

- **Natural Numbers**

- The natural numbers (or positive integers) is the set

$$\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}.$$

- Non-negative integers is the set

$$\mathcal{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}.$$

- The main property of the non-negative integers is:

**Principle of Mathematical Induction**

If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$  and  $0 \in S$  and  $(k + 1) \in S$  whenever  $k \in S$ , then  $S = \mathcal{N}$ .

- An ordering relation  $\leq$  on a set  $S$  is called *well-order* if every non-empty subset  $A$  of  $S$  has a smallest element.

**Proposition**  $\mathcal{N}$  is well-ordered by the relation  $\leq$ .

That is,  $\mathcal{N}$  has the *well-ordering property*:

If  $S$  is nonempty subset of  $\mathcal{N}$ , then there exist a smallest element in  $S$ ;

i.e. there is an  $s_0 \in S$ , such that, for all  $x \in S$ ,

$$s_0 \leq x.$$

**Proof.** We prove the statement by reductio ad impossibile.

- Suppose that  $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$  has **no smallest element**.
- Define  $T = \mathcal{N} \setminus S$
- Since  $0 \in \mathcal{N}$  is the smallest element of  $S$  and  $S \subset \mathcal{N}$ , it follows

$$0 \notin S$$

- Let

$$T_0 = \{n \in \mathcal{N} : \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\} \subseteq T\}.$$

- Since  $0 \notin S$ ,  $0 \in T$ , so

$$\{0\} \subseteq T.$$

- Hence  $0 \in T_0$ .

- Suppose that  $k \in T_0$ , then

$$\{0, 1, 2, \dots, k\} \subseteq T.$$

- If  $(k + 1) \notin T$ , then

$$(k + 1) \in S.$$

- Since

$$\begin{aligned}\{0, 1, 2, \dots, k\} &\subset \mathcal{N} \setminus S = T, \text{ thus} \\ S &\subset \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k\} = \{k+1, k+2, \dots\}.\end{aligned}$$

- It follows

$$(k+1) = \min S,$$

a contradiction.

- Therefore,

$$(k+1) \in T$$

- Since

$$\{0, 1, 2, \dots, k\} \subseteq T,$$

it follows that

$$\{0, 1, 2, \dots, k, k+1\} \subseteq T,$$

- Thus, by the definition of  $T_0$

$$(k+1) \in T_0.$$

- Consequently,  $T_0$  satisfies **PMI**.

- Hence

$$T_0 = \mathcal{N},$$

so  $T = \mathcal{N}$ , and

- Therefore,

$$T = \mathcal{N} \setminus S = \mathcal{N},$$

so

$$S = \emptyset.$$

A contradiction. This finishes our proof. ■

- **Remark** One shows that the *Well-Ordering Property* of  $\mathcal{N}$  implies the *Principle of Mathematical Induction* (**PMI**).

**Example** We show that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n j^2 = \frac{1}{6}n(n+1)(2n+1).$$

applying the **PMI**

**Proof** Let

$$S = \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{j=1}^n j^2 = \frac{1}{6}n(n+1)(2n+1) \right\}.$$

- Since

$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^1 j^2 = \frac{1}{6}1 \cdot (1+1) \cdot (2 \cdot 1 + 1) = 1$$

is true,

$$1 \in S.$$

- Moreover, if  $k \in S$ , then

$$\sum_{j=1}^k j^2 = \frac{1}{6}k(k+1)(2k+1)$$

- Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} j^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^k j^2 + (k+1)^2 = \frac{1}{6}k(k+1)(2k+1) + (k+1)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{6}(k(2k+1) + 6(k+1))(k+1) \\ &= \frac{1}{6}(2k^2 + 7k + 6)(k+1) \\ &= \frac{1}{6}(k+1)(k+2)(2k+3), \end{aligned}$$

thus

$$(k+1) \in S,$$

so by **PMI**,

$$S = \mathbb{N}.$$

- That is, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n j^2 = \frac{1}{6}n(n+1)(2n+1).$$

### Integers

- The set of integers is defined by

$$\mathbb{Z} = \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\}$$

**Proposition** Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$  and assume that  $0 \in S$  and

$$(k+1), (k-1) \in S$$

whenever  $k \in S$ , then

$$S = \mathbb{Z}.$$

### Ordered Fields

- A set  $\mathbb{F}$  with two binary operations

$$\begin{aligned} + &: \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}, \\ \cdot &: \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \end{aligned}$$

(called *addition* and *multiplication*) and relation  $\leq$  (called order) is called an *ordered field*, if the following properties are satisfied:

- **Axioms of a commutative field**

a) *Addition axioms*: Addition  $+: \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  (we write  $+(a, b) = a + b$ ) satisfies properties:

a1) For all  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z$$

a2) For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x + y = y + x$$

a3) There is  $0 \in \mathbb{F}$ , such that, for all  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x + 0 = x$$

a4) For each  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ , there is  $-x \in \mathbb{F}$ , such that

$$x + (-x) = 0$$

b) *Multiplication axioms*: Multiplication  $\cdot : \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  (we write  $\cdot(a, b) = a \cdot b$ ) satisfies properties:

b1) For all  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x \cdot (y \cdot z) = (x \cdot y) \cdot z$$

b2) For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x \cdot y = y \cdot x$$

b3) There is  $1 \in \mathbb{F}$ ,  $1 \neq 0$ , such that, for all  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x \cdot 1 = x$$

b4) For each  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ ,  $x \neq 0$ , there is  $x^{-1} \in \mathbb{F}$ , such that

$$x \cdot x^{-1} = 1$$

c) *Distributivity Law*

c1) For all  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$(x + y) \cdot z = x \cdot z + y \cdot z$$

• **Order Axioms**: The order  $\leq$  on  $\mathbb{F}$  satisfies properties:

d1) For all  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x \leq x$$

d2) For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$ , if  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq x$  then

$$x = y$$

d3) For all  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}$ , if  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq z$  then

$$x \leq z$$

d4) For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x \leq y \text{ or } y \leq x$$

d5) For all  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}$ , if  $x \leq y$  then

$$x + z \leq y + z$$

d6) For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$ , if  $0 \leq x$  and  $0 \leq y$ , then

$$0 \leq xy$$

• Define the relation  $<$  on  $\mathbb{F}$ , by setting

$$x < y \text{ iff } x \leq y \text{ and } x \neq y.$$

- Analogously, define

$$x \geq y \text{ iff } y \leq x$$

and

$$x > y \text{ iff } y < x.$$

**Proposition** For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$ ,  $x < y$  or  $x = y$  or  $x > y$ .

**Proof** Exercise.

**Proposition** For all  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}$ , the following properties hold:

1. **i)** If for all  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x + y = x \text{ then } y = 0;$$

- ii)** If for all  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x \cdot y = x \text{ then } y = 1.$$

- **Proof** We prove **i)** and **ii)** is left as an exercise.

- By *a3)*

$$y = 0 + y$$

- By our assumption,

$$0 + y = 0,$$

so by *a2)*

$$\begin{aligned} y &= 0 + y \\ &= y + 0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

- Therefore,

$$y = 0.$$

**Remark** In particular, we showed that 0 is unique neutral element of  $\mathbb{F}$  for the addition.

2. **i)** If  $x + y = 0$ , then  $y = -x$ ;

- ii)** If  $x \cdot y = 1$  then  $y = x^{-1}$ .

- **Proof** We prove **i)** and **ii)** is left as an exercise.

- We see that by properties *a3)* and *a4)* that

$$\begin{aligned} y &= 0 + y = (-x + x) + y \\ &= -x + (x + y) \end{aligned}$$

- By assumption  $x + y = 0$  and by *a3)*, so

$$\begin{aligned} y &= 0 + y = (-x + x) + y \\ &= -x + (x + y) = -x + 0 \\ &= -x \end{aligned}$$

so  $y = -x$ .

3. **i)** If  $x + y = x + z$  then  $y = z$ ;

- ii)** If  $x + z \leq y + z$ , then  $x \leq y$ .

• **Proof** We prove i) and ii) is left as an exercise.

• Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} y &= 0 + y = (-x + x) + y \\ &= -x + (x + y) = -x + (x + z) \\ &= (-x + x) + z = 0 + z = z, \end{aligned}$$

so  $y = z$ .

4. i) If  $xy = xz$  and  $x \neq 0$ , then  $y = z$ ;

ii) If  $xy \leq xz$  and  $x > 0$  then  $y \leq z$ .

5.  $0 \cdot x = 0$

• **Proof** Indeed, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \cdot x &= (0 + 0) \cdot x \\ &= 0 \cdot x + 0 \cdot x \end{aligned}$$

• Since

$$0 \cdot x + 0 = 0 \cdot x + 0 \cdot x$$

by the previous property

$$0 \cdot x = 0.$$

6. If  $x \cdot y = 0$  then  $x = 0$  or  $y = 0$

7.  $-(-x) = x$

8.  $-x = (-1) \cdot x$

9. If  $x \neq 0$ , then  $x^{-1} \neq 0$  and  $(x^{-1})^{-1} = x$ .

10. If  $x \neq 0$  and  $y \neq 0$ , then  $xy \neq 0$  and  $(xy)^{-1} = x^{-1}y^{-1}$

11. If  $x \leq 0$  then  $0 \leq -x$

12.  $0 < 1$

13. If  $x \leq y$  then  $-y \leq -x$

14.  $-xy = (-x) \cdot y = x \cdot (-y)$

15. i) If  $x \leq y$  and  $0 \leq z$ , then  $xz \leq yz$ ;

ii) If  $x \leq y$  and  $z \leq 0$ , then  $yz \leq xz$

16. i) If  $x \leq 0$  and  $y \leq 0$  then  $xy \geq 0$ ;

ii) If  $x \leq 0$  and  $y \geq 0$ , then  $xy \leq 0$

17. For all  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ ,  $x^2 \geq 0$

• **Exercise** Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an ordered field.

Show that, for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$

1.  $xy \leq \frac{1}{2}(x^2 + y^2)$

2.  $x^2 - y^2 = (x - y)(x + y)$

3. If  $0 \leq x < y$  then  $x^2 < y^2$

- For  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ , define

$$|x| = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ -x & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases}$$

and we call it the *absolute value of  $x$* .

**Proposition** Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$ , then

1.  $|x| \geq 0$

2.  $|x| = 0$  iff  $x = 0$

3.  $|xy| = |x| \cdot |y|$

4.  $x \leq |x|$

5.  $|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$

6.  $||x| - |y|| \leq |x - y|$

**Proof.** For 1):

- Let  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ , then

$$x < 0 \text{ or } x = 0 \text{ or } x > 0.$$

- If  $x \geq 0$ , then

$$|x| = x \geq 0.$$

- If  $x < 0$ , then  $-x > 0$ , so

$$|x| = -x > 0.$$

- Therefore, for all  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ ,  $|x| \geq 0$ .

This finishes our proof. ■

**Proof.** For 2):

- If  $x = 0$ , then  $x \geq 0$ , so

$$|0| = 0.$$

- Conversely, suppose that  $x \neq 0$ .

- Then either

$$x < 0 \text{ or } x > 0.$$

- Therefore, if  $x < 0$ ,

$$|x| = -x > 0$$

and if  $x > 0$ ,

$$|x| = x > 0$$

- Hence,

$$|x| > 0.$$

- We showed that:  
if  $x \neq 0$  then  $|x| \neq 0$ ,  
so we showed the *contrapositive*, i.e.  
if  $|x| = 0$  then  $x = 0$ .

This finishes our proof. ■

**Proof.** For 3):

- If  $x, y \geq 0$ , then

$$xy \geq 0,$$

so

$$|xy| = xy = |x| |y|.$$

- If  $x > 0$  and  $y < 0$ , then

$$xy < 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |xy| &= -xy \\ &= (-1) xy \\ &= x ((-1) y) \\ &= x (-y) = |x| |y|. \end{aligned}$$

- Analogously, if  $x < 0$  and  $y > 0$ .
- If  $x = 0$  or  $y = 0$ , then

$$xy = 0$$

so  $|xy| = 0$ .

- Therefore,

$$|x| |y| = 0,$$

so

$$|xy| = |x| |y|.$$

- Finally, if  $x < 0$  and  $y < 0$ , then

$$xy > 0,$$

so

$$|xy| = xy = (-x)(-y) = |x| |y|$$

This finishes our proof. ■

**Proof.** For 4):

- Indeed, if  $x \geq 0$ , then

$$|x| = x, \text{ so } x \leq |x|.$$

- If  $x < 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} |x| &= -x > 0, \text{ so } x < 0 < -x = |x|, \text{ thus} \\ x &< |x|. \end{aligned}$$



- Therefore, for all  $x$ ,

$$x \leq |x|.$$

This finishes our proof. ■

**Proof.** For 5):

- We first show that, for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$|x| \leq y \text{ iff } -y \leq x \leq y.$$

- We assume that  $|x| \leq y$ .

- Since  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x < 0 \text{ or } x = 0 \text{ or } 0 \leq x.$$

- Assume that  $x < 0$ , then

$$-x = |x| \leq y,$$

so  $-y \leq x$ , thus

$$-y \leq x \leq |x| \leq y,$$

- Thus

$$-y \leq x \leq y.$$

- If  $x \geq 0$ , then

$$0 \leq x = |x| \leq y,$$

so  $0 \leq y$ .

- Hence  $-y \leq 0$  and

$$-y \leq 0 \leq x = |x| \leq y,$$

so

$$-y \leq x \leq y.$$

- Assume that

$$-y \leq x \leq y.$$

- Since  $x \in \mathbb{F}$

$$x < 0 \text{ or } x = 0 \text{ or } x > 0.$$

- If  $x \geq 0$ , then

$$|x| = x \leq y,$$

so

$$|x| \leq y.$$

- If  $x < 0$ , then

$$-x > 0.$$

- Since  $-y \leq x$ ,

$$-x \leq y,$$

and

$$|x| = -x \leq y.$$

- This shows that

$$|x| \leq y \text{ iff } -y \leq x \leq y.$$

- We now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \underbrace{|x+y|}_{|z|} &\leq \underbrace{|x|+|y|}_a \\ &\text{iff} \\ -\left(\underbrace{|x|+|y|}_a\right) &\leq \underbrace{x+y}_z \leq \left(\underbrace{|x|+|y|}_a\right). \end{aligned}$$

- Since, for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} -|x| &\leq x \leq |x| \text{ and} \\ -|y| &\leq y \leq |y| \end{aligned}$$

since  $-|x| \leq x$  then

$$-|x| - |y| \leq x - |y| \leq x + y \leq |x| + |y|$$

so

$$-(|x| + |y|) \leq x + y \leq |x| + |y|.$$

This finishes our proof. ■

**Proof.** For 6):

- Since

$$\begin{aligned} |x| &= |x - y + y| \\ &\leq |x - y| + |y|, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$|x| - |y| \leq |x - y|$$

- Since

$$\begin{aligned} |y| &= |y - x + x| \\ &\leq |x - y| + |x|, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} -(|x| - |y|) &\leq |x - y|, \text{ so} \\ -|x - y| &\leq |x| - |y| \end{aligned}$$

- Therefore,

$$-|x - y| \leq |x| - |y| \leq |x - y|$$

- Hence

$$||x| - |y|| \leq |x - y|.$$

This finishes our proof. ■

- **Field of Rational Numbers**

- The set of all *rational numbers* is defined as

$$\mathbb{Q} = \left\{ \frac{m}{n} : n, m \in \mathbb{Z}, n \neq 0 \right\}.$$

- One checks that  $\mathbb{Q}$  with  $+$  and  $\cdot$  defined in a familiar way satisfies all properties of an ordered field.
- One of the main property of  $\mathbb{Q}$  is:

**Proposition**  $\mathbb{Q}$  is *dense in itself*. That is,

for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}$ , if  $x < y$ , then there is  $z \in \mathbb{Q}$ , such that

$$x < z < y.$$

**Proof.** Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}$ , and assume that  $x < y$ .

- Define

$$z = \frac{1}{2}(x + y).$$

- Since  $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,

$$x + y \in \mathbb{Q}$$

and since  $\frac{1}{2} \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,

$$z = \frac{1}{2}(x + y) \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

- We show that

$$x < z < y.$$

- We see that

$$\begin{aligned} x &< y, \text{ so } x + x < y + x \\ x &< y, \text{ so } x + y < y + y \\ y + x &= x + y, \\ 2x &= x + x < x + y < y + y = 2y, \text{ so} \\ 2x &< x + y < 2y. \end{aligned}$$

- Since  $\frac{1}{2} > 0$ ,

$$\frac{2x}{2} < \frac{1}{2}(x + y) < \frac{2y}{2}$$

- Consequently,

$$x < z < y.$$

This finishes our proof. ■

- **Proposition**  $\mathbb{Q}$  is countable.

**Proof.** Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and define

$$A_n = \left\{ \frac{m}{n} : m \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \subset \mathbb{Q}.$$

- We see that

$$\mathbb{Q} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n.$$

- Since each  $A_n$  is countable,  
by theorem  $\mathbb{Q}$  is countable as a countable union of countable sets.

This finishes our proof. ■

- **Proposition** (*Archimedean Property*) If  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ , then there is  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , such that

$$x < n.$$

**Proof.** Let  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

- If  $x \leq 0$ , then take  $n = 1 \in \mathbb{Z}$  and

$$x \leq 0 < 1 = n,$$

- Hence, there is  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , such that

$$x < n.$$

- Assume that  $x > 0$ .

- If  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then

$$n = x + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}$$

and

$$x = x + 0 < x + 1 = n.$$

- Therefore, assume that  $x \notin \mathbb{Z}$ .
- Since  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $x = \frac{p}{q}$ , where  $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $p \geq 1$  and  $q > 1$ .
- Let  $n = 2p$ .
- Since  $1 < 2$ ,

$$p < 2p$$

and since

$$1 < q,$$

multiplying by  $2p$  gives

$$2p < 2pq = nq.$$

- Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} p &< 2p < nq, \text{ so} \\ p &< nq. \end{aligned}$$

- Since  $q > 1 > 0$ , consequently

$$\frac{p}{q} < \frac{nq}{q} = n.$$

- We showed that, for

$$x = \frac{p}{q},$$

there is an integer  $n$ , such that

$$x < n.$$

This finishes our proof. ■

- **Proposition** Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an order field.

The following conditions are equivalent:

1. If  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ , then there is  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , such that

$$x < n.$$

2. If  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $0 < x < y$  then there is an integer  $n$ , such that

$$y < nx$$

3. If  $x \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $x > 0$ , then there is an integer  $n > 0$ , such that

$$0 < \frac{1}{n} < x.$$

**Proof.** We **show that** 1)  $\rightarrow$  2).

- Let

$$0 < x < y$$

- Since  $x > 0$ , in particular  $x \neq 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{x} \in \mathbb{F}.$$

- Consider  $\frac{y}{x} \in \mathbb{F}$ .

- By 1), there is  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , such that

$$\frac{y}{x} < n$$

- Since  $x > 0$ ,

$$y < nx.$$

- We **show that** 2)  $\rightarrow$  3).

Assume that  $x > 0$ .

- If  $0 < x < 1$ , then by 2), there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that

$$1 < nx,$$

so

$$0 < \frac{1}{n} < x.$$

- If  $x \geq 1$ , take  $n > 1$ .

- Then  $\frac{1}{n} < 1 \leq x$ , so

$$0 < \frac{1}{n} < x.$$

- Finally, we **show that** 3)  $\rightarrow$  1).

Let  $x \in \mathbb{F}$  and assume that  $x \leq 0$ .

- Since  $0 < 1$  in  $\mathbb{F}$ ,

$$x \leq 0 < 1,$$

we take  $n = 1$ .

- Assume that  $x > 0$ .

- Thus

$$0 < \frac{1}{x},$$

so there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that

$$0 < \frac{1}{n} < \frac{1}{x},$$

- Hence

$$x < n.$$

This finishes our proof. ■

- **Completeness**

**Definition** Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an ordered field and  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ .

A number  $M \in \mathbb{F}$  is called *an upper bound for  $S$*  if for all  $x \in S$ ,

$$x \leq M.$$

A number  $\beta \in \mathbb{F}$  is called *the least upper bound* (or *supremum*) for  $S$  if

- i)  $\beta$  is an upper bound of  $S$ , and
- ii) if  $\beta'$  is an upper bound for  $S$ , then

$$\beta \leq \beta'.$$

- The least upper bound for  $S$  (if exists) is denoted by  $\sup S$ , i.e.

$$\beta = \sup S.$$

- If  $S$  is not bounded above, then we say that  $\sup S$  is infinite and we write

$$\sup S = +\infty.$$

- We also note that if  $S = \emptyset$ , then it makes sense to define

$$\sup S = -\infty.$$

- Analogously, we define a *lower bound of  $S$*  and *the greatest lower bound* denoted by  $\inf S$  provided it exists.

- By conventions

$$\inf S = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } S \text{ is not bounded below} \\ +\infty & \text{if } S = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

**Proposition** Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ , then

$$\beta = \sup S$$

iff

- i)  $\beta$  is an upper bound of  $S$ , i.e. for all  $x \in S$ ,

$$x \leq \beta,$$

and

- ii)  $\beta - \epsilon$  is not an upper bound of  $S$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$

(that is, no number smaller than  $\beta$  is an upper bound of  $S$ ), i.e.

For all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $x \in S$ , such that,

$$\beta - \epsilon < x.$$

**Proof.** We show that

$$\beta = \sup S$$

iff  $\beta$  satisfies both **i)** and **ii)**.

- Assume that  $\beta = \sup S$ .

- Since for all  $x \in S$ ,

$$x \leq \beta,$$

$\beta$  is an upper bound for  $S$ , so **i)** holds.

- Let  $\epsilon > 0$ .

- Since  $\beta$  is the least upper bound,

$$\beta - \epsilon < \beta$$

is not an upper bound for  $S$ , so there is

$$x \in S,$$

such that

$$\beta - \epsilon$$

so **ii)** also holds.

- Assume that  $\beta$  satisfies both **i)** and **ii)**.

- Since  $\beta$  satisfies **i)**, for all  $x \in S$ ,

$$x \leq \beta.$$

- Therefore,  $\beta$  is an upper bound of  $S$ .

- We need to show that  $\beta$  is the least upper bound of  $S$ .

- Suppose that  $\beta'$  is an upper bound of  $S$  and assume that

$$\beta' < \beta.$$

- Let  $\epsilon = (\beta - \beta') > 0$ .

- By **ii)** there is  $x \in S$ , such that

$$\beta - \epsilon < x.$$

- Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta' &= \beta - (\beta - \beta') \\ &= \beta - \epsilon \\ &< x \end{aligned}$$

so  $\beta'$  is not an upper bound of  $S$ . Contradiction.

- It follows that

$$\beta \leq \beta'.$$

- Therefore,

$$\beta = \sup S.$$

This finishes our proof. ■

- **The least upper bound property (LUB)**

Every *nonempty and bounded above subset*  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  has the least upper bound, that is,

There is  $\beta \in \mathbb{F}$ , such that

$$\beta = \sup S.$$

**Definition** An ordered field  $\mathbb{F}$  is called *complete* if it satisfies the least upper bound property.

**Proposition** Every complete ordered field  $\mathbb{F}$  is Archimedean.

**Proof.** We prove this statement by reductio ad impossibile.

- Assume that, there is

$$\alpha \in \mathbb{F},$$

such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$n \leq \alpha.$$

- Let  $S = \mathbb{N}$ .

- Since  $1 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $S \neq \emptyset$ .

- Since, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$n \leq \alpha,$$

$S$  is bounded.

- Since  $\mathbb{F}$  is complete,  $S$  has the least upper bound and let

$$\beta = \sup S \in \mathbb{F}.$$

- Take  $\epsilon = 1$ .

- By Proposition, there is

$$n \in S,$$

such that,

$$\beta - \epsilon = \beta - 1 < n.$$

- Since  $\mathbb{F}$  is an ordered field,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= (\beta - 1) + 1 \\ &< n + 1 \end{aligned}$$

- Since  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  satisfies **PMI**,

$$(n + 1) \in \mathbb{N}.$$

- We see that, there is

$$(n + 1) \in S,$$

such that

$$\beta < n + 1$$

- Therefore,  $\beta$  is not an upper bound of  $S$ .

- Contradiction since we assumed that

$$\beta = \sup S.$$



- It follows that:

For every  $x \in \mathbb{F}$ , there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that  $x \leq n$ .

- Therefore,  $\mathbb{F}$  has Archimedean property.

This finishes our proof. ■

- **Theorem** There exists a unique (up to an isomorphism of ordered fields) a complete ordered field called the *field of real numbers* and we denote it by  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**Proof.** See any textbook with a construction of  $\mathbb{R}$ . ■

- **Exercise** Let

$$S = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

Show that  $\inf S = 0 = \epsilon$ .

- We use the following result

Let  $S \subseteq F$  be nonempty and bounded below.

Then  $\alpha = \inf S$  iff

i)  $\forall x \in S, \alpha \leq x$ , and

ii)  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists x \in S \ni x < \alpha + \epsilon$ .

- Since  $n > 0$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\frac{1}{n} > 0.$$

- It follows that

$$0 \leq x, \text{ for all } x \in S, \text{ so } i) \text{ is true.}$$

- Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given.

- Since  $\mathbb{R}$  is complete, as we showed,  $\mathbb{R}$  is Archimedean.

- Since  $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , by the Archimedean property of  $\mathbb{R}$ , there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that

$$\underbrace{x = \frac{1}{n}}_{\in S} < \epsilon = 0 + \epsilon$$

so ii) holds.

- It follows from the proposition that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \inf S \\ &= \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Exercise** Let  $a < b$  and

$$S = (a, b) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a < x < b\}.$$

Show that

$$b = \sup S.$$

- Indeed, for every  $x \in S$ ,

$$x \leq b,$$

so  $b$  is an upper bound of  $S$ .

- We show that  $b$  is the least upper bound for  $S$ , i.e.
- $b - \epsilon$  is not an upper bound of  $S$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .
- Let  $x = \max \left\{ b - \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{a+b}{2} \right\}$ .
- Since  $a < b$

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \frac{a+a}{2} \\ &< \frac{a+b}{2} \\ &< \frac{b+b}{2} \\ &= b, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \in S.$$

- Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} a &< \frac{a+b}{2} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ b - \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{a+b}{2} \right\} \\ &= x \end{aligned}$$

and since

$$b - \frac{\epsilon}{2} < b$$

and

$$\frac{a+b}{2} < b,$$

- We see that

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \max \left\{ b - \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{a+b}{2} \right\} \\ &< b. \end{aligned}$$

- It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} a &< x < b, \text{ so} \\ x &\in S. \end{aligned}$$

- Since

$$\begin{aligned} b - \epsilon &< b - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ b - \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{a+b}{2} \right\} \\ &= x, \end{aligned}$$

- it follows that

$$b - \epsilon < x$$

and since  $x \in S$ ,

$$b - \epsilon$$

is not an upper bound of  $S$ .

- It follows that,
- $b$  is the least upper bound of  $S$ .
- Hence

$$b = \sup S.$$

**Exercise** Let  $a < b$  and  $S = (a, b) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a < x < b\}$ .

Show that

$$a = \inf S.$$

**Exercise** Suppose that  $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ,  $A \neq \emptyset$  and  $B$  is bounded.

Show that

$$\inf B \leq \inf A \leq \sup A \leq \sup B$$