

## SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS FOR PROBLEM SET 2

FALL 2010, MATH 311:01

**0.5.43.** Let  $A = \{r : r \text{ is a rational number and } r^2 < 2\}$ . Prove that  $A$  has no largest member. (*Hint:* If  $r^2 < 2$ , and  $r > 0$ , choose a rational number  $\delta$  such that  $0 < \delta < 1$  and  $\delta < \frac{2 - r^2}{2r + 1}$ . Show that  $(r + \delta)^2 < 2$ .)

*Proof.* We suppose for a contradiction that  $A$  has a largest member, namely  $r$ . Since  $r > 0$  and  $r^2 < 2$ , we have  $2 - r^2 > 0$  and  $2r + 1 > 0$ , so that we may find a rational number  $\delta$  such that  $0 < \delta < 1$  and  $\delta < (2 - r^2)/(2r + 1)$ . A rearrangement of the second inequality yields  $r^2 + \delta(2r + 1) < 2$ , or  $r^2 + 2r\delta + \delta < 2$ . The first inequality implies that  $\delta^2 < \delta$ , whence

$$(r + \delta)^2 = r^2 + 2r\delta + \delta^2 < r^2 + 2r\delta + \delta < 2.$$

It follows that  $r + \delta \in A$ ; this is absurd, as  $r$  was assumed to be the largest member of  $A$ . We conclude that  $A$  does not have a largest member.  $\square$

**Remark.** This shows that the field  $\mathbb{Q}$  of rational numbers is not complete. The field  $\mathbb{R}$  of real numbers is the *completion* of  $\mathbb{Q}$ , in the sense that every bounded-above subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  has a least upper bound.

**0.5.44.** If  $x = \sup S$ , show that, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $a \in S$  such that  $x - \varepsilon < a \leq x$ .

*A direct proof.* Fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , so that  $x - \varepsilon < x$ . Since  $x$  is the least upper bound of  $S$ , it follows that  $x - \varepsilon$  is not an upper bound, viz., there exists an element  $a \in S$  such that  $x - \varepsilon \leq a$ . Noting that the least upper bound of a set is no smaller than any of the elements in the set, we may conclude that the  $a$  we have furnished satisfies the inequality  $x - \varepsilon \leq a < x$ .  $\square$

*A proof by contradiction.* We suppose for a contradiction that  $\varepsilon > 0$  does not satisfy  $x - \varepsilon < a \leq x$  for any  $a \in S$ . Then  $x - \varepsilon \geq a$  for all  $a \in S$ , whence  $x - \varepsilon$  is an upper bound of  $S$  such that  $x - \varepsilon < x$ . This contradicts the definition of least upper bound, and it follows that every  $\varepsilon > 0$  furnishes an  $a \in S$  such that  $x - \varepsilon < a \leq x$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** This shows that the least upper bound of a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  is a *limit point* of the set, viz., every open interval containing the supremum contains an element of the set.

**0.5.45.** If  $y = \inf S$ , show that, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $a \in S$  such that  $y \leq a < y + \varepsilon$ .

*A direct proof.* Fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , so that  $y - \varepsilon > y$ . Since  $y$  is the greatest lower bound of  $S$ , it follows that  $y - \varepsilon$  is not a lower bound, viz., there exists an element  $a \in S$  such that  $y - \varepsilon \geq a$ . Noting that the greatest lower bound of a set is no bigger than any of the elements in the set, we may conclude that the  $a$  we have furnished satisfies the inequality  $y - \varepsilon \geq a > y$ .  $\square$

*A proof by contradiction.* We suppose for a contradiction that  $\varepsilon > 0$  does not satisfy  $y + \varepsilon > a \geq y$  for any  $a \in S$ . Then  $y + \varepsilon \leq a$  for all  $a \in S$ , whence  $y + \varepsilon$  is a lower bound of  $S$  such that  $y + \varepsilon > y$ .

This contradicts the definition of greatest lower bound, and it follows that every  $\varepsilon > 0$  furnishes an  $a \in S$  such that  $y + \varepsilon > a \geq y$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** This shows that the greatest lower bound of a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  is a limit point of the set.

**Exercise 1.** Show that there are no negative numbers in the intersection of  $(-1/n, 1/n)$  where  $n$  goes from 1 to infinity.

*Proof.* We first show that every negative real number  $x$  admits a natural number  $n$  such that  $x < -1/n$ . To show this, we invoke theorem 0.22 to find a rational number  $q$  between  $x$  and 0. By the definition of rational numbers, we may find positive integers  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  such that  $q = -p_1/p_2$ . We now observe that

$$x < -\frac{p_1}{p_2} \leq -\frac{1}{p_2} < 0,$$

whence the desired result follows.

Now, if  $x$  is any negative real number, then we may find a natural number  $n$  such that  $x < -1/n$ . Hence,  $x \notin (-1/n, 1/n)$ , and we see that

$$x \notin \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1/n, 1/n).$$

Since  $x$  was arbitrary, the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark.** The preliminary result proved above is a special case of the following theorem:

**Theorem** (The Archimedean Property). *If  $x$  is a positive real number, and  $y$  a real number, then there exists a natural number  $n$  such that  $nx > y$ .*

**Exercise 2.** Prove that  $2n + 1 < 2^n$  for  $n \geq 3$ .

*Proof.* We proceed by mathematical induction on  $n$ . Clearly,  $2 \cdot 3 + 1 < 2^3$ . If we suppose that the statement holds for some fixed  $n \geq 3$ , then we see that

$$2(n + 1) + 1 = (2n + 1) + 2 < 2^n + 2 < 2^n + 2^n = 2 \cdot 2^n = 2^{n+1};$$

note that we have used  $2 < 2^n$ , which is true for all  $n > 1$ .  $\square$

**Exercise 3.** Prove that there is only one greatest lower bound.

*Proof.* Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , and suppose that  $p$  and  $q$  are greatest lower bounds of  $S$ .  $p$  is a lower bound of  $S$ , hence  $p \leq q$ . Likewise,  $q \leq p$ , and it follows that  $p = q$ .  $\square$