

(1)

H.W. #1

1. Suppose $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $x \notin \mathbb{Q}$. If $x+r \in \mathbb{Q}$ then $x+r=s$, for some rational number s . This implies that $x=s-r \in \mathbb{Q}$, which contradicts our hypothesis about x . The proof that rx is irrational for every $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ ($r \neq 0$) is similar.

2. Suppose $\left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^2 = 12$ and $\gcd(m, n) = 1$.

Then $m^2 = 4(3n^2)$, implying that $3|m^2$. Since 3 is prime, $3|m$. In particular, $m = 3k$ for some integer k .

Thus $m^2 = 9k^2 = 4(3n^2)$ or, equivalently, $3k^2 = 4n^2$.

Since $3|4n^2$ and $3 \nmid 4$, it follows that $3|n^2$ and, therefore, $3|n$. It follows that $n = 3p$ for some $p \in \mathbb{Z}$. This is a contradiction, because $\gcd(m, n) = \gcd(3k, 3p) \geq 3 > 1$ violates the assumption $\gcd(m, n) = 1$.

3. Let $x \in E$ and suppose α is a lower bound of E and β is an upper bound of E . Then $\alpha \leq x \leq \beta$.

In particular $\alpha \leq \beta$.

4. Suppose $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is bounded below by α . That is, $\alpha \leq x$ for all $x \in A$. Define $-A = \{-x : x \in A\}$. Then $-A$ is bounded above by $-\alpha$ (why?)

(2)

Let $\beta = \sup(-A)$. Notice that $-x \leq \beta$ for all $-x \in -A$. This means that $-\beta \leq x$ for all $x \in A$. In particular, $-\beta$ is a lower bound of A . Let $\epsilon > 0$, then $\beta - \epsilon$ is not an upper bound of $-A$ (why?); there exists some $-x \in -A$ such that $\beta - \epsilon < -x \leq \beta$. It follows that $-\beta + \epsilon > x \geq -\beta$, which tells us that $-\beta + \epsilon$ is not a lower bound. We conclude that $-\beta$ is the greatest lower bound of A . That is $\inf A = -\beta = -\sup(-A)$.

5. (a) Let $r = \frac{m}{n} = \frac{p}{q}$. Then $mq = np$ and

$$\left((b^m)^{1/n} \right)^{nq} = b^{mq} = b^{np} = \left((b^p)^{1/q} \right)^{nq}$$

Since roots are unique, it follows that $(b^m)^{1/n} = (b^p)^{1/q}$. Hence it makes sense to define $b^r = (b^m)^{1/n}$.

(b) Let $r = \frac{m}{n}$ and $s = \frac{c}{z}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (b^{r+s})^{nz} &= b^{mz+nc} = b^{mz} b^{nc} = \left((b^{mz})^{1/nz} \right)^{nz} \left((b^{nc})^{1/nz} \right)^{nz} \\ &= \left(b^{\frac{m}{n}} \right)^{nz} \left(b^{\frac{c}{z}} \right)^{nz} = (b^r)^{nz} (b^s)^{nz} = (b^r b^s)^{nz} \end{aligned}$$

Since roots are unique, it follows that $b^{r+s} = b^r b^s$.

(c) Let $s, t \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $s < t$. Then $t-s = \frac{m}{n} > 0$, and

$$\left(\frac{b^t}{b^s} \right)^n = (b^{t-s})^n = \left(b^{\frac{m}{n}} \right)^n = b^m. \text{ Since } b > 1, \text{ it follows}$$

(3)

that $b^m > b > 1$. We conclude that $(b^m)^{1/m} > 1$ (why?)

Thus $b^{t-s} > 1$ or, equivalently, $b^t > b^s$.

If we define $B(x) = \{b^t : t \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ and } t \leq x\}$, we obtain

$b^r = \sup B(r)$, because for any $t < r$ $b^t < b^r$ and $b^r \in B(r)$.

(d) Let $b^p \in B(x)$ and $b^q \in B(y)$. Then $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $p < x$, $q < y$. It follows that $b^p b^q = b^{p+q} \in B(x+y)$.

Therefore $\sup B(x) \sup B(y) \leq \sup B(x+y)$.

Let $t < x+y$. Then $t-x < y$. Since the rationals are dense on the real number-line there exists $s \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $t-x < s < y$. Since $t-s < x$, there exists some $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $t-s < r < x$. Hence $t < r+s < x+s < x+y$ where $r < x$ and $s < y$. Thus $b^t < b^{r+s} = b^r b^s \leq \sup B(x) \sup B(y) = b^x b^y$. In other words, $b^{x+y} = \sup B(x+y) \leq b^x b^y$.

Since $b^{x+y} \leq b^x b^y$ and $b^x b^y \leq b^{x+y}$, it follows that $b^{x+y} = b^x b^y$.

$$6. (a) \quad b^n - 1 = (b-1)(b^{n-1} + b^{n-2} + \dots + 1) > (b-1)(1+1+\dots+1) = (b-1)n.$$

(b) Let $\alpha = b^{1/n}$. Then $\alpha^n - 1 > n(\alpha - 1)$ by part (a) (since $\alpha > 1$). Now $\alpha^n = b$ and the inequality can

(4)

be expressed as $(b-1) > n(b^{1/n}-1)$

(c) If $t > 1$ and $n > \frac{b-1}{t-1}$, then, by part (b), $n(t-1) > b-1 > n(b^{1/n}-1)$. The inequality $n(t-1) > n(b^{1/n}-1)$ is equivalent to $t > b^{1/n}$.

(d) Suppose $b^w < y$, then $y b^{-w} > 1$. Setting $t = y b^{-w}$ and $n > \frac{b-1}{t-1}$ yields $b^{1/n} < y b^{-w}$ (by part (c)). Therefore $b^w b^{1/n} = b^{w+1/n} < y$.

(e) Suppose $b^w > y$, then $y^{-1} b^w > 1$. Setting $t = y^{-1} b^w$ and $n > \frac{b-1}{t-1}$ yields $b^{1/n} < t = y^{-1} b^w$ (by part (c)). Thus $y < b^w b^{-1/n} = b^{w-1/n}$.

(f) Let $A = \{w \in \mathbb{R} : b^w < y\}$. Then

i) $A \neq \emptyset$: If $y > 1$, set $n > \frac{b-1}{y-1}$ and use part (c) to conclude that $b^{1/n} < y$. In other words, $1/n \in A$. If $y = 1$, then $b^0 = 1 = y$, hence $0 \in A$.

If $y < 1$, $\frac{1}{y} > 1$ and setting $m > \frac{b-1}{\frac{1}{y}-1}$ yields $b^{1/m} < \frac{1}{y}$ by part (c). It follows that $y < b^{-1/m}$. In any case, A is not empty.

ii) A is bounded above: Define $B = \{b^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then B does not have an upper bound; Assume that it does. Set $\sup B = S$. Since $b > 1$, $\frac{S}{b} < S$. In particular, $\frac{S}{b}$ is not an upper bound of B . There exists some $n \in \mathbb{N}$

(5)

such that $b^n > \frac{s}{b}$. But then $b^{n+1} > s$ which contradicts the assumption $s = \sup B$. It follows that B is not bounded above. This means that for some integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $b^k > \gamma$. Since $w < k$ implies $b^w < b^k$ (and $b^w < b^k$ implies that $w < k$), we see that A is bounded above by k .

Let $x = \sup A$. We wish to show that $b^x = \gamma$.

If $b^x < \gamma$, part (d) implies that $b^{x+\frac{1}{n}} < \gamma$ for some sufficiently large n . Thus $b^x < b^{x+\frac{1}{n}} < \gamma$ and $x+\frac{1}{n} \in A$ in contradiction to the assumption $x = \sup A$.

If $b^x > \gamma$, part (e) implies that $b^{x-\frac{1}{n}} > \gamma$ for some sufficiently large n . Thus $x-\frac{1}{n}$ is an upper bound of A . (Why is this impossible?)

(g) If α and β satisfy $b^\alpha = b^\beta = \gamma$ then $\alpha = \beta$. This follows from the fact that if $\alpha < \beta$ then there are rationals r, s that satisfy $\alpha < r < s < \beta$. Thus $b^\alpha < b^r < b^s < b^\beta$ by the work done in the previous problem.

It follows that an x satisfying $b^x = \gamma$ is unique.

7. Suppose $x = \frac{a_1}{p} + \dots + \frac{a_n}{p^n}$. Then

$$x = \frac{a_1}{p} + \dots + \frac{a_{n-1}}{p^{n-1}} + \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{p-1}{p^i} \quad (\text{why?})$$

(6)

Let $0.b_1b_2\dots b_n\dots$ and $0.c_1c_2\dots c_n\dots$ be any two base p decimal expansions for x and suppose n is the first integer for which $b_i \neq c_i$. Then, without loss of generality, $b_1 = c_1, b_2 = c_2, \dots, b_{n-1} = c_{n-1}, b_n < c_n$.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 0.b_1b_2\dots b_n\dots &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_i}{p^i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_i}{p^i} + \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{p-1}{p^i} = \\ &= \frac{b_1}{p} + \frac{b_2}{p^2} + \dots + \frac{b_{n+1}}{p^n} \leq \frac{c_1}{p} + \frac{c_2}{p^2} + \dots + \frac{c_n}{p^n} \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{p^i} = 0.c_1c_2\dots c_n\dots \end{aligned}$$

With equality if and only if $b_{n+i} = p-1, c_n = b_{n+1}$, and $c_{n+i} = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$.

This means that if x has two decimal expansions, one of them must be finite. Hence if x does not have a finite decimal expansion (mod p), its representation is unique.

8. If order is imposed on \mathbb{C} , then, for each $z \in \mathbb{C}$ ($z \neq 0$) either $z > 0$ or $z < 0$.

Let $z = i$. By proposition 1.18 (d) $z^2 > 0$ for any $z \neq 0$.

Thus $-1 = i^2 > 0$. However, since $1 = 1^2 > 0$ (by 1.18 (d)), it follows that both 1 and -1 are greater than 0 . This violates proposition 1.18 (a). Thus \mathbb{C} cannot be an ordered field.

(7)

9. The proof that the lexicographic order makes \mathbb{C} into an ordered set is trivial. To see whether or not \mathbb{C} is transformed into a set with the least-upper bound property, set $A = \{bi : b \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Then A is bounded above by any element $z \in \mathbb{C}$ for which $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$.

Observe also that if $z = a + bi$ with $a = \operatorname{Re}(z) \leq 0$ then $w = (|b| + 1)i \in A$ satisfies $w > z$.

Although A is bounded above, A does not have a least-upper bound. To see this, suppose $\alpha + \beta i$ is an upper bound.

Then $\alpha > 0$ and $\frac{\alpha}{2} + \beta i$ is also an upper bound with $\frac{\alpha}{2} + \beta i < \alpha + \beta i$.

10. Let $z = a + bi$ and $w = u + vi$. Then $z^2 = w$ if and only if the equations

$$a^2 - b^2 = u \quad (1)$$

$$2ab = v \quad (2)$$

are satisfied. Write $b = \frac{v}{2a}$ and plug into first equation to obtain $a^2 - \frac{v^2}{4a^2} = u$. Multiply the last

equation by a^2 to obtain $a^4 - a^2 u - \frac{v^2}{4} = 0$. Then

$$a^2 = \frac{u + \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}}{2}. \quad \text{Since } b^2 = u - a^2 \text{ by equation (1),}$$

(8)

$$b^2 = \frac{-2u + \sqrt{4u^2 + v^2}}{2}. \quad \text{Therefore } a^2 = \frac{|w| + u}{2} \quad \text{and } b^2 = \frac{|w| - u}{2},$$

from which we obtain $a = \pm \left(\frac{|w| + u}{2}\right)^{1/2}$ and $b = \pm \left(\frac{|w| - u}{2}\right)^{1/2}$.

$$\text{If } v > 0 \text{ then } 2 \left(\frac{|w| + u}{2}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{|w| - u}{2}\right)^{1/2} = 2 \left(\frac{|w|^2 - u^2}{4}\right)^{1/2} = \\ = 2 \left(\frac{v^2}{4}\right)^{1/2} = |v| = v.$$

$$\text{Similarly, } 2 \left[-\left(\frac{|w| + u}{2}\right)^{1/2}\right] \left[-\left(\frac{|w| - u}{2}\right)^{1/2}\right] = v \text{ if } v > 0.$$

Thus $|a| + |b|i$ and $-(|a| + |b|i)$ are solutions to the equation $z^2 = w$ in this case.

If $v < 0$, then $-|a| + |b|i$ and $|a| - |b|i$ are solutions to $z^2 = w$.

We see that if $w \neq 0$ the equation $z^2 = w$ has at least two solutions. It can be shown that a polynomial equation of degree n can have at most n solutions. In particular, $z^2 - w = 0$ can have at most 2 solutions. Thus if $w \neq 0$, the equation $z^2 = w$ has exactly two solutions.

11. Let $z \neq 0$ and set $r = |z|$ and $w = \frac{z}{|z|}$ then $|w| = 1$ and $r > 0$. Clearly $z = r w$. To see that z determines r and w uniquely, suppose $z = p u$, where $p > 0$ and $|u| = 1$.

Then $|z| = |p u| = |p| |u| = p$. But $|z| = r$, hence $p = r$.

Now $\frac{1}{r} z = \frac{1}{r} p u = \frac{1}{r} r w$. It follows that $u = w$.

Remark: If $z = 0$, $z = r w$ when $r = 0$ and $|w| = 1$.

(9)

12. This follows by repeatedly applying theorem 1.33 (e).

$$\begin{aligned} 13. \text{ Suppose } z\bar{z} &= 1. \text{ Then } |1+z|^2 + |1-z|^2 = \\ &= (1+z)\overline{(1+z)} + (1-z)\overline{(1-z)} = (1+z)(1+\bar{z}) + (1-z)(1-\bar{z}) = \\ &= (1+\bar{z}+z+z\bar{z}) + (1-\bar{z}-z+z\bar{z}) = (2+\bar{z}+z) + (2-\bar{z}-z) = \\ &= 4. \end{aligned}$$