**1:** Let R be a ring and let F be a field.

(a) Using only the rules R1-R9 which define a field, prove that for all  $a \in F$  if  $a \cdot a = a$  then (a = 0 or a = 1). Solution: Let  $a \in F$ . Suppose that  $a \cdot a = a$ . Suppose that  $a \neq 0$ . Using R9, since  $a \neq 0$  we can choose  $b \in F$  so that  $a \cdot b = b \cdot a = 1$ . Then we have

$$a = 1 \cdot a , \text{ by R6}$$
  
=  $(b \cdot a) \cdot a , \text{ since } b \cdot a = 1$   
=  $b \cdot (a \cdot a) , \text{ by R5}$   
=  $b \cdot a , \text{ since } a \cdot a = a$   
= 1 , since  $b \cdot a = 1$ .

This proves that if  $a \neq 0$  then a = 1 or, equivalently, that either a = 0 or a = 1.

(b) Using only the rules R1-R9, prove that for all  $a \in F$  if  $a \cdot a = 1$  then (a = 1 or a + 1 = 0).

Solution: Let  $a \in F$ . Suppose that  $a \cdot a = 1$ . Suppose that  $a + 1 \neq 0$ . Using R9, choose  $b \in F$  so that  $(a + 1) \cdot b = b \cdot (a + 1) = 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} a &= a \cdot 1 , \text{ by R6} \\ &= a \cdot ((a+1) \cdot b) , \text{ since } (a+1) \cdot b = 1 \\ &= (a \cdot (a+1)) \cdot b , \text{ by R5} \\ &= (a \cdot a + a \cdot 1) \cdot b , \text{ by R7} \\ &= (1+a \cdot 1) \cdot b , \text{ since } a \cdot a = a \\ &= (1+a) \cdot b , \text{ by R6} \\ &= (a+1) \cdot b , \text{ by R2} \\ &= 1 , \text{ since } (a+1) \cdot b = 1. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that if  $a + 1 \neq 0$  then a = 1 or, equivalently, that either a = 1 or a + 1 = 0.

(c) Using only the rules R1-R7 which define a ring, together with the rule R0 which states that for all  $a \in R$  we have  $(a \cdot 0 = 0 \text{ and } 0 \cdot a = 0)$ , prove that for all  $a, b, c, d \in R$ , if a + c = 0 and b + d = 0 then ab = cd. Solution: Let  $a, b, c, d \in R$ . Suppose that a + c = 0 and b + d = 0. Then

$$\begin{aligned} ab &= ab + 0 , \text{ by R3} \\ &= ab + c0 , \text{ by R0} \\ &= ab + c(b + d) , \text{ since } b + d = 0 \\ &= ab + (cb + cd) , \text{ by R7} \\ &= (ab + cb) + cd , \text{ by R1} \\ &= (a + c)b + cd , \text{ by R1} \\ &= (a + c)b + cd , \text{ by R7} \\ &= 0b + cd , \text{ since } a + c = 0 \\ &= 0 + cd , \text{ by R0} \\ &= cd + 0 , \text{ by R2} \\ &= cd , \text{ by R3.} \end{aligned}$$

## **2:** Let S be an ordered set and let F be an ordered field.

(a) Using only the rules O1-O3, and the rule O0 which defines the strict order < by stating that for all  $a, b \in S$  we have  $a < b \iff (a \le b \text{ and } a \ne b)$ , prove that for all  $a, b, c \in S$ , if  $a \le b$  and b < c then a < c.

Solution: Let  $a, b, c \in S$ . Suppose that  $a \leq b$  and b < c. Since b < c we have  $b \leq c$  and  $b \neq c$  by O0. Since  $a \leq b$  and  $b \leq c$  we have  $a \leq c$  by O3. Suppose, for a contradiction, that a = c. Since  $a \leq b$  and a = c we have  $c \leq b$  (by substitution). Since  $b \leq c$  and  $c \leq b$  we have b = c by O2. But  $b \neq c$ , so we have obtained the desired contradiction, and so  $a \neq c$ . Since  $a \leq c$  and  $a \neq c$  we have a < c by O0.

(b) Using only the rules R1-R9 and O1-O5, prove that for all  $a, b \in F$  if  $0 \le a$  and  $a \le b$  then  $a \cdot a \le b \cdot b$ .

Solution: Let  $a, b \in F$ . Suppose that  $0 \le a$  and  $a \le b$ . Since  $0 \le a$  and  $a \le b$  we have  $0 \le b$  by O3. Using R4, choose  $c \in F$  so that a + c = 0. Since  $a \le b$  we have  $a + c \le b + c$  by O4, and hence  $0 \le b + c$  since a + c = 0. Since  $0 \le a$  and  $0 \le b + c$  we have  $0 \le a(b + c)$  by O5. Also, since  $0 \le b + c$  and  $0 \le b$  we have  $0 \le (b + c)b$ . Thus

$0 \le a(b+c)$		0 < (b+c)b
$0 + aa \le a(b+c) + aa$ , by O4	and	0 = (b+c)b $0 + ab \le (b+c)b + ab$ , by O4
$aa+0 \leq a(b+c)+aa$ , by R2		$ab + 0 \le (b + c)b + ab$ , by R2
$aa \leq a(b+c) + aa$ , by R3		$ab \leq (b+c)b+ab$ , by R3
$aa \leq (ab + ac) + aa$ , by R7		$ab \leq (bb + cb) + ab$ , by R7
$aa \leq ab + (ac + aa)$ , by R1		$ab \leq bb + (cb + ab)$ , by R1
$aa \leq ab + a(c+a)$ , by R7		$ab \leq bb + (c+a)b$ , by R7
$aa \leq ab + a(a+c)$ , by R2		$ab \leq bb + (a+c)b$ , by R2
$aa \leq ab + a0$ , since $a + c = 0$		$ab \leq bb + 0b$ , since $a + c = 0$
$aa \leq a(b+0)$ , by R7		$ab \leq (b+0)b$ , by R7
$aa \leq ab$ , by R3		$ab \leq bb$ , by R3

Since  $aa \leq ab$  and  $ab \leq bb$  we have  $aa \leq bb$  by O3.

(c) Using only rules R1-R9 and O1-O5, together with the rule R0 from Exercise 1(c), prove that  $0 \le 1$ . Solution: Choose  $u \in R$  so that 1 + u = 0 (we can do this by R4). Then

$$\begin{split} u \cdot u &= u \cdot u + 0 \text{, by R3,} \\ &= u \cdot u + 0 \cdot 1 \text{, by R6,} \\ &= u \cdot u + (1 + u) \cdot 1 \text{, since } 1 + u = 0, \\ &= u \cdot u + (1 \cdot 1 + u \cdot 1) \text{, by R7.} \\ &= (1 \cdot 1 + u \cdot 1) + u \cdot u \text{, by R2.} \\ &= 1 \cdot 1 + (u \cdot 1 + u \cdot u) \text{, by R1,} \\ &= 1 \cdot 1 + u \cdot (1 + u) \text{, by R7,} \\ &= 1 \cdot 1 + u \cdot 0 \text{, since } 1 + u = 0, \\ &= 1 \cdot 1 + 0 \text{, by R0,} \\ &= 1 \cdot 1 \text{, by R3,} \\ &= 1 \text{, by R6.} \end{split}$$

By O1 we know that either  $0 \le 1$  or  $1 \le 0$ . Suppose, for a contradiction, that  $1 \le 0$ . Then

$$\begin{array}{l} 1+u \leq 0+u \ , \, \mbox{by O4}, \\ 0 \leq 0+u \ , \, \mbox{since } 1+u=0, \\ 0 \leq u+0 \ , \, \mbox{by R2}, \\ 0 \leq u \ , \, \mbox{by R3}, \\ 0 \leq u \cdot u \ , \, \mbox{by O5}, \\ 0 \leq 1 \ , \, \mbox{since } u \cdot u=1, \, \mbox{as shown above.} \end{array}$$

Since  $0 \le 1$  and  $1 \le 0$  we have 0 = 1 by O2. This gives the desired contradiction because  $0 \ne 1$ , from the definition of a ring.

- **3:** In this problem, you may use any of the algebraic properties and order properties of N, Z, Q and R described in Chapter 1 of the Lecture Notes.
  - (a) Let  $A = \{(-1)^n + \frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ . Find (with proof) sup A and inf A.

Solution: We claim that  $\sup A = \frac{3}{2}$ . Let  $x \in A$ , say  $x = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n}$  where  $1 \le n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . If n is even then  $(-1)^n = 1$  and  $n \ge 2$  so that  $\frac{1}{n} \le \frac{1}{2}$ , and so we have  $x = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n} = 1 + \frac{1}{n} \le 1 + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{2}$ . If n is odd then  $(-1)^n = -1$  and  $n \ge 1$  so that  $\frac{1}{n} \le 1$ , and so we have  $x = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n} = -1 + \frac{1}{n} \le -1 + 1 = 0 \le \frac{3}{2}$ . In either case, we have  $x \le \frac{3}{2}$ . Thus  $x \le \frac{3}{2}$  for all  $x \in A$ , and so  $\frac{3}{2}$  is an upper bound for A in  $\mathbb{R}$ . If  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  is any upper bound for A then  $c \le x$  for all  $x \in A$ , and in particular  $c \le (-1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{2}$ . Thus  $\frac{3}{2} = \sup A$ . We claim that  $\inf A = -1$ . Let  $x \in A$ , say  $x = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n}$  with  $1 \le n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $(-1)^n \ge -1$  and  $\frac{1}{n} > 0$  we have  $x = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n} > -1 + 0 = -1$ . Since x > -1 for all  $x \in A$  we see that -1 is a lower bound for A in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  be any lower bound for A. Suppose, for a contradiction, that  $c \ge -1$ . Then  $c + 1 \ge 0$  hence

We claim that  $\inf A = -1$ . Let  $x \in A$ , say  $x = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n}$  with  $1 \le n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $(-1)^n \ge -1$  and  $\frac{1}{n} > 0$ we have  $x = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n} > -1 + 0 = -1$ . Since x > -1 for all  $x \in A$  we see that -1 is a lower bound for Ain  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  be any lower bound for A. Suppose, for a contradiction, that c > -1. Then c+1 > 0 hence  $\frac{1}{c+1} > 0$ . Choose an odd integer  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $n > \frac{1}{c+1} > 0$  (we are using the Archimedean Property here) and note that  $\frac{1}{n} < c+1$ . Let  $x = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n}$ . Then  $x \in A$  with  $x = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n} = -1 + \frac{1}{n} < -1 + (c+1) = c$ , which contradicts the fact that c is a lower bound for A. Thus we must have  $c \le -1$ . Since -1 is a lower bound for A and since every lower bound c for A satisfies  $c \le -1$ , it follows that  $-1 = \inf A$ , as claimed.

(b) Prove that for every  $0 \le y \in \mathbb{R}$  there exists a unique  $0 \le x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x^2 = y$  (this number x is called the square root of y and is denoted by  $x = \sqrt{y} = y^{1/2}$ ). In other words, prove that the function  $f: [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$  given by  $f(x) = x^2$  is bijective.

Solution: First we prove uniqueness. Suppose that  $x_1 \ge 0$  and  $x_2 \ge 0$  and  $x_1^2 = x_2^2 = y$ . Since  $x_1^2 = x_2^2$  we have  $(x_1 - x_2)(x_1 + x_2) = x_1^2 - x_2^2 = 0$  and hence either  $x_1 - x_2 = 0$  or  $x_1 + x_2 = 0$  (since a field has no zero divisors). In the case that  $x_1 + x_2 = 0$ , since  $x_1 \ge 0$  and  $x_2 \ge 0$  we must have  $x_1 = x_2 = 0$  (indeed if we had  $x_2 > 0$  then we would have  $x_1 = -x_2 < 0$ , so we must have  $x_2 = 0$ , and hence  $x_1 = -x_2 = -0 = 0$ ). In the case that  $x_1 - x_2 = 0$  we have  $x_1 = x_2$ . In either case, we have  $x_1 = x_2$ . This proves uniqueness.

Next we prove existence. Let  $0 \le y \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $A = \{0 \le t \in \mathbb{R} | t^2 \le y\}$ . Note that  $A \ne \emptyset$  since  $0 \in A$ . We claim that A is bounded above. If  $0 \le y \le 1$  then A is bounded above by 1 because  $t > 1 \implies t^2 > 1 \implies t^2 > y \implies t \notin A$ . If  $y \ge 1$  then A is bounded above by y because  $t > y \ge 1 \implies t^2 > y^2 > y \implies t \notin A$ . In either case, A is bounded above. Since  $A \ne \emptyset$  and A is bounded above, we know that A has a supremum in  $\mathbb{R}$  by the Completeness Property of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $x = \sup A$ . We claim that  $x^2 = y$ . Suppose, for a contradiction, that  $x^2 < y$ . Note that for  $0 < \epsilon \le 1$  we have  $(x + \epsilon)^2 = x^2 + 2x\epsilon + \epsilon^2 \le x^2 + 2x\epsilon + \epsilon = x^2 + (2x + 1)\epsilon$  and we have  $x^2 + (2x + 1)\epsilon \le y \iff \epsilon \le \frac{y - x^2}{2x + 1}$ . Choose  $\epsilon = \min\{1, \frac{y - x^2}{2x + 1}\}$ . Then  $(x + \epsilon)^2 \le x^2 + (2x + 1)\epsilon \le y$  so that  $x + \epsilon \in A$ , which contradicts the fact that  $x = \sup A$ . Thus we must have  $x^2 \ge y$ . Now suppose, for a contradiction, that  $x^2 > y$ . Note that for  $0 < \epsilon \le x$  we have  $(x - \epsilon)^2 = x^2 - 2x\epsilon + \epsilon^2 > x^2 - 2x\epsilon$  and we have  $x^2 - 2x\epsilon \ge y \iff \epsilon \le \frac{x^2 - y}{2x}$ . Choose  $\epsilon = \min\{x, \frac{x^2 - y}{2x}\}$ . Then  $(x - \epsilon)^2 > x^2 - 2x\epsilon \ge y$ . Since  $x = \sup A$ , by the Approximation Property we should be able to choose  $t \in A$  with  $(x - \epsilon) < t \le x$ , but when  $t > x - \epsilon$  we have  $t^2 > (x - \epsilon)^2 > y$  so that  $t \notin A$ , and so we have the desired contradiction. Thus we must have  $x^2 \le y$ . Since  $x^2 \ge y$  and  $x^2 \le y$  we must have x = y.