• For each subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , give its maximum, minimum, supremum, and infimum, if they exist: {1,3}: min and inf=1, max and sup=3  $\left\{\frac{n}{n+1}: n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ : min and inf= $\frac{1}{2}$ , max=none, sup=1  $(-\infty, 4)$ : min and inf=none, max=none, sup=4

p.21: #1. (a) Suppose  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$  and x is irrational and r + x is rational. Then  $r = \frac{p}{q}$  and  $r + x = \frac{s}{t}$  for  $p, q, p, s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$  where  $q, t \neq 0$ . Thus  $x = (r + x) - r = \frac{s}{t} - \frac{p}{q} = \frac{sq-pt}{tq}$ . Since sq - pt and tq are integers and  $tq \neq 0$ , x is rational. This is a contradiction.  $\therefore$  If r is rational and x is irrational then r + x is irrational.

(b) (a) Suppose  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$  and x is irrational and rx is rational. Then  $r = \frac{p}{q}$  and  $rx = \frac{s}{t}$  for  $p, q, p, s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$  where  $q, t \neq 0$ . Thus  $x = rx\frac{1}{r} = \frac{s}{t} * \frac{p}{q} = \frac{sp}{tq}$ . Since sp and tq are integers and  $tq \neq 0$ , x is rational. This is a contradiction.  $\therefore$  If r is rational and x is irrational then rx is irrational.

#2. Suppose there exists a rational number r whose square is 12. Write r in lowest terms,  $r = \frac{m}{n}$  where  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and have no factors in common. Then  $m^2 = 12n^2 = 3 \times 2^2 \times n^2$ . Since 3 appears in the right-hand side, 3 divides  $m^2$ . But 3 is prime, so it must divide m; hence  $m^2$  must be divisible by 9. But then 3 divides  $n^2$  and therefore n as well, contrary to the assumption that m and n have no common factors. Thus there is no rational number whose square is 12.

# 4. Since E is nonempty, it has at least one element, say, x. Since  $\alpha$  is a lower bound of E, we know  $\alpha \leq x$ . Similarly, since  $\beta$  is an upper bound of E,  $x \leq \beta$ . By the transitivity of the order  $\leq$  we conclude  $\alpha \leq \beta$ .

# 5. Since A is nonempty and bounded below, there exists infA. By definition,  $infA \leq x, \forall x \in A$ , so  $-infA \geq -x, \forall x \in A$ , i.e.,  $-infA \geq y, \forall y \in -A$ . Thus -infA is an upper bound of -A. The set -A is thus nonempty and bounded above, hence there exists sup(-A). Since  $sup(-A) \geq y, \forall y \in -A, -sup(-A) \leq -y, \forall y \in -A, i.e., -sup(-A) \leq x, \forall x \in A$ . Thus -sup(-A) is a lower bound of A. Now  $-\inf A \geq sup(-A), -sup(-A) \leq infA$  since a lower bound is not bigger than the greatest lower bound and an upper bound is not smaller than the least upper bound. But these last inequalities are equivalent to  $-infA \geq sup(-A), -infA \leq sup(-A)$ . Hence -infA = sup(A).

• Suppose  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  and x < y. Consider  $\tilde{x} = \frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}$  and  $\tilde{y} = \frac{y}{\sqrt{2}}$ . By the density of the reals, there exists a rational number r such that  $\tilde{x} < r < \tilde{y}$  which implies  $\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}} < r < \frac{y}{\sqrt{2}}$ . Define  $w = r\sqrt{2}$  which is irrational by a previous #1b.