Solutions for *Analysis I&II* (Forth Edition) by Terence Tao

Ilia Koloiarov

January 6, 2026

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

No exercises in this chapter.

Chapter 2

Starting at the beginning: the natural numbers

2.1 The Peano axioms

Axiom 2.1. 0 *is a natural number.*

Axiom 2.2. *If n is a natural number, then $n{+}{+}$ is also a natural number.*

Axiom 2.3. 0 *is not the successor of any natural number; i.e., we have $n{+}{+} \neq 0$ for every natural number n.*

Axiom 2.4. *Different natural numbers must have different successors; i.e., if n, m are natural numbers and $n \neq m$, then $n{+}{+} \neq m{+}{+}$. Equivalently, if $n{+}{+} = m{+}{+}$, then we must have $n = m$.*

Axiom 2.5. *(Principle of mathematical induction). Let $P(n)$ be any property pertaining to a natural number n. Suppose that $P(0)$ is true, and suppose that whenever $P(n)$ is true, $P(n{+}{+})$ is also true. Then $P(n)$ is true for every natural number n.*

Definition 2.1.3. *We define 1 to be the number $0{+}{+}$, 2 to be the number $(0{+}{+}){+}{+}$, etc.*

Proposition 2.1.4. 3 *is a natural number.*

Proof. Given the Axiom 2.1, 0 is a natural number. $1:=0{+}{+}$ is a natural number by Axiom 2.2. Same as $2:=1{+}{+}$ and $3:=2{+}{+}$. $\square$

Proposition 2.1.6. 4 *is not equal to* 0.

Proof. By Definition 2.1.3, $4:=3{+}{+}$, thus $3{+}{+} \overset{\not\ell}{=} 0$ what contradicts Axiom 2.3 $\square$

Proposition 2.1.8. 6 *is not equal to* 2

Proof. Let's assume that $6=2$. By Definition 2.1.3, $6=5{+}{+}$ and $2=1{+}{+}$. That means, $5=1$ by Axiom 2.4. Repeating the procedure, we end up with $4 \overset{\not\ell}{=} 0$ what contradicts previously proven Proposition 2.1.6 $\square$

Proposition 2.1.16. *(Recursive definitions). Suppose for each natural number n, we have some function $f_n : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ from the natural numbers to the natural numbers. Let c be a natural number. Then we can assign a $\underline{unique}$ natural number to each natural number n, such that $a_0 = c$ and $a_{n{+}{+}} = f_n(a_n)$ for each natural number n.*

Proof. First, none of a_n redefines a_0 by Axiom 2.3. Second, let's assume that the procedure gives the unique value for a_n. Then it also provides the unique value for $a_{n{+}{+}}$ by Axiom 2.4 what closes the induction. $\square$

2.2 Addition

Definition 2.2.1. *(Addition of natural numbers). Let m be a natural number. To add zero to m, we define $0 + m := m$. Now suppose inductively that we have defined how to add n to m. Then we can add n++ to m by defining $(n\text{++}) + m := (n + m)\text{++}$.*