

Week 10 Reflection

Paul Schulze

November 5th, 2024

1 General Results about Limits

Theorem. $\lim_{x \rightarrow h} f(x) = L$ iff $\text{st}(f(\gamma)) = L$ for all $\gamma \simeq h$

Proof. If $\lim_{x \rightarrow h} f(x) = L$, then for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $(\forall x)(|x - h| < \delta \rightarrow |f(x) - L| < \epsilon)$. Transferring this, we notice that $|\gamma - h| < \delta \rightarrow |f(\gamma) - L| < \epsilon$. But $|\gamma - h| < \delta$ for every real $\delta > 0$, and so $|f(\gamma) - L| < \epsilon$ for every real $\epsilon > 0$. Hence $f(\gamma) \simeq L$.

Next, say any $\gamma \simeq h$ satisfies $f(\gamma) \simeq L$ (equivalently, $\text{st}(f(\gamma)) = L$). Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we can take any positive infinitesimal θ and have $(\forall x)(|x - h| < \theta \rightarrow |f(x) - L| < \epsilon)$, since if $|x - h| < \theta$ we have $x \simeq h$ and so $f(x) \simeq L$. Thus, in the hyperreals we have $(\exists \delta > 0)(\forall x)(|x - h| < \delta \rightarrow |f(x) - L| < \epsilon)$, and we can then transfer that statement to the reals. Since this is true for any real $\epsilon > 0$, we find $\lim_{x \rightarrow h} f(x) = L$. \square

2 Integration as Hyperfinite Sums

2.1 Hyperfinite Sums

Definition. An internal set $A = [A_n]$ is *hyperfinite* if A_n is finite for all n .

Since ${}^* \varphi(A)$ iff $[[\varphi(A_n)]] \in \mathcal{F}$, we can transfer a lot of properties of finite sets to hyperfinite ones. In particular, if $\varphi(X)$ for any finite set X , then ${}^* \varphi(A)$ for any hyperfinite set A . For instance, every hyperfinite set has a maximum element by $\varphi(X) = (\exists x \in X)(\forall y \in X)(y \leq x)$.

Definition. If $A = [A_n]$ is hyperfinite and $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define the *hyperfinite sum*

$$\sum_{x \in [A_n]} {}^* f(x) = \left[\sum_{x \in A_n} f(x) \right]$$

Note that $\sum_{x \in A_n} f(x)$ is just the sum of a finite number of real numbers.

2.2 Integration

Now, let $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an integrable function. To take $\int_a^b f(x) dx$, we want to divide $[a, b]$ into infinitely many segments of infinitesimal width, and then add up the area of the rectangles above or below those segments. Hyperfinite sums give us a way to do this.

To divide $[a, b]$ into infinitely many segments of infinitesimal width, we will construct a hyperfinite partition where the segments are of infinitesimal width $dx > 0$. Say $dx = [\langle \Delta x_1, \Delta x_2, \dots \rangle]$. Let $P_n \cup \{b\}$ be partition of $[a, b]$ into segments of width Δx_n (plus a final “remainder” segment of length $\leq \Delta x_n$). So

$$P_n = \left\{ a + k\Delta x_n \mid 0 \leq k < \frac{b-a}{\Delta x_n}, k \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

Let N_n denote $|P_n| = \frac{b-a}{\Delta x_n}$, and let r_n denote the length of the “remainder” segment $r_n = b - (a + k(N_n - 1))$. Notice $r_n \leq \Delta x_n$. Then, the left Riemann sum of f on $[a, b]$ with partition $P_n \cup \{b\}$ is

$$S_a^b(f, \Delta x_n) = \sum_{x \in P_n} f(x) \Delta x_n - f(a + k(N_n - 1))(\Delta x_n - r_n)$$

Intuitively, we would hope that the integral $\int_a^b f(x)dx$ is the sum of the infinitely many rectangles of infinitesimal width

$$\sum_{x \in P} f(x)dx = \left[\sum_{x \in P_n} f(x)\Delta x_n \right]$$

as well as the extension

$$^*S_a^b(f, dx) := \left[\sum_{x \in P_n} f(x)\Delta x_n - f(a + k(N_n - 1))(\Delta x_n - r_n) \right]$$

The difference between these two hyperreals is $[f(a + k(N_n - 1))(\Delta x_n - r_n)] = [f(a + k(N_n - 1))][(\Delta x_n - r_n)]$. Since f is integrable on $[a, b]$, it is bounded, and so $[f(a + k(N_n - 1))]$ is bounded. Meanwhile, $[\Delta x_n]$ and $[r_n]$ are infinitesimal, so $[\Delta x_n - r_n] = [\Delta x_n] - [r_n]$ is infinitesimal. Since the product of an infinitesimal and a bounded number is infinitesimal, we get that $[f(a + k(N_n - 1))][(\Delta x_n - r_n)]$ is infinitesimal, so

$$^*S_a^b(f, dx) \simeq \sum_{x \in P} f(x)dx$$

and so

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx = \text{st} \left(^*S_a^b(f, dx) \right) = \text{st} \left(\sum_{x \in P} f(x)dx \right)$$

In our hyperfinite sum, we neglected to account for the last interval perhaps being shorter than dx , but as we see here the difference it would make is infinitesimal and so can safely be ignored.

2.3 Improper Integrals

Say $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is integrable on every interval $[a, c]$ for $a < c < b$. Standardly, we take the *improper integral* (where defined) to be

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx := \lim_{c \rightarrow b} \int_a^c f(x)dx$$

By an easy modification of the theorem in section 1, we have that

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx = \text{st} \left(\int_a^\gamma f(x)dx \right)$$

Where $b \simeq \gamma < b$ and $\int_a^t f(x)dx$ indicates the extension $^*g(t)$ of $g(t) = \int_a^t f(x)dx$. Similarly, we have

$$\int_a^\infty f(x)dx = \text{st} \left(\int_a^\kappa f(x)dx \right)$$

Where κ is a positive unbounded hyperreal. To be clear, there is no guarantee that these standard parts exist, or that they are the same across all potential γ 's or κ 's—in those cases, the improper integral is undefined.

Example. Say we want to evaluate $\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} dx$.

3 Exponentiation

Let $e_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function $e_n(x) = \sum_{k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}} \frac{x^k}{k!} = 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{2} + \frac{x^3}{3!} + \dots$. We define the internal function $\text{inx} = [e_n]$ by $[e_n]([x_n]) = [e_n(x_n)]$. Note that for any real number x , we have $\text{inx}(x) = [e_n(x)] = [\sum_{k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}} \frac{x^k}{k!}] = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{N}} \frac{x^k}{k!}$, where \mathbf{N} is the hyperfinite set $[\{0, 1\}, \{0, 1, 2\}, \dots]$.

Let $\exp : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be $\exp(x) = \text{st}(\text{inx}(x))$. Then we have its extension $^*\exp([x_n]) = [\text{st}(\text{inx}(x_n))]$. It's worth being careful here: we may be tempted to expand this to $[\text{st}([e_n](x_n))] = [\text{st}([e_n(x_n)])]$, but this is mixing indices. The proper expansion, using $[x_k]_k$ to denote $[\langle x_1, x_2, \dots \rangle]$, is $^*\exp([x_n]_n) = [\text{st}([e_k(x_n)]_k)]_n$, by which we mean $[\text{st}([e_k(\langle x_n, x_n, x_n, \dots \rangle)]_k)]_n$.

3.1 Derivative of exp

Let $\delta = [\delta_n]$ be a nonzero infinitesimal. We want to evaluate

$$\frac{d}{dx} \exp(x) = \text{st} \left(\frac{{}^*\exp(x + \delta) - \exp(x)}{\delta} \right)$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{{}^*\exp(x + \delta) - \exp(x)}{\delta} &= \frac{[\exp(x + \delta_n)] - [\exp(x)]}{[\delta_n]} \\ &= \left[\frac{\exp(x + \delta_n) - \exp(x)}{\delta_n} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Peeling back another layer,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\exp(x + \delta_n) - \exp(x)}{\delta_n} &\simeq \frac{\text{inx}(x + \delta_n) - \text{inx}(x)}{\delta_n} \\ &= \frac{[e_k(x + \delta_n)]_k - [e_k(x)]_k}{\delta_n} \\ &= \left[\frac{e_k(x + \delta_n) - e_k(x)}{\delta_n} \right]_k \end{aligned}$$

Now, we know

$$\begin{aligned} e_k(x + \delta_n) &= 1 + x + \delta_n + \frac{x^2 + 2x\delta_n + \delta_n^2}{2} + \frac{x^3 + 3x^2\delta_n + \delta_n^2 \cdot (\dots)}{3 \cdot 2!} + \frac{x^4 + 4x^3\delta_n + \delta_n^2 \cdot (\dots)}{4 \cdot 3!} \\ &= e_k(x) + \delta_n e_{k-1}(x) + \delta_n^2 \cdot (\dots) \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\frac{e_k(x + \delta_n) - e_k(x)}{\delta_n} = e_{k-1}(x) + \delta_n \cdot (\dots)$$

And so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\exp(x + \delta_n) - \exp(x)}{\delta_n} &\simeq \left[\frac{e_k(x + \delta_n) - e_k(x)}{\delta_n} \right]_k \\ &= [e_{k-1}(x)]_k + \delta_n \cdot [(\dots)]_k \end{aligned}$$

We will assume, for now, that $[e_{k-1}(x)] \simeq \text{inx}(x)$. Then we have

$$\frac{\exp(x + \delta_n) - \exp(x)}{\delta_n} \simeq \text{inx}(x) + \delta_n \cdot R_n$$

But the left side of this is real, and so must be equal to the standard part of the right side

$$\frac{\exp(x + \delta_n) - \exp(x)}{\delta_n} = \text{st}(\text{inx}(x) + \delta_n \cdot R_n) = \text{st}(\text{inx}(x)) + \text{st}(\delta_n \cdot R_n) = \exp(x) + \text{st}(\delta_n R_n)$$

And after all that, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{{}^*\exp(x + \delta) - \exp(x)}{\delta} &= \left[\frac{\exp(x + \delta_n) - \exp(x)}{\delta_n} \right] \\ &= [\exp(x) + \delta_n \text{st}(R_n)] = \exp(x) + [\delta_n] \text{st}(R_n) \end{aligned}$$

And so, assuming for now that $[\delta_n \text{st}(R_n)]$ is infinitesimal, we finally have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \exp(x) &= \text{st} \left(\frac{{}^*\exp(x + \delta) - \exp(x)}{\delta} \right) \\ &= \text{st}(\exp(x) + [\delta_n] \text{st}(R)) \\ &= \exp(x) \end{aligned}$$

3.2 Lemmas for 3.1

Lemma. $[e_{n-1}(x)] \simeq \text{inx}(x)$

Proof. We want to show that $\text{inx}(x) - [e_{n-1}(x)] \simeq 0$, i.e. that $[e_n(x) - e_{n-1}(x)] \simeq 0$, i.e. that $[\frac{x^n}{n!}] \simeq 0$, which is true for any choice of x by the same reasoning that shows $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x^n}{n!} = 0$. \square

Lemma. Given an infinitesimal $\delta = [\delta_n]$, define $R_n = [(e_k(x + \delta_n) - e_k(x) - \delta_n e_{k-1}(x))/\delta_n]_k$. Show that $[\text{st}(R_n)]_n$ is infinitesimal.

We have changed notation here slightly, so that what we are now calling R_n we were before calling $\delta_n R_n$.

Proof. Let $R_n = [R_n^k]_k$ (that's an upper index, not an exponent). We'll assume that both x and δ_n are positive—if not, we can just as easily replace R_n^k by $|R_n^k|$, x by $|x|$, and δ_n by $|\delta_n|$ and still get a proof that $[|R_n|]$ is infinitesimal, which will suffice. From 3.1, we have

$$R_n^k = \frac{\delta_n}{2} + \frac{3x\delta_n + \delta_n^2}{3!} + \frac{6x^2\delta_n + 4x\delta_n^2 + \delta_n^3}{4!} + \cdots + \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{q=0}^{k-2} \binom{k}{q} x^q \delta_n^{(k-1-q)}$$

In index notation,

$$\begin{aligned} R_n^k &= \sum_{i=2}^k \sum_{q=0}^{i-2} \binom{i}{q} \frac{x^q \delta_n^{(i-1-q)}}{i!} \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^k \sum_{q=0}^{i-2} \frac{x^q \delta_n^{(i-1-q)}}{(i-q)!q!} \\ &= \delta_n \sum_{i=2}^k \sum_{q=0}^{i-2} \frac{x^q \delta_n^{(i-2-q)}}{(i-q)!q!} \\ &= \delta_n \sum_{q=0}^{k-2} \sum_{i=q+2}^k \frac{x^q \delta_n^{(i-2-q)}}{(i-q)!q!} \\ &\leq \delta_n \sum_{q=0}^{k-2} \sum_{p=0}^{k-2-q} \frac{x^q \delta_n^p}{2q!} \\ &\leq \delta_n \sum_{q=0}^{k-2} \frac{x^q}{2q!(1-\delta_n)} = \frac{\delta_n}{(1-\delta_n)} \sum_{q=0}^{k-2} \frac{x^q}{2q!} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the geometric series $\sum_{p=0}^{k-2-q} a \delta_n^p \leq \frac{a}{1-\delta_n}$, a fact I am using from Calc II. We know $\sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^q}{2q!}$ converges in the standard definition by the ratio test (also Calc II), and so we know there is some upper bound B such that $\sum_{q=0}^{k-2} \frac{x^q}{2q!} < B$ for all k .

Now, take any positive real number r . $\delta = [\delta_n]$ is infinitesimal, so $\frac{\delta}{1-\delta} = [\frac{\delta_n}{1-\delta_n}]$ is too. So $[\frac{\delta_n}{1-\delta_n}] < r/B$, and so $\frac{\delta_n}{1-\delta_n} < r/B$ for \mathcal{F} -almost all n . When $\frac{\delta_n}{1-\delta_n} < r/B$, we have $R_n^k \leq \frac{\delta_n}{1-\delta_n} \cdot B \leq \frac{r}{B} \cdot B = r$ for all k , and so $[R_n^k]_k \leq r$.

So, given any positive real number r , we know that for \mathcal{F} -almost all n , we have $[R_n^k]_k \leq r$, so $\text{st}(R_n) \leq r$. So for any positive real number r , we have $[\text{st}(R_n)]_n \leq r$, and hence $[\text{st}(R_n)]_n$ is infinitesimal. \square

How did this happen. I thought this would be easy. I guess I have to talk about geometric series and the ratio test next week. I don't even know if there is a nonstandard proof of the ratio test.

4 Notes & Goals

4.1 Notes

This wasn't supposed to happen. I spend so much time on exponentiation. It was supposed to be a quick detour.

Anyways, unless I've made a critical error and it's all nonsense this is definitely going in, if only because it's all original work. Defining \exp in terms of hyperfinite summation is a cool idea, I think. I do still have to prove that

that...is bounded, and hence has a standard part, for all real inputs. Actaully, if I do that properly then I won't have to bring it up in the middle of the lemma.

I also spent a lot of time this week worrying about the “remainder” section in integration, before I realized that I *can* assume that if f is integrable on $[a, b]$ it is bounded. I forgot that improper integrals weren't real integrals. Whoops.

4.2 Goals

- *Actually for real* sit down and list everything that's going in the thesis.
- Figure out if I can prove the properties of geometric series and the ratio test nonstandardly.
- Read Chapters 13.14—14 (pp. 176-189) in Goldblatt. This is almost certainly not going to be concluded, but dang it, I wanna make sure I've read it by the end of the semester anyways.

Things I'm Looking At

- [1] Robert Goldblatt. *Lectures on the Hyperreals*. Vol. 188. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. New York, NY: Springer, 1998. ISBN: 978-1-4612-6841-3 978-1-4612-0615-6. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4612-0615-6. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4612-0615-6> (visited on 09/25/2024).