



- 16. Let  $a$  and  $b$  be nonzero integers. If there exists  $r$  and  $s$  such that  $ar + bs = 1$ . Show that  $a$  and  $b$  are relatively prime.

- 19. Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$  be relatively prime. If  $xy$  is a perfect square, prove that  $x$  and  $y$  must both be perfect squares.

- 28. Let  $p \geq 2$ . Prove that if  $2^p - 1$  is prime then  $p$  is also prime.

# Mersenne primes.

- If  $p$  is a prime,  $2^p - 1$  is not necessarily a prime. E.g.,  $2^{11} - 1 = 2047 = 23 \cdot 89$ .
- **Definition:** When  $2^n - 1$  is prime it is said to be a **Mersenne prime**.

$$P^2 = 2q^2$$

- Using the fact that 2 is a prime, show that there do not exist integers  $p$  and  $q$  such that  $p^2 = 2q^2$ .

There are various proofs of this result. Since you are asked to use the fact that 2 is prime, possibly the following one is intended.

Suppose that  $p^2 = 2q^2$ , and factorise each side into primes. Since  $p^2$  is a square, the number of factors of 2 on the LHS is even. Similarly, the number of factors of 2 in  $q^2$  is even; but the extra 2 makes the number of factors of 2 on the RHS odd. Therefore LHS cannot equal RHS.

# Infinite $4k-1$ primes

- 30. Prove that there are an infinite number of primes of the form  $4k-1$ .

- 假设 $4k-1$ 形素数只有 $n$ 个，分别为 $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n$   
 考虑 $N=4p_1p_2\dots p_{n-1}$ ，设 $N$ 的标准分解为  
 $N=q_1q_2\dots q_m$ ，即有 $4p_1p_2\dots p_{n-1}=q_1q_2\dots q_m$   
 因为 $q_i(i=1, 2, \dots, m)$ 为质数，所以只有 $4k+1$ 和  
 $4k-1$ 形  
 若某个 $q_i$ 为 $4k-1$ 形，则有  
 $q_i=p_j(i=1, 2, \dots, m; j=1, 2, \dots, n)$ ，则有 $q_i \mid -1$ ，  
 矛盾  
 若 $q_i$ 都是 $4k+1$ 形，两边对4求余有 $-1 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ ，又  
 矛盾  
 所以形如 $4k+3$ 形素数有无穷多个



# Infinite $6n+1$ primes

- Prove that there are an infinite number of primes of the form  $6n + 1$ .

# Dirichlet's Theorem

- In [number theory](#), **Dirichlet's theorem**, also called the Dirichlet prime number theorem, states that for any two positive [coprime integers](#)  $a$  and  $d$ , there are infinitely many [primes](#) of the form  $a + nd$ , where  $n$  is a non-negative integer.
- This result had been conjectured by Gauss, but was first proved by Dirichlet (1837).

8. If  $k = jq + r$ , as in Euclid's division theorem, is there a relationship between  $\gcd(q, k)$  and  $\gcd(r, q)$ ? If so, what is it?

**15.** If  $k = jq + r$ , as in Euclid's division theorem, is there a relationship between  $\gcd(j, k)$  and  $\gcd(r, k)$ ? If so, what is it?

The end.

# Infinite primes

- [Euclid](#) offered the following proof published in his work [Elements](#) (Book IX, Proposition 20), [\[1\]](#) which is paraphrased here.
- Consider any finite list of prime numbers  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n$ . It will be shown that at least one additional prime number not in this list exists. Let  $P$  be the product of all the prime numbers in the list:  $P = p_1 p_2 \dots p_n$ . Let  $q = P + 1$ . Then  $q$  is either prime or not:
- If  $q$  is prime, then there is at least one more prime than is in the list.
- If  $q$  is not prime, then some [prime factor](#)  $p$  divides  $q$ . If this factor  $p$  were on our list, then it would divide  $P$  (since  $P$  is the product of every number on the list); but  $p$  divides  $P + 1 = q$ . If  $p$  divides  $P$  and  $q$ , then  $p$  would have to divide the difference [\[2\]](#) of the two numbers, which is  $(P + 1) - P$  or just 1. Since no prime number divides 1, this would be a contradiction and so  $p$  cannot be on the list. This means that at least one more prime number exists beyond those in the list.
- This proves that for every finite list of prime numbers there is a prime number not on the list, and therefore there must be infinitely many prime numbers.
- Euclid is often erroneously reported to have proved this result by [contradiction](#), beginning with the assumption that the set initially considered contains all prime numbers, or that it contains precisely the  $n$  smallest primes, rather than any arbitrary finite set of primes. [\[3\]](#) Although the proof as a whole is not by contradiction (it does not assume that only finitely many primes exist), a proof by contradiction is within it, which is that none of the initially considered primes can divide the number  $q$  above.