

Chapter 1

Basics of elementary number theory

1.1 Divisibility

Definition 1.1 (Divisibility). Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We say m **divides** n and write $m \mid n$ if there exists some integer q such that $n = qm$. If m divides n , we say n is a **multiple** of m and say m is a **divisor** or a **factor** of n .

Definition 1.2 (Congruence). Let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$. If $q \mid (a - b)$, we say a and b are **congruent** modulo q and write

$$a \equiv b \pmod{q}.$$

Definition 1.3 (Greatest common divisor and least common multiple). Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, not both zero. The **greatest common divisor** (g.c.d. for short) of m and n , denoted by (m, n) or $\gcd(m, n)$, is the largest positive integer d such that $d \mid m$ and $d \mid n$.

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. The **least common multiple** (l.c.m. for short) of m and n , denoted by $[m, n]$ or $\text{lcm}(m, n)$, is the smallest positive integer d such that $m \mid d$ and $n \mid d$. If $mn = 0$, we define $[m, n] = 0$.

Similarly, we can iteratively define the g.c.d. or l.c.m. of multiple integers.

Theorem 1.1 (Euclidean division theorem). Let a be an integer and let b be a positive integer. Then there is a unique pair of integers q and r such that

$$a = bq + r, \quad 0 \leq r < b.$$

The integer q is called the **quotient** and r is called the **remainder** when b is divided by a .

Proof. Take q to be the largest integer with $bq \leq a$ and set $r = a - bq$. Then r satisfies $0 \leq r < b$ since otherwise $q' = q + 1$ will be a larger integer satisfying $bq' \leq a$. \square

Remark. Theorem 1.1 implies that \mathbb{Z} is a euclidean domain hence is a principal ideal domain. So any non-zero ideal \mathfrak{a} of \mathbb{Z} is of the form $m\mathbb{Z}$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Let $m\mathbb{Z}$ be a non-zero ideal of \mathbb{Z} , we have the natural homomorphism of rings

$$\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} : a \mapsto a + m\mathbb{Z}.$$

For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, we usually denote the image of a under the above homomorphism by \bar{a} or $a \pmod{m}$. The concepts of divisibility and congruences can be described in the language of ring theory:

- $a \mid b \iff b \in a\mathbb{Z} \iff \bar{b} = \bar{0} \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}/a\mathbb{Z}.$
- $a \equiv b \pmod{m} \iff a + m\mathbb{Z} = b + m\mathbb{Z} \iff \bar{a} = \bar{b} \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}/a\mathbb{Z}.$

In order to obtain the greatest common divisor, we can use the following **euclidean algorithm**: Let a and b be positive integers. By repeatedly applying Theorem 1.1, we find the sequence of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} a &= bq_1 + r_1, & 0 < r_1 < b, \\ b &= r_1q_2 + r_2, & 0 < r_2 < r_1, \\ r_1 &= r_2q_3 + r_3, & 0 < r_3 < r_2, \\ &\dots \\ r_{n-1} &= r_nq_{n+1} + r_{n+1}, & 0 < r_{n+1} < r_n \\ r_n &= r_{n+1}q_{n+2}. \end{aligned}$$

This process must terminate in finitely many steps since the decreasing sequence b, r_1, r_2, \dots can not contain more than b positive integers. Clearly, we have

$$(a, b) = (b, r_1) = (r_1, r_2) = \dots = (r_n, r_{n+1}) = r_{n+1}.$$

Example 1.1. We apply the euclidean algorithm to evaluate $(525, 231)$:

$$\begin{aligned} 525 &= 231 \cdot 2 + 63, \\ 231 &= 63 \cdot 3 + 42, \\ 63 &= 42 \cdot 1 + 21, \\ 42 &= 21 \cdot 2. \end{aligned}$$

So we find $(525, 231) = 21$.

1.2 The prime numbers

Definition 1.4 (Prime number). *An integer p is a **prime number** if it satisfies the following equivalent conditions:*

$$i) \quad p = ab \text{ with } a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \Rightarrow \quad a \in \mathbb{Z}^\times \text{ or } b \in \mathbb{Z}^\times.$$

$$ii) \quad p \mid ab \text{ with } a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \Rightarrow \quad p \mid a \text{ or } p \mid b.$$

The set of positive prime numbers is denoted by \mathbb{P} . Positive integers larger than 1 which are not prime are called **composite**.

Convention. Unless otherwise stated, when we say “prime number”, we mean “positive prime number”. The lowercase letter p , with or without subscripts, is considered as a prime number, unless otherwise stated. This convention is usually used when p appears as a variable in \sum or \prod . For example, the notation

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p}$$

means summing over all prime numbers not exceeding x .

Theorem 1.2 (Fundamental theorem of arithmetic). *Every integer $n > 1$ can be uniquely represented as a product of prime numbers, up to the order of factors.*

Definition 1.5 (Prime factorization). *By the fundamental theorem of arithmetic, we have the **prime factorization** for each integer $n > 1$:*

$$n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k},$$

where p_1, \dots, p_k are distinct prime numbers and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ are positive integers.

Definition 1.6 (p -adic valuation). *Let p be a prime number and let $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. Then there exists a unique non-negative integer α such that $p^\alpha \mid n$ but $p^{\alpha+1} \nmid n$. We denote this case as $p^\alpha \parallel n$. The exponent α is called the **p -adic valuation** of n and is denoted by $v_p(n)$. Set $v_p(0) = +\infty$.*

Remark. Clearly, for any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$v_p(mn) = v_p(m) + v_p(n). \tag{1.1}$$

That is, $v_p(n)$ is a completely additive function (ref. Definition 2.1).

Theorem 1.3 (The infinity of prime numbers). *There are infinitely many prime numbers.*

Proof I. Suppose on the contrary that there are only finitely many prime numbers, say, p_1, \dots, p_k . Then any prime factor of $p_1 \cdots p_k + 1$ is a prime number differing from p_1, \dots, p_k . This is a contradiction. \square

Proof II. Suppose on the contrary that there are only finitely many prime numbers, say, p_1, \dots, p_k . Let N be an arbitrarily large integer. By Theorem 1.2, every positive integer $n \leq N$ can be uniquely represented as

$$n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$$

with $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{N}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Moreover, since $n \leq N$, we have

$$p_j^{\alpha_j} \leq n \leq N \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha_j \leq \frac{\log N}{\log p_j} \leq \frac{\log N}{\log 2}.$$

So the number of possible choices of $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ is at most

$$\left(\frac{\log N}{\log 2} + 1 \right)^k.$$

But for sufficiently large N , we have

$$\left(\frac{\log N}{\log 2} + 1 \right)^k < N.$$

This is a contradiction. \square

In analytic number theory, we are more concerned with quantitative behavior. For $x \geq 1$, we define the **prime counting function** $\pi(x)$ by

$$\pi(x) = |\mathbb{P} \cap [1, x]|.$$

In other words, $\pi(x)$ is the number of prime numbers not exceeding x . Actually, our proof of Theorem 1.3 provides a (very weak) lower bound for $\pi(x)$. Let p_n denote the n -th prime. From the first proof, it is not hard to obtain the inequality

$$p_n \leq 2^{2^n},$$

which implies the lower bound (provided that x is sufficiently large)

$$\pi(x) \geq \frac{\log \log x}{\log 2} - \left(\frac{\log \log 2}{\log 2} + 1 \right).$$

The second proof provides a better bound:

$$\pi(x) \geq \frac{\log x}{\log \log x}.$$

But these bounds are far from the best since we have the following well-known prime number theorem.

Theorem 1.4 (Prime number theorem). *As $x \rightarrow +\infty$, we have $\pi(x) \sim x/\log x$, i.e.*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\pi(x)}{x/\log x} = 1.$$

Proving the prime number theorem is one of the main goals of this course.

1.3 The functions $[x]$ and $\{x\}$

Let $[x]$ denote the “rounding down” function, i.e.

$$[x] = \text{the largest integer not exceeding } x.$$

Clearly, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$[x] = n \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad n \leq x < n + 1.$$

Let $\{x\} = x - [x]$ denote the fractional part of x . The following facts about these two functions can be easily checked.

Proposition 1.5. *i) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $0 \leq \{x\} < 1$.*

ii) For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $[x + n] = [x] + n$ and $\{x + n\} = \{x\}$.

iii) For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $[x] + [y] \leq [x + y]$.

Proposition 1.6. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$. The number of positive integers not exceeding x which are divisible by d is $[x/d]$.*

Proof. The set of positive integers not exceeding x divisible by d can be represented as

$$\{d, 2d, \dots, kd\},$$

where k is the largest positive integer such that $kd \leq x$. But

$$kd \leq x \iff k \leq \frac{x}{d}.$$

So $k = [x/d]$. □

Theorem 1.7. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and let $p \in \mathbb{P}$. We have*

$$v_p(n!) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{n}{p^k} \right].$$

Proof. By (1.1), we have

$$v_p(n!) = \sum_{m=1}^n v_p(m) = \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{k \leq v_p(m)} 1 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{m \leq n \\ v_p(m) \geq k}} 1.$$

Notice that

$$v_p(m) \geq k \iff p^k \mid m.$$

So by Proposition 1.6, the last summation is

$$\sum_{\substack{m \leq n \\ v_p(m) \geq k}} 1 = \sum_{\substack{m \leq n \\ p^k \mid m}} 1 = \left[\frac{n}{p^k} \right].$$

This completes the proof. □

Theorem 1.8. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ with $m \leq n$. Then the binomial number*

$$\binom{n}{m} = \frac{n(n-1) \cdots (n-m+1)}{m!} = \frac{n!}{m!(n-m)!}$$

is an integer.

Proof. It is sufficient to show that for any prime number p , the p -adic valuation of the denominator does not exceed that of the numerator. By Theorem 1.7 and iii) of Proposition 1.5, we have

$$v_p(n!) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{n}{p^k} \right] \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\left[\frac{m}{p^k} \right] + \left[\frac{n-m}{p^k} \right] \right) = v_p(m!(n-m)!).$$

□

Theorem 1.9 (Dirichlet's approximation theorem). *Let $Q \geq 1$ be a positive integer. Then for any real number α , there exist integers a, q with $1 \leq q \leq Q$ and $(a, q) = 1$, such that*

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{qQ}.$$

Proof. Consider the following $(Q + 1)$ points in $[0, 1)$:

$$0, \{\alpha\}, \{2\alpha\}, \dots, \{Q\alpha\}.$$

By the pigeonhole principle, there are two points whose distance is less than $1/Q$. That is, there exist $0 \leq m_1 < m_2 \leq Q$ such that

$$|\{m_2\alpha\} - \{m_1\alpha\}| < \frac{1}{Q}.$$

We have

$$\{m_2\alpha\} - \{m_1\alpha\} = (m_2 - m_1)\alpha - ([m_2\alpha] - [m_1\alpha]).$$

Take

$$\frac{a}{q} = \frac{[m_2\alpha] - [m_1\alpha]}{m_2 - m_1}$$

and the desired result follows. \square

Remark. In fact, the requirement “ Q is an integer” is not necessary. The same result holds for real $Q \geq 1$. One could prove this slightly stronger version by slightly modifying the above proof. We leave it as an exercise.

Corollary 1.10. *Let α be an irrational number. Consider the irrational rotation on the unit circle*

$$\begin{aligned} T_\alpha : \mathbb{T}^1 &\rightarrow \mathbb{T}^1 \\ x &\mapsto x + \alpha \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbb{T}^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} = \{x \pmod{1} \mid x \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Then for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$, the orbit $\{T_\alpha^n x\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is dense in \mathbb{T} .

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$U \cap \{T_\alpha^n x\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \neq \emptyset$$

for any interval U . In fact, suppose that the length of U is ε . By Theorem 1.9, there exist integers a, q with $q \geq 1$ such that

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{q} \quad \Rightarrow \quad |q\alpha - a| < \varepsilon.$$

Let $\delta = q\alpha - a$. Then $|\delta| < \varepsilon$ and

$$T_\alpha^q x = x + q\alpha \pmod{1} = x + \delta \pmod{1}.$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$. Therefore, under the repeated action of T_α^q , x will eventually enter U . \square