

UiO: University of Oslo

Numbers

Helmer Aslaksen

Dept. of Teacher Education & Dept. of Mathematics University of Oslo

> helmer.aslaksen@gmail.com www.math.nus.edu.sg/aslaksen/

UiO: University of Oslo Natural numbers

- In Let $\mathbb N$ denote the positive, natural numbers $\{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$.
- **P** Remember that positive means > 0 and negative means < 0 , so nonnegative is not the same as positive, but means positive or zero.

$$
\frac{100 \text{ : University of Oslo}}{Why \text{ is } (-1)(-1) = 1?
$$

- \triangleright One way to understand why $(-1)(-1) = 1$, is to say that multiplying by −1 is the same as "flipping" across zero on the number line, in which case, flipping twice does nothing.
- \blacktriangleright However, it is instructive to also see an algebraic proof. Assume that we know how to multiply natural numbers, and that we want to extend this to integers. We want to do this in such a way that the following three properties are preserved.
	- 1. Commutative $ab = ba$
	- 2. Associative $(ab)c = a(bc)$
	- 3. Distributive $a(b + c) = ab + ac$

UiO: University of Oslo Why is $(-1)(-1) = 1$? 2

Assume that $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. We know that

$$
a(-b) = (-b) + (-b) + \cdots + (-b) = -ab \qquad (1)
$$

by repeated addition.

^I To compute (−*a*)*b*, we use commutativity and Equation (1) to get

$$
(-a)b = b(-a) = -ba = -ab.
$$

UiO: University of Oslo Why is $(-1)(-1) = 1?3$

> \triangleright We want to show that $(-1)(-1) = 1$, and to do that, we consider $(-1)(-1) - 1$ and use distributivity

$$
(-1)(-1) - 1 =
$$

\n
$$
(-1)(-1) + (-1) =
$$

\n
$$
(-1)(-1) + (-1) \cdot 1 =
$$

\n
$$
(-1)(-1 + 1) =
$$

\n
$$
(-1) \cdot 0 = 0.
$$

Hence $(-1)(-1) = 1$.

UiO: University of Oslo Division by zero

 \blacktriangleright The key to understanding division and fractions is that

$$
\frac{a}{b}=c \iff a=bc. \tag{2}
$$

This shows why we cannot divide by 0. If $b = 0$, we get

$$
\frac{a}{0}=c \iff a=0 \cdot c=0,
$$

which shows that we get a contradiction if we try to assign a value to $a/0$ when $a \neq 0$.

But what if $a = 0$? In that case, the above equation just says that $0 = 0 \cdot c = 0$, which is true for any *c*. But that is precisely the problem. We could theoretically define $0/0$ to be anything, without violating (2), but which value should we choose? Since we theoretically could pick any value, we say that $0/0$ is an in[de](#page-2-0)terminate form.

UiO: University of Oslo Division by fractions

 \blacktriangleright Many students do not understand why dividing by a fraction is the same as inverting the second fraction and multiplying

$$
\frac{a}{b} : \frac{c}{d} = \frac{a}{b} \frac{d}{c}.
$$
 (3)

To see this, we must show that if multiply the number on the right by the divisor, we get the dividend, i.e.,

$$
\left(\frac{ad}{b\ c}\right)\frac{c}{d}=\frac{a}{b}\left(\frac{d\ c}{c\ d}\right)=\frac{a}{b}.
$$

UiO: University of Oslo Division by fractions 2

Another way to see this is to use complex fractions

$$
\frac{\frac{a}{b}bd}{\frac{c}{d}bd}=\frac{ad}{bc}.
$$

UiO: University of Oslo Division by fractions 3

It is also instructive to consider unit fractions, $1/d$. There are many ways to argue that

$$
a:\frac{1}{d}=ad.
$$

 \blacktriangleright It then follows from associativity that

$$
\left(\frac{a}{b}\right): \frac{c}{d} = \left(\left(\frac{1}{b}a\right): \left(\frac{1}{d}\right)\right): c = \frac{1}{b}(ad): c = \frac{ad}{bc}.
$$

UiO: University of Oslo Powers

Assume that we have defined a^n with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ to be

$$
a^n = \overbrace{a \cdots a}^n. \hspace{1cm} (4)
$$

For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ it is easy to see that we have the following property

$$
a^n a^m = \overbrace{a \cdots a}^n \overbrace{a \cdots a}^m = \overbrace{a \cdots a}^{n+m} = a^{n+m}.
$$
 (5)

► We now want to extend Definition (4) to $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ in way that preserves property (5). In other words, we will assume that (5) holds, and see [w](#page-4-0)hat that implies about a^0 and a^{-n} for $n \in \mathbb{N}.$

UiO: University of Oslo Powers 2

Setting $m = 0$ in (5), we get

$$
a^n=a^{n+0}=a^n\cdot a^0,
$$

so if $a\neq 0$, we can divide by a^n and conclude that $a^0=$ 1. (We will discuss 0^0 later.)

 I We now set $m = -n$ in (5) and get

$$
1 = a^0 = a^{n-n} = a^n a^{-n},
$$

so it follows that

$$
a^{-n}=\frac{1}{a^n}.
$$

 \blacktriangleright We can now check that

$$
\frac{a^n}{a^m}=\frac{a^{n-m}a^m}{a^m}=a^{n-m}
$$

holds for $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

UiO: University of Oslo Powers 3

> An[ot](#page-4-1)her way to understand this, is to interpret a^0 as an "empty" product". The "empty sum" $0 \cdot a$ is the additive identity 0, while the "empty product" a^0 is the multiplicative identity 1.

UiO: University of Oslo Fractional Exponents

 \triangleright Again we want to extend a definition to a larger set of numbers by preserving a property. We know that for $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$
(a^n)^m = \underbrace{a^n \cdots a^n}_{m} = \underbrace{(a \cdots a) \cdots (a \cdots a)}_{m} = \underbrace{a \cdots a}_{m} = a^{n \cdot m}.
$$
 (6)

We want to extend the definition of a^n to $n \in \mathbb{Q}$, while maintaining property (6). To see how to do this, we simply write $x = a^{1/n}$.

 \blacktriangleright Then

$$
x^n = (a^{1/n})^n = a^{\left(\frac{1}{n}n\right)} = a^1 = a
$$

so we see that

$$
a^{1/n}=\sqrt[n]{a}.
$$

 \triangleright Using property (6) again, we get that

$$
a^{m/n}=(a^m)^{\frac{1}{n}}=\sqrt[n]{a^m}.
$$

UiO: University of Oslo $Is 0^0 = 1?$

- ▶ We have seen that for $a \neq 0$ we have $a^0 = 1$, so lim_{a→0} $a^0 = 1$. It therefore seems natural to define $0^0 = 1$. However, for $x > 0$, we have $0^x = 0$ and it follows that $\lim_{x\to 0^+} 0^x = 0$.
- If This shows that the function $f(a, x) = a^x$ does not have a limit at (0, 0) since we get different values depending on how we approach (0, 0). It follows that *f* is not continuous at (0, 0).
- \blacktriangleright That makes it harder to find a good value for 0⁰, but not impos[s](#page-6-0)ible.

 \blacktriangleright We often write a polynomial as

$$
p(x)=\sum_{k=0}^n a_kx^k.
$$

 \blacktriangleright However, then

$$
p(0) = a_0 0^0 + \cdots + a_n 0^n = a_0 0^0,
$$

and we are implicitly assuming that $0^0 = 1$.

UiO: University of Oslo
 $\text{IS } 0^0 = 1?3$

 \blacktriangleright We can also consider a power series like

$$
f(x)=\frac{1}{1-x}=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}x^n.
$$

Then

$$
f(0) = 1 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 0^n = 0^0.
$$

If we do not define 0^0 to be 1, we will have trouble with even simple expressions like this.

Another example is the Binomial Theorem

$$
(a+b)^n=\sum_{k=0}^n\binom{n}{k}a^kb^{n-k}.
$$

Setting $a = 0$ on both sides and assuming $b \neq 0$ we get

$$
b^n = (0+b)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n {n \choose k} 0^k b^{n-k} = {n \choose 0} 0^0 b^n = 0^0 b^n,
$$

where, we have used that $0^k = 0$ for $k > 0$, and that $\binom{n}{0}$ $\binom{n}{0} = 1.$

 \blacktriangleright We see that we must set $0^0 = 1$ in order for the binomial theorem to be valid.

UiO: University of Oslo $Is 0^0 = 1?5$

- Another reason why $0^0 = 1$ is because x^0 is the "empty" product", which should be the multiplicative identigy 1. For the same reason we also get $0! = 1$.
- \blacktriangleright In order for the differentiation rule

$$
\frac{d}{dx}x^n = nx^{n-1}
$$

to hold for $n = 1$ when $x = 0$, we get

$$
1 = \frac{d}{dx}x = \frac{d}{dx}x^1 = 1 \cdot x^{1-1} = x^0,
$$

which requires $0^0 = 1$.

So to sum up, we must write $0^0 = 1$ to make many expressions work.

UiO: University of Oslo Rational numbers

 \triangleright We will study the rational numbers

$$
\mathbb{Q} = \left\{ \left. \frac{a}{b} \right| a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, b \neq 0 \right. \right\}.
$$

We want to show that $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.

 \triangleright We will need the following lemma

Lemma

*A natural number a is even if and only if a*² *is even.*

Proof: If *a* is even we can write $a = 2k$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and then

$$
a^2 = (2k)^2 = 4k^2 = 2(2k^2),
$$

so we see that

a is even
$$
\implies a^2
$$
 is even.

UiO: University of Oslo Rational numbers 2

 \blacktriangleright In order to show

a is even
$$
\leftarrow a^2
$$
 is even,

we will use that

$$
p \implies q \quad \text{is the same as} \quad \neg p \iff \neg q.
$$

 \triangleright So we will show that

a is odd
$$
\implies
$$
 a² is odd.

If $a = 2k + 1$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then

$$
a2 = (2k + 1)2 = 4k2 + 4k + 1 = 2(2k2 + 2k) + 1,
$$

so *a* 2 is odd.

 \Box

UiO: University of Oslo Rational numbers 3

\blacktriangleright Theorem √

2 *is irrational.*

► Proof: We will assume that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational and can be written as *a/b*, where *a*, $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ are relatively prime, i.e., they have no common factors. Then

$$
2 = \frac{a^2}{b^2}
$$
 and $2b^2 = a^2$,

and we see that a^2 is even. But then we know from the above Lemma that *a* is also even, so $a = 2k$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and

$$
a^2 = (2k)^2 = 4k^2 = 2(b^2)
$$
 or $b^2 = 2k^2$.

Since b^2 is even, it follows that *b* is also even. We have now shown that both *a* and *b* are even, but this contradicts the assumption that *a* and *b* are relatively prime.

 \Box

UiO: University of Oslo **Countable**

- \triangleright We say that two sets *X* and *Y* have the same cardinality if there is a bijection $f: X \rightarrow Y$.
- \triangleright We say that X is countably infinite if there is a bijection $f: \mathbb{N} \to X$.
- \triangleright We say that *X* is countable if there is a surjection $f: \mathbb{N} \to X$. This means that we can write the elements of X as a list.
- \triangleright A countable set is either countably infinite or finite.

 \blacktriangleright The set of integers, $\mathbb Z$ is countable, since

$$
\mathbb{Z} = \{0, 1, -1, 2, -2, 3, -3, \ldots\}.
$$

 \blacktriangleright The set of rational numbers, $\mathbb Q$, is countable. This can be seen in many ways.

UiO: University of Oslo Countable 3

Figure 1 The rational numbers a/b correspond to the pair (a, b) , so $\mathbb Q$ corresponds to $\mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\})$.

UiO: University of Oslo Countable 4

- \triangleright This shows that the set of positive rationals is countable. By alternating between positive and negative numbers, we can show that the whole of $\mathbb Q$ is countable.
- \blacktriangleright This picture also shows that a countable union of countable sets is countable.

UiO: University of Oslo Countable 5

 \blacktriangleright

- In 1874, Georg Cantor (1845 -– 1918) proved that $\mathbb R$ is not countable.
- Assume that $\mathbb R$ is countable. Then [0, 1] is also countable, and we can write $[0, 1] = \{r_1, r_2, \ldots\}$ where $r_i = 0.d_{i1}d_{i2} \ldots$

```
r_1 = 0. d_{11} d_{12} d_{13} d_{14} d_{15} \cdotsr_2 = 0. d_{21} d_{22} d_{23} d_{34} d_{25} \cdotsr_3 = 0. d_{31} d_{32} d_{33} d_{34} d_{35} \cdotsr_4 = 0. d_{41} d_{42} d_{43} d_{44} d_{45} \cdotsr_5 = 0. d_{51} d_{52} d_{53} d_{54} d_{55} \cdots÷
```
- \blacktriangleright $r = 0$, d_1 , d_2 , d_3 , d_4 , d_5 , ...
- \blacktriangleright We then construct a number $r = 0.d_1d_2\ldots$, where $d_i \neq d_{ii}$ and $d_i \neq 9$. Then $r \neq r_i$ for all *i*, and *r* is not in the list.