

Math 5210

Wed 1/14

Problem sessions start tomorrow Thurs.
2-3:15 LCB 222

Real arithmetic §2.2

Recall (for sequences of rational #'s)

$\{x_n\}$ Cauchy :=

if $\{x_n\}, \{y_n\}$ Cauchy, then $\{x_n\} \equiv \{y_n\}$ iff
the real #'s $\mathbb{R}$ are: *

* We need to show $\equiv$ is an equivalence relation!

Notation: if $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence (today all sequences are of rational numbers)
we will write

$$[\{x_n\}] \in \mathbb{R}$$

↑
the equivalence class of $\{x_n\}$.

Remark: if we identify the rational number $q \in \mathbb{Q}$
with the Cauchy sequence $\{q, q, q, \dots\}$
and with $[\{q, q, q, \dots\}] \in \mathbb{R}$

we can think of $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}$:

This is because

$i(q) := [\{q, q, \dots\}]$ is injective (1-1)

pf: if $p \neq q$ then $|p - q| > 0$
so $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|p - q| > \frac{1}{n}$ (Arch. Lemma)

therefore $\{p, p, p, \dots\} \neq \{q, q, q, \dots\}$

so $[\{p, p, p, \dots\}] \neq [\{q, q, q, \dots\}]$

$i(p) \neq i(q)$.

We aim to verify today that
real arithmetic is well-defined, and
extends rational arithmetic. Of course, you've always taken this for granted!

Def 1: $[\{x_k\}] + [\{y_k\}] := [\{x_k + y_k\}]$

$$[\{x_k\}] \cdot [\{y_k\}] := [\{x_k y_k\}]$$

$$-[\{x_k\}] := [\{-x_k\}]$$

Of course, we must check that these definitions

- make sense - (i) the sequences on the right must be Cauchy
(ii) the definitions cannot depend on equivalence class representatives

The following lemmas will make our life easier to check "well-defined" above, and subsequently

Lemma 1 (Cauchy $\Rightarrow$ bounded): $\{x_k\}$ Cauchy $\Rightarrow \exists M$ s.t. $|x_k| \leq M \forall k$.

pf: for $n=1$ pick m s.t. $|x_j - x_k| < \frac{1}{n} = 1 \forall j, k \geq m$

$$\Rightarrow |x_j - x_m| < 1 \quad \forall j \geq m.$$

$$\Rightarrow |x_j| = |x_j - x_m + x_m| < 1 + |x_m| \quad \forall j \geq m$$

Define $M = \max\{|x_1|, |x_2|, \dots, |x_{m-1}|, |x_m| + 1\}$. ■

Lemma 2 (Easier Cauchy and Limits)

2a) Let $\{x_k\}$ be a sequence. If $\exists C > 0$ s.t. $\forall n > 0 \exists m$ s.t. $j, k \geq m \Rightarrow |x_j - x_k| < \frac{C}{n}$ then $\{x_k\}$ is Cauchy

2b) To prove $\{x_k\} \rightarrow L$ it suffices to find $C > 0$ s.t.

$$\forall n > 0 \exists m \text{ s.t. } k \geq m \Rightarrow |x_k - L| < \frac{C}{n}$$

2c) If $\{x_k\}, \{y_k\}$ are Cauchy and $\exists C > 0$ s.t. $\forall n > 0 \exists m > 0$ s.t. $k \geq m \Rightarrow |x_k - y_k| < \frac{C}{n}$, then $\{x_k\} \equiv \{y_k\}$

proofs:

2a) Assume hypothesis, with given C . [Let $n' > 0$] Pick n s.t. $\frac{C}{n} < \frac{1}{n'}$ (iff $Cn' < n$)
For this $n \exists m$ s.t. $|j, k \geq m| \Rightarrow |x_j - x_k| < \frac{C}{n}$
thus $|x_j - x_k| < \frac{1}{n'}$ ■

2b) (Similar to 2a): If C exists, let $n' > 0$, then pick n with $\frac{C}{n} < \frac{1}{n'}$. Then $\exists m$ s.t. $k \geq m \Rightarrow |x_k - L| < \frac{C}{n} < \frac{1}{n'}$

2c) $\{x_k\} \equiv \{y_k\}$ iff $\{x_k - y_k\} \rightarrow 0$.

By (2b), $\{x_k - y_k\} \rightarrow 0$ if $\exists C > 0$ s.t. $\forall n > 0 \exists m > 0$ s.t. $k \geq m \Rightarrow |x_k - y_k - 0| < \frac{C}{n}$; 2c! ■

Theorem 1: Definitions 1 are well-defined: Let $\{x_k\}, \{x'_k\}, \{y_k\}, \{y'_k\}$ Cauchy
 Let $\{x_k\} \equiv \{x'_k\}, \{y_k\} \equiv \{y'_k\}$

Then (i) $\{x_k + y_k\}, \{x_k y_k\}, \{-x_k\}$
 are Cauchy (also with 's)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(ii)} \quad \{x_k + y_k\} &\equiv \{x'_k + y'_k\} \\ \{x_k y_k\} &\equiv \{x'_k y'_k\} \\ \{-x_k\} &\equiv \{-x'_k\} \end{aligned}$$

Proof: (i) $\{-x_k\}$ is clearly Cauchy.

sum: let $n > 0$. $|x_j + y_j - (x_k + y_k)| \leq |x_j - x_k| + |y_j - y_k|$

pick m_1 s.t. $j, k \geq m_1 \Rightarrow |x_j - x_k| < \frac{1}{n}$
 m_2 s.t. $j, k \geq m_2 \Rightarrow |y_j - y_k| < \frac{1}{n}$

So, for $m = \max(m_1, m_2)$

$$|(x_j + y_j) - (x_k + y_k)| < \frac{2}{n} \quad \blacksquare \quad (\text{Lemma 2})$$

product: Let $n > 0$. Pick m_1, m_2 as above, also m .

$$\text{Let } M_1 \text{ s.t. } |x_k| \leq M_1 \quad \forall k$$

$$M_2 \text{ s.t. } |y_k| \leq M_2 \quad \forall k$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{then for } j, k \geq m: \quad |x_j y_j - x_k y_k| &= |x_j (y_j - y_k) + y_k (x_j - x_k)| \\ &\leq M_1 \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) + M_2 \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = \frac{C}{n} \end{aligned}$$

$$C := M_1 + M_2$$

so $\{x_k y_k\}$ is Cauchy (Lemma 2)

$\blacksquare$

(ii) $\{-x_k\} \equiv \{-x'_k\}$ clear

$$\text{Let } n > 0. \quad \exists m_1 \text{ s.t. } k \geq m_1 \Rightarrow |x_k - x'_k| < \frac{1}{n}$$

$$m_2 \text{ s.t. } k \geq m_2 \Rightarrow |y_k - y'_k| < \frac{1}{n}$$

for $k \geq m = \max(m_1, m_2)$

$$\text{sum} \quad |(x_k + y_k) - (x'_k + y'_k)| \leq \frac{2}{n} \Rightarrow \{x_k + y_k\} \equiv \{x'_k + y'_k\}$$

$$\text{product} \quad |x_k y_k - x'_k y'_k| = |x_k (y_k - y'_k) + y'_k (x_k - x'_k)|$$

$$\leq \frac{M_1}{n} + \frac{M_2}{n} = \frac{C}{n}$$

$$\text{where } M_1 := \max_k |x_k|$$

$$M_2 := \max_k |y'_k|$$

$$\Rightarrow \{x_k y_k\} \equiv \{x'_k y'_k\} \quad \blacksquare$$

Theorem 2 The field axioms hold for $\mathbb{R}$

1. $a+b = b+a$ $(a+b)+c = a+(b+c)$
 $a \cdot b = b \cdot a$ $(a \cdot b)c = a \cdot (b \cdot c)$
2. $a \cdot (b+c) = ab+ac$
3. $0+a = a$
 $1 \cdot a = a$
4. $a+(-a) = 0$
 $a \cdot \frac{1}{a} = 1 \quad a \neq 0.$

pf: 1-3 are straight forward, as is additive inverse in 4, using Theorem 1

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{e.g. } (a \cdot b)c = a \cdot (b \cdot c) & \longrightarrow & [\{x_k\}]([\{y_k\}][\{z_k\}]) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 ([\{x_k\}] \cdot [\{y_k\}]) \cdot [\{z_k\}] & & [\{x_k\}] \cdot [\{y_k z_k\}] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 [\{x_k y_k\}] \cdot [\{z_k\}] & & [\{x_k y_k z_k\}] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 [\{x_k y_k z_k\}] & \equiv & [\{x_k y_k z_k\}]
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{in (3): } 0 &:= [\{0, 0, \dots\}] \\
 1 &:= [\{1, 1, \dots\}]
 \end{aligned}$$

We need to be a little careful in 4b: multiplicative inverses
 we'll return to this after discussing ordering:

Theorem 3 Let $x = [\{x_k\}] \in \mathbb{R}$. Then exactly one of the following holds:

- a) $x = 0$
- b) $\exists n > 0$ and $m > 0$ s.t. $\forall k \geq m \quad x_k > \frac{1}{n}$. In this case we say $x > 0$
 and for each $\{y_k\} \equiv \{x_k\} \quad \exists n', m' > 0$ s.t. $\forall k \geq m', y_k > \frac{1}{n'}$
- or c) $\exists n > 0$ and $m > 0$ s.t. $\forall k \geq m \quad x_k < -\frac{1}{n}$. In this case we say $x < 0$
 and for each $\{y_k\} \equiv \{x_k\} \quad \exists n', m' > 0$ s.t.
 $\forall k \geq m', y_k < -\frac{1}{n'}$.

This defines an ordering on $\mathbb{R}$

proof of Theorem 3

- Cases (b), (c) are mutually exclusive.

- If (b) holds and $\{y_k\} = \{x_k\}$, pick $n, m > 0$ s.t. $x_k > \frac{1}{n} \forall k \geq m$.

For $n_1 = 2n$ pick m_1 s.t. $|x_k - y_k| \leq \frac{1}{2n} \forall k \geq m_1$

(let $n' = 2n$, $m' = \max(m, m_1)$,
then $k \geq m' \Rightarrow$

- If (c) holds then the analogous statement to the one in (b), holds for $\{y_k\} = \{x_k\}$

$$y_k = y_k - x_k + x_k \geq \frac{1}{2n} + \frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{2n} = \frac{1}{n'} \quad \blacksquare$$

- If neither (b) nor (c) hold, we shall show $x = 0$.

If (b) doesn't hold, it is not true that

- $\exists n > 0$ for which $\exists m > 0$ s.t. $\forall k \geq m, x_k > \frac{1}{n}$
- i.e. $\nexists n > 0$ s.t. $\exists m > 0$ s.t. $\forall k \geq m, x_k > \frac{1}{n}$
- i.e. $\forall n > 0 \nexists m > 0$ s.t. $\forall k \geq m, x_k > \frac{1}{n}$
- i.e. $\forall n > 0$ and $\forall m > 0 \exists k \geq m$ s.t. $x_k \leq \frac{1}{n}$

But $\{x_k\}$ is Cauchy, so

$$\forall n > 0 \exists m > 0 \text{ s.t. } \forall j, l \geq m, |x_j - x_l| < \frac{1}{n}$$

$\uparrow$
for this m , find $k \geq m$ s.t. $x_k \leq \frac{1}{n}$

then $j \geq m \Rightarrow |x_j - x_k| \leq \frac{1}{n}$

$$\Rightarrow x_j = x_k + (x_j - x_k) \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} = \frac{2}{n}$$

Thus $\forall n > 0 \exists m > 0$ s.t.
 $j \geq m \Rightarrow x_j \leq \frac{2}{n}$

If (c) doesn't hold, deduce

$$\forall n > 0 \exists \tilde{m} > 0 \text{ s.t. } j \geq \tilde{m} \Rightarrow x_j > -\frac{2}{n}$$

(let $n > 0$. let $\tilde{m} = \max(m, \tilde{m})$.
Then $j \geq \tilde{m} \Rightarrow |x_j| \leq \frac{2}{n}$

Thus $\{\{x_j\}\} = 0$.



(Still need to check mult inverses, prove Δ ineq., etc.)