

Existence of Real field:-

There exists an ordered field \mathbb{R} which has LUB property & it contains \mathbb{Q} (as sub-field).

Theorem:-

(a) If $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x > 0$, \exists a true integer 'n' s.t. $nx > y$ that is called Archimedean property.

Lecture-03

proof:-

let $A = \{nx : n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \wedge x \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}\}$

suppose that given statement \square

false i.e

$$nx \leq y$$

$\Rightarrow y$ is an upper bound of A $\left(\begin{array}{l} x \leq \beta \\ x \in E \\ B \in S \\ B \supseteq UB \end{array} \right)$

Since we are dealing with

the set of reals, therefore it has the LUB property.

$$\text{let } \alpha = \sup A$$

$$\because \alpha > 0 \Rightarrow -\alpha < 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \alpha - \alpha < \alpha + 0$$

$\alpha - \alpha < \alpha$ (if $\alpha = \sup A$. Then any element less than α is not upper bound). So

$\Rightarrow \alpha - \alpha$ is not upper bound of A .

$\Rightarrow \alpha - \alpha < mx$ where $mx \in A$ for some true integer m .

$$\Rightarrow \alpha - \alpha + \alpha < mx + \alpha$$

$\Rightarrow \alpha < (m+1)x$ where $(m+1)$

is integer so $(m+1)x \in A$

so which is impossible b/c α
is LUB of A i.e. $\alpha = \sup A$.

so our contradiction is wrong.
4 given statement is right.

b) Given any number $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$
~~is~~ satisfying $n > x$

(c)

Given any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $y > 0$, $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$,
s.t. $0 < \frac{1}{n} < y$

(d)

Given any real no $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\exists m \in \mathbb{Z}$,
s.t. $m-1 \leq x < m$

Density of \mathbb{Q} in \mathbb{R}

If $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x < y$ then $\exists p \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t.
 $x < p < y$, i.e. b/w any two
real, there is a rational of \mathbb{Q}
is dense in \mathbb{R} .

Proof:-

$\therefore x < y$ then we can write

$$\Rightarrow x - y < 0 \Rightarrow y - x > 0$$

Now by using (c) ; as

$$y - x > 0 \text{ s.t. } \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ s.t. } \frac{1}{n} < (y - x) \text{ or}$$

$$n > \frac{1}{y - x}$$

$$\Rightarrow n(y - x) > 1$$

$$\Rightarrow ny - nx > 1$$

$$\Rightarrow ny > 1 + nx \text{ --- (1)}$$

Now by (d), ; as $x \in \mathbb{R}, x > 0 \exists m \in \mathbb{Z}$
s.t. $m - 1 \leq x < m$

Here as $n > 0, x > 0, nx > 0$, so

$$\Rightarrow m - 1 \leq nx < m$$

$$\Rightarrow nx < m \text{ --- (2) } \leftarrow \text{from (1)}$$

$$m - 1 \leq nx < m$$

$$\Rightarrow m \leq 1 + nx \text{ --- (3)}$$

from (1) & (3)

$$\Rightarrow m \leq 1 + nx < ny$$

$$\Rightarrow m < ny \text{ --- (4) } \text{ so from (2) & (4)}$$

$$\Rightarrow nx < m < ny$$

$$\Rightarrow x < \frac{m}{n} < y \Rightarrow x < p < y.$$

proved.

H.W \Rightarrow b/w any two reals, there exist irrational i.e.

$$x < y$$

Hint:

(i) if we divide any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ by any irrational, result is still real.

(ii) prod of rational & irrational is irrational.

Theorem:-

For every real x , there is a set E of rational numbers s.t.

$$x = \sup E.$$

Proof:-

$$\text{let } E = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} : q < x\}$$

Then E is bounded above.

$\therefore E \subset \mathbb{R}$, therefore $\sup E$ exists in \mathbb{R} .

suppose $\sup E = d$

$$\Rightarrow d \leq x$$

if $d < x$ then nothing to prove

$\therefore E \subset \mathbb{R}$
 $\forall x \in E$
 $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$
 $x < \beta$
 $\therefore E \subset \text{set}$
 $\beta \neq \sup$

if $d < x$, \exists a $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t.
 $d < q < x$, which is not

possible b/c as def:-

x is upper bound of E if

there is any upper bound d

then $x \leq d$, so

$$x = \sup E$$

Theorem:-

For every real $x > 0$, every integer
 $n > 0$, there is one and only
one real y s.t. $y^n = x$

proof:-

let $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $0 < y_1 < y_2$

$\Rightarrow (y_1)^n < (y_2)^n$ i.e. there is

at most one $y \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t.

$y^n = x$ (uniqueness of y).

let's suppose that E be the
set of all the reals s.t.
 $t^n < x$, i.e.

$$E = \{t : t \in \mathbb{R}, t^n < x\}$$

$$\because x > 0 \Rightarrow 1+x > x > 0$$

$$\Rightarrow 0 < x < 1+x$$

$$\Rightarrow 0 < \frac{x}{1+x} < \frac{1+x}{1+x} \quad (\div \text{ by } 1+x)$$

$$\Rightarrow 0 < \frac{x}{1+x} < 1$$

Then $t \in \bar{E} \quad t = \frac{x}{1+x}$

$$\Rightarrow 0 < t < 1$$

$$\Rightarrow t^n < t < t^n x$$

$$\Rightarrow t^n < t < x$$

$$\Rightarrow t \in E \quad \& \quad E \text{ is non-empty}$$

Now, consider;

if $t > 1+x$ then $t^n > t > x$, so
 $t \notin E$.

$\Rightarrow 1+x$ is an upper bound of E

($\because x$ is upper bound. Then $1+x$ is upper bound if $x \leq 1+x$).

so E is non-empty & bounded above. Therefore $\sup E$ exists.

TK Take $y = \sup E$

To show that $y = x$, we will show that each of

the inequality $y < x$ & $y > x$ leads to the contradiction.

$t = 0.5$
$t^3 = 0.125$
$t^3 < x$ ($n=3$)

consider

$$b^n - a^n = (b-a)(b^{n-1} + b^{n-2}a + b^{n-3}a^2 + \dots + a^{n-1}), n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$$

which yields inequality (each a

is replaced by b on R.H.S of above)

$$b^n - a^n < (b-a)(nb^{n-1}) \quad \text{--- (1) } \left. \begin{array}{l} a > 0 \\ b > 0 \\ a < b \\ b-a > 0 \end{array} \right\}$$

$$b^n - a^n = (b-a)(b^{n-1} + b^{n-2}a + b^{n-3}a^2 + \dots + a^{n-1})$$

$$b^n - a^n = (b-a)(b^{n-1} + b^{n-1} + b^{n-1} + \dots + b^{n-1})$$

$$b^n - a^n < (b-a)(nb^{n-1}) \quad \text{--- (1) } \quad 0 < a < b$$

Now suppose $y^n < x$

choose h so that $0 < h < 1$

$$y + h < \frac{x - y^n}{n(y+1)^{n-1}}$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \because y^n < x, x > 0 \\ x - y^n > 0 \end{array} \right\}$$

put $a = y$ & $b = y+h$

in (1); as

$$(y+h)^n - y^n < (y+h)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{(1)} \Rightarrow nb^{n-1} > 0 \\ \Rightarrow n(y+1)^{n-1} > 0 \\ \frac{x - y^n}{n(y+1)^{n-1}} > 0 \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (y+h)^n - y^n &< (y+h-y)(n)(y+h)^{n-1} \\ &< nh(y+1)^{n-1} \\ &(\because h < 1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{as } h > 0 \\ \frac{x - y^n}{n(y+1)^{n-1}} > h \end{array} \right\}$$

$\Rightarrow (y+h)^n < x - y + y^n$
 $\Rightarrow (y+h)^n < x$
 $\Rightarrow y+h \in E$
 $\therefore y+h > y$ so it contradicts
 the fact that y is $\sup E$.
 $\Rightarrow y^n < x$ is impossible.

$$h < \frac{x - y^n}{n(y+1)^{n-1}}$$

$$nh(y+1)^{n-1} < x - y^n$$

Now suppose $y^n > x$
 put $k = \frac{y^n - x}{ny^{n-1}}$, okey

if $t \geq y - k \Rightarrow y - k \leq t$
 ① $\Rightarrow b^n - a^n < (b - a)(nb^{n-1})$

Now if $b = y, a = t$

$$\Rightarrow y^n - t^n < (y - t)(ny^{n-1})$$

$$\leq k ny^{n-1}$$

$$= y^n - x$$

$$-t^n < y^n - x - y^n$$

$$\Rightarrow -t^n < -x \Rightarrow t^n > x$$

$$t \in E$$

$\Rightarrow y - k$ is upper bound of E but
 $y - k < y$ which contradict that
 $y = \sup E$, so
 $y^n = x$

$$y - k \leq t$$

$$y - t \leq k$$

$$\therefore h < x - y^n$$

$$k = \frac{y^n - x}{ny^{n-1}}$$

$$nkny^{n-1} = y^n - x$$