in S$. We assume that $k \in S$, that is :

$$1^2 + 2^2 + \dots + k^2 = \frac{k(k+1)(2k+1)}{6}$$

We observe that if we add $k+1$ to both sides of the above equation we get the left hand side, of what we want to prove.

$$\begin{aligned} 1^2 + 2^2 + \dots + k^2 + (k+1)^2 &= \frac{k(k+1)(2k+1)}{6} + (k+1)^2 \\ &= \frac{k(k+1)(2k+1) + 6(k+1)^2}{6} \\ &= \frac{(k+1)(k(2k+1) + 6(k+1))}{6} \\ &= \frac{(k+1)(2k^2 + 7k + 6)}{6} \\ &= \frac{(k+1)(k+2)(2k+3)}{6} \\ &= \frac{(k+1)((k+1)+1)(2(k+1)+1)}{6} \end{aligned}$$

After working out the right hand side it is the original formula with $k+1$ subbed in. Therefore we have shown that if $k \in S$ then $k+1 \in S$ as wanted, thus by the principle of mathematical induction

$$S = \mathbb{N}$$

.

■

Definition 2 (Extended principle of mathematical induction)

This is the same as normal induction, though now we don't have to start with 1. If

- *Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}, n_0 \in S$*
- *$k \in S \implies k + 1 \in S$*

Then

$$S \supseteq \{n_0, n_0 + 1, \dots\}$$

Observe that S is only a subset of these numbers as these are the ones that are guaranteed to be in S , there may be others.

Example 1.1.2

Prove for all integers n greater than or equal to 7 that the following holds:

$$\underline{n!} \geq 3^n \chi$$

Proof.

Let S be the set of all natural numbers that χ holds for. We verify that $7 \in S$

$$\underline{7!}_{5040} \geq \underline{3^7}_{2187}$$

therefore 7 satisfies χ and so $7 \in S$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we assume χ holds for k , that is

$$k! \geq 3^k$$

We will prove

$$(k+1)! \geq 3^{k+1}$$

We observe that $(k+1)! = (k+1)k!$, but recall that we assumed that $k! \geq 3^k$ so we have

$$k!(k+1) \geq 3^k(k+1)$$

Recall that $k \geq 7$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq 3^k 8 \\ &\geq 3^{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we've shown that

$$(k+1)! \geq 3^{k+1}$$

as required, and so

$$S \supseteq \{7, 8, 9, \dots\}$$

■

Chapter 2

Section One Problems

composite

- $2 \mid 68$
- $3 \mid 129$
- $2 \mid 20, 101, 116$

primes

- Maybe?
- no, $3 \mid 153$
- Maybe?
- no, $2 \mid 851, 486$

sum of primes

- $97 + 3 = 100$?

Chapter 3

Lecture 2

Definition 3 (Well Ordering Principle)
Every subset of \mathbb{N} other than \emptyset has a smallest element.

3.1 Proof of Induction

Remark 3.1.1

We accepted the Principle of Mathematical Induction, though we should prove it.

Recall, the Principle of Mathematical Induction, suppose $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, if

- $1 \in S$
- $k + 1 \in S$ whenever $k \in S$

then

$$S = \mathbb{N}$$

We'll prove the statement

Proof.

Let $T = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \notin S\}$. suppose that $T \neq \emptyset$, therefore by the Well Ordering Principle we know that T has a smallest element, let n_0 be that element. Note that $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $n_0 \neq 1$ since $1 \in S \therefore 1 \notin T$, therefore $n_0 \geq 2$.

since $n_0 \geq 2$ we know $n_0 - 1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $n_0 - 1 \notin T$ since n_0 is the smallest element in T .

$$n_0 - 1 \notin T \implies n_0 - 1 \in S$$

But by property 2, of S we know that if $n_0 \in S$ then $n_0 \in S$, though this is a contradiction as $n_0 \notin S$

Therefore $T = \emptyset$ and $S = \mathbb{N}$ ■

3.2 Division

Definition 4 (Divides)

for $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ we say that a divides b if there exists a $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$b = ca$$

And we say

$$a \mid b$$

Remark 3.2.1

$2 \cdot 3.5 = 7$, though our definition is only for natural numbers, since no $c \in \mathbb{N}$ gives $2 \cdot c = 7$

Definition 5 (Prime)

$p \in \mathbb{N}$ is prime if the only divisor of p are 1 and p and $p \neq 1$

Example

- 7 is prime, since the only divisor is 1 and 7
- 10 is not prime, 2 and 5 divide 10

Theorem 1 (Product of Primes)

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \neq 1$ n can be written as a product of primes

Example

- $42 = 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 7$
- $12 = 3 \cdot 2^2$

Definition 6 (Complete Induction)

Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$

- if $n_0 \in S$
 - and $k + 1 \in S$ when $n_0, n_0 + 1, \dots, k \in S$

Then

$$S \supseteq \{n_0, n_0 + 1, \dots\}$$

We will prove the product of primes theorem

Proof.

Let $S = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{theorem holds for } n\}$ we will prove

$$S = \mathbb{N}$$

- 2, is prime therefore it is a product of primes and so the Base Case holds.
- We assume if $2, 3, \dots, k \in S$ then $k + 1 \in S$
 - **Case 1:** $k + 1$ is prime, then we are done like the base case
 - **Case 2:** $k + 1$ is not prime, then there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 < m < k + 1$ and $m \mid k + 1$ by definition this means

$$k + 1 = c \cdot m, \text{ for some } c \in \mathbb{N}$$

observe that $1 < c < k + 1$ since if $c = 1, c = k + 1$ or if larger we get a contradiction.

Therefore we can use the Induction Hypothesis on c and m to write them both as a product of primes, multiplying them together gives us a new product of primes equal to $k + 1$ as required.

Therefore by the principle of complete induction we can say that

$$S \supseteq \{2, 3, \dots\}$$

though we want to show that $S = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ observe that 1 is not a product of primes as it is not prime and also not composite, therefore $1 \notin S$ so $S = \{2, 3, \dots\}$ ■

The intuition behind this proof comes from the fact that if we take a number say 24 it is either prime or not, in this case it is not, and we can write it as $24 = 6 \cdot 4$ then by an inductive argument, we already know that 6 and 4 are already product of primes so we are done. We will show next that in fact this is a unique product.

Chapter 4

Lecture 3

Recall from last lecture we showed that every natural number besides 1 can be written as a product of primes. Thus we have the following

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1 \implies n \text{ is divisible by some prime}$$

Let's call the above α

4.1 There is no largest prime

Proof.

suppose by contradiction p is the largest prime, that is

$$\{2, 3, \dots, p\}$$

are all the primes. Let $m = (2 \cdot 3 \cdot \dots \cdot p) + 1$, we note that for any $j \in \{2, 3, \dots, p\}$ they must not divide m as they each of a remainder of 1. We observe that $m \geq 1$ thus by α we know that there exists some $q \in \mathbb{N}$ where q is prime such that

$$q \mid m$$

So then $q \neq 2, 3, \dots, p$ and so we have found a new prime, which contradicted that we had found all primes, so we get a contradiction, therefore there is no largest prime. ■

Chapter 5

Lecture 4

Theorem 2 (Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic)

Every natural number other than 1, is a product of primes (proved last lecture) and the primes in the product are unique (including multiplicity) except for the order in which they occur.

Recall given $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \neq 1$, n is a product of primes that is

$$n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{k-1} p_k$$

for example

$$180 = 9 \cdot 10 \cdot 2 = 3^2 5^1 2^2$$

So equivalently we have

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, 1 < n \implies n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$$

where p_i are distinct primes and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}$

We will prove that the prime factorization of any natural number greater than 1 has is unique by contradiction.

Proof.

We commence

- Suppose there are some numbers with two distinct factorizations into primes.
- Let \mathcal{X} be the set of these numbers, observe that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ thus by the Well Ordering Principle we let n be the smallest such number in \mathcal{X} , we have

$$n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{k-1} p_k = q_1 q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l$$

(Note here we aren't using powers, but we allow for repeated primes, and that p_i, q_j are primes)

- Suppose that the two product of primes share at least one factor, say $p_r = q_r$, then in each product of primes they cancel out and we get that a new smaller number that can be written as a product of primes, though this would cause a contradiction since we assumed n was the smallest such number with this property.
 - Therefore all the p_i are different than the q_j
- Since we know $p_i \neq q_j$ then specifically $p_1 \neq q_1$ if this is true there are two cases either $p_1 \leq q_1$ or $p_1 \geq q_1$.
- **Case 1:** $p_1 < q_1$

- We note $n = q_1 q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l > p_1 q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l$
- $p_1 q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l < n \Leftrightarrow 0 < n - p_1 q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l$
- Note that $p_i, q_j \in \mathbb{N}$ so the product of any of them is also an element of the naturals, and then also $n - p_1 q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l \in \mathbb{N}$.

Why?

- Note that $m < n \implies m$ has a unique factorization into primes, we know

- $m = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{k-1} p_k - q_1 q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l = p_1 (p_2 \cdots p_{k-1} p_k - q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l)$
- $m = q_1 q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l - p_1 q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l = (q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l)(q_1 - p_1)$
- * Together

$$p_1 (p_2 \cdots p_{k-1} p_k - q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l) = \underbrace{(q_2 \cdots q_{l-1} q_l)}_{\chi} (q_1 - p_1)$$

- The left hand side of the above tells us that p_1 is a prime factor of m which means it is also a factor of the right hand side.
 - But observe $p_1 \nmid \chi$ since $p_1 \neq q_j$
 - Therefore it must be that $p_1 \mid (q_1 - p_1)$ this is true if and only if $p_1 \mid q_1$ since q_1 is prime this means that $p_1 = 1$ or $p_1 = q_1$ either of which are contradictions, therefore

What does this contradict?

■

Techniques Used in this proof

- Here

Definition 7 (Composite)

A natural number c is called composite if

$$c \neq 1$$

c is not prime

Q: Can we find 20 consecutive composite numbers?

Yes, consider

$$21! + 2, 21! + 3, \dots, 21! + 21$$

Observe 2 divides the first number, 3, divides the next on until 21, giving us 20 composites

Q: Can we find k consecutive composite numbers?

Yes, using the same method we have

$$(k+1)! + 2, (k+1)! + 3, \dots, (k+1)! + k + 1$$

thus we conclude there are arbitrary long stretches of composite numbers.

5.1 Modular Arithmetic

For some intuition, consider military time, if someone tells us it's 15 o'clock we know that this is equivalent to 3 o'clock, and this will help us represent this type of situation

First we define the integers that is

$$\mathbb{Z} = \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\}$$

Definition 8 (Congruence)

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. if

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

then we say a is congruent to b and we write

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

Example

- Let $m = 12$ (the hours on the clock)
 - it follows that $13 \equiv 1 \pmod{12}$ since $12 \mid (13 - 1)$
 - $14 \equiv 2 \pmod{12}$ and $23 \equiv -1 \pmod{12}$
 - So this shows us in the world of the clock some numbers are the “same”
- $m = 2$
 - We observe
 - * $0 \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \Leftrightarrow 2 \mid (0 - 0)$ which is true since we take $c = 0$ in the definition of divisibility.
 - * $1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$
 - * $2 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$
 - * $3 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$
 - * $4 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$
 - * $5 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$