

## Construction of the Real Number System

Reema Agarwal<sup>1</sup>, Mahesh Kumar<sup>2</sup>

1(Department of Mathematics, Lady Shri Ram College For Women, University of Delhi, India)

2(Department of Mathematics, Lady Shri Ram College For Women, University of Delhi, India)

**Abstract:** In this paper it will be shown that  $\mathbb{R}$  is the only complete Archimedean ordered field. The two approaches to completeness for Archimedean ordered field are given and then it is concluded that they are equivalent.

**Keywords:** Complete Archimedean ordered field, right end point, open lower segment.

### I. Defect In Rationals

Although it has been noticed that the set of rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$  forms a rich algebraic system having order properties, it is inadequate for the purpose of analysis. It has already been noticed that not every positive rational number has a rational square root. For example, there is no rational number whose square is 2. The defect in the rationals that has been described here may be described in a variety of ways. One form of the defect that has already been noticed is that a nonempty subset of rational numbers that is bounded above need not have a least upper bound (in the set of rationals). A slightly less standard approach which is more picturesque is that there are open lower segments in  $\mathbb{Q}$  without having right endpoints in  $\mathbb{Q}$ , and this is considered to be a defect. For this purpose, the notion of an open lower segment in the set of rationals is defined.

Definition 1: A set  $J \subset \mathbb{Q}$  is called an open lower segment if

- 1)  $J \neq \emptyset$
- 2)  $J \neq \mathbb{Q}$
- 3) For every  $x \in J$ , there is a  $y \in J$  such that  $y > x$ ,
- 4) If  $x \in J$  and  $y < x$  then  $y \in J$ .

A point  $x$  will be called the right endpoint of an open lower segment  $J$  if

- 1) for every  $y \in J$ ,  $x > y$ ,
- 2) if  $z$  is such that for every  $y \in J$ ,  $z > y$ , then  $z \geq x$ .

For example, consider  $J \subset \mathbb{Q}$  to be the set of all non-positive rational numbers, together with the positive rational numbers whose square is less than 2. Then  $J$  is an open lower segment of  $\mathbb{Q}$  having no right endpoint in  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Note: If a right endpoint of  $J$  exists, it is unique, and it is the smallest rational greater than every element of  $J$ .

### II. The Real Numbers

The set of real numbers is an extension of the set of rational numbers, which removes the defect described above. It will be seen that the real numbers are an Archimedean ordered field in which every open lower segment has a right end point. The real numbers are obtained from the rationals by what may be described as filling the gaps. In other words, the right endpoints are added as ideal elements, or new numbers, to correspond to those open lower segments which do not have right endpoints among the rationals.

One way of doing this is to consider the open lower segment itself to be a substitute for its own right endpoint. One can see that this is an entirely natural approach when one agrees that open lower segments are to be in one-to-one correspondence with their right endpoints.

In accordance with the above, the set  $\mathbb{R}$  of real numbers is defined to be the set of open lower segments of rational numbers.

First addition is defined in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Let  $I$  and  $J$  be real numbers i.e., open lower segments of rational numbers. Define  $I + J$  as

$$I + J = \{x + y : x \in I, y \in J\}$$

Then  $I + J$  is an open lower segment. Let  $x \in I$  and  $y \in J$ , so that  $x + y \in I + J$ , and let  $u < x + y$ . Then we can write  $u = x + z$ , where  $x \in I$  and  $z (= u - x) < y$ , so that  $z \in J$ . So,  $x + z > x + y$  and  $x + z \in I + J$ . Now, it follows that  $I + J$  is an open lower segment. Also



$u < x \Rightarrow u \in U$  which is a contradiction). Thus,  $u$  is an upper bound of  $S$ .

Let  $y < u$ . Then  $y \in U$  since  $U$  is an open lower segment and  $u$  is its right endpoint. So there is an  $x$  in  $S$  with  $y < x$ . Thus,  $y$  is not an upper bound of  $S$ . Hence  $u = \sup S$ .

Thus, it is actually the property of Theorem 1 that is being used to obtain all further properties of the real numbers. Thus, the fact that  $\mathbb{R}$  is a complete Archimedean ordered field is basic to all further developments.

The Theorem 3 below shows that  $\mathbb{R}$  is the only complete Archimedean ordered field.

**Theorem 3:** Any two complete Archimedean ordered fields  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , with set of positive elements  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively, are algebraically and order isomorphic, i.e., there exists a one-to-one mapping  $\tau$  of  $F_1$  onto  $F_2$  such that

$$\tau(x + y) = \tau(x) + \tau(y), \tau(xy) = \tau(x)\tau(y), \tau(x) \in P_2 \text{ iff } x \in P_1.$$

**Proof:** Let  $1_1$  and  $1_2$  be the units of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  and  $0_1$  and  $0_2$  the zeros. Note that every ordered field contains an isomorph of  $\mathbb{Q}$ . So we define the mapping  $\tau$  first on the rational elements of  $F_1$  as follows.

$$\tau\left(\frac{m}{n} 1_1\right) = \frac{m}{n} 1_2$$

where  $m$  is an integer,  $n$  is a non-zero integer

If  $x \in F_1$  and  $x$  is not of the form  $\frac{m}{n} 1_1$  then define

$$\tau(x) = \sup\left\{\frac{m}{n} 1_2 : \frac{m}{n} 1_1 < x\right\}$$

One can prove that  $\tau$  has the desired properties.

Now another construction of the real numbers system is given in which a real number is defined as an equivalence class of Cauchy sequences of rational numbers.

**Definition 2 :** Let  $F$  be an ordered field. A sequence  $(a_n)$  of elements of  $F$  is called bounded if there is an element  $b \in F$  such that  $|a_n| \leq b$  for each positive integer  $n$ .

**Definition 3:** A sequence  $(a_n)$  of elements of  $F$  is called Cauchy iff for every  $\epsilon \in F$  such that  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a positive integer  $N$  such that  $|a_p - a_q| < \epsilon$  for all  $p, q \geq N$ .

**Definition 4:** A sequence  $(a_n)$  of elements of  $F$  is called null iff for every  $\epsilon \in F$  such that  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a positive integer  $N$  such that  $|a_p| < \epsilon$  for all  $p \geq N$ .

The families of sequences satisfying these conditions will be denoted by  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  respectively.

Now few theorems and lemmas (without proofs) are stated before stating the two important results which concern them in the theme of this paper. The details of the proofs can be found in [3].

**Theorem 4:** The inclusions  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}$  is obtained.

**Theorem 5:** For  $(a_n), (b_n) \in \mathcal{C}$ , let  $(a_n) + (b_n) = (a_n + b_n)$  and  $(a_n)(b_n) = (a_n b_n)$ . With these definitions of sum and product,  $\mathcal{C}$  is a commutative ring with unity, and  $\mathcal{N}$  is an ideal in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{N} \subsetneq \mathcal{C}$ .

**Theorem 6:** Let  $\mathcal{C} / \mathcal{N}$  denote the set whose elements are the set  $(a_n) + \mathcal{N}$  (called cosets of  $\mathcal{N}$ ), where  $(a_n) \in \mathcal{C}$ . Addition and multiplication in  $\mathcal{C} / \mathcal{N}$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} ((a_n) + \mathcal{N}) + ((b_n) + \mathcal{N}) &= (a_n) + (b_n) + \mathcal{N} = (a_n + b_n) + \mathcal{N} \text{ and} \\ ((a_n) + \mathcal{N})((b_n) + \mathcal{N}) &= (a_n)(b_n) + \mathcal{N} = (a_n b_n) + \mathcal{N} \end{aligned}$$

These definitions are unambiguous, and with addition and multiplication so defined,  $\mathcal{C} / \mathcal{N}$  is a field.

Notation: The field  $\mathcal{C} / \mathcal{N}$  will be written as  $\bar{F}$ . Henceforth elements  $(a_n) + \mathcal{N}$  of  $\mathcal{C} / \mathcal{N}$  will be denoted by small greek letters:  $\alpha, \beta, \dots$ . If  $a \in F$  then the element  $(a_n) + \mathcal{N}$  of  $\bar{F}$  will be written as  $\bar{a}$ ; it is the coset of  $\mathcal{N}$  containing the constant sequence all of whose terms are  $a$ .

Theorem 7: In  $\bar{F}$ , let  $\bar{P} = \{\alpha \in \bar{F} : \alpha \neq \bar{0} \text{ and there exists } (a_n) \in \alpha \text{ such that } a_n > 0 \text{ for } n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ . With this set  $\bar{P}$ ,  $\bar{F}$  is an ordered field. The mapping  $\tau: \tau(a) = \bar{a}$  is an order preserving algebraic isomorphism of  $F$  into  $\bar{F}$ .

Definition 5: Given a sequence  $a_n$  in an ordered field  $F$  and  $b \in F$ , it is said that limit of  $a_n$  is  $b$  and we write  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = b$  or  $a_n \rightarrow b$  if for every positive  $e$  in  $F$  there exists a positive integer  $L$  such that  $|a_n - b| < e$  for all  $n \geq L$ . An ordered field is said to be complete (in the sense of Cantor) if every Cauchy sequence in  $F$  has a limit in  $F$ .

Lemma 1: A sequence with a limit is a Cauchy sequence. If  $(a_n)$  is a Cauchy sequence and  $(a_{n_k})$  is a subsequence with limit  $b$ , then  $(a_n)$  has limit  $b$ .

Lemma 2: For  $\alpha > 0, \alpha \in \bar{F}$ , there exists  $e \in F$  such that  $\bar{0} < \bar{e} < \alpha$ . If  $F$  is Archimedean ordered, then  $\bar{F}$  is also Archimedean ordered.

Lemma 3: Let  $\alpha \in \bar{F}$  and  $(a_n) \in \alpha$ . Then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{a}_n = \alpha$ .

Now the two important results mentioned above are stated.

Theorem 8: The field  $\bar{F}$  is complete (in the sense of Cantor).

The following Theorem 9 below shows that a complete Archimedean ordered field (complete in the sense of Cantor) is also complete Archimedean ordered field (complete in the sense of Dedekind).

Theorem 9: Let  $F$  be a complete Archimedean ordered field (complete in the sense of Cantor), and let  $A$  be a nonempty subset of  $F$  that is bounded above. Then  $\sup A$  exists.

Note: Theorem 3 above also holds for complete Archimedean ordered fields (complete in the sense of Cantor). So, we have the following definition:

Definition 6: The real number field  $\mathbb{R}$  is any complete ordered field. For example,  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ .

### III. Conclusion:

We see that the two approaches to completeness for Archimedean ordered fields are equivalent. So, for the reals it is entirely a matter of choice which approach one prefers. However, there are situations in which the Cauchy sequence approach is the only one possible. For example, in the field of complex numbers  $\mathbb{C}$  which is not ordered (as  $i \neq 0$  but  $i^2 = -1 < 0$ ) Theorem 8 which is another version of the completeness property for fields does not require the order relation,  $<$ . It is a useful axiom to consider for other fields other than ordered fields. All that is required is the distance function  $d(x, y)$  to have meaning in that field.

### Reference

**Books:**

- [1] Casper Goffman, Introduction to Real Analysis
- [2] W. Rudin, Principle of Mathematical Induction
- [3] Hewitt and Stromberg, Real and Abstract Analysis
- [4] N.L. Carothers, Real Analysis