## Abbot Chapter 1 Section 2

Heman Gandhi 2024-10-22

## Exercise 1.2.1-a

This follows the exercise\_1\_2\_1 section in Lean, so might be overly detailed. I'm also pretentiously going to use lemmas that correspond to the Lean theorems.

**Lemma.** First, we show that for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we know that there is an  $x \in \mathbb{N}$  so that 3x = n, 3x + 1 = n, or 3x + 2 = n.

*Proof.* We proceed by induction, showing that  $3 \cdot 0 = 0$ , then if the statement holds for n, we proceed by cases and show that for the same x we reached for n, we either have 3x + 1 = n + 1, 3x + 2 = n + 1, or 3(x + 1) = n + 1.

**Lemma.** If  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $3 \nmid n$  if and only if for some  $x \in \mathbb{N}$ , 3x + 1 = n or 3x + 2 = n.

*Proof.* We can prove the forward direction by the above statement: since 3x = n would contradict the assumption that  $3 \nmid n$ .

The reverse direction is simplest by contradiction: if we have the x with remainder 1 or 2, we cannot find some y so that 3y = n, since we'd form the equation 3(y - x) = r for r being 1 or 2, which is absurd since 3 cannot divide a non-zero number less than itself.

For the final lemma: we show that

**Lemma.** For  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  if  $3 \mid ab$ ,  $3 \mid a$  or  $3 \mid b$ .

*Proof.* We show the contrapositive: assuming  $3 \nmid a$  and  $3 \nmid b$ , we have  $3x_a + r_a = a$  and  $3x_b + r_b = b$  for  $x_a, x_b \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $r_a, r_b \in \{1, 2\}$  from the forward direction of the above. We compute ab with the above in all four cases:

- 1. if  $r_a, r_b = 1$ , then  $ab = 9x_ax_b + 3x_a + 3x_b + 1 = 3(3x_ax_b + x_a + x_b) + 1$ ;
- 2. if  $r_a = 1$ ,  $r_b = 2$ , then  $ab = 9x_ax_b + 6x_a + 3x_b + 1 = 3(3x_ax_b + 2x_a + x_b) + 2$ ;
- 3. if  $r_a = 2$ ,  $r_b = 1$ , then  $ab = 9x_ax_b + 3x_a + 6x_b + 1 = 3(3x_ax_b + x_a + 2x_b) + 2$ ;
- 4. if  $r_a, r_b = 2$ , then  $ab = 9x_ax_b + 6x_a + 6x_b + 4 = 3(3x_ax_b + 2x_a + 2x_b + 1) + 1$ .

In all the cases, we can express ab = 3y + r for  $y \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $r \in \{1, 2\}$  and apply the backwards direction of the lemma above to conclude  $3 \nmid ab$ , showing the contrapositive.

**Lemma.**  $\sqrt{3}$  is irrational.

*Proof.* For contradiction, let  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\frac{a^2}{b^2} = 3$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that a and b don't share factors. Rewriting this as  $a^2 = 3b^2$ , we see that  $3 \mid a^2$ , so the above gives us that  $3 \mid a$ . Hence, we write a = 3d, so  $a^2 = 9d^2 = 3b^2$ , which means that  $b^2 = 3d^2$ , so  $3 \mid b$ . This contradicts the assumption that a and b don't share factors.  $\square$ 

The proof would more-or-less work for  $\sqrt{6}$ .

The proof below is kept brief, emphasizing the differences between the case for  $\sqrt{3}$  and  $\sqrt{6}$ . Lean has all the details.

**Lemma.**  $\sqrt{6}$  is irrational.

*Proof.* We follow the above structure of the proof for  $\sqrt{3}$ : we have that for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is an  $x \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 \le r \le 5$  with  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . Futhermore, r = 0 if and only if  $6 \mid n$ . Finally, instead of the prior lemma, we show  $6 \mid a^2$  implies  $6 \mid a$ . If we attempt the contrapositive, we have 5 cases for a = 6x + r, where we rewrite  $a^2 = 6(6x^2 + 2rx) + r^2 = 6y + r^2$ :

- 1. if r = 1,  $r^2 = 1$ , so  $a^2 = 6y + 1$ ;
- 2. if r = 2,  $r^2 = 4$ , so  $a^2 = 6y + 4$ ;
- 3. if r = 3,  $r^2 = 9$ , so  $a^2 = 6(y+1) + 3$ ;
- 4. if r = 4,  $r^2 = 16$ , so  $a^2 = 6(y + 2) + 4$ ;
- 5. if r = 5,  $r^2 = 25$ , so  $a^2 = 6(y+4) + 1$ .

This shows that if  $a \nmid 6$ ,  $a^2 \nmid 6$ . We can proceed with this, showing that if  $a^2 = 6b^2$  and a and b don't share factors, we get  $6 \mid a$  and  $6 \mid b$ .

## Exercise 1.2.1-b

The proof of theorem 1.1.1 breaks down at the first supposition that  $p^2 = 4q^2$  as p = 2, q = 1 already suffices. Furthermore,  $4 \mid 6^2$  but  $4 \nmid 6$ , so in the next step, we cannot conclude anything from the fact that  $4 \mid p^2$ .

## Exercise 1.2.2

*Proof.* If we suppose that  $2^r = 3$  for some rational r, we can show that  $2^p = 3^q$  for some  $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$  with p > 1. However, we can show that all such powers of 2 are even whereas all powers of 3 are odd. Therefore, such a p, q cannot exist.  $\square$