

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

Assume that \mathbb{C} is one orderd feild.

~~Then (by prop 1.18) Since $i \neq 0$. We consider i < 0, i = 0, i > 0.~~

Then by definition 1.5, one of them is true.

$$i < 0, i = 0, i > 0.$$

We know that i is non-zero. So we consider two cases $i < 0$ and $i > 0$

Case-I $i < 0$

Then, $-i > 0$ (by Prop 1.18)

$$(-i)(-i) = (i)(i) = i^2 = -1 > 0$$

(by defⁿ 1.17-ii)

This is contradiction.

Case-II $i > 0$. Then

$$(i)(i) = i^2 = -1 > 0 \text{ (by def}^h \text{ 1.17-ii)}$$

This is also contradiction.
Therefore, there is no order relation in \mathbb{C}

9. Suppose $z = a + bi$, $w = c + di$. Define $z < w$ if $a < c$, and also if $a = c$ but $b < d$. Prove that this turns the set of all complex numbers into an ordered set. (This type of order relation is called a *dictionary order*, or *lexicographic order*, for obvious reasons.) Does this ordered set have the least-upper-bound property?

Let $z = a + bi$ and $w = c + di$

where $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$. Since

\mathbb{R} is an ordered set.

and $(a < c \text{ or } a = c \text{ and } b < d)$
 $(b < d \text{ or } b = d \text{ and } a > c)$

Case-I If $a < c$, then $z < w$

Case-II If $a > c$ then $z > w$

Case-III If $a = c$ and $b > d$ then $z > w$

Case-IV If $a = c$ and $b < d$ then $z < w$

Case-V If $a = c$ and $b = d$ then $z = w$

Therefore one of them always true. i.e:

either $z < w$ or $z = w$ or $z > w$

Now let's check second condition of ordered set.

Let $u = e + fi$.

Suppose that $z > w$ and $z > u$

Suppose that $z < w$ and $w < u$

$z < w \Rightarrow (a < c) \text{ or } (a = c \text{ and } b < d)$

$w < u \Rightarrow (c < e) \text{ or } (c = e \text{ and } d < f)$

$w < u \Rightarrow (c < e) \text{ or } (c = e \text{ and } d < f)$

Case-I If $a < c$ and $c < e$ then $a < e$.
Thus, $z < \cancel{w} u$

Case-II If $a < c$ and $c = e$ and $d < f$ then $a < e$. This implies $z < \cancel{w} u$.

Case-III If $a = c$ and $b < d$ and $c < e$ then $a < e$ then $z < \cancel{w} u$

Case-IV If $a = c$ and $b < d$ and $c = e$ and $d < f$. Then $a = e$ and $b < f$.
This implies $z < u$.

This 4 cases. implies $\cancel{z < w}$ and $\cancel{w < u}$

If $z < w$ and $w < u$ then $z < w$.

10. Suppose $z = a + bi$, $w = u + iv$, and

$$a = \left(\frac{|w| + u}{2} \right)^{1/2}, \quad b = \left(\frac{|w| - u}{2} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Prove that $z^2 = w$ if $v \geq 0$ and that $(\bar{z})^2 = w$ if $v \leq 0$. Conclude that every complex number (with one exception!) has two complex square roots.

Suppose that $z = a + bi$ and $w = u + iv$ and

$$\text{where } a = \left(\frac{|w| + u}{2} \right)^{1/2}, \quad b = \left(\frac{|w| - u}{2} \right)^{1/2}$$

Suppose that $v \geq 0$.

Need to show: $z^2 = w$

$$\begin{aligned} z^2 &= (a + bi)^2 = (a + bi)(a + bi) \\ &= a^2 + bi + bi + 2i^2 ab \\ &= (a^2 - b^2) + 2iab \end{aligned}$$

$$a^2 - b^2 = \left(\frac{|w| + u}{2} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{|w| - u}{2} \right)^2 = u$$

$$\begin{aligned} 2ab &= 2 \left(\frac{|w| + u}{2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{|w| - u}{2} \right)^{1/2} = 2 \left(\left(\frac{|w| + u}{2} \right) \left(\frac{|w| - u}{2} \right) \right)^{1/2} \\ &= 2 \left(\frac{|w|^2 - u^2}{4} \right)^{1/2} = 2 \left(\frac{v^2}{4} \right)^{1/2} = v \end{aligned}$$

(Since $v \geq 0$)

Thus,

$$z^2 = (a^2 - b^2) + (2ab)i$$

$$= u + vi = w$$

NTS: If $\gamma \leq 0$ then $(\bar{z})^2 = w$

Suppose that $\gamma \leq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{z}^2 &= \bar{z}\bar{z} = (a-bi)(a-bi) \\ &= a - bi - bi + i^2 b \\ &= (a^2 - b^2) - (2ab)i\end{aligned}$$

We already show that $(a^2 - b^2) = u$ and
 $2ab = 2\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2}\right)^{1/2}$.

$$\text{Since } \gamma \leq 0, 2ab = 2\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2}\right)^{1/2} = -\gamma$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Therefore, } (\bar{z})^2 &= (a^2 - b^2) - (2ab)i \\ &= u - (-\gamma)i \\ &= u + \gamma i = w\end{aligned}$$

11. If z is a complex number, prove that there exists an $r \geq 0$ and a complex number w with $|w| = 1$ such that $z = rw$. Are w and r always uniquely determined by z ?

Suppose that $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

- If $z=0$, choose $r=0$ and $w=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}i$

$$\text{Then } |w| = \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}} = 1$$

- If $z \neq 0$, choose $r=|z|$ and

$$w = \frac{z}{|z|}. \text{ Then } r=|z| \geq 0 \text{ and}$$

$$|w| = \sqrt{\left|\frac{z}{|z|}\right|^2} = \frac{|z|}{|z|} = \frac{|z|}{|z|} = 1$$

(by thm 1.33-c)

(by thm 1.33d)

(This idea is get from the unit vectors)

Therefore, $z \in \mathbb{C} \Rightarrow (\exists (r \geq 0 \text{ and } w \in \mathbb{C} \text{ with } |w|=1)) \text{ such that } z=rw$

- In first case, uniqueness does not hold.

Because if $z=0$, then we can choose $r=0$ and ~~any~~ $w \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|w|=1$.

- In second case, uniqueness holds. If $z \neq 0$ then we can choose

Assume that $z = r_1 w_1 = r_2 w_2$ with

$r_1 > 0, r_2 > 0, |w_1| = 1, |w_2| = 1$. Take modulus of both sides

$$|r_1 w_1| = |r_2 w_2|$$

$$(r_1 || w_1 |) = (r_2 || w_2 |) \quad (\text{thm 1.33 and})$$

$$r_1 |w_1| = r_2 |w_2| \quad (\text{Since } r_i \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } |w_i| = 1)$$

$$r_1 = r_2 \quad (\text{Since } |w_1| = |w_2| = 1)$$

Thus, ~~$r_1 w_1 = r_2 w_2$~~ By our equation ①, ②
implies $w_1 = w_2$

Therefore r, w are uniquely determined by z .

12. If z_1, \dots, z_n are complex, prove that

$$|z_1 + z_2 + \cdots + z_n| \leq |z_1| + |z_2| + \cdots + |z_n|.$$

(12) Suppose that $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{C}$

We are going to use mathematical induction.

$$\cancel{|z_1 + z_2 + \cdots + z_n|} \rightarrow$$

If $n=2$, by thm 1.33 triangle equality holds. i.e:

$$|z_1 + z_2| \leq |z_1| + |z_2|$$

Now assume that following holds for $n=p \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|z_1 + z_2 + \cdots + z_p| \leq |z_1| + \cdots + |z_p|$$

Now Consider following,

$$|z_1 + z_2 + \cdots + z_p + z_{p+1}| \leq |z_1 + \cdots + z_p| + |z_{p+1}|$$

(by base case)

$$|z_1 + \cdots + z_p + z_{p+1}| \leq |z_1 + \cdots + z_p| + |z_{p+1}|$$

(Induction hypothesis)

Therefore, by mathematical hypothesis, we get

$$|z_1 + z_2 + \cdots + z_n| \leq |z_1| + \cdots + |z_n| \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$$

13. If x, y are complex, prove that

$$||x| - |y|| \leq |x - y|.$$

Let $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$. By theorem 1.33

$$|z+w| \leq |z| + |w| \text{ for all } z, w \in \mathbb{C}$$

We use $z = (x-y)$ and $w = y$. Using triangle inequality,

$$|(x-y)+y| \leq |x-y| + |y|$$

$$|x| \leq |x-y| + |y|$$

$$|x| - |y| \leq |x-y| \quad \textcircled{*}$$

Now, we use $z = y-x$ and $w = x$. By triangle inequality,

$$|(y-x)+x| \leq |y-x| + |x|$$

$$|y| \leq |y-x| + |x|$$

$$|y| - |x| \leq |y-x|$$

We know that, $|x-y| = |y-x|$. Thus,

$$|y| - |x| \leq |x-y| \quad \textcircled{**}$$

By $\textcircled{*}$ and $\textcircled{**}$, $||x| - |y|| \leq |x-y|$

14. If z is a complex number such that $|z| = 1$, that is, such that $z\bar{z} = 1$, compute $|1+z|^2 + |1-z|^2$.

Suppose that $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z|=1$.

P By definit 1.32,

$$\begin{aligned}
 |1+z|^2 &= (1+z)(\overline{1+z}) \quad (\text{defn 1.32}) \\
 &= (1+z)(\overline{1+\bar{z}}) \quad (\text{By thm 1.31-a}) \\
 &= (1+z)(1+\bar{z}) \quad (\because 1 \in \mathbb{R}) \\
 &= 1 + \bar{z} + z + z\bar{z} \quad (\text{distributive property}) \\
 &= 1 + \bar{z} + z + |z| \quad (\text{defn 1.32}) \\
 &= 1 + \bar{z} + z + 1 \quad (\text{by hypothesis}) \\
 &= 2 + \cancel{\bar{z} + z} \quad \text{--- } \textcircled{1}
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
 |1-z|^2 &= (1-z)(1-\bar{z}) \quad (\text{defn 1.32 and thm 1.31}) \\
 &= 1 - \bar{z} - z + z\bar{z} \quad (\text{distributive}) \\
 &= 1 - \bar{z} - \bar{z} + |z| \quad (\text{defn 1.32}) \\
 &= 1 - \bar{z} - \bar{z} + 1 \quad (\text{Hypothesis}) \\
 &= 2 - \cancel{\bar{z} + \bar{z}} \quad \text{--- } \textcircled{2}
 \end{aligned}$$

By ① and ②,

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