

369 Prove that every positive integer is a product of primes. By “product” we mean the result of multiplying together any natural number of (not necessarily distinct) numbers. By “prime” we mean a natural number with exactly two factors.

After trying the question, scroll down to the solution.

§ Number theorists call this “the fundamental theorem of arithmetic”, or maybe this plus the words “unique factorization”. But I think there are much more fundamental theorems than this one. How about

$$\forall n: \text{nat} \cdot \exists m: \text{nat} \cdot m > n$$

which says “for every natural number, there's a bigger one”. I think that's more fundamental.

The plan is to prove that every positive integer is a product of primes by using

$$\forall n: \text{nat} \cdot (\forall m: \text{nat} \cdot m < n \Rightarrow P m) \Rightarrow P n \Rightarrow \forall n: \text{nat} \cdot P n$$

which is a consequence of induction, sometimes called “course-of-values induction”; it is in Subsection 6.0.0 of the textbook. The number 1 is the empty product, and every element of the empty bunch is prime, so 1 is a product of primes. For each $n \geq 2$, if n is prime, then it's the product of one prime (itself). If n is non-prime, then it's a product $a \times b$ where $a, b: 2, \dots, n$. By the induction hypothesis, both a and b are products of primes. So $a \times b$ is also a product of primes. That's an informal proof, or proof plan. Now we need to formalize it.

The question says a prime is a natural with exactly two factors. So define

$$\text{prime} = \langle p: \text{nat} \cdot (\nexists n: \text{nat} \cdot p: n \times \text{nat}) = 2 \rangle$$

The proof plan says we need $P n$ to mean “ n is a product of primes” for positive integers n , and that can be defined as

$$P 1 = \top$$

$$\forall n: \text{nat} + 2 \cdot (P n = \text{prime } n \vee \exists a, b: 2, \dots, n \cdot P a \wedge P b \wedge n = a \times b)$$

We want to prove $\forall n: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot P n$. That's almost the consequent of induction, except for the $+1$. So we redefine $P n$ to mean “ $n+1$ is a product of primes”.

$$P 0 = \top$$

$$\forall n: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot (P n = \text{prime } (n+1) \vee \exists a, b: 2, \dots, n+1 \cdot P a \wedge P b \wedge n+1 = a \times b)$$

Now we want to prove $\forall n: \text{nat} \cdot P n$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall n: \text{nat} \cdot P n && \text{induction} \\ \Leftarrow & \forall n: \text{nat} \cdot (\forall m: \text{nat} \cdot m < n \Rightarrow P m) \Rightarrow P n && \text{divide first domain: } \text{nat} = 0, \text{nat} + 1 \\ = & ((\forall m: \text{nat} \cdot m < 0 \Rightarrow P m) \Rightarrow P 0) \wedge (\forall n: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot (\forall m: \text{nat} \cdot m < n \Rightarrow P m) \Rightarrow P n) \\ & \text{The left conjunct simplifies to } P 0 \text{ and then to } \top. \\ = & \forall n: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot (\forall m: \text{nat} \cdot m < n \Rightarrow P m) \Rightarrow P n && \text{divide second domain: } \text{nat} = 0, \text{nat} + 1 \\ = & \forall n: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot (0 < n \Rightarrow P 0) \wedge (\forall m: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot m < n \Rightarrow P m) \Rightarrow P n && \text{Left conjunct is } \top. \\ = & \forall n: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot (\forall m: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot m < n \Rightarrow P m) \Rightarrow P n && \text{idempotence} \\ = & \forall n: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot (\forall m: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot m < n \Rightarrow P m) \wedge (\forall m: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot m < n \Rightarrow P m) \Rightarrow P n \\ & \text{rename local variables} \\ = & \forall n: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot (\forall a: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot a < n \Rightarrow P a) \wedge (\forall b: \text{nat} + 1 \cdot b < n \Rightarrow P b) \Rightarrow P n \\ & \text{Now we need to use the definition of } P \text{ and then } \text{prime} \text{ and it's going} \\ & \text{to be a lot of hard work and then eventually we get} \\ = & \top \end{aligned}$$