## Chapter 1: The Real and Complex Number Systems

Author: Meng-Gen Tsai Email: plover@gmail.com

Unless the contrary is explicitly stated, all numbers that are mentioned in these exercise are understood to be real.

**Exercise 1.1.** If r is a rational  $(r \neq 0)$  and x is irrational, prove that r + x and rx are irrational.

*Proof.* Assume  $r + x \in \mathbb{Q}$ .  $\mathbb{Q}$  is a field, then  $-r \in \mathbb{Q}$  for any  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ . So  $(-r) + (r+x) = (-r+r) + x = 0 + x = x \in \mathbb{Q}$ , a contradiction.

Similarly, assume  $rx \in \mathbb{Q}$ .  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$  with  $r \neq 0$  implies that there exists an element  $1/r \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $r \cdot (1/r) = 1$ . So  $(1/r) \cdot (rx) = ((1/r) \cdot r) \cdot x = 1 \cdot x = x \in \mathbb{Q}$ , a contradiction.  $\square$ 

Exercise 1.2. Prove that there is no rational number whose square is 12.

Apply the argument in Example 1.1. Again we can examine this situation a little more closely. Let A be the set of all positive rational p such that  $p^2 < 12$  and let B be the set of all positive rational p such that  $p^2 > 12$ . We might show that A contains no largest number and B contains no largest number again.

In fact, we can associate with each rational p > 0 the number

$$q = p - \frac{p^2 - 12}{p + 12} = \frac{12p + 12}{p + 12}.$$

Then

$$q^2 - 12 = \frac{132(p^2 - 12)}{(p+12)^2}.$$

If  $p \in A$  then  $p^2 - 12 < 0$ , q > p and  $q^2 < 12$ . Thus  $q \in A$ . If  $p \in B$  then  $p^2 - 12 > 0$ , 0 < q < p and  $q^2 > 12$ . Thus  $q \in B$ .

*Proof (Example 1.1).* We now show that the equation

$$p^2 = 12$$

is not satisfied by any rational p. If there were such a  $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ , we could write  $p = \frac{m}{n}$  where  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$  are relatively prime. Let us assume this is done. Then

$$p^2 = 12$$
 implies

$$m^2 = 12n^2.$$

This shows that  $3 \mid m^2$ . Hence  $3 \mid m$  (since 3 is a prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$ ), and so  $m^2$  is divisible by 9. It follows that  $12n^2$  is divisible by 9, so that  $4n^2$  is divisible by 3, so that  $n^2$  is divisible by 3, which implies that  $3 \mid n$ . That is, both m and n have a common factor 3 > 1, contrary to our choice of m and n. Hence  $p^2 = 12$  is impossible for rational p.  $\square$ 

## Exercise 1.3. Prove Proposition 1.15.

**Proposition 1.15.** The axioms for multiplication imply the following statements.

- (a) If  $x \neq 0$  and xy = xz then y = z.
- (b) If  $x \neq 0$  and xy = x then y = 1.
- (c) If  $x \neq 0$  and xy = 1 then y = 1/x.
- (d) If  $x \neq 0$  then 1(1/x) = x.

*Proof of (a).* By the axioms for multiplication,

$$xy = xz, x \neq 0 \Longrightarrow \exists 1/x \in F, (1/x) \cdot (xy) = (1/x) \cdot (xz)$$
 (M5)

$$\Longrightarrow ((1/x)x)y = ((1/x)x)z \tag{M3}$$

$$\Longrightarrow (x(1/x))y = (x(1/x))z \tag{M2}$$

$$\implies 1y = 1z$$

$$\implies y = z.$$
 (M4)

Proof of (b). Let z = 1 in (a) and note that x1 = 1x = x ((M2)(M4)).  $\square$ 

Proof of (c). Let z = 1/x in (a) and note that x(1/x) = 1 ((M5)).  $\square$ 

*Proof of (d).* Since x(1/x) = (1/x)x = 1 ((M2)), by (c), x = 1/(1/x).  $\Box$ 

**Exercise 1.4.** Let E be a nonempty subset of an ordered set; suppose  $\alpha$  is a lower bound of E and  $\beta$  is an upper bound of E. Prove that  $\alpha \leq \beta$ .

Proof.

- (1) Since  $E \neq \emptyset$ , there is  $y \in E$ .
- (2) By the definition of the upper bound,  $x \leq \beta$  for every  $x \in E$ . In particular,  $y \leq \beta$ .

- (3) Similarly,  $y \ge \alpha$ .
- (4) By (2)(3),  $\alpha \le y \le \beta$  for some  $y \in E$ . In particular,  $\alpha \le \beta$  (Definition 1.5(ii)).

**Exercise 1.5.** Let A be a nonempty set of real numbers which is bounded below. Let -A be the set of all numbers -x, where  $x \in A$ . Prove that

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

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha = \inf A$  and  $\beta = \sup(-A)$ .

(1)

$$\begin{split} x \geq \alpha \ \, \forall x \in A \Longrightarrow -x \leq -\alpha \ \, \forall -x \in -A \\ \Longrightarrow -\alpha \ \, \text{is an upper bound of } -A \\ \Longrightarrow \beta \leq -\alpha \\ \Longrightarrow \alpha \leq -\beta \end{split}$$

(2)

$$-x \leq \beta \ \forall -x \in -A \Longrightarrow x \geq -\beta \ \forall x \in A$$
 
$$\Longrightarrow -\beta \text{ is a lower bound of } A$$
 
$$\Longrightarrow \alpha \geq -\beta$$

By (1)(2),  $\alpha = -\beta$ , or inf  $A = -\sup(-A)$ .  $\square$ 

Exercise 1.6. Fix b > 1.

(a) If m, n, p, q are integers, n > 0, q > 0, and r = m/n = p/q, prove that  $(b^m)^{1/n} = (b^p)^{1/q}$ .

Hence it makes sense to define  $b^r = (b^m)^{1/n}$ .

- (b) Prove that  $b^{r+s} = b^r b^s$  if r and s are rational.
- (c) If x is real, define B(x) to be the set of all numbers  $b^t$ , where t is rational and  $t \leq x$ . Prove that

$$b^r = \sup B(r)$$

where r is rational. Hence it makes sense to define

$$b^x = \sup B(x)$$

for every real x.

(d) Prove that  $b^{x+y} = b^x b^y$  for all real x and y.

Proof of (a).

(1) Define  $k=mq=np\in\mathbb{Z}$  (since r=m/n=p/q). Notice that nq>0 (since n>0 and q>0). So there is one and only one  $y\in\mathbb{R}$  such that

$$y^{nq} = b^k$$

where  $b^k$  is defined in  $\mathbb{R}$  (Theorem 1.21).

(2) Show that  $y = (b^m)^{1/n}$  and  $y = (b^p)^{1/q}$  are solutions of  $y^{nq} = b^k$ . In fact,  $((b^m)^{1/n})^{nq} = (b^m)^q = b^{mq} = b^k.$ 

$$((b^p)^{1/q})^{nq} = (b^p)^n = b^{pn} = b^k.$$

(3) By (1)(2), the uniqueness of y shows that  $(b^m)^{1/n} = (b^p)^{1/q}$ , or the map  $r \mapsto b^r$  is well-defined for  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

*Proof of (b).* Write r = m/n and s = p/q where m, n, p, q are integers with n > 0, q > 0.

$$b^{r+s} = b^{\frac{mq+np}{nq}}$$

$$= (b^{mq} \cdot b^{np})^{\frac{1}{nq}} \qquad (mq + np \in \mathbb{Z})$$

$$= (b^{mq})^{\frac{1}{nq}} \cdot (b^{np})^{\frac{1}{nq}} \qquad (Corollary to Theorem 1.21)$$

$$= b^{\frac{mq}{nq}} \cdot b^{\frac{np}{nq}}$$

$$= b^{\frac{m}{n}} \cdot b^{\frac{n}{n}} \qquad ((a))$$

$$= b^{r} \cdot b^{s}.$$

Proof of (c).

- (1) Given any  $r \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ ,  $b^r > 1$  since b > 1 is given.
- (2) Given any  $r, s \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $b^r > b^s$  whenever r > s. In fact,

$$b^{r} = b^{r-s}b^{s}$$

$$> 1 \cdot b^{s}$$

$$= b^{s}.$$
((b))

(3) Given any  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $b^t \leq b^r$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$  whenever  $t \leq r$ . So  $\sup B(r) \leq b^r$ . Conversely, since  $r \in B(r)$ ,  $b^r \leq \sup B(r)$ . So  $b^r = \sup B(r)$ .

(4) Given any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . We can always find  $r, s \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that r < x < s. Therefore,  $r \in B(x)$  and B(s) is an upper bound of B(x). So there is a least upper bound  $\sup B(x)$  for B(x), i.e.,  $b^r = \sup B(r)$  is well-defined.

**Lemma.** If x is real, define B'(x) to be the set of all numbers  $b^t$ , where t is rational and t < x. Prove that  $\sup B'(x) = \sup B(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Proof of Lemma (Reductio ad absurdum). It suffices to show that  $\sup B'(r) = \sup B(r) = b^r$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ . (The case  $x \in \mathbb{R} - \mathbb{Q}$  is nothing to do.) Clearly,  $\sup B'(r) \leq b^r$ . If  $\alpha = \sup B'(r) < b^r$ , then for  $\frac{b^r}{\alpha} > 1$  there is  $n > (b-1)/\left(\frac{b^r}{\alpha} - 1\right)$  such that

$$b^{\frac{1}{n}} < \frac{b^r}{\alpha}$$

(Exercise 1.7(c)). So  $\alpha < b^{r-\frac{1}{n}}$ . Therefore,  $b^{r-\frac{1}{n}} \in B'(r)$  since  $r - \frac{1}{n} \in \mathbb{Q}$ , or we find an element in B'(r) such that is greater than  $\alpha$ , contrary to the maximality of  $\alpha$ .  $\square$ 

Proof of (d). Apply Lemma to use B(x) or B'(x) interchangeably.

(1) Show that

$$\sup B'(x+y) \le \sup B'(x) \sup B'(y).$$

Given any  $b^t \in B'(x+y)$  such that t < x+y. There are rational numbers r,s such that  $r < x, \ s < y$  and t = r+s. (Rewrite t < x+y as t-y < x. So there is a rational number r such that t-y < r < x. Let s = t-r < y.) (Here we use B'(x+y) instead of B(x+y) to ensure the existence of r and s. That is, if  $0 = -\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2}$ , we cannot find rational numbers  $r \le -\sqrt{2}$  and  $s \le \sqrt{2}$  such that r+s=0.) Therefore,

$$b^t = b^{r+s} = b^r b^s \le \sup B'(x) \sup B'(y)$$

(by (b)). Take supremum,  $\sup B'(x+y) \le \sup B'(x) \sup B'(y)$ .

(2) Show that

$$\sup B'(x+y) \ge \sup B'(x) \sup B'(y).$$

Given any  $b^r \in B'(x)$ ,  $b^s \in B'(y)$ . r < x and s < y. So  $b^r b^s = b^{r+s} \in B'(x+y)$  (by (b)). So  $b^r b^s \le \sup B'(x+y)$ . So

$$b^r \le \frac{\sup B'(x+y)}{b^s}$$

since  $b^s>0$  for any  $s\in\mathbb{Q}$ . Here  $\frac{\sup B'(x+y)}{b^s}$  is an upper bound for B'(x). So

$$\sup B'(x) \le \frac{\sup B'(x+y)}{b^s},$$

or  $b^s \leq \frac{\sup B'(x+y)}{B'(x)}$ . Use the same argument again,

$$\sup B'(y) \le \frac{\sup B'(x+y)}{\sup B'(x)}$$

or  $\sup B'(x) \sup B'(y) \le \sup B'(x+y)$ .

By (1)(2),  $\sup B'(x) \sup B'(y) = \sup B'(x+y)$  or  $b^x b^y = b^{x+y}$ .  $\square$ 

**Exercise 1.8.** Prove that no order can be defined in the complex field that turns it into an ordered field. (Hint: -1 is a square.)

Proof (Reductio ad absurdum). If  $\mathbb{C}$  were an ordered field, consider the complex number  $i = \sqrt{-1}$ .

- (1)  $i \neq 0$ . If i were 0, then  $i \cdot i = 0 \cdot i$  or -1 = 0, or 1 = 0, contrary to 1 > 0 (Proposition 1.18).
- (2) Since  $i \neq 0$ , we have  $i^2 > 0$  (Proposition 1.18). So -1 > 0, or 1 < 0, contrary to the fact 1 > 0 (Proposition 1.18).

**Supplement**  $(x^2 > 0 \text{ if } x \neq 0)$ . Show that the only automorphism of  $\mathbb{R}$  is the identity. (Hint: If  $\sigma$  is an automorphism, show that  $\sigma|_{\mathbb{Q}} = id$ , and if a > 0, then  $\sigma(a) > 0$ ).

It is an interesting fact that there are infinitely many automorphisms of  $\mathbb{C}$ , even thought  $[\mathbb{C}:\mathbb{R}]=2$ . Why is this fact not a contradiction to this problem?

**Exercise 1.12.** If  $z_1, \ldots, z_n$  are complex, prove that

$$|z_1 + z_2 + \dots + z_n| < |z_1| + |z_2| + \dots + |z_n|$$
.

*Proof.* Use mathematical induction on n. n=2 is established by Theorem 1.33 (e). Suppose the inequality holds on n=k, then n=k+1 we again apply Theorem 1.33 (e) to get the result, say

$$|z_1 + z_2 + \dots + z_k + z_{k+1}| \le |z_1 + z_2 + \dots + z_k| + |z_{k+1}|$$
  
 $\le |z_1| + |z_2| + \dots + |z_k| + |z_{k+1}|$ 

Supplement. If  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , then

$$|x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n| \le |x_1| + |x_2| + \dots + |x_n|.$$

Here we might use Theorem 1.37 (e) to prove it. Since the norm  $|\cdot|$  on  $\mathbb{C}$  is the same as the norm on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , we might prove this supplement first and then set k=2 on  $\mathbb{R}^k=\mathbb{R}^2$  to give another proof of Exercise 1.12.

**Exercise 1.13.** If x, y are complex, prove that

$$||x| - |y|| \le |x - y|.$$

We can show f(x) = |x| is uniformly continuous in  $\mathbb{R}$  by using this inequality.

Proof (Exercise 1.12). Since

$$|y| \le |x| + |y - x| = |x| + |x - y|$$
  
 $|x| \le |y| + |x - y|,$ 

we have

$$-|x - y| \le |x| - |y| \le |x - y|,$$

or

$$||x| - |y|| \le |x - y|.$$

**Exercise 1.14.** If z is a complex number such that |z| = 1, that is, such that  $z\overline{z} = 1$ , compute

$$|1+z|^2 + |1-z|^2.$$

Proof  $(|z|^2 = z\overline{z})$ .

$$|1+z|^2 = (1+z)\overline{(1+z)} = (1+z)(1+\overline{z}) = 1+z+\overline{z}+z\overline{z}$$
$$|1-z|^2 = (1-z)\overline{(1-z)} = (1+z)(1-\overline{z}) = 1-z-\overline{z}+z\overline{z}$$
$$|1+z|^2+|1-z|^2 = 2+2z\overline{z} = 2+2=4.$$

*Proof (Exercise 1.17).* Regard  $\mathbb C$  as  $\mathbb R^2$ . Then put  $\mathbf x=1,\mathbf y=z$  in the parallelogram law (Exercise 1.17) to get

$$|1+z|^2 + |1-z|^2 = 2|1|^2 + 2|z|^2 = 4.$$

Exercise 1.15. Under what conditions does equality hold in the Schwarz inequality?

Theorem 1.35 (Schwarz inequality). If  $a_1, \ldots, a_n$  and  $b_1, \ldots, b_n$  are complex numbers, then

$$\left|\sum_{j=1}^n a_j \overline{b_j}\right|^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^n |a_j|^2 \sum_{j=1}^n |b_j|^2.$$

In fact, the Lagrange's identity for complex numbers shows

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \overline{b_k} \right|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} |a_k|^2 \sum_{k=1}^{n} |b_k|^2 - \sum_{1 \le k < j \le n} |a_k b_j - a_j b_k|^2.$$

In general, the Binet-Cauchy identity shows

$$\sum_{1 \le k < j \le n} (a_k b_j - a_j b_k) (A_k B_j - A_j B_k)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k A_k\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^n b_k B_k\right) - \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k B_k\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^n b_k A_k\right).$$

Proof of Binet-Cauchy identity.

$$\begin{split} &\sum_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} (a_k b_j - a_j b_k) (A_k B_j - A_j B_k) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} (a_k b_j A_k B_j + a_j b_k A_j B_k) - \sum_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} (a_k b_j A_j B_k - a_j b_k A_k B_j) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} (a_k A_k b_j B_j + a_j A_j b_k B_k) - \sum_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} (a_k B_k b_j A_j + a_j B_j b_k A_k) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq k \neq j \leq n} a_k A_k b_j B_j - \sum_{1 \leq k \neq j \leq n} a_k B_k b_j A_j \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq k, j \leq n} a_k A_k b_j B_j - \sum_{1 \leq k, j \leq n} a_k B_k b_j A_j \\ &\text{(since } a_k A_k b_j B_j - a_k B_k b_j A_j = 0 \text{ as } k = j) \\ &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k A_k\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n b_j B_j\right) - \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k B_k\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n b_j A_j\right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k A_k\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^n b_k B_k\right) - \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k B_k\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^n b_k A_k\right). \end{split}$$

Proof of Lagrange's identity. Put  $(a_k, b_k, A_k, B_k) \mapsto (a_k, b_k, \overline{a_k}, \overline{b_k})$  in the Binet-Cauchy identity.  $\square$ 

Proof of Schwarz inequality (Lagrange's identity). Notice the term

$$\sum_{1 \le k < j \le n} \left| a_k b_j - a_j b_k \right|^2 \ge 0.$$

Write  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  and  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$  as two vectors in the vector space  $\mathbb{C}^n$  over  $\mathbb{C}$ . Back to the exercise now.

Proof (Lagrange's identity).  $\sum_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} |a_k b_j - a_j b_k|^2 = 0 \iff a_k b_j = a_j b_k$  for any  $1 \leq k < j \leq n$ . The equality holds in the Schwarz inequality  $\iff$  **a** and **b** are linearly dependent.  $\square$ 

Proof (Theorem 1.35). The equality holds in the Schwarz inequality.  $\iff B = 0$  or the term  $\sum |Ba_j - Cb_j|^2$  in the proof of Theorem 1.35 is 0.  $\iff \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$  or  $\mathbf{a} = c\mathbf{b}$  for some  $c \in \mathbb{C}$ .  $\iff \mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  are linearly dependent.  $\square$ 

## Exercise 1.17. Prove that

$$|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}|^2 + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2 = 2|\mathbf{x}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{y}|^2$$

if  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . Interpret this geometrically, as a statement about parallelograms.

Proof.

$$|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}|^2 + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2$$

$$= (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) + (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$$

$$= (\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x} + 2\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{y}) + (\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x} - 2\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{y})$$

$$= 2\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x} + 2\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{y}$$

$$= 2|\mathbf{x}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{y}|^2.$$

Interpret this geometrically, the sum of the squares of the lengths of the four sides of a parallelogram equals the sum of the squares of the lengths of the two diagonals.

If the parallelogram is a rectangle, the two diagonals are of equal lengths, so that the statement reduces to the Pythagorean theorem.  $\Box$ 

**Exercise 1.18.** If  $k \geq 2$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , prove that there exists  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k$  such that  $\mathbf{y} \neq 0$  but  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = 0$ . Is this also true if k = 1?

Proof.

- (1) There are only two possible cases.
  - (a)  $\exists i \text{ such that } x_i = 0.$  Let  $\mathbf{y} = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \neq 0$  whose entries are all 0 except for a 1 in the *i*-th position. So  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = 0 + \dots + 0 = 0$ .
  - (b)  $\forall i, x_i \neq 0$ . Since  $k \geq 2$ , we can define  $\mathbf{y} = (x_2, -x_1, 0, \dots, 0) \neq 0$ . So  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = x_1 x_2 + x_2 (-x_1) + 0 + \dots + 0 = 0$ .
- (2) It is not true for k = 1 since  $\mathbb{R}^1 = \mathbb{R}$  is a field.