The relation between the field of real numbers and

The field of rational numbers

Proposition 1.1: Every ordered field contains a subfield like the field of rational numbers.

Proof: Let (F, +, .) be any ordered field.

 \therefore 0, 1 \in *F* (0 is additive identity and 1 is multiplicative identity), then we see that

$$\underbrace{1+1+1+\dots+1}_{(n-\text{times})} = n.1 \ (n \in Z^+) \Rightarrow n.1 \neq 0 \ (\text{why?})$$

Thus, if $n. 1 = 0, \forall n \in Z^+$. So, If it is not, *i.e.*, let n. 1 = 0 for some $n \in Z^+$, and let K be the least positive integer such that

$$\underbrace{1+1+1+\dots+1}_{(\mathrm{K-times})} = k.1 = 0$$

Clearly that k > 1 (since 1 > 0) and $(k - 1) \cdot 1 > 0$ (why?)

$$\Rightarrow 0 < (k-1). 1 < k. 1 = 0 \Rightarrow 0 < 0 \Rightarrow C!,$$

thus $n. 1 = 0 \Leftrightarrow n = 0$ $(n \in Z^+).$

From the above remarks we see that F contains elements of kind

$$n.1 = n, (n \in Z^+),$$

×CJ

and

$$n.1=0 \Leftrightarrow n=0$$
 ,

also $n. 1 = m. 1 \Leftrightarrow n = m$.

: F is a field \Rightarrow F contains – *n*. 1 where

$$\underbrace{(-1) + (-1) + (-1) + \dots + (-1)}_{(-1)(n-\text{times})} = -n.1$$

Thus, F contains a copy of Z.

$$: F \text{ is a field} \Rightarrow \forall 0 \neq n \in Z \Rightarrow \frac{1}{n} \in F,$$

therefore *F* contains a copy of Q.

Proposition 1.2: The equation $x^2 = 2$ has no solution in *Q*.

Proof: Assume that $x^2 = 2$ has a solution in *Q*, say *y*

$$\therefore y \in Q \Rightarrow y = \frac{a}{b}, b \neq 0 \ (a, b \in Z) \text{ and } y^2 = 2 \Rightarrow a^2 = 2 \ b^2, \ a^2 > 0$$

Suppose that *a*, *b* is positive number and the greatest common factor between them is 1. Then we have the following cases:

1. *a* and b are odd $\Rightarrow a^2 = 2 b^2 \Rightarrow C!$

2. *a* is odd, b is even. When b is even then b = 2c ($c \in N$)

 $: a^2 = 2 \ b^2 \Rightarrow a^2 = 8 \ c^2 \Rightarrow C!$

- 3. *a* is even, b is odd, then a = 2d ($d \in N$)
- $: a^2 = 2 \ b^2 \Rightarrow 4d^2 = 2 \ b^2 \Rightarrow 2d^2 = b^2 \Rightarrow C!$

From all above we get that $x^2 = 2$ has no solution in the rational number $Q \blacksquare$

Theorem 1.1: The equation $x^2 = 2$ has a unique positive real root.

Proof: Let $S = \{x \in Q | x > 0 \text{ and } x^2 < 2\}$

:: 1 ∈ *S* ⇒ *S* ≠ *φ*, and S is bounded above (since 2,3, ..., is an upper bound of *S*), then by completeness property of *R*, *S* has least upper bound in *R*.

Let $\sup(S) = y_0$, $y_0 \in R$. Clearly that $y_0 > 0$ (by Def. of *S*).

Now, claim that $y_0^2 = 2$, if not (i.e. $y_0^2 \neq 2$), then $y_0^2 < 2$ or $y_0^2 > 2$.

1. If $y_0^2 < 2$, choose *h* s.t 0 < h < 1

$$\therefore (y_0 + h)^2 = y_0^2 + 2y_0h + h^2 = y_0^2 + h(2y_0 + h) < y_0^2 + h(2y_0 + 1)$$

Also, let h satisfy the following condition

$$h < \frac{2 - y_0^2}{2y_0 + 1} \Rightarrow y_0^2 + h(2y_0 + 1) < 2$$
$$\Rightarrow (y_0 + h)^2 < y_0^2 + h(2y_0 + 1) < 2$$

 $: (y_0 + h)^2 < 2, \text{ then } (y_0 + h) \in S, \text{ when } y_0 < y_0 + h \Rightarrow y_0 \text{ is not}$ upper bound of *S* ⇒ *C*! (*y*₀ = sup(S)).

2. If
$$y_0^2 > 2$$
, choose k s.t $0 < k < 1$

$$\therefore (y_0 - k)^2 = y_0^2 - 2y_0k + k^2 = y_0^2 - k(2y_0 - k) > y_0^2 - k(2y_0 + 1)$$

Also, let k satisfy the following condition

$$k > \frac{y_0^2 - 2}{2y_0 + 1} \Rightarrow k(2y_0 + 1) < y_0^2 - 2 \Rightarrow -k(2y_0 + 1) > 2 - y_0^2$$
$$\Rightarrow y_0^2 - k(2y_0 + 1) > 2 \Rightarrow (y_0 + k)^2 > y_0^2 - k(2y_0 + 1) > 2$$

 $\Rightarrow (y_0 - k)^2 > 2$, then $(y_0 - k)$ is an upper bound of *S*, thus $y_0 > y_0 - k$ (because y_0 least upper bound of *S*) $\Rightarrow C! (y_0 - k < y_0)$.

From (1) and (2) $\Rightarrow y_0^2 = 2$.

Here to prove that y_0 is unique. Let $\exists z \in R$ s.t $z \neq y_0$ and $z^2 = 2$

$$\therefore z \neq y_0$$
, then either $z > y_0 \Rightarrow 2 = z^2 > y_0^2 = 2 \Rightarrow 2 > 2 \Rightarrow C!$

or
$$z < y_0 \Rightarrow 2 = z^2 < y_0^2 = 2 \Rightarrow 2 < 2 \Rightarrow C!$$

Thus $z = y_0$ and y_0 is the only one positive real root to $x^2 = 2$

Remark:

- From above Q is a proper subfield of R (i.e.Q ⊊ R) because√2 ∈
 R, but √2 ∉ Q.
- 2. *Q* is not complete, because $S = \{x \in Q | x > 0 \text{ and } x^2 < 2\} \subset Q, S \neq \varphi \ (1 \in S)$

S is bounded above and sup(*S*) = $\sqrt{2} \notin Q$, then *S* has no least upper bound in *Q*, thus *Q* is not complete field.

 \mathbb{Q}_2 : prove that $x^2 = 3$ has no solution in Q. (Check) \mathbb{Q}_3 : prove that $x^2 = 3$ has a unique positive real root. (Check)

Theorem 1.2: For any positive real number *a* and for any $n \in Z^+, \exists !$ positive real number satisfies the following $x^n = a$ and denoted this unique number by $\sqrt[n]{a}$ (or $a^{1/n}$).

Proof: The proof is similar to proof of (Theorem 1.1).

 \mathbb{Q}_4 : Let a, b be tow positive real numbers and $n \in Z^+$ prove that $(a, b)^{\frac{1}{2}} = a^{\frac{1}{2}} b^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (Check)

Theorem 1.3: (Archimedes property)

For any real numbers a, b and a > 0, there is a positive integer number n s.t na > b.

For any real numbers a, b and a > 0, there is a positive integer number n s.t na > b.

Let any real numbers a, b ann if there is a positive integer number n such that $na \le b$, then, a < 0

and a > 0, there is a positive integer number n s.t na > b.

Proof: Let $S = \{ak | k \in N\} \subset R, S \neq \varphi$ (becauce 1. $a = a \in S$)

∴ by completeness of *R*, *S* has least upper bound. Let $y = \sup(S)$, ($y \in R$)

 $\therefore a > 0 \Rightarrow y - a < y \Rightarrow y - a \text{ is not upper bound of } S. \text{ Hence, } \exists$ element $ma \in S$ (for some $m > 0, m \in Z^+$) s.t $y - a < ma \Rightarrow ma + a > y \Rightarrow (m + 1)a > y$

But, $(m + 1)a \in S$, $(m + 1 \in N) \Rightarrow C!$, because y is an upper bound of S. Then na > b

Corollary 1.1: For any positive real number ϵ , there is a positive integer n such that $\frac{1}{n} < \epsilon$. (i. e.) $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists n \in N \text{ s.t } \frac{1}{n} < \epsilon$.

Proof: Take b = 1 and $a = \epsilon$, then by (Theorem 1.3), we get that $\frac{1}{n} < \epsilon$.

Density of Rational Numbers

Theorem 1.4: If $a, b \in R$ such that a < b, then there exists $r \in Q$ such that a < r < b.

Or ((Between any two real numbers there is at least one rational number)).

Proof:

Case 1: Let 0 < a < b, and b - a > 1.

and

Let $S = \{n \in N | n = n, 1 > a\}$

 $\therefore S \neq \varphi$ (by Archimedes property) (How?)

,d Marsor

Let *k* be the smallest positive integer in S [:: $\varphi \neq S \subset N$ and *N* is wellordered set, then by (Def. 1.6) *S* has a smallest element]

$$\Rightarrow \frac{k-1 \le a < k}{b-a > 1} \} \Rightarrow a < k < b (How?)$$

In this case k is the rational number between a and b (k is an integer number).

Now, if

$$0 < a < b$$
, and $0 < b - a < 1$.

when (b - a) > 0, then by (Archimedes property), $\exists n \in N$ s.t n(b - a) = nb - na > 1

:. From case (1), $\exists k \in N$ s.t $na < k < nb \Rightarrow a < \frac{k}{n} < b$ and hence $\frac{k}{n}$ is rational number.

Case 2: a < 0 < b, in this case 0 is the rational number between a, b.

Case 3: $a < b < 0 \Rightarrow 0 < -b < -a$

By case (1), $\exists k \in Q \text{ s. } t - b < r < -a \Rightarrow a < -r < b. \blacksquare$

Corollary 1.2: Let a < b, prove that there exists infinitely many of rational numbers between a, b.

Proof: (check).