

MATH 554 - FALL 08
Lecture Note Set # 1

Defn. From the introductory lectures, an *ordered set* is a set S with a relation ' $<$ ' which satisfies two properties:

1. (Trichotomy property) for any two elements $a, b \in S$, **exactly one** of the following hold

$$a < b, a = b, \text{ or } b < a.$$

2. (Transitive property) for any three elements $a, b, c \in S$, if $a < b$ and $b < c$, then $a < c$.

In this case the relation ' $<$ ' is called an *order*.

Defn. Suppose that S is an ordered set and $A \subseteq S$. An element $\beta \in S$ is said to be an *upper bound* for A if

$$a \leq \beta, \quad \forall a \in A.$$

An element α is said to be a *least upper bound* for A if

1. α is an upper bound for A
2. if β is any upper bound for A , then $\alpha \leq \beta$.

In this case, the *supremum of A* ($=: \sup A$) is defined as α . The definitions are similar for *lower bound*, *greatest lower bound* and $\inf A$, respectively. Note that we have already shown that the least upper bound (for a nonempty set bounded from above) is unique.

Defn. A set S is said to have the *least upper bound property* if each nonempty subset of S which is bounded from above, has a least upper bound.

Theorem. Suppose the ordered set S has the least upper bound property, then it has the greatest lower bound property (i.e. each nonempty subset of S which is bounded from below has a greatest lower bound).

Proof. Suppose that a nonempty set A has a lower bound, call it ℓ . Define L as the set of all lower bounds of A , then L is nonempty ($\ell \in L$). Observe that each member of the nonempty set A is an upper bound of L so by the least upper bound property, L has a least upper bound. Call this element α .

First observe that α is a lower bound for A . Otherwise, there exists an element $b \in A$ with $b < \alpha$, but each element of A is an upper bound for L , so this element b is an upper bound of L which is smaller than α , the least upper bound of L . This would be a contradiction. Therefore, $\alpha \in L$.

Also, if ℓ is any lower bound of A , then $\ell \leq \alpha$ since $\alpha = \sup L$. Hence α is the greatest lower bound of A . \square

Defn. The *real numbers* are defined to be a set \mathbb{R} with two binary operations $(+, \cdot)$ which satisfy the following properties: Given any a, b, c in \mathbb{R}

1. $a + (b + c) = (a + b) + c$.
2. $a + b = b + a$.
3. $\exists 0 \in \mathbb{R} \ni a + 0 = a, \forall a \in \mathbb{R}$.
4. for each $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\exists (-a) \in \mathbb{R}$, so that $a + (-a) = 0$.

5. $a \cdot (b \cdot c) = (a \cdot b) \cdot c$.
6. $a \cdot b = b \cdot a$.
7. $\exists 1 \in \mathbb{R} \ni 1 \neq 0$ and $a \cdot 1 = a, \forall a \in \mathbb{R}$.
8. for each $a \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a \neq 0$, $\exists a^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}$, so that $a \cdot a^{-1} = 1$.
9. $a \cdot (b + c) = (a \cdot b) + (a \cdot c)$.

(Note: These properties just say that \mathbb{R} is a nontrivial field.)

Moreover, there is a distinguished subset \mathbb{P} (the positive cone) of \mathbb{R} with the following properties: Given any a, b in \mathbb{P} ,

- a. $a + b \in \mathbb{P}$,
- b. $a \cdot b \in \mathbb{P}$,
- c. For each a in \mathbb{R} , exactly one of the following properties holds:
 - i) $a \in \mathbb{P}$,
 - ii) $-a \in \mathbb{P}$,
 - iii) $a = 0$.

Finally, \mathbb{R} must satisfy the **least upper bound** property, that is, each nonempty subset of \mathbb{R} which has an *upper bound* has a *least upper bound*. These terms are defined shortly.

Defn. For the real numbers, define $a < b$ as $b - a \in \mathbb{P}$.

Lemma. Using the field properties of \mathbb{R} , the following properties hold and are all assigned homework problems (see p. 3 of this lecture set):

- (1) The additive and multiplicative identities are unique.
- (2) The additive and multiplicative inverses are unique.
- (3) If $a \in \mathbb{R}$, then $a \cdot 0 = 0$.

Theorem. The positive cone \mathbb{P} induces an order on the real numbers, i.e. \mathbb{R} equipped with the relation ' $<$ ', is an ordered set.

Proof. Assigned homework Problem 2.5. \square

Notation:

- ' $b - a$ ' is defined as $b + (-a)$.
 ' $a \leq b$ ' means either $a < b$ or $a = b$.
 The fraction ' $\frac{a}{b}$ ' means $a \cdot b^{-1}$.

Lemma. For each $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$,

- (i.) $(-a) = (-1) \cdot a$.
- (ii.) $0 < 1$.
- (iii.) if $0 < a$, then $(-a) < 0$.
- (iv.) if $a < b$ and $0 < c$, then $a \cdot c < b \cdot c$.
- (v.) if $a < b$, then $a + c < b + c$.
- (vi.) if $0 < a$, then the multiplicative inverse of a is positive, i.e. $0 < a^{-1}$.
- (vii.) the product of two negative real numbers is positive, while the product of a negative real number and a positive real number is negative.

Proof. Since

$$a + ((-1) \cdot a) = (1 \cdot a) + ((-1) \cdot a) = a \cdot (1 + (-1)) = 0 \cdot a,$$

it follows from the fact that $a \cdot 0 = 0$ (Homework Problem 2.4) that $\alpha := (-1) \cdot a$ is an additive inverse for a . But additive inverses are unique (from your Homework Problem 2.2), so the conclusion of part (i) follows.

To prove part (ii), we assume to the contrary, i.e. that $1 \notin \mathcal{I}$. By the definition, $1 \neq 0$, so $(-1) \in \mathcal{I}$ and therefore $0 < -1$. But $(-1) \cdot (-1) = -(-1) = 1$ by part (i) and the HW Problem that additive inverses are unique. This shows that $1 \in \mathcal{I}$ by property (b) of the positive cone and the assumption that $(-1) \in \mathcal{I}$. Contradiction, by the trichotomy property (c).

For part (iii), observe that $0 < a$ means $a \in \mathcal{I}$. Since additive inverses are unique, then $-(-a) = a$, and so $(0 - (-a)) = -(-a) = a \in \mathcal{I}$. This is equivalent to the statement $(-a) < 0$.

To prove (iv), use the definition of $<$ to show both $b - a$ and c are in \mathcal{I} . The positive cone is closed under multiplication, so $(b - a)c \in \mathcal{I}$. Using the property (i) shows then that $(bc) - (ac) \in \mathcal{I}$ and so $ac < bc$.

Property (v), is proved similar to showing that $0 < 1$. Indeed, suppose that $b := a^{-1} < 0$, then $-b$ is positive and so $-1 = (-b) \cdot a$ is positive. Contradiction, since -1 is negative.

The proof of property (vi) is left for additional practice. \square

Lemma. Suppose that A is a nonempty subset of \mathbb{R} , with least upper bound M , then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $a \in A$ such that

$$M - \epsilon < a \leq M.$$

Proof. Since $0 < \epsilon$, then $M - \epsilon < M$. This shows that $M - \epsilon$ cannot be an upper bound for A . Hence there is a member of A , call it a , so that $M - \epsilon < a$. \square

Theorem. (Archimedean Property) Suppose a, b are positive real numbers, then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b < n \cdot a$. (Here \mathbb{N} is the set of *natural numbers*, i.e. 1 and all its *successors*, $1, 1 + 1, 1 + 1 + 1, \dots$).

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $na < b$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then it follows that $\alpha := b/a$ is an upper bound for the natural numbers. Let M be the least upper bound. By the lemma, $1/2 > 0$, so there exists a natural number N so that $M - 1/2 < N$. But then, $M < N + 1/2 < N + 1$, which shows that M is not an upper bound for \mathbb{N} . Contradiction. \square

Corollary. The natural numbers \mathbb{N} are not bounded.

Corollary. Given any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 < 1/n < \epsilon$.

Homework #2 (Due Tuesday Sept 9.)

1. Show that the additive (or multiplicative) identity is unique.
2. Show that additive (or multiplicative) inverses are unique.
3. Prove that $-(a + c) = (-a) + (-c)$.
4. Prove that $a \cdot 0 = 0$ for each a in \mathbb{R} .
5. Prove that ' $<$ ' is an order for \mathbb{R} .
6. Prove that $a < b$ and $c < 0$ implies that $b \cdot c < a \cdot c$.

7. Prove that if $0 < a < b$, then $0 < \frac{1}{b} < \frac{1}{a}$.

Notation: Next we define intervals of real numbers.

$(a, b) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a < x < b\}$ is called the *open interval* with endpoints a, b .

$[a, b] := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x \leq b\}$ is called the *closed interval* with endpoints a, b .

$(a, b] := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a < x \leq b\}$ and $[a, b) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x < b\}$ are called the *half open intervals* with endpoints a, b .

The common length, or measure, of these intervals is defined to be $b - a$.

Theorem. Suppose that I is an interval with endpoints a, b and $a < b$, then I contains a rational number.

Proof. Define the *length of I* by $\ell := b - a$. By the previous corollary, there exists $n_o \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 < 1/n_o < \ell$. Let $A := \{k \mid k \text{ an integer and } k/n_o < a\}$. A is nonempty, since the negative integers are not bounded from below. Let k_o belong to A . Set $B := \{k \mid k \text{ an integer and } k \geq k_o\} \cap A$. Also, A is bounded from above by $a \cdot n_o$, which shows that B is in fact a finite set of integers. Let K be the largest member of B and therefore of A , then $K + 1 \notin A$. Let $r := (K + 1)/n_o$, then

$$a < \frac{K + 1}{n_o} < \frac{K}{n_o} + \ell \leq a + (b - a) = b,$$

which shows that the rational $r \in (a, b) \subseteq I$. \square

Corollary. Each interval with nonzero length contains an infinite number of rationals.

Defn. A real number is said to be *irrational* if it is not rational.

Remark: Each interval with nonzero length contains an uncountably infinite number of irrationals. (Proved later.)

We establish a few other facts about irrational numbers and also prove directly that each interval of positive length contains an infinite number of irrationals.

Lemma. The product of a nonzero rational with an irrational is irrational.

Proof. Suppose that $q_1 \cdot \alpha = q_2$, where q_1, q_2 are rational and α is irrational. Since $q_1 \neq 0$, then $\alpha = q_2/q_1$ and it follows that α is rational. Contradiction. \square

Lemma. If m is an odd integer, then m^2 is odd.

Proof. If m is odd, then there exists an integer k such that $m = 2k + 1$. In this case $m^2 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1$. \square

Lemma. $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.

Proof. Suppose that $\sqrt{2} = m/n$ where m, n are integers with $n > 0$. We may assume that the rational is in lowest terms (i.e. m and n have no common factors). Squaring the equation and multiplying by n^2 , we obtain that $m^2 = 2n^2$. This shows that m^2 is even. By the lemma m must be even and equivalently that it contains 2 as a factor. This shows $4k^2 = 2n^2$ for some integer k .

Consequently, n is even and 2 appears as one of its factors. Contradiction, since m/n was supposed to be in lowest terms. \square

Theorem. Each interval with nonzero length contains an infinite number of irrationals.

Proof. Let a, b be the endpoints of the interval I . Consider the interval $(a/\sqrt{2}, b/\sqrt{2})$. It has length $(b-a)/\sqrt{2} > 0$, and so contains a nonzero rational number q . It follows that $q\sqrt{2}$ is between a and b and hence belongs to I . \square

Defn. The absolute value of a real number a is defined by

$$|a| := \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } a \geq 0 \\ -a, & \text{if } a < 0. \end{cases}$$

Lemma. The *absolute value* function has the following properties:

1. $|a| \geq 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$.
2. $\pm a \leq |a|$
3. $|-a| = |a|$
4. $|a \cdot b| = |a| \cdot |b|$
5. Suppose $\alpha \geq 0$, then
 $|a| \leq \alpha$ if and only if $-\alpha \leq a \leq \alpha$.
6. $|a + b| \leq |a| + |b|$
7. $||b| - |a|| \leq |b - a|$

Proof. To prove property 1, ‘case it out.’ Either $a \geq 0$ or $a < 0$. In the first case $|a| = a \geq 0$. In the second case, $|a| = -a > 0$, since $a < 0$. Property 2 follows similarly. Properties 3 and 4 are left for the student.

To prove property 5, notice that $|a| \leq \alpha$ is equivalent to the statement $\pm a \leq \alpha$. Using the elementary order properties, it is easy to see that this last statement is equivalent to both inequalities: $a \leq \alpha$ **and** $-\alpha \leq a$. This is equivalent to the statement on the right hand side of property 5.

To prove property 6, set $\alpha = |a| + |b|$ and apply property 5 after verifying that $\pm(a + b) \leq \alpha$.

To prove property 7, use the fact that $|b| = |(b - a) + a| \leq |b - a| + |a|$ and subtract $|a|$ from each side. This shows that $|b| - |a| \leq |b - a|$. By symmetry in a and b , one proves that $|a| - |b| \leq |a - b| = |b - a|$. \square