

## REAL AND RATIONAL NUMBERS

### 1. AXIOMS FOR THE REAL NUMBERS

The set of real numbers, denoted  $\mathbb{R}$ , has the following properties:

1. **(Operations)** There are binary operations  $+$  (addition) and  $\cdot$  (multiplication), which take pairs of elements of  $\mathbb{R}$  to elements of  $\mathbb{R}$ ,

2. **(Commutativity)** For all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$a + b = b + a \quad \text{and} \quad a \cdot b = b \cdot a.$$

3. **(Associativity)** For all  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$a + (b + c) = (a + b) + c \quad \text{and} \quad a \cdot (b \cdot c) = (a \cdot b) \cdot c.$$

4. **(Distributive Law)** For all  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$a \cdot (b + c) = a \cdot b + a \cdot c.$$

5. **(Identity)** There are elements  $0, 1 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$a + 0 = a \quad \text{and} \quad a \cdot 1 = a.$$

Moreover,  $0 \neq 1$ .

6. **(Additive Inverses)** For each  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists  $-a \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$a + (-a) = 0.$$

We write  $b - a$  to mean  $b + (-a)$ .

7. **(Multiplicative Inverses)** For each  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $a \neq 0$ , there exists  $a^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$a \cdot a^{-1} = 1.$$

We write  $\frac{b}{a}$  to mean  $b \cdot a^{-1}$ .

8. **(Positive Integers)** There is a subset  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  which we call the **positive real numbers**. We write  $a < b$  when  $b - a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .

9. **(Positive Closure)** For all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,

$$a + b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \quad \text{and} \quad a \cdot b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

10. **(Trichotomy)** For every  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , exactly one of the following is true:

- (i)  $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , or
- (ii)  $a = 0$ , or
- (iii)  $-a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .

11. **(Least Upper Bound Property)** Every non-empty subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  which has an upper bound has a *least upper bound* in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

These properties are **axioms**, meaning that we declare them to be true without proof.

## 2. BASIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE AXIOMS

Notice that many of the axioms for  $\mathbb{R}$  also appeared in the list of axioms for the integers  $\mathbb{Z}$ . As a result, many of the basic facts we proved about  $\mathbb{Z}$  are also true for  $\mathbb{R}$ . We collect these below.

**Lemma 1.** *For all  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have the following:*

- (a) (Additive Cancellation Property) *If  $a + b = a + c$ , then  $b = c$ .*
- (b) (Uniqueness of Additive Inverses) *If  $a + b = 0$ , then  $b = -a$ .*
- (c)  $a \cdot 0 = 0$ .
- (d) *If  $a \cdot b = 0$ , then  $a = 0$  or  $b = 0$ .*
- (e)  $-(-a) = a$ .
- (f)  $-a = (-1) \cdot a$ .
- (g) (Multiplicative Cancellation Property) *If  $a \neq 0$  and  $a \cdot b = a \cdot c$ , then  $b = c$ .*
- (h) *The multiplicative identity 1 is an element of  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .*
- (i) *Exactly one of the following is true:*
  - (i)  $a < b$ , or
  - (ii)  $a = b$ , or
  - (iii)  $b < a$ .
- (j) *If  $a < b$ , then  $a + c < b + c$ .*
- (k) *If  $a < b$  and  $0 < c$ , then  $a \cdot c < b \cdot c$ .*

*Proof.* The proofs of these statements are identical to the proofs of the analogous statements for  $\mathbb{Z}$ . See the Integers handout for details.  $\square$

The Multiplicative Inverses axiom guarantees that each non-zero real number has a multiplicative inverse. This is significantly different from the integers, where only 1 and  $-1$  have multiplicative inverses. In the next lemma, we record some basic properties of multiplicative inverses.

**Lemma 2.** *For all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $a \neq 0$  and  $b \neq 0$ , we have the following:*

- (a) (Uniqueness of Multiplicative Inverses) *If  $a \cdot b = 1$ , then  $b = a^{-1}$ .*
- (b)  $(a^{-1})^{-1} = a$
- (c)  $(a \cdot b)^{-1} = a^{-1} \cdot b^{-1}$
- (d)  $(-a)^{-1} = -a^{-1}$
- (e)  $a > 0$  if and only if  $a^{-1} > 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $a \neq 0$  and  $b \neq 0$ .

- (a) Suppose  $a \cdot b = 1$ . We also know that  $a \cdot a^{-1} = 1$ , so  $a \cdot b = a \cdot a^{-1}$ . By the Multiplicative Cancellation Property (Lemma 1(g)), we conclude that  $b = a^{-1}$ .
- (b) By the Multiplicative Inverses axiom (and Commutativity),  $a^{-1} \cdot a = 1$ . Thus, by Uniqueness of Multiplicative Inverses, we have  $a = (a^{-1})^{-1}$ .
- (c) By the Multiplicative Inverses, Commutativity, and Associativity axioms, we have

$$(a \cdot b) \cdot (a^{-1} \cdot b^{-1}) = (a \cdot a^{-1}) \cdot (b \cdot b^{-1}) = 1 \cdot 1 = 1.$$

Therefore, by Uniqueness of Multiplicative Inverses,  $a^{-1} \cdot b^{-1} = (a \cdot b)^{-1}$ .

- (d) Observe that  $(-1) \cdot (-1) = -(-1) = 1$  by Lemma 1 parts (e) and (f). Therefore,  $(-1)^{-1} = -1$  by Uniqueness of Multiplicative Inverses. Thus,

$$(-a)^{-1} = ((-1) \cdot a)^{-1} = (-1)^{-1} \cdot a^{-1} = -a^{-1}$$

by part (c).

- (e) Suppose  $a > 0$ . By the Trichotomy axiom, exactly one of the following possibilities holds true:  $a^{-1} > 0$  or  $a^{-1} = 0$  or  $-a^{-1} > 0$ .

We cannot have  $a^{-1} = 0$ , because this would imply  $1 = a \cdot a^{-1} = a \cdot 0 = 0$  by Lemma 1(c), which contradicts the fact that  $1 \neq 0$  by the Identity axiom.

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $-a^{-1} > 0$ . Then the Positive Closure axiom implies that

$$a \cdot (-a^{-1}) = a \cdot (-1) \cdot a^{-1} = (-1) \cdot (a \cdot a^{-1}) = -1 \cdot 1 = -1$$

is an element of  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ; that is,  $-1 > 0$ . But this contradicts the Trichotomy axiom, because  $1 > 0$  by Lemma 1(h).

Thus, we have shown that  $a^{-1} > 0$  if  $a > 0$ .

Conversely, if  $a^{-1} > 0$ , then we apply the same argument to get that  $(a^{-1})^{-1} > 0$ . But  $(a^{-1})^{-1} = a$  by part (b), and so  $a > 0$ .

□

### 3. DIVISION AND RATIONAL NUMBERS

Unsurprisingly, the real numbers contain the integers.

**Theorem 3.** *Every integer is in  $\mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* By the Trichotomy axiom for  $\mathbb{Z}$ , the integers consist of the natural numbers, 0, and the additive inverses of the natural numbers.

First, we know that  $0 \in \mathbb{R}$  by the Identity axiom.

Next, we show that the natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}$  are contained in  $\mathbb{R}$ . We proceed by induction. As the base case,  $1 \in \mathbb{R}$  by the Identity axiom. Now, let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be a natural number and suppose that  $n \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $n + 1 \in \mathbb{R}$  because the sum of two real numbers is a real number. This completes the inductive proof, showing that every natural number is in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Finally, for each natural number  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , since  $n$  is in  $\mathbb{R}$ , the additive inverse  $-n$  is a real number by the Additive Inverses axiom for  $\mathbb{R}$ . □

By thinking of the integers as living inside the real numbers, we may now divide integers to get “fractions,” or rational numbers.

**Definition.** A real number  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  is a **rational number** if there exist integers  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $b \neq 0$  and  $x = a \cdot b^{-1}$ . We write  $x = \frac{a}{b}$ , and say that  $\frac{a}{b}$  is a **fraction** representing the rational number  $x$ . The **numerator** of  $\frac{a}{b}$  is  $a$  and the **denominator** of  $\frac{a}{b}$  is  $b$ . The set of all rational numbers is denoted  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

**Remark.** Every integer  $n$  is a rational number, because  $n = \frac{n}{1} \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

**Remark.** A rational number may be represented by (infinitely) many fractions. Specifically, we have  $\frac{a}{b} = \frac{c}{d}$  if and only if  $a \cdot b^{-1} = c \cdot d^{-1}$  if and only if  $ad = bc$ .

**Lemma 4.** For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}$ , we have the following:

- (a)  $x + y \in \mathbb{Q}$
- (b)  $x - y \in \mathbb{Q}$
- (c)  $x \cdot y \in \mathbb{Q}$
- (d) If  $y \neq 0$ , then  $x \cdot y^{-1} \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

*Proof.* We prove (a) and leave (b)–(d) as exercises.

Since  $x$  and  $y$  are rational numbers, there exist  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $b \neq 0$ ,  $d \neq 0$ , and  $x = \frac{a}{b}$  and  $y = \frac{c}{d}$ . Then

$$x + y = \frac{a}{b} + \frac{c}{d} = a \cdot b^{-1} + c \cdot d^{-1}.$$

Now, clearing denominators, we see that

$$bd(x + y) = bd(a \cdot b^{-1} + c \cdot d^{-1}) = ad + bc.$$

Multiplying by  $(bd)^{-1}$  on both sides yields

$$x + y = (ad + bc) \cdot (bd)^{-1}.$$

Notice that  $ad + bc$  and  $bd$  are integers, and  $bd \neq 0$  because  $b \neq 0$  and  $d \neq 0$ . Thus, we have shown that  $x + y = \frac{ad+bc}{bd}$  is a rational number.  $\square$

The next lemma shows that we may always write a rational number as a fraction with a positive denominator.

**Lemma 5.** Let  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ . Then there exists  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x = \frac{m}{n}$ .

*Proof.* By definition of rational numbers, there exist  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $b \neq 0$  such that  $x = \frac{a}{b}$ . If  $b > 0$ , then we may set  $m = a$  and  $n = b$  and we are done.

Otherwise,  $b < 0$ . Then  $-b > 0$ . Since  $x = \frac{a}{b} = \frac{-a}{-b}$ , we set  $m = -a$  and  $n = -b$ .  $\square$

We now set out to show that each rational number can be written in lowest terms.

**Definition.** A fraction  $\frac{a}{b}$  is in **lowest terms** if for every  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $d|a$  and  $d|b$ , then  $d = 1$ .

**Example.** The fractions  $\frac{2}{3}$  and  $\frac{10}{15}$  are representations of the same rational number (because cross-multiplying gives  $2 \cdot 15 = 3 \cdot 10$ ). The representation  $\frac{2}{3}$  is in lowest terms, while  $\frac{10}{15}$  is not.

In order to prove that any rational number  $x$  can be represented in lowest terms, we will focus on the denominators that show up in the representations of  $x$  as fractions. The representation in lowest terms will be the fraction with the smallest denominator. The following definition is useful in making this precise.

**Definition.** Let  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ . A **possible positive denominator** for  $x$  is a positive integer  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that there exists  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $x = \frac{m}{n}$ .

**Example.** The rational number  $\frac{2}{3}$  may be represented as  $\frac{4}{6}$ ,  $\frac{6}{9}$ , and  $\frac{10}{15}$  (among infinitely many other fractions). So 3, 6, 9, and 15 are some of the possible positive denominators for this rational number.

**Theorem 6.** Let  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ . There exist  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x = \frac{m}{n}$  and  $\frac{m}{n}$  is in lowest terms.

*Proof.* Let  $S$  be the set of all possible positive denominators of  $x$ . By Lemma 5,  $x$  has at least one possible positive denominator, and so  $S$  is a non-empty subset of  $\mathbb{N}$ . By the Well-Ordering Principle, the set  $S$  has a least element  $n$ . Then there exists  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $x = \frac{m}{n}$ .

We claim that  $\frac{m}{n}$  is in lowest terms. For the sake of contradiction, assume it is not. Then there is some  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $d|m$ ,  $d|n$ , and  $d \neq 1$ . Thus, there exist integers  $k$  and  $\ell$  such that

$$m = dk \quad \text{and} \quad n = d\ell.$$

Therefore,

$$x = \frac{m}{n} = \frac{dk}{d\ell} = \frac{k}{\ell}.$$

Because  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  as well. Moreover, since  $d \neq 1$ , we have  $d > 1$ . Hence,  $\ell < n$ . This shows that  $\ell$  is a possible positive denominator for  $x$  which is smaller than  $n$ , a contradiction.

It follows that  $\frac{m}{n}$  is in lowest terms. □

#### 4. LEAST UPPER BOUNDS

The Least Upper Bound Property is perhaps the most subtle of the axioms for  $\mathbb{R}$ , but it captures the fundamental nature of the real numbers. Indeed, the standard picture of the real numbers as a “continuum” along a number line rests on this axiom. You will learn more about this axiom in a real analysis course. Here, we will only try to give an idea of what it is and how it is used.

Let  $S$  be a subset of the real numbers. A real number  $a$  is called an **upper bound** of  $S$  if  $x \leq a$  for all  $x \in S$ . A real number  $a$  is called a **least upper bound** of  $S$  if  $a$  is an upper bound of  $S$  and for all upper bounds  $b$  of  $S$ ,  $a \leq b$ .

**Lemma 7.** Let  $S$  be a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . The least upper bound of  $S$ , if it exists, is unique.

*Proof.* Suppose  $a$  and  $b$  are both least upper bounds of  $S$ . Then, in particular,  $b$  is an upper bound of  $S$ , so by the fact that  $a$  is a least upper bound we get  $a \leq b$ . Similarly,  $a$  is an upper bound of  $S$ , and so the fact that  $b$  is a least upper bound implies that  $b \leq a$ . Therefore,  $a = b$ . □

The Least Upper Bound Property guarantees that any (non-empty) set of real numbers which has an upper bound has a least upper bound in  $\mathbb{R}$ . As the following example illustrates, the least upper bound of a set may or may not be an element of the set.

**Example.** Let  $S = [0, 1]$  be the set of all real numbers  $x$  satisfying  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ , and let  $T = (0, 1)$  be the set of all real numbers  $x$  satisfying  $0 < x < 1$ . Then  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  is an upper bound for  $S$  if and only if  $a$  is an upper bound for  $T$  if and only if  $a \geq 1$ . The number 1 is the least upper bound of both sets. Notice that  $1 \in S$  but  $1 \notin T$ .

The Least Upper Bound Property is particularly useful for showing that certain real numbers exist. This next example provides a sketch of a proof that  $\sqrt{2}$  exists and is a real number.

**Example.** Let  $S$  be the set of all *rational* numbers  $x$  such that  $x^2 \leq 2$ . Notice that  $1 \in S$ , and so  $S$  is non-empty. We can see also that 2 is an upper bound for  $S$ . Indeed, if  $x > 2$ , then  $x^2 > 4 > 2$ , so  $x \notin S$ . By contrapositive, if  $x \in S$  then  $x \leq 2$ .

Therefore, the Least Upper Bound Property implies that  $S$  has a least upper bound  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . One can show that  $a^2 = 2$ ; that is,  $a = \sqrt{2}$ . (You do this by contradiction: If  $a^2 < 2$ , then  $a$  cannot be an upper bound; if  $a^2 > 2$ , then  $a$  will be an upper bound which is not the least upper bound.)

This shows that  $\sqrt{2} \in \mathbb{R}$ . It turns out (as we will soon prove) that there is no rational number  $a$  such that  $a^2 = 2$ . Thus, this example also shows that  $\mathbb{Q}$  *does not* satisfy the Least Upper Bound Property.