# 4.2 The rationals

#### Exercise 4.2.1

Show that the definition of equality for the rational numbers is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive. (Hint: for transitivity, use Corollary 4.1.9.)

*Proof.* We first prove reflexivity, which holds if a//b = a//b,  $b \neq 0$ . ab = ab because reflexivity holds for the integers, and  $ab = ab \iff a//b = a//b$  by definition.

Next we tackle symmetry, which holds if  $a//b = c//d \iff c//d = a//b$ . We have  $a//b = c//d \iff ad = bc$ ,  $b \neq 0$  and  $d \neq 0$ . We also have  $c//d = a//b \iff cb = da$ . By commutativity of multiplication on the integers ad = da and bc = cb. So by symmetry for the integers  $ad = bc \iff cb = ad$ , and thus  $a//b = c//d \iff c//d = a//b$ .

Finally for transitivity, which holds if a//b = c//d and c//d = e//f implies a//b = e//f. We have  $a//b = c//d \iff ad = bc$ , we also have  $c//d = e//f \iff cf = de$ , where b, d, f are all nonzero. By the cancellation rule (Lemma 4.1.9), adf = bcf. Also by 4.1.9, bcf = bde. By transitivity for the integers, adf = bde, and by 4.1.9 again af = be, so a//b = e//f as desired.

## Exercise 4.2.3

## Prove the remaining components of Proposition 4.2.4.

I will only prove a subset of these, using x = a//b, y = c//d, and z = e//f for integers a, c, e and nonzero integers b, d, f.

a. 
$$(xy)z = x(yz)$$

Proof.
$$((a//b)(c//d))(e//f) = (ac//bd)(e//f) = (ace//bdf)$$

$$(a//b)((c//d)(e//f)) = (a//b)(ce//df) = (ace//bdf)$$

b. x(y + z) = xy + xz

Proof.

$$(a//b)((c//d) + (e//f)) =$$

$$(a//b)((cf + de)//(df)) =$$

$$(a(cf + de)//bdf) =$$

$$(acf + ade)//bdf$$

$$(a//b)(c//d) + (a//b)(e//f) =$$

$$(ac//bd) + (ae//bf) =$$

$$(acbf + aebd)//(bdbf) =$$

$$(acbf + aebd)//(bdbf) =$$

$$((acf + aed)//bdf) * (b//b) =$$

$$((acf + aed)//bdf) * (1//1) =$$

$$((acf + aed)//bdf) * 1 =$$

$$((acf + aed)//bdf) =$$

$$((acf + aed)//bdf) =$$

$$((acf + aed)//bdf) =$$

#### Exercise 4.2.5

Proposition 4.2.9 (Basic properties of order on the rationals) Let x, y, z be rational numbers. Then the following properties hold.

Let x = a/b, y = c/d, and z = e/f for integers a, b, c, d, e, f where b, d, f are nonzero.

a. (Order trichotomy) Exactly one of the three statements x = y, x < y, or x > y is true.

Proof. 
$$x < y \implies x \neq y$$

$$x > y \implies x \neq y$$

Then by contrapositive x = y implies both x < y and x > y are false.

$$x > y \iff x - y \text{ is positive}$$

$$x < y \iff x - y \text{ is negative}$$

By the trichotomy of rationals x - y cannot be both positive and negative. So x > y and x < y are exclusive.

b. (Order is antisymmetric) One has x < y if and only if y > x.

*Proof.* We have two directions to prove.

Suppose x < y. By def of order on rationals x - y is negative, i.e (ad - bc)/bd is negative. Then by def of negative on rationals -(ad - bc) and bd are both positive integers. -(ad - bc) = (cb - da) by negation and commutativity. Therefore (cb - da)/bd is a positive rational, which is equal to (y - x). Thus, y > x.

Suppose y > x. Then y - x is positive, i.e. (cb - da)/db is positive. Then (cb - da) and (db) are both positive integers. If (cb - da) is positive, its negation -(cb - da) is negative. We know -(cb - da) = (ad - bc) by negation and commutativity. Then (ad - bc)/db is a negative rational. Then so is (x - y). Thus, x < y.

c. (Order is transitive) If x < y and y < z, then x < z.

Lemma. First we need to prove (-a)/b = a/(-b), so we can write the proof without loss of generality.  $(-a)/b = a/(-b) \iff -a(-b) = ab$ . We can prove this in either direction.

$$-a(-b) = (-1)(-1)(ab)$$

$$= (0 - - - 1)(0 - - - 1)(ab)$$

$$= ((0 * 0 + 1 * 1) - (0 * 1 + 1 * 0))(ab)$$

$$= ((0 + 1) - (0 + 0))(ab)$$

$$= (1 - 0)(ab)$$

$$= 1(ab)$$

$$= ab.$$

Lemma. We wish to prove  $a/b < c/d \iff ad < bc$ , and  $b, d \neq 0$ . From above, we can assume without loss of generality that b > 0 and d > 0 (otherwise choose -a/-b and -c/-d). Suppose a/b < c/d. We know  $a/b < c/d \iff (a/b-c/d)$  is a negative rational number. By definition of subtration (ad-bc)/bd is negative. By our generality assumption, bd is positive, so (ad-bc) is negative. Suppose ad = bc, then (ad-bc) = 0, so by contradiction  $ad \neq bc$ . There must be some m such that (ad-bc) + m = 0, so there exists some nonzero m such that ad + m = bc. Thus by the previous two statements, ad < bc. Suppose ad < bc. Then ad + m = bc,  $m \neq 0$ , and ad - bc = 0 - m, or (ad - bc) is negative. Since we have assumed bd is positive, the rational (ad - bc)/bd is negative. (ad - bc)/bd = (a/b - c/d), so the latter is negative too. Thus a/b < c/d.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume b, d, f > 0. (If b > 0, then set a' = a, b' = b; otherwise set a' = -a, b' = -b, and note that in either case x = a'/b' and b' > 0.) Likewise for y, z.

- 1. Suppose x < y and y < z.
- 2. Then ad < bc by above lemma.
- 3. Likewise, cf < de.
- 4. adf < bcf since we assume f is positive, and Lemma 4.1.11c (positive multiplication preserves order on integers).
- 5. bcf < deb since we assume b is positive.
- 6. adf < deb by transitivity of order on integers.
- 7. af < eb since we assume d is positive.
- 8. x < z.
- d. (Addition preserves order) If x < y, then x + z < y + z.
- e. (Positive multiplication preserves order) If x < y and z is positive, then xz < yz.