

## Archimedean Property of Real Numbers

Theorem → "If  $x$  and  $y$  are any two positive real numbers with  $y < x$ , then there exists a positive integer 'n' such that  $ny > x$ "

Proof → Let if possible  $ny \leq x \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$  then ~~then~~ the set  $S = \{ny : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is non-empty and bounded above by  $x$ .

By the completeness property in  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\sup S$  exists in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let it be  $\alpha$ .

Now, we have  $ny \leq x \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$   
 $\Rightarrow (n+1)y \leq x \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$   
 $\Rightarrow ny \leq x - y \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$   
 $\Rightarrow (\alpha - y)$  is an upper bound of  $S$   
and  $(\alpha - y) < \alpha$

But it is contrary to the fact that  $\alpha$  is the  $\sup S$ .

Therefore, our assumption that  $ny \leq x \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$  is wrong.

Hence,  $ny > x \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$

Proved

Theorem If  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $\exists$  a rational number 'n' such that  $x < n$ .

Proof  $\rightarrow$  We suppose that if possible that  $x \geq n$

$$\Rightarrow n \leq x \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

$\Rightarrow$  The set  $\mathbb{N}$  is bounded above

By Completeness Property of real numbers the set  $\mathbb{N}$  must have supremum say 'u'.

$$\text{Sup } \mathbb{N} = u$$

$$u-1 < u$$

Therefore,  $(u-1)$  is not an upper bound of  $\mathbb{N}$

$\Rightarrow \exists$  at least one element 'm' such that

$$m > u-1$$

$$\Rightarrow m+1 > u$$

$$\text{Now, } m \in \mathbb{N} \Rightarrow (m+1) \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\text{Thus, } (m+1) > u \quad \forall (m+1) \in \mathbb{N}$$

This inequality contradicts the fact that  $u$  is the Sup  $\mathbb{N}$ .

Hence, our assumption is wrong.

Therefore,  $\exists$  at least one natural number 'n' such that  $x < n$

— Proved

Theorem For any real number ' $x$ ', there exist two integers  $m$  and  $n$  such that  $m < x < n$ .

Proof  $\rightarrow$  By previous result, we have  $x < n$  — (1)

Further,  $-x$  is also a real number  
 $\exists$  a +ve integer  $p > -x$  i.e.  $-p < x$

Putting  $-p = m$ , we have  $m < x$  — (2)

On combining eq. (1) & (2), we get  $\rightarrow$   
 $m < x < n \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$