

MUSA 74 Homework 3

Tarang Srivastava

a. Homework 1.67

Proof. Proceed by induction on n . For the base case consider when $n = 1$. That is, $p|a_1$. The base case is trivially true, and the statement holds. Assume the statement holds for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. That is, if $p|a_i \dots a_k$, then there is some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $p|a_i$. In the inductive step, we need to show the statement holds for $k + 1$. That is, if $p|a_i \dots a_{k+1}$, then there is some $i \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$ such that $p|a_i$. We will prove the inductive step by cases. The first case is when i is in some set $\{1, \dots, k\}$. From our inductive hypothesis we know there exists an $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $p|a_i$. The second case is when i is not in some set $\{1, \dots, k\}$. Therefore, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $p \nmid a_i$. Which is equivalent to the $\gcd(p, a_i) = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, but since $p|a_i \dots a_{k+1}$, and the \gcd for p and $a_i \dots a_{k+1}$ is p . There must exist an a_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$ such that \gcd for p and a_i is p and therefore $p|a_i$. Thus, having shown the inductive step the statement holds for all n .

b. Homework 1.68

Proof. Since we are concerned about a Cartesian product an arbitrary n times we can proceed by induction on n . For the base case of $n = 0$, \mathbb{N} is trivially countable. Assume that for some Cartesian product $k \in \mathbb{N}$ times, the product is countable. We will show that the Cartesian product for $k + 1$ times is also countable. Let $g : X_1 \times X_2 \times \dots \times X_k \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ from the inductive hypothesis. Then we can define a bijective function f such that for $f(2k) = g(2k)$ and $f(2k + 1) = n \in X$. This definition of f creates a bijection for the $k + 1$ case and therefore by induction the statement holds for all n .

c. Homework 1.69

Proof. Proceed by induction on n . For the base case consider when $n = 1$. The statement holds since,

$$1^2 = \frac{1(2)(3)}{6} = 1$$

For the inductive step assume the statement holds for some k . That is,

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

We will show the statement holds for $k + 1$. That is,

$$1^2 + 2^2 + \dots + (k+1)^2 = \frac{(k+1)(k+2)(2k+3)}{6}$$

From our inductive hypothesis we can substitute in

$$\frac{k(k+1)(2k+1)}{6} + (k+1)^2 = \frac{(k+1)(k+2)(2k+3)}{6}$$

Which with some algebraic manipulations we can show are equivalent.

d. Homework 5.8

Proof. Suppose for contradiction there exists a $\phi \in \alpha$ such that $P(\phi)$ is false. The first case is that $\phi = 0$ in which case the statement does not hold. The second case is that if $P(k+1)$ is false, then $P(k)$ is false. This does not hold for $\phi = 1$ and by strong induction for all γ less than the limit. Lastly, if ϕ is a limit, then by the second condition it is also true. Therefore, no such ϕ exists and thus the statement is false. Thus, the original statement is proved by contradiction.

e. Homework 5.10

Proof. For the Zero stage $\beth_b = |\mathbb{N}|$, in which case $\beth_a = |\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})|$. It is known that $|\mathbb{N}| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})|$, in which case the statement holds. For the successor stages we will proceed by Cantor's diagonal argument. Assume that $\beth_a = \beth_b$. Then there exists a bijection between the two ordinals. We can now construct a subset ϕ , that is not in the bijection by ordering all the subsets. We simply look at the first value, if it is not in the first set we add it to ϕ otherwise if it is in the first subset we do not add it to ϕ . By this construction we arrive at a subset that is not in the bijection, and therefore the cardinality is greater. Thus, the statement holds for the successor stages. For the Limit stage.

I couldn't prove this part, and to be honest did not completely understand the definition for the limit case of ordinals