

1. **Definition.**

Let S be a subset of \mathbb{R} . Let $\lambda \in S$. λ is said to be a **least element** of S if ($\lambda \leq x$ whenever $x \in S$).

Well-Ordering Principle for integers (WOPI).

Let S be a non-empty subset of \mathbb{N} . S has a least element.

Remark. A more formal way to express ‘ S has a least element’ is: there exists some $\lambda \in S$ such that λ is a least element of S .

2. **Theorem (DAN). (Division Algorithm for natural numbers.)**

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $n \neq 0$. Then there exist some unique $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m = qn + r$ and $0 \leq r < n$.

Remark on terminology. In the statement of Theorem (DAN), the numbers q, r are called the **quotient** and **remainder** in the division of m by n .

Proof of Theorem (DAN). The result follows from Lemma (E) and Lemma (U). The argument for Lemma (E) relies on the Well-Ordering Principle for integers.

3. **Lemma (E). (Existence part of Theorem (DAN).)**

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $n \neq 0$. Then there exist some $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m = qn + r$ and $0 \leq r < n$.

Lemma (U). (Uniqueness part of Theorem (DAN).)

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $n \neq 0$. Let $q, r, q', r' \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $m = qn + r$ and $0 \leq r < n$ and $m = q'n + r'$ and $0 \leq r' < n$. Then $q = q'$ and $r = r'$.

4. **Proof of Lemma (E).**

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $n \neq 0$.

[Idea. Remember that we want to name appropriate natural numbers q, r satisfying both $m = qn + r$ and $0 \leq r < n$. We put these two conditions in the form $0 \leq m - qn = r < n$. This suggests we look for a candidate for r from the list of natural numbers

$$m - 0 \cdot n, m - 1 \cdot n, m - 2n, m - 3n, \dots$$

This is a descending arithmetic progression. Does it terminate or not? It has to terminate; otherwise, it would ‘descend into the negative integers’. A candidate for r is ‘located’ where this list terminates. (Why?) With this candidate for r we also obtain a candidate for q . Now we are ready to proceed with the formal argument.]

(Ea) Define $S = \{x \in \mathbb{N} : \text{There exists some } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } x = m - kn\}$.

By definition, S is a subset of \mathbb{N} .

Note that $m = m - 0 \cdot n$ and $0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore $m \in S$. $S \neq \emptyset$.

Hence S is a non-empty subset of \mathbb{N} .

By the Well-ordering Principle for Integers, S has a least element, which we denote by r .

(Eb) By definition, since $r \in S$, we have $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Also, since $r \in S$, there exists some $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r = m - qn$.

So $m = qn + r$ for these $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$.

(Ec) By definition, $r \geq 0$. We verify that $r < n$:

- Suppose it were true that $r \geq n$. Write $\hat{r} = r - n$. We would have $\hat{r} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\hat{r} < r$.
 Note that $\hat{r} = r - n = m - (q + 1)n$.
 Since $q \in \mathbb{N}$, we would have $q + 1 \in \mathbb{N}$.
 Then $\hat{r} \in S$ by the definition of S .
 But r is a least element of S . Contradiction arises.
 Hence $r < n$ in the first place.

The result follows.

5. **Proof of Lemma (U).**

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $n \neq 0$. Suppose $q, r, q', r' \in \mathbb{N}$.

Suppose $m = qn + r$ and $0 \leq r < n$ and $m = q'n + r'$ and $0 \leq r' < n$.

We have $qn + r = q'n + r'$. Therefore $|q - q'|n = |r' - r|$.

Since $0 \leq r \leq n - 1$ and $0 \leq r' \leq n - 1$, we have $0 \leq |q - q'|n = |r' - r| \leq n - 1$.

Since $|q - q'| \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $|q - q'|n = 0$ or $|q - q'|n \geq n$.

Since $|q - q'|n \leq n - 1 < n$, we have $|q - q'|n = 0$. Therefore $q = q'$. Also, $r = r'$.

6. **Corollary (DAZ1). (Division Algorithm for integers.)**

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose $n > 0$. Then there exist some unique $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $m = qn + r$ and $0 \leq r < n$.

Proof of Corollary (DAZ1).

(a) ['Existence argument'.] Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose $n > 0$. Note that $m \geq 0$ or $m < 0$.

- (Case 1). Suppose $m \geq 0$. Then, by Theorem (DAN), there exists some $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m = qn + r$ and $0 \leq r < n$.
- (Case 2). Suppose $m < 0$. [Idea: Is there an integer in the list $m + 0 \cdot n, m + 1 \cdot n, m + 2n, m + 3n, \dots$ which is non-negative? If yes, can we apply Theorem (DAN) to this non-negative integer?]
Note that $-m \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $n > 0$, we have $m + (-m)n = (-m)(n - 1) \in \mathbb{N}$.
By Theorem (DAN), there exist some $p, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m + (-m)n = pn + r$ and $0 \leq r < n$.
Now define $q = p + m$. Since $p, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $q \in \mathbb{Z}$.
For these q, r , we have $m = -(-m)n + pn + r = (p + m)n + r = qn + r$.

(b) ['Uniqueness argument'.] Exercise. (Refer to the proof of Lemma (U). Change 'Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $n \neq 0$. Suppose $q, r, q', r' \in \mathbb{N}$ ' to 'Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose $n > 0$. Suppose $q, r, q', r' \in \mathbb{Z}$ '. See what happens.)

Corollary (DAZ2). (Division Algorithm for integers.)

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose $n \neq 0$. Then there exist some unique $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $m = qn + r$ and $0 \leq r < |n|$.

Proof of Corollary (DAZ2). Exercise.

Remark on terminology. In each of Corollary (DAZ1) and Corollary (DAZ2), the numbers q, r are called the **quotient** and **remainder** in the division of m by n .

7. Refer to Theorem (2) in the Handout *De Moivre's Theorem and roots of unity*:

Let n be a positive integer. Write $\theta_n = \frac{2\pi}{n}$. Define $\omega_n = \cos(\theta_n) + i \sin(\theta_n)$.

- (a) ω_n is an n -th root of unity.
- (b) The n -th roots of unity are the n complex numbers of modulus 1, given by $1, \omega_n, \omega_n^2, \dots, \omega_n^{n-1}$.

Corollary (DAZ1) is the tacit assumption needed in the argument for this result.

8. **Theorem (DIV).**

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose $n \neq 0$. m is divisible by n iff the remainder is 0 in the division of m by n .

Proof of Theorem (DIV). Exercise.

Remark. This result provides the connection between the definition of divisibility and Division Algorithm.

Definition.

Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

- (a) n is said to be **even** if n is divisible by 2.
- (b) n is said to be **odd** if n is not divisible by 2.

Theorem (O). (Equivalent formulation of the definition of odd-ness for integers.)

Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The statements (†), (‡) are logically equivalent:

- (†) n is odd.
- (‡) There exists some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $n = 2k + 1$.

Proof of Theorem (O). Exercise.