MATH 287 HOMEWORK 7

ANDREW MOORE

Exercise 1. Type in the piecewise definition of the Fibonacci numbers.

Answer.

$$f_n = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if n} = 0 \\ 1, & \text{if n} = 1 \end{cases}$$

$$f_{n-1} + f_{n-2} & \text{otherwise}$$

 \Diamond

Date: October 29, 2021.

Exercise 2. Proposition 8.18: For all $m, n \in \mathbf{R}, (-m)(-n) = mn$.

Proof. Let $m, n \in \mathbf{R}$. First, we should note that -m+m=0 and -n+n=0 (Axiom 8.4). Multiplying the first equation by n and the second equation by -m gives us

$$n(-m+m) = 0$$
 and $(-m)(-n+n) = 0$.

From Prop. 8.15, we know that $-m \cdot 0 = 0$ and $n \cdot 0 = 0$, so the right-hand sides of each equation remain the same. After distributing and rearranging (Prop. 8.8 and 8.1 (iii)), we have

$$mn + (-m)n = 0$$
 and $(-m)n + (-m)(-n) = 0$.

Using Axiom 8.1 (i) to rearrange the equation on the left, we can show

$$(-m)n + mn = 0$$

$$(-m)n + (-m)(-n) = 0.$$

From Prop. 8.11, we know that the additive inverses of real numbers are unique. Therefore, (-m)(-n) must be mn, i.e., (-m)(-n) = mn.

Exercise 3. Proposition 8.32: For all $w, x, y, z \in \mathbf{R}$:

- (1) If x < y then x + z < y + z.
- (2) If x < y and z < w then x + z < y + w.
- (3) If 0 < x < y and $0 < z \le w$ then xz < yw.
- (4) If x < y and z < 0 then yz < xz.

Claim 3.1. If x < y then x + z < y + z.

Proof. Let $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$. We are told that x < y, that is, $y - x \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$. Then, suppose we take any arbitrary element $z \in \mathbb{R}$, and add z to both x and y:

$$x + z < y + z \Rightarrow (y + z) - (x + z) \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$$
 (definition of <)

$$\Rightarrow y + z - x - z \in \mathbf{R}_{>0} \text{ (distributing)}$$

$$\Rightarrow y - x + 0 \in \mathbf{R}_{>0} \text{ (Axiom 8.4)}$$

$$\Rightarrow x < y \text{ (definition of <)}.$$

We have shown that when adding an arbitrary constant value z to both sides of the inequality, the quantity z is zeroed out, preserving the inequality between x and y. Thus we have shown that for all $z \in \mathbf{R}$, if x < y, x + z < y + z.

Claim 3.2. If x < y and z < w then x + z < y + w.

Proof. Let $w, x, y, z \in \mathbf{R}$. We are told that x < y and z < w. That is, $y - x \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$ and $w - z \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$, by the definition of <. Adding (y - x) and (w - z) gives

$$(y-x) + (w-z) \in \mathbf{R}_{>0} \Rightarrow y + w - x - z \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$$

$$\Rightarrow (y+w) - (x) - (z) \in \mathbf{R}_{>0} \text{ (Prop. 8.22)}$$

$$\Rightarrow (y+w) - (x+z) \in \mathbf{R}_{>0} \text{ (Axiom 8.1 (ii))}$$

$$\Rightarrow x+z < y+w.$$

Claim 3.3. If 0 < x < y and $0 < z \le w$ then xz < yw.

Proof. Let $w, x, y, z \in \mathbf{R}$. We know that $y - x \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$, $x - 0 \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$, and $z - 0 \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$. We also know that $w - z \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$ or w = z. If w = z then, we have

$$z(y-x) \in \mathbf{R}_{>0} \Rightarrow yz - xz \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$$

(3)
$$\Rightarrow xz < yz$$

$$\Rightarrow (xz < yz) \equiv (xw < yw) \equiv (xw < yz) \equiv (xz < yw).$$

If z < w, then $w - z \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Multiplying (y - x) and (w - z), we have

$$(y-x)\cdot(w-z)\in\mathbf{R}_{>0}\Rightarrow yw-yz-xw-xz\in\mathbf{R}_{>0}.$$

Letting j = -(yz + xw + xz), we can see that $yw - j \in \mathbf{R}_{>0} \Rightarrow j < yw$. Given that xz is part of j's sum, and each of x, w, y, z > 0, we can conclude that $yw - xz \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$, i.e., xz < yw.

Claim 3.4. If x < y and z < 0 then yz < xz.

Proof. Let $x, y, z \in \mathbf{R}$. We are told that x < y and z < 0. This means that $y - x \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$ and $0 - z \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$ (i.e., $-z \in \mathbf{R}_{>0}$). We know that \mathbf{R} is closed under multiplication, so we can multiply -z and y - x to show that

$$(-z)\cdot(y-x)\in\mathbf{R}_{>0}\Rightarrow -yz\cdot(-z)(-x)\in\mathbf{R}_{>0}$$

$$(4) \qquad \Rightarrow xz - yz \in \mathbf{R}_{>0} \text{ (Prop. 8.18 \& Axiom 8.1 (i))}$$

 $\Rightarrow yz < xz$ (by the definition of <).

Exercise 4. Proposition 8.53: Every nonempty subset of \mathbf{R} that is bounded below has a greatest lower bound.

Proof. Let $A \subset \mathbf{R}$ where $A \neq \emptyset$, and let M be a lower bound of A.