

Math 2550

PSET 2

September 11 2025

# Contents

Ex 1.1; Rudin 1.3	2
Ex 1.2, Rudin 1.3	2
Ex 1.3	2
Ex 1.4	3

## Ex 1.1

### Question

Let  $F$  be any ordered field (for example  $F = \mathbb{Q}$  or  $F = \mathbb{R}$ ). Suppose  $A \subset F$  has a supremum. Suppose  $\epsilon \in F$  with  $\epsilon > 0$ . Prove that there exists some  $x \in A$  such that  $x > (\sup A) - \epsilon$ .

### Proof

$A$  having a supremum means that there is some  $y \in F$  that is a least upper bound for  $A$  such that for any upper bound  $y' \in F$ ,  $y \leq y'$ . Yet for all  $x \in A$ ,  $x \leq y$ .

Let us suppose that the statement is false. That would mean that  $\forall x \in A$ ,  $x \leq (\sup A) - \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon \geq 0$

Letting  $\sup A = y$  this would mean that there exists some upper bound  $y - \epsilon < y$ , since  $\epsilon > 0$ . Which contradicts the statement that  $y$  is an upper bound of  $A$  such that for all other upper bounds,  $y' \leq y$

Meaning the statement is true.



## Ex 1.2, Rudin 1.5

### Question

Let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$  be nonempty and bounded below. Define

$$-A = \{-x \mid x \in A\}. \quad (1)$$

Prove that  $\inf A = -\sup(-A)$ .

### Proof

The infimum of  $A$  is a number  $y \in A$  such that  $y$  is a lower bound for  $A$  and any lower bound  $y'$  for  $A$  has  $y' \leq y$ . The supremum of  $A$  is a number  $z \in -A$  such that  $z$  is a lower bound for  $-A$  and any lower bound  $z'$  for  $-A$  has  $z \leq z'$ .  $\mathbb{R}$  is an ordered field and set meaning that the subset  $A$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  inherits that ordering. So for  $x, x' \in A$ ,  $x < x'$  if  $x < x'$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  but since  $-A$  is defined by multiplying all values of  $x \in A$  by  $-1$  and if  $x < x'$  and  $c < 0$  where  $c$  is  $-1$  then  $xc > x'(c)$ . This means that the ordering of  $A$  is flipped in  $-A$ . So what would have been our infimum of  $A$  is now the supremum of  $A$ . Yet the sign is flipped again in the equation when we take the negative of the supremum of  $-A$  making it once again the infimum of  $A$



## Ex 1.3

### Question

Suppose  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}$  are both nonempty and bounded above. Define the set  $A + B$  by

$$A + B = \{a + b \mid a \in A, b \in B\}. \quad (2)$$

Prove that  $\sup(A + B) = \sup A + \sup B$ .

### Proof

The supremum of a set is a number  $x$  in the set such that  $x$  is a lower bound for the set and any lower bound  $x'$  for the set has  $x \leq x'$ .  $\mathbb{R}$  is an ordered field meaning that it follows the order axiom that means that if  $a < b$  and  $c < d$  then  $a + b < c + d$ .  $A$  and  $B$  are both subsets of the ordered field  $\mathbb{R}$  meaning that they also have an ordering. So that if  $a, a'$  are in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $b, b'$  are in  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $a < a'$  and  $b < b'$  it follows that  $a + b < a' + b'$  by the order axiom of fields so for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  there exists some least upper bound  $q$  such that  $\forall x \in A$ ,  $x \leq q$  and the same applies for  $B$ . Following the order axiom that means that  $q + p \geq a + b$

for all  $a + b \in A, B$



## Ex 1.4

### Question

In each of the following,  $S$  is an ordered set, and  $A \subset S$ . Answer the following in each case, and prove your answers:

- Is  $A$  bounded above?
  - Does  $A$  have a maximum element, and if so, what is it?
  - Does  $A$  have a supremum in  $S$ , and if so, what is it?
1.  $S = \mathbb{Z}, A = \{2, 3\}$ .
  2.  $S = \mathbb{Q}, A = \{-\frac{2n}{5} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .
  3.  $S = \mathbb{Q}, A = \{-\frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .
  4.  $S = \mathbb{Q}, A = \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .
  5.  $S = \mathbb{Q}, A = \{x \in \mathbb{Q} \mid 0 < x \leq 1\}$ .
  6.  $S = \mathbb{Q}, A = \{x \in \mathbb{Q} \mid 0 < x < 1\}$ .

### Proof

1.  $S = \mathbb{Z}, A = \{2, 3\}$ 
  - (a) It is bounded above, it has 2 elements 2, 3 and is a subset of the ordered set  $\mathbb{Z}$  this means that it inherits the ordering. With  $2 < 3$ . So  $A$  is bounded above by 3
  - (b) Yes, 3.
  - (c) Yes 3.
2.  $S = \mathbb{Q}, A = \{-\frac{2n}{5} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .
  - (a) no
  - (b) no
  - (c) no
3.  $S = \mathbb{Q}, A = \{-\frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .
  - (a) Yes
  - (b) Yes, 1
  - (c) Yes, 1
4.  $S = \mathbb{Q}, A = \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .
  - (a) Yes
  - (b) Yes
  - (c) Yes, 1
5.  $S = \mathbb{Q}, A = \{x \in \mathbb{Q} \mid 0 < x \leq 1\}$ .
  - (a) Yes

- (b) Yes, 1  
(c) Yes, 1

6.  $S = \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $A = \{x \in \mathbb{Q} \mid 0 < x < 1\}$ .

- (a) Yes  
(b) No  
(c) Yes, 1



### Question

Suppose  $F$  is an ordered field and  $x, y, z \in F$ .

1. Prove that if  $x > 0$ , then  $x^{-1} > 0$ .
2. Prove that if  $x > 0$ , then  $y > z$  if and only if  $xy > xz$ .
3. Recall the field  $\mathbb{F}_3 = \{0, 1, 2\}$  which we discussed in class. Prove that there does not exist an order on  $\mathbb{F}_3$  such that it is an ordered field.

### Proof

1.  $F$  is an ordered field and fields have the property that  $\forall x \in F \exists$  some  $x' \in F$  such that  $x \cdot x^{-1} = 1$ . We know that  $x > 0$  and that  $x'$  is its multiplicative inverse. Lets suppose for sake of contradiction that  $x^{-1} < 0$ . This means that  $x$  is a positive integer and  $x'$  is a negative integer. The sign rules of multiplication state that a negative times a positive leads to a negative but if  $x^{-1}$  is a multiplicative inverse of  $x$  then  $x$  times  $x^{-1}$  is a negative number which contradicts the statement that  $x \cdot x^{-1} = 1$

2. Let us suppose that  $x > 0$  and for sake of contradiction that  $y < z$  however  $xy > yz$ . Since  $F$  is an ordered field that means that there is some  $x^{-1} \forall x \in F$  such that  $x \cdot x^{-1} = 1$ . This along with the prperty that if  $x, y \in F$  then  $xy \in F$  means that we can multiply both sides of the inequality  $xy > yz$  by  $x^{-1}$

$$xy > yz \Rightarrow x \cdot x^{-1} \cdot y > x \cdot x^{-1} \cdot z \Rightarrow (x \cdot x^{-1})y > (x \cdot x^{-1})z$$

$$\rightarrow (1)y > (1)z \Rightarrow y > z$$

Which contradicts the statement that  $y < z$ .

Now lets do the other side let us suppose for sake of contradiction that  $xy < xz$  however  $y > z$ . Since  $F$  is an ordered field that means that there is some  $x^{-1} \forall x \in F$  such that  $x \cdot x^{-1} = 1$ . This along with the prperty that if  $x, y \in F$  then  $xy \in F$  means that we can multiply both sides of the inequality  $xy > yz$  by  $x^{-1}$



### Question

This exercise is a reminder that the “size” of infinite sets can be a bit counterintuitive.

1. Suppose  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , with  $a < b$ . Prove that there is a bijection from  $(a, b)$  to  $(0, 1)$ .
2. Prove that there is a bijection from  $(0, 1)$  to  $(1, \infty)$ .
3. Suppose  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Prove that there is a bijection from  $(a, \infty)$  to  $(b, \infty)$ .