Math 4317 (Prof. Swiech, S'18): HW #1

Peter Williams

1/25/2018

Section 1

F. Show that the symmetric difference D, defined in the preceding exercise is also given by $D = (A \cup B) \setminus (A \cap B)$ Show $D = (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A) = (A \cup B) \setminus (A \cap B)$:

First, $x \in (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A) \implies x \in (A \setminus B)$ or $x \in (B \setminus A) \implies$, x is in A but not B, or, x is in B but not $A \implies x$ is in A or B but not in A and $B \implies x \in (A \cup B) \setminus (A \cap B)$.

In the other direction, $x \in (A \cup B) \setminus (A \cap B) \implies x \in (A \cup B)$ but not in $(A \cap B) \implies x$ is in A but not B, or, x is in B but not $A \implies x \in (A \setminus B)$ or $x \in (B \setminus A) \implies x \in (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A) \implies (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A) = (A \cup B) \setminus (A \cap B)$

I. If $\{A_1, A_2, ..., A_n\}$ is a collection of sets, and if E is any set, show that:

(i)
$$E \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^n (E \cap A_i)$$
, and (ii), $E \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^n (E \cup A_i)$

- (i) $x \in E \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j \implies x \in E \text{ and } x \in \{A_1 \text{ or } A_2 \dots \text{ or } A_n\} \implies x \in E \text{ and that there exists for some } j=1,2,...,n \text{ an } A_j \text{ such that } x \in A_j \text{ and } x \in E \implies (x \in E \text{ and } A_1) \text{ or } (x \in E \text{ and } A_2) \dots \text{ or } (x \in E \text{ and } A_n) \implies x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^n (E \cap A_j).$ In the other direction, $x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^n (E \cap A_j) \Leftrightarrow x \in (E \cap A_1) \cup (E \cap A_2) \dots \cup (E \cap A_n) \implies x \in E \text{ and } A_1 \text{ or } E \text{ and } A_2 \dots \implies \text{ there exists a } j=1,...,n \text{ such that } x \in (E \cap A_j) \implies x \in E \text{ and } x \in A_1 \text{ or } A_2, \dots, \text{ or } A_n \implies x \in E \text{ and } \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j \implies x \in E \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j.$
- (ii) $x \in E \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} A_j \implies x \in E$ or $x \in A_1$ or $A_2 \dots$ or $A_n \implies$ for some j = 1, ..., n that $x \in E \cup A_j \implies x \in E \cup A_1$ or $x \in E \cup A_2 \dots$ or $x \in E \cup A_n \implies x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} (E \cup A_j)$. In the other direction, $x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} (E \cup A_j) \Leftrightarrow x \in E \cup A_1$ or $x \in E \cup A_2 \dots$ or $x \in E \cup A_n \implies$ there exists some j = 1, ..., n such that $x \in E \cup A_j \implies (x \in E \text{ or } x \in A_1)$ or $(x \in E \text{ or } x \in A_2) \dots$ or $(x \in E \text{ or } x \in A_n) \implies x \in E$ or $x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} A_j \implies x \in E \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} A_j$.
- J. If $\{A_1, A_2, ..., A_n\}$ is a collection of sets, and if E is any set, show that:

(i)
$$E \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^{n} A_j = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n} (E \cap A_j)$$
, and (ii), $E \cup \bigcap_{j=1}^{n} A_j = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n} (E \cup A_j)$

- (i) $x \in \cap \cap_{j=1}^n A_j \implies x \in E$ and $x \in \cap_{j=1}^n A_j \implies x \in E$ and $x \in A_j$ for all $j=1,...,n \implies x \in E$ and $[x \in A_1 \text{ and } x \in A_2 \dots \text{ and } x \in A_n] \implies [x \in E \text{ and } A_1] \text{ and } \dots \text{ and } [x \in E \text{ and } A_n] \implies x \in \bigcap_{j=1}^n (E \cap A_j)$. In the other direction, $x \in \cap_{j=1}^n (E \cap A_j) \implies x \in (E \cap A_1)$ and $a \in (E \cap A_2) \dots$ and $x \in (E \cap A_n) \implies x \in (E \cap A_j)$ for all $j=1,...,n \implies x \in E$ and $x \in A_1$ and $x \in A_2 \dots$ and $x \in A_n \implies x \in E$ and $x \in \cap_{j=1}^{nA_j} \implies x \in E \cap \cap_{j=1}^{nA_j}$.
- (ii) $x \in E \cup \cap_{j=1}^n A_j \implies x \in E \text{ or } x \in \cap_{j=1}^n A_j \implies x \in E \text{ or } [x \in A_1 \text{ and } x \in A_2 \dots \text{ and } x \in A_n] \implies x \in E \text{ or } A_1 \text{ and } x \in E \text{ or } A_2 \dots \text{ and } x \in E \text{ or } A_n \implies x \in \cap_{j=1}^n (E \cup A_j).$ In the other direction, $x \in \cap_{j=1}^n (E \cup A_j) \implies x \in (E \text{ or } A_1) \text{ and } x \in (E \text{ or } A_2) \dots \text{ and } x \in (E \text{ or } A_n) \implies \text{that for all } j = 1, \dots, n \text{ , } x \in (E \text{ or } A_j) \implies x \in E \text{ or } (x \in A_1 \text{ and } x \in A_2 \dots \text{ and } x \in A_n) \implies x \in \cap_{j=1}^n A_j \text{ or } x \in E \implies x \in E \cup \cap_{j=1}^n A_j.$

K. Let E be a set and $\{A_1, A_2, ..., A_n\}$ be a collection of sets. Establish the De Morgan laws:

(i)
$$E \setminus \bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j = \bigcup_{j=1}^n (E \setminus A_j)$$
, and, (ii) $E \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j = \bigcap_{j=1}^n (E \setminus A_j)$

- (i) $x \in E \setminus \bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j \implies x \in E$ but not $(A_1 \text{ and } A_2 \dots \text{ and } A_n) \implies$ there exists a j=1,...,n such that $x \in E$ but not $A_j \implies x \in E$ but not A_1 , or $x \in E$ but not $A_2,...$, or $x \in E$ but not $A_n \implies x \in E \setminus A_1$ or $x \in E \setminus A_2 \dots$ or $x \in E \setminus A_n \implies x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^n (E \setminus A_j)$. In the other direction, $x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^n (E \setminus A_j) \implies x \in (E \text{ but not } A_1)$ or $(E \text{ but not } A_2)$ or $(E \text{ but not } A_n) \implies$ there exists $j=1,...,n, \ x \in E \text{ but not } A_j \implies x \in E \text{ but not } (A_1 \text{ and } A_2 \dots \text{ and } A_n) \implies x \in E \setminus \bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j$.
- (ii) $x \in E \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^n \implies x \in E$ but A_1 or $A_2 \ldots$ or $A_n \implies x \in E$ and $x \notin A_j$ for all $j=1,...,n \implies x \in E$ but not A_1 , and $x \in E$ but not A_2, \ldots , and $x \in E$ but not $A_n \implies x \in (E \setminus A_1)$ and $x \in (E \setminus A_2) \ldots$ and $x \in (E \setminus A_n) \implies x \in \bigcap_{j=1}^n (E \setminus A_j)$. In the other direction, $x \in \bigcap_{j=1}^n (E \setminus A_j) \implies x \in (E \setminus A_1 \text{ and } E \setminus A_2 \ldots \text{ and } E \setminus A_n) \implies x \in E$ but not A_j for all $j=1,...,n \implies x \in E$ but A_1 or $A_2 \ldots$ or $A_n \implies x \in E$ but not $\bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j \implies x \in E \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j$

Section 2

C. Consider the subset of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ defined by $D = \{(x,y) : |x| + |y| = 1\}$. Describe this set in words. Is it a function?

This set consists of points on the line segments connecting a rotated square in the (x,y) plane with vertices $(1,0),\ (0,1),\ (-1,0),\$ and (0,-1). If we attempt to define a function, with the elements (x,y) from the set D, i.e. $y=f(x),f:x\to y$, we have $|x|+|y|=1\implies \sqrt{y^2}=1-|x|\implies y=\pm\sqrt{(1-|x|)^2}$. $f(x)=y=\pm\sqrt{(1-|x|)^2}$ does not fit the defintion of a function, since, as an example, the set D includes the elements (0,1) and (0,-1), which if, f is a function, $f:x\to y\implies -1=1$, which is clearly not true.

E. Prove that if f is an injection from A to B, then $f^{-1} = \{(b, a) : (a, b) \in f\}$ is a function. Then prove it is an injection.

If f is an injection, and $(a,b) \in f$, and $(a',b) \in f$, then a=a'. $f^{-1}=\{(b,a):(a,b) \in f\}$ contains the pair (b,a) and (b,a'), and we know that a=a' from the definition of f, so we can assume that f^{-1} is a function. Since f is injective, each unique element b=f(a), is mapped to by a unique element a, and by definition $f^{-1}=\{(b,a):(a,b) \in f\}$ maps the unique element a back to a, meaning a and a and a and only if a is also injective.

H. Let f, g be functions such that

$$g \circ f(x) = x$$
, for all x in $D(f)$

$$f \circ g(y) = y$$
, for all y in $D(g)$

Prove that $g = f^{-1}$

For two elements $x, x' \in D(f)$, if $f(x) = f(x') \implies g \circ f(x) = g(f(x)) = g(f(x')) \implies g(f(x)) = x = g(f(x')) = x'$, that is $x = x' \implies g \circ f$ is an injection. For two elements $y, y' \in D(g)$, if $g(y) = g(y') \implies f \circ g(y) = f(g(y')) = f(g(y')) \implies f(g(y)) = y = f(g(y')) = y'$, that is $y = y' \implies f \circ g$ is an injection, and implies f and g are injections as well.

This implies g can be defined $g = \{(f(x), x) : (x, f(x)) \in f\}$, which is the definition for f^{-1} , implying $g = f^{-1}$.

J. Let f be the function on \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} given by $f(x) = x^2$, and let $E = \{x \in \mathbb{R} - 1 \le x \le 0\}$ and $F = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : 0 \le x \le 1\}$. Then $E \cap F = \{0\}$ and $f(E \cap F) = \{0\}$ while $f(E) = f(F) = \{y \in \mathbb{R} : 0 \le y \le 1\}$. Hence $f(E \cap F)$ is a proper subset of $f(E) \cap f(F)$. Now delete 0 from E and F.

The sets E and F with 0 deleted are denoted $E' = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : -1 \le x < 0\}$ and $F' = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : 0 < x \le 1\}$, respectively. We still have the equality $f(E') = f(F') = \{y \in \mathbb{R} : 0 < y \le 1\} = f(E') \cap f(F')$. We also have $E' \cap F' = \emptyset$, and thus $f(E' \cap F') = \emptyset$, and $\emptyset = f(E' \cap F') \subseteq F(E') \cap f(F')$, since the empty set is a subset of all sets.

Section 3

B. Exhibit a one-to-one correspondence between the set O of odd natural numbers and $\mathbb N$

The function $f(x) = \frac{x+1}{2}, x \in \mathbb{N}$ maps the set of odd natural numbers, $O = \{2k-1 : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \to \mathbb{N}$.

D. If A is contained in some initial segment of \mathbb{N} , use the well-ordering property of \mathbb{N} to define a bijection of A onto some initial segment of \mathbb{N} .

If $A \neq \emptyset$ is a subset of some initial segment \mathbb{N} , by the well-ordering principle, there exists an $m \in A$ such that $m \leq k$ for all $k \in A$. A bijection f can be defined by the mapping from set A consisting of elements $\{a_1, a_2, ..., a_k\}$ to elements of some initial segment $S_k = \{1, 2, ..., k\}$ as a set of ordered pairs $\{(a_1, 1), (a_2, 2), ..., (a_k, k)\}$, such that $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq ... \leq a_k$ and clearly the corresponding elements in the pairs from set S_k , $1 \leq 2 \leq ... \leq k$. Here the number of elements in A and A0 are the same, which has a one-one correspondence A1 and A2 and the A3 and the A4 and the A5 and the A6 and the A8 and the A8

F. Use the fact that every infinite set has a denumerable subset to show that every infinite set can be put into one-one correspondence with a proper subset of itself.

By defintion, having a denumberable subset \implies there exists a bijective function that maps a proper subset of an infinite set, B, onto \mathbb{N} . If we take infinite set $B = \{b_1, b_2, ..., b_n, ...\}$ and $B_1 = \{b_2, b_3, ..., b_n, b_{n+1}, ...\}$, $B_1 \subseteq B$, we can create a one-one correspondence $f: B \to B_1$ defined by the set or ordered pairs $\{(b_n, b_{n+1}): n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ which maps B to $B_1 = B \setminus \{b_1\}$.

H. Show that if the set A can be put into one-one correspondence with a set B, and if B can be put into one-one correspondence with a set C, then A can be put into one-one correspondence with C.

If A can be put into one-one correspondence with a set $B \Longrightarrow$ there exists an injective function, f from $A \to B$. This means that for $a, a' \in A$, and $b \in B$, $f(a) = f(a') = b \Longrightarrow a = a'$. Similarly, if B can be put into one-one correspondence with a set $B \Longrightarrow$ there exists an injective function, g from $B \to C$, and with $b, b' \in A$, $g(b) = g(b') = c \in C \Longrightarrow b = b'$. By these properties, the composition of these two injective functions, $g \circ f(a) = g \circ f(a') \Longrightarrow f(a) = f(a') \Longrightarrow a = a'$ putting A and C in one-one correspondence.

I. Using induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$, show that the initial segment determined by n cannot be put into one-one correspondence with the initial segment determined by $m \in \mathbb{N}$, if m < n.

Let $S_n = \{1, 2, 3, ..., n\}$ be the initial segment determined by $n \in N$ and S_m be the initial segment determined by $m \in N, m < n$. If S_n can be put into one-one correspondence with $S_m \Longrightarrow$ there exists and injection $f: S_n \to S_m$. For n=1 we have $f: \{1\} \to S_m$, m < 1, but S_m does not exist by definition for m < 1 implying the function is not valid for the case n=1, m < n. For, the case n=k+1, we again have a map $f: \{1,2,...,k+1\} \to \{1,...,m\}, \ m < k+1$ which implies a mapping of k+1 elements to m < k+1 elements m < k+1 where exists at least two elements m < k+1 for which m < k+1 and m < k+1 are injection does not exist between these sets.

Section 4

C. Prove part (b) of Theorem 4.4, that is, Let $a \neq 0$ and b be arbitrary elements of \mathbb{R} . Then the equation $a \cdot x = b$ has the unique solution $x = \frac{1}{a}b$

Let x_1 be any solution to the equation, that is, $a \cdot x_1 = b$. By (M4) we have that there is exists for each element $a \neq 0$ in \mathbb{R} there exists an element $\frac{1}{a}$ such that $a(\frac{1}{a}) = 1$. Thus we have $(\frac{1}{a})ax_1 = b(\frac{1}{a}) \implies 1 \cdot x_1 = b(\frac{1}{a}) \implies a \cdot x_1 = b$ has the unique solution $x_1 = \frac{b}{a}$.

F. Use the argument in Theorem 4.7 to show that there does not exist a rational number s such that $s^2 = 6$.

If we assume that $s^2 = (\frac{p}{q})^2 = 6$, where $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}, q \neq 0$ and assume that p and q have no common integral factors, since $p^2 = 2(3q^2) \implies$ that p^2 , and p is even for some $p = 2k, k \in \mathbb{N} \implies p^2 = 4k^2 = 2(3q^2) \implies 2k^2 = 3q^2 \implies q^2$, and q must be even, which is a contradiction of the assumption that p and q have no common integral factors, and thus a rational number s such that $s^2 = 6$ does not exist.

G. Modify the argument in Theorem 4.7 to show there there does not exists a ration number t such that $t^2 = 3$.

If we assume that $t^2=(\frac{p}{q})^2=3$, where $p,q\in\mathbb{Z},q\neq 0$ and assume that p and q have no common integral factors, we have $p^2=3q^3$ which implies that p^2 and p are divisible by $3\Longrightarrow$ there exists $k\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $p=3k\Longrightarrow p^2=9k^2=3q^2\Longrightarrow 3k^2=q^2$. This implies that q^2 is also divisible by $3\Longrightarrow q$ is divisible by 3. This is again a contradiction of assumption p and q have no common integral factors, and thus a rational number t such that $t^2=3$ does not exist.

H. If $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ is irrational and $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $r \neq 0$, is rational, show that $r + \xi$ and $r\xi$ are irrational.

If we take another rational number $c=\frac{a}{b},\ a,b\in\mathbb{Z},b\neq0$, and assume the contradiction that $r+\xi,r=\frac{p}{q},\ p,q\in\mathbb{Z},q\neq0$ is rational, that is $r+\xi=c$, we have $\xi=c-r=\frac{a}{b}-\frac{p}{q}=\frac{aq-bp}{bq}$ where $\frac{aq-bp}{bq}$ is a rational number, but clearly ξ cannot not be equal to a rational number. Similarly for $r\xi=c\implies \xi=\frac{c}{r}=\frac{aq}{bp}$ where $\frac{aq}{bp}$ is clearly a rational number, again implying the contradiction that ξ is equal to a rational number. Thus, by contradiction, $r+\xi$ and $r\xi$ must be irrational.

Section 5

B. If $n \in \mathbb{N}$, show that $n^2 \geq n$ and hence $\frac{1}{n^2} \leq \frac{1}{n}$.

If $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $n \ge 1 \implies n^2 \ge n$, since $n^2 = n \cdot n \cdot 1 \ge n \cdot 1 \implies n \ge \frac{n \cdot 1}{n \cdot 1} \implies n \ge 1$, a condition of n being a natural number.

- C. If $a \ge -1$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$, show that $(1+a)^n \ge 1 + na$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- F. Suppose that 0 < c < 1. If $m \ge n$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, show that $0 < c^m \le c^n < 1$.
- G. Show that $n < 2^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence $(1/2)^n < 1/n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- K. If $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \neq 0$, show that |a/b| = |a|/|b|
- (i) For the case, $a \ge 0$, b > 0, $a \cdot 1/b \ge 0$, and we thus have $|a/b| = |a \cdot 1/b| = a/b = |a| \cdot |1/b|$, thus a/b = |a|/|b|.
- (ii) For the case, $a \ge 0$, b < 0, we have $a/b \le 0 \ \forall a,b$, thus $|a/b| = |a \cdot 1/b| = -(a/b) = a \cdot 1/-b$, and $a, -b \in \mathbb{P} \implies a \cdot 1/-b \ge 0$, thus a/-b = |a|/|b|.
- (iii) For the case, $a \le 0$, b < 0, we have $a/b \ge 0$, $\forall a, b$, thus, $|a/b| = |a \cdot 1/b| = (a/b) = -a \cdot 1/-b$, thus -a/-b = a/b = |a|/|b|.
- (iiii) For the case, $a \le 0$, b > 0 we have $a/b \le 0 \ \forall a, b$, thus, |a/b| = -(a/b) = -a/b = -a/|b| = |a|/|b|.
- L. If $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, then |a + b| = |a| + |b| if and only if $ab \ge 0$.

 $ab \ge 0 \implies a, b \in \mathbb{P}$ or $-a, -b \in \mathbb{P}$. For the case, $a, b \in \mathbb{P}$, we have $|a+b| = a+b = |a|+|b| \ \forall \ a, b \in \mathbb{P}$. For the case, $-a, -b \in \mathbb{P}$, we have, |a+b| = -(a+b) = -a-b = |a|+|b|.

Section 6

B. C. G. H. J. K.

Section 7

F. G. K.