

Lesson 4

Consequences of the Axiom of Completeness,
Decimals, Extended Real Number System

MATH 311, Section 04, FALL 2022

September 16, 2022

Archimedean property of \mathbb{Q}

Archimedean property on \mathbb{Q}

- ① Given any number $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$n > x.$$

- ② Given any rational number $y > 0$ there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{n} < y.$$

Proof

The second property follows from the first one by taking $x = \frac{1}{y}$. Thus it suffices to prove the first statement. If $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $x \leq 0$, then there is nothing to do. Suppose that $x > 0$, then $x = \frac{p}{q}$ for some $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$.

Consider the set

$$A = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : n \leq x\}.$$

This set is nonempty since $x > 0$. We see that $m \in A$ iff $p - qm \geq 0$.

Consider now the set

$$B = \{p - qn : n \in A\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0, \quad \text{and} \quad B \neq \emptyset.$$

By the well-ordering principle B contains the smallest element, say $p - qm_0$ for some $m_0 \in A$. Thus for all $n \in A$ we have

$$p - qm_0 \leq p - qn \iff n \leq m_0 \leq x.$$

Now we see that $x < m_0 + 1$ has desired property. □

Example

Example

Let $E = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \subset \mathbb{Q}$. Then

$$\sup E = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \in E,$$

$$\inf E = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \notin E.$$

- We now show that $\sup E = 1$. Of course $\frac{1}{n} \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \in E$, which shows that $\sup E = 1$.
- To prove that $\inf E = 0$ we note that $\frac{1}{n} > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now take $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $x > 0$. By the Archimedean property we always find $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 < \frac{1}{m} < x$ and we are done.

Axiom of completeness AoC

Let us recall the axiom of completeness.

Axiom of completeness AoC

Every non-empty set of real numbers that is bounded above has a least upper bound.

Our goal is to apply the axiom of completeness to study some properties of real numbers.

Application 1 - nested interval property

Nested interval property

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, assume we are given a closed interval

$$I_n = [a_n, b_n] = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a_n \leq x \leq b_n\}.$$

Assume also that $I_n \supseteq I_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the resulting nested sequence of closed intervals

$$I_1 \supseteq I_2 \supseteq I_3 \supseteq \dots$$

has a nonempty intersection, that is

$$\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof 1/2



Using **(AoC)** we will produce $x \in \mathbb{R}$ so that $x \in I_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n \supset \{x\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Consider the set $A = \{a_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of all left-hand endpoints of the intervals I_n . Because the intervals are nested one sees that every b_n serves as an upper bound for A . Thus by the **(AoC)** we are allowed to write

$$x = \sup A \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The proof will be complete if we show $x \in I_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof 2/2

Since x is an upper bound for A thus

$$a_n \leq x \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The fact that b_n is an upper bound for A and that x is the least upper bound implies

$$x \leq b_n \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus

$$a_n \leq x \leq b_n$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ hence $x \in I_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and consequently

$$x \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n.$$



Application 2 - Archimedean property of \mathbb{R}

Archimedean property

- (i) Given any number $x \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$n > x.$$

- (ii) Given any real number $y > 0$ there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{n} < y.$$

Proof

Proof. Note that (ii) follows from (i) by letting $x = \frac{1}{y}$. It suffices to prove (i).

Without loss of generality we can assume that $x > 0$ and consider

$$A = \{nx : n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Suppose for a contradiction that A is bounded, i.e. there is $y \geq 0$ such that $nx \leq y$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This means that y is an upper bound for A .

By the (AoC):

$$\alpha = \sup A \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since $x > 0$, $\alpha - x < \alpha$ and $\alpha - x$ is not upper bound of A . Thus we find $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\alpha - x < mx \iff \alpha < (m + 1)x.$$

This is contradiction since α is the supremum of A .

Corollary - \mathbb{Q} is dense in \mathbb{R}

\mathbb{Q} is dense in \mathbb{R}

If $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x < y$ then there is $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $x < p < y$.

Proof. Since $x < y$, by **Archimedean property** there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$n(y - x) > 1.$$

- Then, we apply **Archimedean property** to find $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $m_1 > nx$ and $m_2 > -nx$. Then $-m_2 < nx < m_1$.
- Hence there is an integer m with $-m_2 \leq m \leq m_1$ such that

$$m - 1 \leq nx < m.$$

- We combine these inequalities to get

$$nx < m \leq nx + 1 < ny, \quad \text{so} \quad x < p = \frac{m}{n} < y.$$



More general

Theorem 1.4.5

For every real $x > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a unique real number $y > 0$ such that

$$y^n = x.$$

Proof: Uniqueness. The fact that there exists at most one such y is clear, since $0 < y_1 < y_2$ implies

$$y_1^n < y_2^n.$$

Identity $b^n - a^n$

In the proof (in the existence part), we will use the following identity

$$b^n - a^n = (b - a)(b^{n-1} + b^{n-2}a + \dots + a^{n-2}b + a^{n-1})$$

which holds for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof: 1/3

- **Proof: Existence.** Let

$$E = \{t > 0 : t^n < x\}.$$

- If $t = \frac{x}{x+1}$, then $0 \leq t < 1$ hence

$$t^n \leq t < x$$

thus $t \in E$ and $E \neq \emptyset$.

- If $t > x + 1$, then $t^n > t > x$, so that $t \notin E$. Thus $x + 1$ is an upper bound of E .
- By the (AoC) we may write $y = \sup E \in \mathbb{R}$. We will show that

$$y^n = x.$$

- It suffices to show that $y^n < x$ and $y^n > x$ cannot hold.

Proof: 2/3. Case $y^n < x$.

- The identity

$$b^n - a^n = (b - a)(b^{n-1} + b^{n-2}a + \dots + a^{n-2}b + a^{n-1})$$

gives

$$b^n - a^n < (b - a)nb^{n-1}$$

if $0 < a < b$.

- Assume $y^n < x$. Choose $0 < h < 1$ so that

$$h < \frac{x - y^n}{n(y + 1)^{n-1}}.$$

- Put $a = y$, $b = y + h$. Then

$$(y + h)^n - y^n < hn(y + h)^{n-1} < hn(y + 1)^{n-1} < x - y^n.$$

- Thus $(y + h)^n < x$ and $y + h \in E$. Since $y + h > y$ this contradicts the fact that y is an upper bound of E .

Proof: 3/3. Case $y^n > x$.

- Assume that $y^n > x$ and set

$$k = \frac{y^n - x}{ny^{n-1}}.$$

- Then $0 < k < y$. If $t \geq y - k$ we conclude

$$y^n - t^n \leq y^n - (y - k)^n < kny^{n-1} = y^n - x.$$

- Thus $t^n > x$ and $t \notin E$. It follows that $y - k$ is an upper bound of E .
But

$$y - k < y,$$

which contradicts the fact that y is the least upper bound of E .

- Hence

$$y^n = x.$$

Corollary

Corollary

If $a, b > 0$ are real numbers and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$(ab)^{1/n} = a^{1/n}b^{1/n}$$

It is a consequence of the uniqueness property in the previous theorem.

x^y for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$

Fix $b > 1$.

- If $m, n, p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n, q > 0$ and $r = \frac{m}{n} = \frac{p}{q}$, then

$$(b^m)^{\frac{1}{n}} = (b^p)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

- Hence, it makes sense to define $b^r = (b^m)^{\frac{1}{n}}$.
- If $r, s \in \mathbb{Q}$, then

$$b^{r+s} = b^r b^s.$$

- If $x \in \mathbb{R}$ define

$$B(x) = \{b^t : t \in \mathbb{Q}, t \leq x\}.$$

- Then $b^n = \sup B(x)$ when $r \in \mathbb{Q}$. Hence, it makes sense to define

$$b^x = \sup B(x)$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Decimals 1/2

Let $x > 0$ be real. Let n_0 be the largest integer such that $n_0 \leq x$.

Remark

Note that the existence of n_0 follows from the Archimedean property. **Why?**

Then, we define n_1 to be the largest integer such that

$$n_0 + \frac{n_1}{10} \leq x.$$

then, having n_0, n_1 , we define n_2 to be the largest integer such that

$$n_0 + \frac{n_1}{10} + \frac{n_2}{100} \leq x.$$

We continue this procedure...

Decimals 2/2

Having chosen

$$n_0, n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}$$

let n_k be the largest integer such that

$$n_0 + \frac{n_1}{10} + \frac{n_2}{10^2} + \dots + \frac{n_k}{10^k} \leq x.$$

Let

$$E = \left\{ n_0 + \frac{n_1}{10} + \frac{n_2}{10^2} + \dots + \frac{n_k}{10^k} : k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \right\}.$$

Then one can show that $x = \sup E$.

Decimal system - example

Example

Write down $0,25$ in the form $\frac{n}{m}$.

Solution. We write

$$0,25 = \frac{2}{10} + \frac{5}{100} = \frac{20}{100} + \frac{5}{100} = \frac{25}{100} = \frac{1}{4}.$$



Decimal system - example

Example

Write down $x = 0,101010101\dots$ in the form $\frac{n}{m}$.

Solution. Note that

$$10x = 10,10101010\dots,$$

hence

$$10x = 10 + x$$

$$9x = 10 \iff x = \frac{10}{9}.$$



The extended real number system

The extended real number system

The extended real number system consists of real numbers \mathbb{R} and **two symbols** $+\infty$ and $-\infty$.

We preserve the original order in \mathbb{R} and define

$$-\infty < x < +\infty$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Example

If $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $E \neq \emptyset$ but not bounded then

$$\sup E = +\infty.$$

Properties of the extended real number system

Properties

If $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then

- A $x + \infty = \infty, x - \infty = -\infty, \frac{x}{+\infty} = \frac{x}{-\infty} = 0,$
- B if $x > 0$, then $x(+\infty) = +\infty, x(-\infty) = -\infty,$
- C if $x < 0$, then $x(+\infty) = -\infty, x(-\infty) = +\infty.$