

# Fundamentals of Mathematics

Supplement 1

Spring, 2008

<http://staffweb.ncnu.edu.tw/shieng>

*Example 1.* For all integers  $m$  and  $n$ , if  $m$  and  $n$  are even, then  $m + n$  is even.

*Proof.* Since  $m$  and  $n$  are even numbers, there exist integers  $m'$  and  $n'$  such that  $m = 2m'$  and  $n = 2n'$ . Hence  $m + n = 2m' + 2n' = 2(m' + n')$  is an even number.

*Example 2.* For all odd integers  $n$ , the number  $n^2 - 1$  is divisible by 8.

*Proof.* Let  $n$  be an odd number. We divide the discussion into two cases:  $n = 4k_1 + 1$  and  $n = 4k_2 + 3$  for some integers  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ .

- $n = 4k_1 + 1$ :  $n^2 - 1 = (4k_1 + 1)^2 - 1 = 16k_1^2 + 8k_1 + 1 - 1 = 8(2k_1^2 + k_1)$  is a multiple of 8.
- $n = 4k_2 + 3$ :  $n^2 - 1 = (4k_2 + 3)^2 - 1 = 16k_2^2 + 24k_2 + 9 - 1 = 8(2k_2^2 + 3k_2 + 1)$  is a multiple of 8.

Since both cases lead to the same conclusion, the claim is proved.

*Example 3.* For all integers  $n$ , if  $n^2$  is even, then  $n$  is even.

*Proof.* We show its contraposition: If  $n$  is not even, then  $n^2$  is not even. Let  $n$  be an odd number and assume  $n = 2k + 1$ . Then  $n^2 = (2k + 1)^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1$  is an odd number. Therefore from contraposition, we get the assertion

*Example 4.*  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational.

*Proof.* Suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational. We will show contradiction happened. Since we assume  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational, there exist integers  $m$  and  $n$ , having no common divisor other than 1, such that  $\sqrt{2} = \frac{m}{n}$ . Squaring both sides, we get  $2 = \frac{m^2}{n^2}$ . Thus,  $2n^2 = m^2$ . Hence 2 divides  $m^2$ , and subsequently, 2 divides  $m$ . Let  $m = 2m_1$  where  $m_1$  is an integer. Substitute  $m$  by  $2m_1$  into  $2n^2 = m^2$ . We get  $2n^2 = 4m_1^2$ . Hence  $2m_1^2 = n^2$ . By the same argument, 2 divides  $n^2$ , and thus 2 divides  $n$ . Therefore 2 is a common divisor of  $m$  and  $n$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $m$  and  $n$  have no common divisor other than 1. Hence,  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational.

*Example 5.* For all integers  $a$  and  $p$ , if  $p$  is prime, then either  $p$  is a divisor of  $a$ , or  $a$  and  $p$  have no common factor greater than 1.

*Proof.* Let  $p$  be a prime. Assume  $a$  and  $p$  have common divisor greater than 1. Since  $p$  is a prime, the only positive factor of  $p$  other than 1 is  $p$  itself. Therefore the common divisor of  $a$  and  $p$  greater than 1 can only be  $p$ . Thus, we get the conclusion that  $p$  divides  $a$ .

*Example 6.* For all integers  $n$ ,  $n^2 - 1$  is either divisible by 8 or relatively prime to 8.

*Proof.* We divide  $n$  into two cases:  $n = 2k$  and  $n = 2k + 1$ . When  $n = 2k$ ,  $n^2 - 1$  is always an odd number, and thus, relatively prime to 8. When  $n = 2k + 1$ , from Example 2, we get the claim that  $n^2 - 1$  is divisible by 8. Since all of the cases lead to the conclusion, the claim is proved.

*Example 7.* For all integers  $n$ , the following statements are equivalent:

- (1)  $n$  is even;
- (2)  $n^2$  is even;
- (3)  $n^k$  is even for all integers  $k \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* We use cyclic argument to establish their equivalence.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (3): The multiplication of two even numbers is again even. Hence if  $n$  is even,  $n^k$  for  $k \geq 1$  are all even numbers.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Setting  $k = 2$  we get the implication.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Has been proven in Example 3.

*Example 8.* Every finite, directed, and acyclic graph must have a source.

*Proof.* Note that a graph is acyclic iff it has no cycle, and a node is a source iff it has no incoming edges. Suppose there exists a counter example. That is, there is a finite, directed, and acyclic graph  $G$  that has no source. Then pick up any node in  $G$ , say  $n_1$ . Since there is no source in  $G$ ,  $n_1$  has an incoming edge. Trace back along this edge. There is a node  $n_2$  that connects  $n_1$ . This process can continue, and we can eventually find an infinite sequence  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_i, \dots$  such that there is always an edge from  $n_{i+1}$  to  $n_i$  for each integer  $i \geq 1$ . However,  $G$  is a finite graph, and thus, some node must repeat infinite times on this sequence. Let  $p$  be such a node. There exist  $n_s = n_t = p$  and  $s < t$ . This indicates a cycle starting from  $n_t = p$  and ending at  $n_s = p$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $G$  is acyclic.

*Example 9.* There exists a number that is not rational.

*Proof.* We have shown that  $\sqrt{2}$  is not rational in Example 4. Hence the existence is established.

*Example 10.* Given any seven integers  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_7$ , there always exist  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq 7$  such that  $a_i + a_{i+1} + \dots + a_j$  is a multiple of 7.

*Proof.* We show this by using the pigeon hole principle. Let  $S_k = a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k$  for  $1 \leq k \leq 7$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume all  $S_k$ 's for  $1 \leq k \leq 7$  are not multiple of 7; otherwise, we can simply set  $i = 1$  and  $j = k$  and the claim is established. Hence the remainders of  $S_k$ 's divided by 7 can only be 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. However, there are seven  $S_k$ 's but six remainders. By the pigeon hole principle, there exist  $1 \leq u < v \leq 7$  such that the remainders of  $S_u$  and  $S_v$  are the same with respect to the divisor 7. Consequently,  $S_v - S_u$  is a multiple of 7. Now let  $i = u + 1$  and  $j = v$ , and accordingly,  $a_i + a_{i+1} + \dots + a_j$  is a multiple of 7.

*Example 11.* Given any integer  $n$ , there is an integer  $m$  with  $m > n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $n$  be any integer. Let  $m = n + 1$ , then clearly  $m = n + 1 > n$ .

*Example 12.* Given a natural number  $n$ , there is always a prime number  $p$  that is greater than  $n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $n$  be any natural number. Set  $m = n! + 1$ . We claim that any prime factor of  $m$  is larger than  $n$ . Let  $p$  be a prime factor of  $m$ . If  $p$  is less than or equal to  $n$ ,  $n!$  is a multiple of  $p$ . Then by the Euclidean algorithm, the greatest common divisor of  $p$  and  $m$  is 1. That is,  $p$  cannot divide  $m$ , a contradiction. Therefore, such  $p$  must be larger than  $n$ .