

# Notes on “Finite-Dimensional Vector Spaces”

## by Paul R. Halmos

October 25, 2022

Each `\section` corresponds to the scope of one member’s assignment, and each `\subsection` corresponds to one theorem or exercise in the textbook, specified in the format  $m.n$  where  $m$  is the section number and  $n$  is the theorem/exercise number. If  $n$  is not given, we use  $n = 1$  instead.

## Contents

<b>1 Toga (2022/09/19)</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Exercise 1.1 . . . . .	1
<b>2 Mohehe (2022/09/27)</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 Exercise 1.1 . . . . .	1
<b>3 Mohehe (2022/09/19)</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1 Exercise 1.2 . . . . .	2
<b>4 Mohehe (2022/10/8)</b>	<b>3</b>
4.1 Exercise 1.3 . . . . .	3
4.2 Exercise 1.4 (2022/10/24) . . . . .	5

## 1 Toga (2022/09/19)

### 1.1 Exercise 1.1

- (a) Since addition is commutative,  $0 + \alpha = \alpha + 0$  holds. We also have  $\alpha + 0 = \alpha$  by definition, hence  $0 + \alpha = \alpha$ .

## 2 Mohehe (2022/09/27)

### 2.1 Exercise 1.1

- (b) If  $\alpha + \beta = \alpha + \gamma$ , we have  $\beta = \beta + 0 = 0 + \beta = (\alpha + (-\alpha)) + \beta = ((-\alpha) + \alpha) + \beta = (-\alpha) + (\alpha + \beta) = (-\alpha) + (\alpha + \gamma) = ((-\alpha) + \alpha) + \gamma =$

- $(\alpha + (-\alpha)) + \gamma = 0 + \gamma = \gamma + 0 = \gamma$  by definition. Therefore,  $\beta = \gamma$  holds.
- (c) We have  $\alpha + (\beta - \alpha) = \alpha + (\beta + (-\alpha)) = \alpha + ((-\alpha) + \beta) = (\alpha + (-\alpha)) + \beta = 0 + \beta = \beta + 0 = \beta$  by definition. Therefore,  $\alpha + (\beta - \alpha) = \beta$  holds.
- (d) We have  $\alpha 0 + \alpha 0 = \alpha(0 + 0) = \alpha 0 = \alpha + 0$  by definition, hence  $\alpha 0 = 0$  by Exercise 1(b). We also have  $\alpha \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot \alpha$  by definition. Therefore,  $\alpha \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot \alpha = 0$
- (e) We have  $\alpha + (-1)\alpha = 1\alpha + (-1)\alpha = (1 + (-1))\alpha = 0\alpha = 0$  by definition and Exercise 1(d). Since the additive inverse is unique, we obtain  $(-1)\alpha = -\alpha$ .
- (f) We have  $(-\alpha)(-\beta) = ((-1)\alpha)((-1)\beta) = (\alpha(-1))((-1)\beta) = \alpha((-1)((-1)\beta)) = \alpha((-1)(-1)\beta)$  by Exercise 1(e) and definition. We also have  $(-1)(-1) = 0 + (-1)(-1) = (1 + (-1)) + (-1)(-1) = 1 + (-1) + (-1)(-1) = 1 + (-1)((-1) + 1) = 1 + (-1)(1 + (-1)) = 1 + (-1)0 = 1 + 0 = 1$  by definition. By it and definition,  $\alpha((-1)(-1)\beta) = \alpha(1\beta) = \alpha(\beta 1) = \alpha\beta$  holds. Therefore,  $(-\alpha)(-\beta) = \alpha\beta$  holds.
- (g) If  $\alpha\beta = 0$ , suppose  $\alpha \neq 0$  and  $\beta \neq 0$  hold. By supposition and definition, we have  $0 = \alpha^{-1}0 = \alpha^{-1}(\alpha\beta) = (\alpha^{-1}\alpha)\beta = (\alpha\alpha^{-1})\beta = 1\beta = \beta 1 = \beta$ , hence  $\beta = 0$ . However, this result contradicts supposition, “ $\alpha \neq 0$  and  $\beta \neq 0$ ”. Therefore, if  $\alpha\beta = 0$ , then either  $\alpha = 0$  or  $\beta = 0$  (or both).

### 3 Mohehe (2022/09/19)

#### 3.1 Exercise 1.2

- (a) The set of positive integers is not a field since there is no additive inverse for 1.
- (b) The set of integers is not a field since there is no multiplicative inverse for 2.
- (c) There exists a bijective map  $\varphi$  from  $\mathbb{N}$  (or  $\mathbb{Z}$ ) to  $\mathbb{Q}$  [1], where  $\mathbb{Q}$  is a field [2]. We can make  $\mathbb{N}$  a field by re-defining (i) addition by  $a \oplus b = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(a) + \varphi(b))$  and (ii) multiplication by  $a \otimes b = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(a)\varphi(b))$  for each  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that the additive and multiplicative identities become  $\varphi^{-1}(0)$  and  $\varphi^{-1}(1)$ , respectively. For each  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ , the additive inverse becomes  $\varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha))$ , and the multiplicative inverse becomes  $\varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha))$  if  $\alpha \neq \varphi^{-1}(0)$ .

Let  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \alpha', \beta' \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that

- 1)  $\alpha \oplus \beta = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\alpha)) = \beta \oplus \alpha$  holds. (addition is commutative)

- 2)  $\alpha \oplus (\beta \oplus \gamma) = \alpha \oplus (\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + (\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}((\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta)) + \varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta))) + \varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta)) \oplus \gamma = (\alpha \oplus \beta) \oplus \gamma$  holds.(addition is associative)
- 3)  $\alpha \oplus \varphi^{-1}(0) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(0))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + 0) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)) = \alpha$  holds.(there exists additive identity,  $\varphi^{-1}(0)$ ) If  $\alpha'$  and  $\beta'$  are additive identity, we have  $\alpha' = \alpha' \oplus \beta' = \beta' \oplus \alpha' = \beta'$  by 1) and the definition of additive identity.(additive identity is unique)
- 4)  $-\varphi(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Q}$  holds by definition, so  $\varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha)) \in \mathbb{N}$  holds. Therefore,  $\alpha \oplus \varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + (-\varphi(\alpha))) = \varphi^{-1}(0)$  holds.(for each  $\alpha$  ( $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ ), there exists additive inverse) For each  $\alpha$ , if  $\alpha'$  and  $\beta'$  are additive inverse, we have  $\alpha' = \alpha' \oplus \varphi^{-1}(0) = \alpha' \oplus (\alpha \oplus \beta') = (\alpha' \oplus \alpha) \oplus \beta' = (\alpha \oplus \alpha') \oplus \beta' = \varphi^{-1}(0) \oplus \beta' = \beta \oplus \varphi^{-1}(0) = \beta'$  by 1), 2), 3) and the definition of additive inverse.(additive inverse is unique)
- 5)  $\alpha \otimes \beta = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\alpha)) = \beta \otimes \alpha$  holds.(multiplication is commutative)
- 6)  $\alpha \otimes (\beta \otimes \gamma) = \alpha \otimes (\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)))\varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)) \otimes \gamma = (\alpha \otimes \beta) \otimes \gamma$  holds.(multiplication is associative)
- 7)  $\alpha \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(1))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) \cdot 1) = \alpha$  holds.(there exists additive identity,  $\varphi^{-1}(1)$ ) If  $\alpha'$  and  $\beta'$  are additive identity, we have  $\alpha' = \alpha' \otimes \beta' = \beta' \otimes \alpha' = \beta'$  by 5) and definition of multiplicative identity.(multiplicative identity is unique)
- 8) For each  $\alpha$  ( $\alpha \neq \varphi^{-1}(0)$ ),  $(1/\varphi(\alpha)) \in \mathbb{Q}$  holds by definition, so  $\varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha)) \in \mathbb{N}$  holds. Therefore,  $\alpha \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)(1/\varphi(\alpha))) = \varphi^{-1}(1)$  holds.(for each  $\alpha$  ( $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ ), there exists multiplicative inverse) For each  $\alpha$  ( $\alpha \neq \varphi^{-1}(0)$ ), if  $\alpha'$  and  $\beta'$  are multiplicative inverse, we have  $\alpha' = \alpha' \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1) = \alpha' \otimes (\alpha \otimes \beta') = (\alpha' \otimes \alpha) \otimes \beta' = (\alpha \otimes \alpha') \otimes \beta' = \varphi^{-1}(1) \otimes \beta' = \beta' \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1) = \beta'$  by 5), 6), 7) and the definition of multiplicative inverse.(multiplicative inverse is unique)
- 9)  $\alpha \otimes (\beta \oplus \gamma) = \alpha \otimes (\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta))) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha \otimes \beta) + \varphi(\alpha \otimes \gamma)) = \alpha \otimes \beta \oplus \alpha \otimes \gamma$  holds.(distributive law stands)

## 4 Mohehe (2022/10/8)

### 4.1 Exercise 1.3

For two integers  $a$  and  $b$ , we denote by  $a \% b$  the remainder after dividing  $a$  by  $b$ , and write  $b \mid a$  if and only if  $a \% b = 0$ . For clarity, we denote the ordinary

sum and product of two integers  $a$  and  $b$  by  $a +_{\mathbb{Z}} b$  and  $a \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} b$ , respectively. Note that  $\alpha + \beta = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m$  and  $\alpha\beta = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m$  for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{Z}_m$ .

(a) Let  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_m, k \in \mathbb{Z}$

1' Proof : if  $m$  is a prime,  $\mathcal{Z}_m$  is a field.

Suppose  $m$  is a prime,

- 1)  $\alpha + \beta = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m = (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \alpha) \% m = \beta + \alpha$  (addition is commutative)
- 2) Since  $\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta + \gamma) = \alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m \equiv \alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \equiv (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma = (\alpha + \beta) +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \pmod{m}$  holds,  $\alpha + (\beta + \gamma) = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta + \gamma)) \% m = ((\alpha + \beta) +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m = (\alpha + \beta) + \gamma$  holds. (addition is associative)
- 3)  $\alpha + 0 = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} 0) \% m = \alpha \% m = \alpha$  (there exists additive identity)  
By it and 1), if  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  are additive identity,  $\beta = \beta + \gamma = \gamma + \beta = \gamma$  (additive identity is unique)
- 4) If  $\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta = m$ ,  $\alpha + \beta = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m = m \% m = 0$  (there exists additive inverse)
- 5)  $\alpha\beta = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m = (\beta \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \alpha) \% m = \beta\alpha$  (multiplication is commutative)
- 6) Since  $\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta\gamma) = \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} ((\beta \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m) \equiv \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \equiv ((\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma = (\alpha\beta) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \pmod{m}$  holds,  $\alpha(\beta\gamma) = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta\gamma)) \% m = ((\alpha\beta) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m = (\alpha\beta)\gamma$  holds. (multiplication is associative)
- 7)  $\alpha 1 = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} 1) \% m = \alpha \% m = \alpha$  (there exists multiplicative identity) By it and 5), if  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  are multiplicative identity,  $\beta = \beta\gamma = \gamma\beta = \gamma$  (multiplicative identity is unique)
- 8) For all  $\alpha (\alpha \neq 0)$ , suppose there doesn't exist  $\beta$  that makes  $\alpha\beta = 1$ . There exist  $\beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_m$  with  $\beta \neq \gamma$  and  $\alpha\beta = \alpha\gamma$ , because  $\beta$  is any one from 0 to  $m-1$  and  $\alpha\beta$  is any one from 0 to  $m-1$  except 1. Therefore,  $(\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma)) = \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\gamma)) = km$  holds. The right side has divisor  $m$ , but it contradicts that the left side doesn't have divisor of  $m$  except 1, because  $0 < \alpha < (m-1)$  and  $((-m) < (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\gamma)) < 0$  or  $0 < (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\gamma)) < m$ ) holds. Thus, there exists  $\beta$  that makes  $\alpha\beta = 1$ . (there exists multiplicative inverse)  
**A brief proof:** Since each  $\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}_m \setminus \{0\}$  is coprime to  $m$ , there exist integers  $x$  and  $y$  such that  $\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} x +_{\mathbb{Z}} m \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} y = 1$  by [3]. Putting  $x' = x \% m \in \mathcal{Z}_m$ , we obtain  $\alpha x' = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} x) \% m = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} x +_{\mathbb{Z}} m \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} y) \% m = 1 \% m = 1$ . Hence  $x' = \alpha^{-1}$ .
- 9)  $\alpha(\beta + \gamma) = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta + \gamma)) \% m = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} ((\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m)) \% m \equiv (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma)) \% m = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta + \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m \equiv ((\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m) \% m \equiv (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m + (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m \equiv \alpha\beta + \alpha\gamma$  holds. (distributive law stands)

In conclusion, if  $m$  is a prime,  $\mathcal{Z}_m$  is a field.

2' Proof : If  $\mathcal{Z}_m$  is a field,  $m$  is a prime.

By contraposition, it is equivalent to prove "If  $m$  is not a prime,  $\mathcal{Z}_m$  is not a field." We can show 1) to 7) and 9) in the same way as 1'. For each  $m$ , suppose there exist  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  that make  $\alpha\beta = 1$ .  $m$  is not a prime, so let  $p$  be one of prime factors of  $m$  and then we have  $m = p \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p' (p' \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } 1 < p' < m)$

If  $\alpha = p$ , by  $\alpha\beta = 1$  and  $m = p \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p'$ , we have  $\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta = k \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} m + 1 (k \in \mathbb{Z}) \Leftrightarrow p \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta = k \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p' +_{\mathbb{Z}} 1 \Leftrightarrow (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-k \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p')) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p = 1$ . The right side is 1 but the left one is not 1 because of  $1 < p$  and  $\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-k \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p') \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Therefore It is contradicted. For each  $m$ , there doesn't exist  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  that make  $\alpha\beta = 1$ . In conclusion, "If  $m$  is not a prime,  $\mathcal{Z}_m$  is not a field." and "If  $\mathcal{Z}_m$  is a field,  $m$  is a prime."

Because of 1' and 2',  $\mathcal{Z}_m$  is a field if and only if  $m$  is a prime.

(b) 4

(c) 5

## 4.2 Exercise 1.4 (2022/10/24)

Define  $\alpha_n = \overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{n \text{ terms}}$  for  $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha_m \alpha_n &= \alpha_m (\overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{n \text{ terms}}) \\
 &= \alpha_m ((\overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{(n-1) \text{ terms}}) + 1) \\
 &= \alpha_m (\overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{(n-1) \text{ terms}}) + \alpha_m \cdot 1 && \text{(by distributive law)} \\
 &= \alpha_m (\overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{(n-1) \text{ terms}}) + \alpha_m && \text{(by definition of multiplicative identity)} \\
 &= \dots \\
 &= \alpha_m (1 + 1) + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \dots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \\
 &= \alpha_m \cdot 1 + \alpha_m \cdot 1 + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \dots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} && \text{(by distributive law)} \\
 &= \overbrace{\alpha_m + \dots + \alpha_m}^{n \text{ terms}} && \text{(by definition of multiplicative identity)} \\
 &= \overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{m \text{ terms}} + (\overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{m \text{ terms}}) + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \dots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \\
 &= \overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{m \text{ terms}} + ((\overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{(m-1) \text{ terms}}) + 1) + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \dots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{m \text{ terms}} + (1 + \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(m-1) \text{ terms}}) + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \quad (\text{by commutative property}) \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(m+1) \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(m-1) \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \quad (\text{by associative property}) \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(2m-2) \text{ terms}} + (1 + 1) + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{2m \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \quad (\text{by associative property}) \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{m(n-1) \text{ terms}} + \alpha_m \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(mn-2) \text{ terms}} + (1 + 1) \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{mn \text{ terms}} \quad (\text{by associative property}) \\
&= \alpha_{mn}
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $m, n$ .

Assume there exists an  $n$  with  $\alpha_n = 0$  but  $\alpha_k \neq 0$  for any  $k < n$ . It suffices to prove that  $n$  is a prime.

Suppose  $n$  is not any prime. Let  $p$  be one of prime factors of  $n$  and then we have  $n = pp'$  ( $p' \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p' > 1$ ). By  $\alpha_m \alpha_n = \alpha_{mn}$  for all  $m$  and  $n$ ,  $\alpha_n = \alpha_p \alpha_{p'}$  holds. We have either  $\alpha_p = 0$  or  $\alpha_{p'} = 0$  (or both) because of  $\alpha_n = 0$  and Exercise 1.1 (g). However, it is contradictory to  $\alpha_p = 0$  and  $\alpha_{p'} = 0$ . Therefore,  $n$  is a prime.

## References

- [1] [https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Rational\\_Numbers\\_are\\_Countably\\_Infinite](https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Rational_Numbers_are_Countably_Infinite)
- [2] [https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Rational\\_Numbers\\_form\\_Field](https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Rational_Numbers_form_Field)
- [3] [https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Bezout%27s\\_Identity](https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Bezout%27s_Identity)