Math Journal

Isabelle Mills

September 1, 2024

8/31/2024

My goal for today is to work through the appendix to chapter 1 in Baby Rudin. This appendix focuses on constructing the real numbers using Dedikind cuts.

We define a <u>cut</u> to be a set $\alpha \subset \mathbb{Q}$ such that:

- 1. $\alpha \neq \emptyset$
- 2. If $p \in \alpha$, $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, and q < p, then $q \in \alpha$.
- 3. If $p \in \alpha$, then p < r for some $r \in \alpha$

Point 3 tells us that α doesn't have a max element. Also, point 2 directly implies the following facts:

- a. If $p \in \alpha$, $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, and $q \notin \alpha$, then q > p.
- b. If $r \notin \alpha$, $r, s \in \mathbb{Q}$, and r < s, then $s \notin \alpha$.

As a shorthand. I shall refer to the set of all cuts as R.

An example of a cut would be the set of rational numbers less than 2.

Firstly, we shall assign an ordering to R. Specifically, given any $\alpha, \beta \in R$, we say that $\alpha < \beta$ if $\alpha \subset \beta$ (a proper subset).

Here we prove that < satisfies the definition of an ordering.

I. It's obvious from the definition of a proper subset that at most one of the following three things can be true: $\alpha < \beta$, $\alpha = \beta$, and $\beta < \alpha$.

Now let's assume that $a \not< \beta$ and $\alpha \ne \beta$. Then $\exists p \in \alpha$ such that $p \notin \beta$. But then for any $q \in \beta$, we must have by fact b. above that q < p. Hence $q \in \alpha$, meaning that $\beta \subset \alpha$. This proves that at least one of the following has to be true: $\alpha < \beta$, $\alpha = \beta$, and $\beta < \alpha$.

II. If for $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in R$ we have that $\alpha < \beta$ and $\beta < \gamma$, then clearly $\alpha < \gamma$ because $\alpha \subset \beta \subset \gamma$.

Now we claim that R equipped with < has the least-upper-bound property. Proof:

Let $A\subset R$ be nonempty and $\beta\in R$ be an upper bound of A. Then set $\gamma=\bigcup_{\alpha\in A}\alpha.$ Firstly, we want to show that $\gamma\in R$

Since $A \neq \emptyset$, there exists $\alpha_0 \in A$. And as $\alpha_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $\alpha_0 \subseteq \gamma$ by definition, we know that $\gamma \neq \emptyset$. At the same time, we know that $\gamma \subset \beta$ since $\forall \alpha \in A$, $\alpha \subset \beta$. Hence, $\gamma \neq \mathbb{Q}$, meaning that γ satisfies property 1. of cuts.

Next, let $p \in \gamma$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that q < p. We know that for some $\alpha_1 \in A$, we have that $p \in \alpha_1$. Hence by property 2. of cuts, we know that $q \in \alpha_1 \subset \gamma$, thus showing that γ satisfies property 2. of cuts.

Thirdly, by property 3. we can pick $r \in \alpha_1$ such that p < r and $r \in \alpha_1 \subset \gamma$. So, γ satisfies property 3. of cuts.

With that, we've now shown that $\gamma \in R$. Clearly, γ is an upper bound of A since $\alpha \subset \gamma$ for all $\alpha \in A$. Meanwhile, consider any $\delta < \gamma$. Then $\exists s \in \gamma$ such that $s \notin \delta$. And since $s \in \gamma$, we know that $s \in \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in A$. Hence, $\delta < \alpha$, meaning that δ is not an upper bound of A. This shows that $\gamma = \sup A$.

Secondly, we want to assign + and \cdot operations to R so that R is an ordered field.

To start, given any $\alpha, \beta \in R$, we shall define $\alpha + \beta$ to be the set of all sums r + s such that $r \in \alpha$ and $s \in \beta$.

Here we show that $\alpha + \beta \in R$.

1. Clearly, $\alpha + \beta \neq \emptyset$. Also, take $r' \notin \alpha$ and $s' \notin \beta$. Then r' + s' > r + s for all $r \in \alpha$ and $s \in \beta$. Hence, $r' + s' \notin \alpha + \beta$, meaning that $\alpha + \beta \neq \mathbb{Q}$.

Now let $p \in \alpha + \beta$. Thus there exists $r \in \alpha$ and $s \in \beta$ such that p = r + s.

- 2. Suppose q < p. Then q s < r, meaning that $q s \in \alpha$. Hence, $q = (q s) + s \in \alpha + \beta$.
- 3. Let $t \in \alpha$ so that t > r. Then p = r + s < t + s and $t + s \in \alpha + \beta$.

Also, we shall define 0^* to be the set of all negative rational numbers. Clearly, 0^* is a cut. Furthermore, we claim that + satisfies the addition requirements of a field with 0^* as its 0 element.

Commutativity and associativity of + on R follows directly from the commutativity and associativity of addition on the rational numbers.

Also, for any $\alpha \in R$, $\alpha + 0^* = \alpha$. If $r \in \alpha$ and $s \in 0^*$, then r + s < r. Hence $r + s \in \alpha$, meaning that $\alpha + 0^* \subseteq \alpha$. Meanwhile, if $p \in \alpha$, then we can pick $r \in \alpha$ such that r > p. Then, $p - r \in 0^*$ and $p = r + (p - r) \in \alpha + 0^*$. So, $\alpha \subseteq \alpha + 0^*$.

Finally, given any $\alpha \in R$, let $\beta = \{p \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \exists \, r > 0 \; s.t. \; -p-r \notin \alpha\}$. To give some intuition on this definition, firstly we want to guarentee that for all $p \in \beta$, -p is greater than all elements of α . Secondly, we add the -r term to guarentee that β doesn't have a maximum element.

We claim that $\beta \in R$ and $\beta + \alpha = 0^*$. Hence we can define $-\alpha = \beta$. To start, we'll show that $\beta \in R$:

1. For $s \notin \alpha$ and p = -s - 1, we have that $-p - 1 \notin \alpha$. Hence, $p \in \beta$, meaning that $\beta \neq \emptyset$. Meanwhile, if $q \in \alpha$, then $-q \notin \beta$ because there does not exist r > 0 such that $-(-q) - r = q - r \notin \alpha$. So $\beta \neq \mathbb{Q}$.

Now let $p \in \beta$ and pick r > 0 such that $-p - r \notin \alpha$.

- 2. Suppose q < p. Then -q-r > -p-r, meaning that $-q-r \notin \alpha$. Hence, $q \in \beta$.
- 3. Let $t=p+\frac{r}{2}$. Then t>p and $-t-\frac{r}{2}=-p-r\notin \alpha$, meaning $t\in \beta$.

Now that we've proved $\beta\in R$, we next prove that β is the additive inverse of α . To start, suppose $r\in\alpha$ and $s\in\beta$. Then $-s\notin\alpha$, meaning that r<-s. So r+s<0, thus showing that $\alpha+\beta\subseteq 0^*$.