## TWO PROOFS OF EUCLID'S LEMMA

**Lemma** (EUCLID). Let p be a prime, and let a, b be integers. If  $p \mid ab$  then  $p \mid a$  or  $p \mid b$ .

There are many ways to prove this lemma.

First Proof. Assume p is the smallest prime for which this assertion fails, and let a and b be such that  $p \mid ab$ and  $p \nmid a$  and  $p \nmid b$ . By replacing a and b with their remainders when dividing by p, we may assume that  $1 \leq a < p$  and  $1 \leq b < p$ . Then kp = ab; clearly,  $1 \leq k < p$ . We have  $k \neq 1$  since p is a prime. Let q be a prime divisor of k. Then  $q \mid ab$ , and so, by the minimality assumption on p, we have  $q \mid a$  or  $q \mid b$ . Then dividing q into k and into one of a or b, we obtain an equation k'p = a'b', where  $1 \leq k' < k$ ,  $1 \leq a' < p$ , and  $1 \leq b' < p$ . Repeating this step as long as necessary, we arrive at an equation k''p = a''b'' with k'' = 1,  $1 \leq a'' < p$ , and  $1 \leq b'' < p$ . This equation contradicts the primality of p, completing the proof.  $\Box$ 

The second proof gives Euclid's Lemma is a corollary of the following.

**Lemma.** Let let a and c be positive integers and let t be the smallest positive integer such that  $c \mid at$ . Let b be a positive integer such that  $c \mid ab$ . Then  $t \mid b$ . In particular,  $t \mid c$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $t \nmid b$ ; let q and r be such that b = tq + r and  $1 \leq r < t$ . Then

$$ab = atq + ar$$

As c is a divisor of the left-hand side and of the first term on the right-hand side, it follows that c is also a divisor of the second term on the right-hand side; i.e.,  $c \mid ar$ . This, however, contradicts the minimality of t. This contraction shows that  $t \mid b$ . Since we have  $c \mid ac$ , this assertion with c = b shows that  $t \mid c$  holds.  $\Box$ 

**Corollary 1** (EUCLID). Let p be a prime, and let a and b be positive integers. If  $p \mid ab$  then  $p \mid a$  or  $p \mid b$ .

*Proof.* Let t be the smallest positive integer such that  $p \mid at$ . Then we have  $t \mid b$  and  $t \mid p$  by the Lemma. The latter implies that t = 1 or t = p. In the former case we have  $p \mid a$ , in the latter case we have  $p \mid b$ .  $\Box$ 

**Corollary 2.** Let a, b, and c be positive integers such that (b, c) = 1. If  $c \mid ab$  then  $c \mid a$ .

*Proof.* Let t be the smallest positive integer such that  $c \mid at$ . Then we have  $t \mid b$  and  $t \mid c$  by the Lemma. As (b, c) = 1, we must have t = 1. Since  $c \mid at$ , this means that  $c \mid a$ .  $\Box$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>0</sup>Notes for Course Mathematics 1311 at Brooklyn College of CUNY. Attila Máté, February 16, 2018.