

1. Prove that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$P(n) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n k^3 = \frac{n^2(n+1)^2}{4}.$$

Argue by induction. For the base case $n = 1$ we have

$$\text{LHS.} = \sum_{k=1}^1 k^3 = 1^3 = 1, \quad \text{RHS.} = \frac{1^2(1+1)^2}{4} = 1,$$

which are equal, so $P(1)$ holds.

For the induction case, we assume that $P(n)$ holds for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (the induction hypothesis). Consider the left side for $n + 1$. Using the induction hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} k^3 &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^n k^3 \right) + (n+1)^3 \\ &= \frac{n^2(n+1)^2}{4} + (n+1)^3 \\ &= (n+1)^2 \left(\frac{n^2}{4} + n + 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{(n+1)^2(n^2 + 4n + 4)}{4} \\ &= \frac{(n+1)^2(n+2)^2}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

which show that then $P(n + 1)$ holds. Since both the base and induction cases hold, we conclude by induction that $P(n)$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

2. Recall the axioms of a field $(\mathcal{F}, +, \times)$. For any $x, y, z \in \mathcal{F}$,

[A1.]	(Commutativity of Addition)	$x + y = y + x.$
[A2.]	(Associativity of Addition)	$x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z.$
[A3.]	(Additive Identity)	$(\exists 0 \in \mathcal{F}) (\forall t \in \mathcal{F}) 0 + t = t.$
[A4.]	(Additive Inverse)	$(\exists -x \in \mathcal{F}) x + (-x) = 0.$
[M1.]	(Commutativity of Multiplication)	$xy = yx.$
[M2.]	(Associativity of Multiplication)	$x(yz) = (xy)z.$
[M3.]	(Multiplicative Identity)	$(\exists 1 \in \mathcal{F}) 1 \neq 0 \text{ and } (\forall t \in \mathcal{F}) 1t = t.$
[M4.]	(Multiplicative Inverse)	If $x \neq 0$ then $(\exists x^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}) (x^{-1})x = 1.$
[D.]	(Distributivity)	$x(y + z) = xy + xz.$

Using only the field axioms, show that if $a, b \in F$ then $(a + b)^2 = a^2 + 2ab + b^2$. Justify every step of your argument using just the axioms listed here. Do not quote any formulas from the text.

$(a + b)^2 = (a + b)(a + b)$	Start from left side. Meaning of square.
$= (a + b)a + (a + b)b$	By distributive (D).
$= a(a + b) + b(a + b)$	By commutativity of multiplication (M1).
$= (a^2 + ab) + (ba + b^2)$	By distributive (D).
$= [(a^2 + ab) + ba] + b^2$	By associativity of addition (A2).
$= [a^2 + (ab + ba)] + b^2$	By associativity of addition (A2).
$= [a^2 + (ab + ab)] + b^2$	By commutativity of multiplication (M1).
$= [a^2 + (1\{ab\} + 1\{ab\})] + b^2$	Multiplicative identity.
$= [a^2 + (\{ab\}1 + \{ab\}1)] + b^2$	By commutativity of multiplication (M2).
$= [a^2 + (\{ab\}[1 + 1])] + b^2$	By distributive (D).
$= [a^2 + \{ab\}2] + b^2$	$1 + 1 = 2$.
$= [a^2 + 2\{ab\}] + b^2$	By commutativity of multiplication (M2).
$= a^2 + [2\{ab\} + b^2]$	By associativity of addition (A2).

Because the last two expressions are equal, there is no ambiguity in concluding $(a + b)^2 = a^2 + 2\{ab\} + b^2$ because both ways of grouping the addition in the right side sum yield the same result. By the same token by associativity of multiplication $2\{ab\} = \{2a\}b$, there is no ambiguity in concluding $2\{ab\} = 2ab$ because both ways of grouping the product yield the same result. So the right side equals $a^2 + 2ab + b^2$.

3. Determine whether the following statements are true or false. If true, give a proof. If false, give a counterexample.

(a) STATEMENT: Let $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $E, G \subset \mathbf{R}$. Then $f(E \setminus G) = f(E) \setminus f(G)$.

FALSE. Consider $f(x) = x^2$, $E = [-2, 3]$, $G = [1, 3]$ then $E \setminus G = [-2, 1]$ so $f(E \setminus G) = [0, 4]$ but $f(E) = [0, 9]$ and $f(G) = [1, 9]$ so $f(E) \setminus f(G) = [0, 1]$ which is not the same as $f(E \setminus G)$.

(b) STATEMENT: If $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is onto and $V, W \subset \mathbf{R}$ such that $f^{-1}(V) \cap f^{-1}(W) = \emptyset$ then $V \cap W = \emptyset$.

TRUE. Argue by contrapositive. Assume the conclusion is false $V \cap W \neq \emptyset$. Hence there is a $y \in V \cap W$. But f is onto so y is in the range of f so that $f^{-1}(V \cap W) \neq \emptyset$. Using the identity for pullback, $f^{-1}(V) \cap f^{-1}(W) = f^{-1}(V \cap W) \neq \emptyset$. Thus the hypothesis is false, proving the assertion.

(c) STATEMENT: $S = \left\{ x \in \mathbf{R} : (\forall \varepsilon > 0)(\exists t > 1)x + t < \varepsilon \right\} = (-\infty, -1]$.

Arguing using intersections and intersections,

$$S = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \bigcup_{t > 1} (-\infty, \varepsilon - t) = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} (-\infty, \varepsilon - 1) = (-\infty, -1].$$

Arguing by set inclusion, to show $(-\infty, -1] \subset S$ choose $x \in (-\infty, -1]$. Then $x \leq -1$. No matter which $\varepsilon > 0$ is chosen, by taking $t = 1 + \varepsilon/2 > 1$ we have $x + t = x + 1 + \varepsilon/2 \leq -1 + 1 + \varepsilon/2 < \varepsilon$. Thus $x \in S$. To show $S \subset (-\infty, -1]$ assume that $y \notin (-\infty, -1]$. Then $y > -1$. Let $\varepsilon = 1 + y > 0$ Then for any $t > 1$ we have $y + t > y + 1 \geq \varepsilon$ so that $y \notin S$.

4. Recall that the rational numbers are defined to be the set of equivalence classes $\mathbb{Q} = S / \sim$ where $S = \left\{ \frac{a}{b} : a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, b \neq 0 \right\}$ is the set of symbols (pairs of integers) and the symbols are equivalent if they represent the same fraction: $\frac{a}{b} \sim \frac{c}{d}$ iff $ad = bc$. We denote the

equivalence class, the “fraction” by $\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]$ to distinguish it from a symbol from S . Addition and multiplication of rationals, for example, is defined on equivalence classes by

$$\left[\frac{m}{n}\right] + \left[\frac{r}{t}\right] = \left[\frac{mt + nr}{nt}\right], \quad \left[\frac{m}{n}\right] \cdot \left[\frac{r}{t}\right] = \left[\frac{mr}{nt}\right].$$

How is $x \leq y$ defined in the rational numbers? Show that the function $f : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ is well defined, where

$$f\left(\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]\right) = \left[\frac{a^2 - b^2}{a^2 + b^2}\right]$$

To define $x \geq 0$ for a rational

$$x = \left[\frac{a}{b}\right]$$

the condition is equivalent to $ab \geq 0$ in the integers. Also, you can always pick a representative in which $b > 0$ and then the condition for $x \geq 0$ reduces to $a \geq 0$. The definition of $x \leq y$ is that $y - x \geq 0$. In terms of fractions,

$$x = \left[\frac{a}{b}\right], \quad y = \left[\frac{c}{d}\right], \quad y - x = \left[\frac{cb - da}{db}\right] \geq 0 \text{ means } (cb - da)bd \geq 0.$$

To show $f(x)$ is well defined, we need to show that if x is represented by an equivalent rational, then the value of f works out to be equivalent when computed in the new representative. Let us suppose

$$\frac{a}{b} \sim \frac{c}{d} \text{ or } ad = bc.$$

Then compute f using two representatives. Is

$$f\left(\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]\right) = \left[\frac{a^2 - b^2}{a^2 + b^2}\right] \stackrel{?}{=} \left[\frac{c^2 - d^2}{c^2 + d^2}\right] = f\left(\left[\frac{c}{d}\right]\right),$$

which is equivalent to is

$$\frac{a^2 - b^2}{a^2 + b^2} \sim \frac{c^2 - d^2}{c^2 + d^2} \quad \text{or} \quad (a^2 - b^2)(c^2 + d^2) = (a^2 + b^2)(c^2 - d^2)? \quad (1)$$

Using $ad = bc$ we see that

$$\begin{aligned} (a^2 - b^2)(c^2 + d^2) &= a^2c^2 + a^2d^2 - b^2c^2 - b^2d^2 \\ &= a^2c^2 + b^2c^2 - a^2d^2 - b^2d^2 \\ &= (c^2 - d^2)(a^2 + b^2) \end{aligned}$$

which shows that (1) holds so f is well defined.

5. Let $E \subset \mathbf{R}$ be a nonempty subset which is bounded above. State the definition: $\ell = \text{lub } E$. Find $\ell = \text{lub } E$ and prove your answer, where $E = \left\{ \frac{n^2 - 1}{3n^2 + 1} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$.

The number $\ell \in \mathbf{R}$ is the least upper bound of E if it is both an upper bound and the least among upper bounds. In other words (1) $x \leq \ell$ for all $x \in E$; and (2), if b is an upper bound for E then $\ell \leq b$. Another way to formulate (2) is to assert no number less than ℓ is an upper bound, in other words, (2') $(\forall \varepsilon > 0)(\exists x \in E)(\ell - \varepsilon < x)$.

First we claim that $\ell = \frac{1}{3}$ is an upper bound. Indeed, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\frac{n^2 - 1}{3n^2 + 1} = \frac{n^2 - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{3}}{3n^2 + 1} = \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{3(3n^2 + 1)} \leq \frac{1}{3}.$$

Second we claim that no smaller number is an upper bound. To show (2'), choose $\varepsilon > 0$. By the Archimidean property, there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n_0} < \frac{9}{2}\varepsilon.$$

Then, for this n_0 we have using $n_0^2 \geq n_0$,

$$\frac{n_0^2 - 1}{3n_0^2 + 1} = \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{3(3n_0^2 + 1)} > \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{9n_0^2} \geq \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{9n_0} > \frac{1}{3} - \varepsilon.$$

Thus for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is member $x \in E$ such that $\ell - \varepsilon < x$ which proves ℓ is least among upper bounds.