

## Chapter 12 Order in the reals, part II

We saw that  $\{x \in \mathbb{Q} : x^2 \leq 2\} = [-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}] \cap \mathbb{Q}$

is an example of a set that had no min/max.

Moreover, the supremum and infimum, while they exist, are not in the set because they're not rational.

This is the key property that distinguishes the real numbers from the rationals.

Completeness Axiom of the Reals Every nonempty subset of real numbers that is bounded above has a supremum.

In other words, the reals are a number system that is closed under taking supremum of sets that are bounded above.

Theorem (Archimedean property of  $\mathbb{R}$ ) Let  $a, b \in (0, \infty)$ .

Then there exists  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $nb > a$ .

Proof Suppose by way of contradiction this is not true.

Then there exist  $a, b \in (0, \infty)$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$

$nb \leq a$ . Then  $a$  is an upper bound for the set

$S = \{nb : n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ . Since  $S$  is bounded above, it has

a supremum  $u = \sup S$  by the Completeness Axiom.

Consider  $u-b$ . Since  $u-b < u$  and  $u$  is the least upper bound,  $u-b$  cannot be an upper bound of  $S$ .

So there exists some  $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $n_0 b > u-b$ .

This implies  $(n_0+1)b > u$ . But  $(n_0+1)b \in S$ , so this contradicts that  $u$  is an upper bound of  $S$ .

Corollary For every  $x \in (0, \infty)$ , there exists  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $x < n$ . Moreover, there exists  $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $\frac{1}{m} < x$ .

Proof For the first part, use the Archimedean property with  $a=x$ ,  $b=1$ . For the second part, use  $a=1$ ,  $b=x$ .

Well-ordering principle of  $\mathbb{N}$  Every nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{N}$

has a minimum. (An axiom we assume about  $\mathbb{N}$ )

Theorem Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $a < b$ . Then there exists  $q \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $a < q < b$ .

Proof We'll do the case when  $a, b \in (0, \infty)$  and leave the other cases as an exercise.

By the corollary of the Archimedean property

there exists  $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $\frac{1}{m} < b - a$ .

Consider the set  $S = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \frac{n}{m} > a\}$ . By

the corollary of the Archimedean property  $S$  is nonempty

By the well-ordering principle of  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $S$  has a minimum,

$n_0 = \min S$ . We claim  $\frac{n_0}{m} < b$ . Note since  $n_0 - 1 < n_0$

and  $n_0 = \min S$ ,  $\frac{n_0 - 1}{m} \leq a$  which implies  $\frac{n_0}{m} \leq a + \frac{1}{m} < b$ .



**Problem 1.** Let  $S = \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 4)$ . Consider the following incorrect proof that  $\sup S = 4$ . What is the logical flaw with this proof?

*Proof.* First we show 4 is an upper bound. Let  $x \in S$ . Then  $0 < x < 4$ , so 4 is clearly an upper bound. Suppose to the contrary that 4 is not the supremum. Then there exists an upper bound  $u$  with  $u < 4$ . But  $u < (u+4)/2$  and we have shown that  $u$  is not an upper bound of  $S$ . This shows that 4 must be the supremum.  $\square$

The flaw is that it's not necessarily the case that  $\frac{u+4}{2} \in S$  since we don't know  $u \in S$ . That means  $u < \frac{u+4}{2}$  doesn't necessarily contradict  $u$  is an upper bound of  $S$ .

**Problem 2.** Fix the proof above, taking advantage of the fact that between any two real numbers there is a rational number.

Let  $x \in S$ . Then  $0 < x < 4$ , so 4 is an upper bound of  $S$ .

Suppose  $u$  is an upper bound of  $S$ . We claim  $u \geq 4$ .

Suppose not. Then  $u < 4$ . Since  $1 \in S$  and  $u$  is an upper bound of  $S$ ,  $1 \leq u$ . Thus  $u \in (0, 4)$ .

Moreover, there exists  $q \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $0 < u < q < 4$ .

Thus  $q \in S$  and  $u < q$  which contradicts that  $u$  is an upper bound of  $S$ . Thus  $u \geq 4$  and so 4 is the least upper bound of  $S$ .

**Problem 3.** Let  $S = \{1 - 1/n : n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ . Show that  $\sup S = 1$ .

Observe that  $1 - \frac{1}{n} \leq 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . Thus

1 is an upper bound of  $S$ . Let  $u$  be an upper bound of  $S$ . We claim  $u \geq 1$ . Suppose not.

Then  $u < 1$ . By the Archimedean property, there exists

$m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $\frac{1}{m} < 1 - u$ . But this implies  $u < 1 - \frac{1}{m}$

which contradicts that  $u$  is an upper bound of  $S$ .