

## 5 10-24 MCCORMICK RYAN

RYAN MCCORMICK

### Proposition 8.19.

- (i)  $\forall m \in \mathbb{R}, -(-m) = m.$
- (ii)  $-0 = 0.$

*Proof.*

- (i) As shown in class,  $-m = (-1)m.$   
Therefore  $-(-m) = (-1)(-m).$   
So we need to show that  $(-1)(-m) = m.$   
Adding  $-m$  to both sides,  
 $(-1)(-m) + (-m) = m + (-m)$   
For the right side,  
 $m + (-m) = 0$  (AXIOM 8.4)  
For the left side,  
 $(-1)(-m) + (-m) = (-m)(-1 + 1)$  (AXIOM 8.1(iii))  
 $(-1 + 1) = (1 + -1) = 0$  (AXIOM 8.1(i) and Axiom 8.4)  
So now we have,  
 $(-m)(-1 + 1) = (-m)(0) = 0$  (PROP 8.15)  
Which leaves us with both sides equaling 0,  
 $0 = 0$ , so both sides of the equation are equal to each other. ✓

- (ii) As shown in class,  $-m = (-1)m.$   
Therefore,  $-0 = (-1)0$  and since  $-1$  is the additive inverse of 1,  $-1 \in \mathbb{R}$   
so  $(-1)0 = 0$  by Prop 8.15, so  $-0 = 0.$  □

**Proposition 8.20.** *Given  $m, n \in \mathbb{R}$  there exists one and only one  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $m + x = n.$*

*Proof.* If  $m = n$ , then  $x = 0$  by Axiom 8.2, and 0 is unique by Proposition 8.11.

If  $m \neq n$ , then let there be two equations,  $m + x_1 = n$  and  $m + x_2 = n.$

---

*Date:* October 24, 2016.

For the first equation,  $x_1 = n + (-m)$  by adding  $(-m)$  to both sides, and simplifying the equation using Axiom 8.1(i), Axiom 8.4, and Axiom 8.2.

The same thing applies for the second equation, leaving us with  $x_2 = n + (-m)$ , therefore  $x_1 = x_2$ , so there only exists one  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  that satisfies this equation for a given  $m, n \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

**Project 8.25.** *Think about why division by 0 ought not to be defined. Come up with an argument that will convince a friend.*

*Proof.* Division is defined as  $y/x$  or  $y \cdot x^{-1}$ .

For a number divided by 0,  $x = 0$ .

However, in Axiom 8.5 which defines multiplicative inverses, 0 is not defined to have a multiplicative inverse. Therefore it follows that division by 0 is not defined because you would be multiplying a number by the multiplicative inverse of 0, which is not defined.  $\square$

**Proposition 8.40.**

(i)  $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \iff 1/x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ )

Since  $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , so  $x^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}$  by Axiom 8.5.

Also,  $x \cdot x^{-1} = 1$  by Axiom 8.5 and  $1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  by Prop 8.28.

Therefore since  $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,  $x^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , then  $x^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  by Proposition 8.36.

( $\Leftarrow$ )

$(1/x)^{-1} = x$  because  $(1/x) \cdot (1/x)^{-1} = 1 = (1/x) \cdot x$ . (Axiom 8.5)

Since  $1/x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,  $1/x \in \mathbb{R}$ , so  $(1/x)^{-1} = x \in \mathbb{R}$  by Axiom 8.5.

Also,  $x^{-1} \cdot x = x \cdot x^{-1} = 1$  by Axiom 8.5 and  $1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  by Prop 8.28.

Therefore since  $1/x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,  $(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , then  $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  by Proposition 8.36.  $\square$

**Proposition 8.41.**  $x^2 < x^3 \iff x > 1$

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ )

$x^2 < x^3$

$x \cdot x < x \cdot x \cdot x$

Multiplying by  $x^{-1}$  on both sides,

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

$x \cdot 1 < x \cdot x \cdot 1$  (AXIOM 8.5)

$x < x \cdot x$  (AXIOM 8.3)

Multiplying by  $x^{-1}$  on both sides again,  
 $x \cdot x^{-1} < x \cdot x \cdot x^{-1}$  (AXIOM 8.3)  
 $1 < x \cdot 1$  (AXIOM 8.5)  
 $1 < x$  (AXIOM 8.3)  
 $x > 1$  ✓

( $<=>$ )

$x > 1 \implies 1 < x$

Multiplying by  $x^2$  on both sides,

$1 \cdot x^2 < x \cdot x^2$

$x^2 < x^3$  (AXIOM 8.3) □

**Proposition 8.43.** *Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x < y$ . There exists  $z \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x < z < y$ .*

*Proof.* Assume for contradiction that  $m = \min(\mathbb{R})$ . Then  $m - 1 \in \mathbb{R}$ , but  $m - 1 < m$  because  $m - (m - 1) = 1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . Therefore  $\mathbb{R}$  has no minimum element.

So for  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a  $z < y$  let's say  $z = y - 1$  for example since there is no minimum element. Similarly, there exists an  $x < z$ , let's say  $x = z - 1 = y - 1 - 1$  for example for the same reason that there is always a real number smaller than another real number.

The same thing could've been done in the opposite direction, showing that  $\mathbb{R}$  has no maximum element, and that there exists a  $z > x$  and a  $y > z$  such that  $x < z < y$  in the real numbers due to its properties. □

**Proposition 8.49.** *Let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$  be nonempty. If  $\sup(A) \in A$  then  $\sup(A)$  is the largest element of  $A$ ,  $\sup(A) = \max(A)$ . Conversely, if  $A$  has a largest element then  $\max(A) = \sup(A)$  and  $\sup(A) \in A$ .*

*Proof.*  $b = \sup(A) \in A \implies b \in A$  and

$\sup(A)$  is an upperbound for  $A \implies b$  satisfies  $a \in A \implies a \leq b$

so  $b = \max(A) = \sup(A)$ .

Conversely, if  $b = \max(A)$  then  $a \in A \implies a \leq b$  by definition of a maximum.

Also if  $b'$  is an upperbound for  $A$ ,  $b \leq b'$ , because  $b = \max(A) \implies b \in A$  and  $b \leq b'$  by definition of an upperbound. Therefore  $\max(A) = \sup(A)$  and  $\sup(A) \in A$ . □

**Proposition 8.50.** *Suppose  $A \subset B \subset \mathbb{R}$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  are bounded above. Then  $\sup(A) \leq \sup(B)$ .*

*Proof.*  $\sup(A)$  is a number  $b$  such that  $a \leq b$  for all  $a \in A$ , and if  $b'$  is an upper bound for  $A$ , then  $b \leq b'$ .

$A \subset B \implies$  every  $a \in A$  is an element of  $B$ .

$\sup(B)$  is an upper bound for  $B \implies$  every element  $c \in B$  follows  $c \leq \sup(B)$ .

So  $\sup(B)$  is an upperbound for  $A$  because every element of  $A$  is an element of  $B$ .

Also,  $\sup(A)$  is the least upper bound for  $A$ , so  $\sup(A) \leq \sup(B)$  by the definition of supremum.  $\square$

**Project 8.51.** *For a nonempty set  $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ , one can define the greatest lower bound,  $\inf(B)$  of  $B$ . Give the precise definition for  $\inf(B)$  and prove that it is unique if it exists. Also define  $\min(B)$  and prove the analogue of Proposition 8.49 for greatest lower bounds and minima.*

*Proof.*  $B$  is bounded below if there exists  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $b \in B \implies b \geq a$ .

The  $\inf(B)$  for  $B$  is a lower bound  $c$  such that if  $c'$  is a lower bound,  $c \geq c'$ .

If  $\inf(B)$  exists, let  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  be greatest lower bounds for  $B$ .

$x_1$  is a lower bound and  $x_2$  is a greatest lower bound  $\implies x_2 \geq x_1$ .

$x_2$  is a lower bound and  $x_1$  is a greatest lower bound  $\implies x_1 \geq x_2$ .

Therefore,  $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq x_1$

So  $x_1 = x_2$  by Proposition 8.31 so the greatest lower bound, or  $\inf(B)$  is unique if it exists.

$\min(B)$ : An element  $a \in B$  is the minimum/smallest element ( $\min(B)$ ) of  $B$  if for all  $b \in B$ ,  $b \in B \implies a \leq b$ .

Analogue to Proposition 8.49:

$a = \inf(B) \in B \implies a \in B$ .

$\inf(B)$  is a lowerbound for  $B \implies a$  satisfies  $b \in B \implies a \leq b$ .

So  $a = \min(B)$ .

Conversely, assuming there exists  $a = \min(B) \in B$ .

$b \in B \implies a \leq b$  by definition of a minimum.

$a = \min(B) \implies a \in B \implies a \geq a'$  for a lower bound  $a'$ , by definition of a lower bound. Therefore,  $a = \inf(B) \in B$ . So,  $\min(B) = \inf(B) \in B$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 8.53.** *Every nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  that is bounded below has a greatest lower bound.*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be every nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  that is bounded below and has a greatest lower bound.

Let  $Y$  be the set  $y = -x : x \in X$ . Since  $X$  is bounded below, there exists a lower bound  $z$  such that  $z \leq x$  for all  $x \in X$ . Therefore since  $z \leq x$ , by subtracting  $x$  from both sides and subtracting  $z$  from both sides, we get  $-x \leq -z$ .

So  $y \leq -z$  for all  $y \in Y$ . So  $Y$  is bounded above by  $-z$ , so by Axiom 8.52,  $\sup(Y)$  exists.

Let  $m = \sup(Y)$ . Then we need to show that  $-m = \inf(X)$ .

$-m \leq x, \forall x \in X$  by Axiom 8.52

$y \leq x, \forall x \in X \implies y \leq -m$ .

Since  $m$  is the least upper bound of  $Y$ ,

$-x \leq m, \forall x \in X$  and

$-x \leq -y, \forall x \in X \implies m \leq -y$ .

So  $-x \leq -y, \forall x \in X \implies m \leq -y$ .

Therefore,  $y \leq x, \forall x \in X \implies y \leq -m$ .

So  $-m = \inf(X)$ .  $\square$