

# 1 Things Past

## 1.1 Some Number Theory

**Definition.** The set of **natural numbers**  $\mathbb{N}$  is defined by

$$\mathbb{N} = \{\text{integers } n : n \geq 0\}$$

**Least Integer Axiom**<sup>1</sup>. There is a smallest number  $n$  in every non-empty subset  $C$  of  $\mathbb{N}$ .

**Definition.** A natural number is **prime** if  $p \geq 2$  and there is no factorization  $p = ab$  where  $a < p$  and  $b < p$  are natural numbers.

**Proposition 1.1.** Every integer  $n \geq 2$  is either a prime or a product of primes.

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be the subset of  $\mathbb{N}$  consisting of all those  $n \geq 2$  for which the proposition is false. If  $C$  is non-empty, then there exists a smallest number  $k$  in  $C$ . Since  $k$  is not a prime, then there are natural numbers  $a$  and  $b$  such that  $k = ab$ , where  $a < k$  and  $b < k$ . But  $a$  and  $b$  are not in  $C$  since  $k$  is the smallest in  $C$ , then  $a$  and  $b$  are primes or product of primes. Therefore, the smallest number  $k$  in  $C$  is a product of primes, contradicting the proposition.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.2 (Mathematical Induction).** Let  $S(n)$  be a family of statements, one for each integer  $n \geq m$ , where  $m$  is some fixed number. If

- (i)  $S(m)$  is true, and
- (ii) if  $S(n)$  is true implies  $S(n+1)$  is true,

then  $S(n)$  is true for all integers  $n \geq m$ .

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be the set of all integers  $n \geq m$  for which  $S(n)$  is false. If  $C$  is not empty, there is a smallest integer  $k$  in  $C$  such that  $S(k)$  is false. By (i) we have  $k > m$ , then there exists an integer  $k-1 \notin C$  such that  $S(k-1)$  is true. By (ii), we have  $S((k-1)+1) = S(k)$ , where  $(k-1)+1 = k \notin C$  is also true. This contradicts the assumption that  $C$  is non-empty, thus  $C$  is empty. Therefore, the proposition is true.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.3 (Second Form of Induction).** Let  $S(n)$  be a family of statements, one for each integer  $n \geq m$ , where  $m$  is some fixed integer. If

1.  $S(m)$  is true, and
2. if  $S(k)$  is true for all  $k$  with  $m \leq k < n$ , then  $S(n)$  is itself true,

then  $S(n)$  is true for all integers  $n \geq m$ .

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be the set of all integers  $n \geq m$  for which  $S(n)$  is false. If  $C$  is not empty, there is a smallest integer  $k$  in  $C$  such that  $S(k)$  is false. By (i) we have  $k > m$ , then there exists an integer  $k-1 \notin C$  such that  $S(k-1)$  is true. Then by (ii), since  $S(i)$  is true for all  $i$  with  $m \leq i < k$ , then  $S(k)$  is itself true, contradicting the assumption that  $S(k)$  is false.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.4 (Division Theorem).** Given integers  $a$  and  $b$  with  $a \neq 0$ , there exist unique integers  $q$  and  $r$  with

$$b = qa + r \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq r < |a|$$

---

<sup>1</sup>This property is usually called the *well-ordering principle*

*Proof.* Suppose there exist another pair of integers  $q'$  and  $r'$  with  $b = q'a + r'$  where  $0 \leq r' < |a|$ . Then  $qa + r = q'a + r' \implies |(q - q')a| = |r' - r|$ . Since  $0 \leq |r' - r| < |r'| < |a| \implies 0 \leq |(q - q')a| < |a|$ , if  $a > 0$ , then  $0 \leq |q - q'| < 1$ , recall that  $q$  and  $q'$  are both integers, then  $q = q'$ ; if  $a < 0$ , then  $-1 < |q - q'| \leq 0 \implies q = q'$ . Both cases implies  $r = r'$  as well. This contradicts the assumption, therefore, the integers are unique.  $\square$

**Definition.** If  $a$  and  $b$  are integers with  $a \neq 0$ , then the integers  $q$  and  $r$  occurring in the division algorithm are called **quotient** and **remainder** after dividing  $b$  by  $a$ .

**Corollary 1.5.** There are infinitely many primes.

*Proof.* (**Euclid**) Suppose there are  $k$  finite primes  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k$ . Then define  $M = \prod_{i=1}^k p_i + 1$ , by Proposition 1.1, it is either a prime or a product of primes. Since our assumption indicates  $M$  is not a prime, then it must be a product of primes. But the fact that  $\frac{M}{\prod_{i=1}^k p_i}$  gives remainder not 0 but 1 shows  $M$  cannot be divided by the existing product of primes, by definition,  $M$  is a prime, which contradicting the assumption. So there must be infinite number of primes.  $\square$

**Definition.** If  $a$  and  $b$  are integers, then  $a$  is a **divisor** of  $b$  if there is an integer  $d$  with  $b = ad$ . We also say that  $a$  **divides**  $b$  or that  $b$  is a **multiple** of  $a$ , and we denote this by  $a \mid b$

**Definition.** A **common divisor** of integers  $a$  and  $b$  is an integer  $c$  with  $c \mid a$  and  $c \mid b$ . The **greatest common divisor** or **gcd** of  $a$  and  $b$ , denoted by  $(a, b)$ , is defined by

$$(a, b) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a = 0 = b \\ \text{the largest common divisor of } a \text{ and } b & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Proposition 1.6.** If  $p$  is a prime and  $b$  any given integer, then

$$(p, b) = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } p \mid b \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$